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DEDICATION

This study is a tribute to Sāoluafata’s Teine past and present who carried the village across more than six hundred years, especially my ninety-year old mother and mentor, Tōfā ‘Aumua Mata’itusi, and my late Aunt Sipi, Tōfā Nu’ualiu Avina, whom I sorely miss in this lifetime. It is also dedicated to my daughters Elisapeta, Koroseta, Celeste, and Alae, and granddaughters Shanelle, Kaylee, Magdalene Luafata, and Madilyn Grace who will one day understand my passion for doing this historiography.
A WORD ABOUT SAMOAN ORTHOGRAPHY

The Samoan language consists of five vowels \textit{a}, \textit{e}, \textit{i}, \textit{o}, and \textit{u} with phonemic variations in length represented by a macron over the vowel. There are 12 consonants corresponding to the English letters \textit{f, g, h, k, l, m, n, p, r, s, t, and v}. A thirteenth consonant, the glottal stop, is represented by an inverted comma ‘ (an apostrophe is often substituted in modern texts and is certainly the case in this dissertation). The macron and glottal stop symbols are often referred to as “diacritical markings” and many Samoan speakers prefer to omit them from the written form of the language unless they are needed to clarify the meaning of a word that is not clear through context. Thus the word \textit{aua}, can actually be pronounced as ‘\textit{aua}, don’t, ‘\textit{auā}, because, or \textit{aua}, a small mullet, and may appear in a written sentence without diacritics: for instance, 1) \textit{Aua le pisa}, don’t make noise, or 2) \textit{Ou te siva aua ua ou fiafia}, I dance because I am happy. This is problematic for non-Samoan speakers since mispronunciation may alter the intended meanings or understanding of the message. To avoid such a problem, I have selected to use the diacritics for the long vowel and the glottal stop.

In this study, common Samoan terms are italicized and are immediately followed by unitalicized translations, for example, \textit{teine}, girl. Anglicized Samoan words are not italicized, for example, \underline{Samoan} \textit{teine}, American Samoa, not American Sāmoa; Simanu-Klutz, not \underline{Simanu-Klutz}. Samoan names and terms in the citations appear as the authors have intended. Finally, names of titles, people, and places are not italicized. For easier reading, two glossaries are available in the order of the English alphabet before the bibliography: one for the common terms and one for the titles, people, and places. The noun \textit{teine}, however, is capitalized (\textit{Teine}) for Sāoluafata’s girls who insist on being addressed as such, and not \textit{tama’ita’i}. The latter is the social construction for all females in Sāmoa.
Many of the key informants are chiefs who should be addressed by their titles. In compliance with cultural etiquette, it is more respectful to identify the chiefs by their titles, not their last names. Thus, Aiono Dr. Fanaafi Le Tagaloa is addressed in the text as Aiono instead of Le Tagaloa, although in the footnotes and bibliography, I use the latter to be consistent with academic protocol; the same is true for ‘Aumua, who is listed as Simanu; however, I use the title Tui Ātua instead of Tamasese for the Head of State in both text and citations.
ABSTRACT

Samoa’s women have been studied in specific albeit rare moments in time by anthropologists in the late nineteenth and the twentieth centuries, but never as historical agents of a society which they have helped shape and sustain in a variety of ways for hundreds of years. This dissertation is an attempt to fill that void by examining the power of the Samoan woman—her pule, authority, mālosi, economic strength, and mamalu, social power—through the story of a unique political entity identified here as the Nu’u o Teine of Sāoluafata, the governing council of women in one of my ancestral villages on the northeastern side of the island of ‘Upolu. This dissertation is concerned with a genealogy of the origins of the chiefly titles in both the Nu’u o Teine and Nu’u o Ali’i, the council of (male) chiefs. It traces the evolution of the teine’s power since its founding in the mid-1300s through more contemporary times, and identifies the historical benefits and challenges of being both feagaiga, in sacred covenant with their brothers, and as suli, heirs to chiefly titles and lands. The rediscovery of this power is particularly critical at a time when globalization and international initiatives promoting women and human rights are affecting personal and cultural identities, as well as local customs and traditions. In this manner, the Nu’u o Teine of Sāoluafata serves as an analytical tool with which to view the changes and continuities in the Samoan women’s sources and mechanisms of power.

Specifically, questions on how these sources and tools of power have been utilized, subjugated, colonized, or manipulated are examined as the teine mediated their way through three distinct periods of time—the Vavau, Samoa’s past before Western contact (1300s-1700s), Faigafa’apapalagi (1722-1962), the ways of the white people, and Faigafa’aonapoei 1962-1998), the ways of today. Though unique in its political beginnings and structure, the Nu’u o Teine is a tool with which to historicize the political, social, economic, and cultural dimensions
of the feagaiga, and the shift by degree from a relationship of complimentarity to one of symmetry as Samoan women reassert their rights to lands and titles which they had historically deferred to their brothers.

Given the scarcity of archival and secondary sources on Sāoluafata’s past in particular and Samoan women’s history in general, this study relies on oral traditions and the ethnologies of nineteenth century government officials. Moreover, in line with David Hanlon’s suggestions of what Pacific islands history might look like, this study has made a conscious effort to view the past through the eyes of the current members of the Nu’u o Teine, and through a critical examination of what Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Efi deems as “indigenous references.” This study is a su’ifefiloi, a medley, of versions made possible by a triangulation of oral, archival, and ethnographic texts and contexts.
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Lāuga o le Feiloa’iga, Opening Oratory as Decorum

‘Ole’ā saveiololo le seuga ‘aua ua malu maunu le fogātia, ina ne’i iai se manu e olo, ‘ona vailupesa ‘ā lea o le seuga, ‘ae lē vailupemaua. Ua ‘atoo tupe o le faafoa, ua ‘atoo fo’i moli i le futiafu e tasi i leaniu tēaoa fesilafa’i, ‘aua o lupe o mafaufauga sa vao ‘ese’ese, ‘a o leaniu ua ēfaga i luma o nu’u, ‘ae le o tua o nu’u. Ua tatou fetaia’i la i magafetau soifia i le pule fa’asosoa a le Atua. Tulou!

‘Oute mua’i fa’atulou atu i le pa’ia o le komiti mamalu o leaniu tusi; i le susuga a le ta’ita’i komiti, Polōfesa David Hanlon, fa’apea sui mai vaega ‘ese’ese o le Matāgaluega o Tala Fa’asolopito i le Iunivesite o Hawai’i—lau susuga Polōfesa David Chappell, Polōfesa Leonard Andaya, ma Polōfesa Jerry Bently. O pa’ia fo’i ia o ali’i polōfesa mai matāgaluega o le Anthropology, Polōfesa Geoffrey M. White, ‘ae mai se le ta’ita’i o le Gagana Sāmoa ma matā’upu tau Gagana a le Indo-Pacific Languages and Literatures, Susuga Lāsei Fepulea’i Dr. John Mayer, o pa’ia lava ia o le Fale Manono ma ‘upu i le ‘Āiga i le Tai.

Tulouna le pa’ia o le ‘aufaigaluega a le Atua, ‘ae mai se i latou ‘olo’o tapua’ia leaniu taumafaiaga. O a tou tatalo ua taumu’u ai i le manuia leaniu fa’amoemoe, ‘ae le o le fa’anoanoa. Fa’afetai mo ā ‘outou talosaga.

E fa’atulou atu i le ‘Oe, Sāoluafata, na fa’alagilagi i le Tu-i-Atua ma Atuafaigā. I le aflipfo i Teu’ialilo ma Tululautū, ma lo lua Nu’u Pa’iia: i mamalu o Tofiga, Alo o le Taofia ma le Uso, ae mai se le Matua le Foutanu. Ma’opū ma le Foulau, ma ‘Oe Sālelesi.

‘E fa’atulou atu fo’i ia le ‘Oe, Sāoluafata, na fa’alagilagi i le Tu-i-Atua ma Atuafaigā. I le aflipfo i Teu’ialilo ma Tululautū, ma lo lua Nu’u Pa’iia: i mamalu o Tofiga, Alo o le Taofia ma le Uso, ae mai se le Matua le Foutanu. Ma’opū ma le Foulau, ma ‘Oe Sālelesi.

Tulouna fo’i le fa’asausauga a Tutuila ma Manu’a, i Fa’atui ma le Motu: Sua ma le Vaifanua, Fofō ma Aitilagi, Sā ‘ole ma Sale’a’aumua, Itū’au ma Ālataua, fa’apea Ma’opū ma le

---

1 Oratory or lāuga is required when chiefs gather to deliberate village or national affairs. The reading of this event meets the standard for which this oratory is presented after all, academic and traditional chiefs are its primary audience. For explications and “how to” of lāuga, see Maulolo Leaula T. Uelese Amosa, Fausaga o Lauga Sāmoa: Vaega I (Auckland: Oceania Printers Limited, 1999), Tatupu Fa’afetai Tu’i Mata’a’afa, Lāuga: Sāmoan Oratory (Suva: University of the South Pacific and Apia: National University of Sāmoa, 1987), and ‘Aumua Mataitusi Simanu, O Sī Manu a Ali’i: A Text for the Advanced Study of Sāmoan Language and Culture (Auckland: Pasifika Press, 2002).

2 These are the honorifics for the founders of Sāoluafata, Luafatā’alae and Taeolalopu’a.
Itū‘aumalosi, ‘ae tainane le mamalu ia te ‘Oe, le Manu’atele. Ua tini pā‘ō le uto ‘aūa lo tou afifio i o tou fala si ‘isi‘i, i le laumua i Mānoa, ‘ae maise i le fa’amalumaluga a tagatānu‘u o Hawai‘i ma le mamalu o itūa ‘iga ‘ese‘ese o le Setete o Hawai‘i. Tulou!

Ia vi‘ia le Atua ma lana pule fa’asoaao ua fa’atumauina ai lou tou sofua lelei ma le lagi e mamā, ua taunu‘u manuia ai fuafuaga o lenei aso sa fauao, faupō, ‘a‘o lenei ua fa’ai‘uina i le finagalo o o tatou tua‘à ma le tamā o i le lagi.

O le tāeao nei ua tatou fesilafa‘i ai i pu’e e manū ‘ae le o pu’e o mala. E manatua ai tāeao tu‘u e ono o le atunu‘u: o tāeao o le toto masa‘a e pei o le tāeao na i Saau; o le tāeao na i Samanā, ma le Aso na i Gamō. O tāeao ia o le ta‘a sauali‘i o Sāmoa, ‘ae o lenei ua tatou i lenei vaitau o le mālāmalama, ‘ona o tāeao o le Tala Lelei, na ea ai le pologa o Sāmoa mai taua ma fevaevaeva‘iga. O le tāeao na i Matāniu Feagai ma le Ata o le LMS, o le tāeao na i Fale’ai ‘i le Ekaesia Metotisi, fa‘apea ma le tāeao na i Mālaoa ma Gafoaga o le Lotu Katoliko.

E ui la i ia tāeao, ‘a ‘o le tāeao e fa‘asino tonu i lenei tuituiti, o le tāeao lea na i Evaloa, o Sā ma Faigā e fa‘asino i le tama‘ita‘i o Luafata‘alae, ma le Nu‘u Pa‘ia o teine o Sāoluafata, ‘oute tautala au‘ili‘ili iai i vaega ‘ese‘ese o lenei tusi.

‘A‘o le ‘autū o lenei aso ma lenei matā‘upu, o faigānu‘u a Teine o Sāoluafata fa‘apea fo‘i ma Sāmoa ‘atoa, i ona vaevaega fa‘apitoliki, fa‘atamāo ‘aiga, ma le fa‘aleagaga. O le agaga o lenei su ‘esu‘ega, e le o se taulagalaga a le ātualoa--se‘i tulou--i ‘upu ua popo a le nū‘u ma le atunu‘u, ‘ae o le fia mālāmalama i measina ua tau mou atu a Sāmoa ona o le lalolagi ua filogia i tu ma aganu‘u ‘ese‘ese mai fafo. Tulou. E lē gata i lea, ‘a‘o le fia mālāmalama i tala tu‘umumu mai ma tala fa‘asolopito o Sāmoa ‘aūa le fa‘amausalā‘ina o fa‘asinomaga a le Sāmoa moni i lona alaalafaga ma lona atunu‘u. E pei ‘ona saunoa le Afioaga a le L’aau na Fausia, le tama‘ita‘i polōfesa o Aiono Dr. Fanaafi Maiai Le Tagaloa, a silafia e le tagata lona lava fa‘asinomaga, e le tau fesiligia po‘o ai ia. E lē gata ai ina malu o ia i fafe, ‘ae fa‘apea fo‘i ona malu ai i fafo.

‘Ona alu, alu lea o sa mātou fa‘amatalaga, ona ‘ou fa‘apea ai lea, Sāmoa e, o i tatou o se atunu‘u e tala lasi. E leai se faiva e lē ‘asa ma le maumau. Āfai e iai se tala ua saisi i lau fa‘afogaga‘aga, ia mālū i vai o tou finagalo. O se galuega sa vilivili fa‘amanu o matagi, ‘ae o lenei ua mā‘a i le alofa o le Atua. Talosia ia avea o se fa‘apuapatē lē gase i mafauauga o tagata, ‘ae o se matagi e logo lelei i tino, o se māsina e alu pea ma sau, ma o se ta‘iala i musumuuga a tua‘ā mo alo ma fanau a ‘oga a le lalolagi.

‘Ā ta‘ape le fili ali‘i i le fa‘a‘i‘uga o lenei tusi, ia tatou māvae i ‘upu o le Falepunaoa: “O manū ta te tete‘a ai, o manū fo‘i ta te toe feiloa‘i ai.” Ia fa‘afualoa lo tou sofua i le finagalo o le Atua, ae ola le tusitala.

Soifua,

Loau Manumaua Luafata Simanu-Klut
Suli o Teu‘ialilo ma Tululautū
Samoan Philosophy of History in Oral Tradition: An Indigenous Reference

The Samoan way of remembering events of proportional significance is a recitation of its tāeao. Made of two small words tae (no macron needed) and ao, (they both mean to gather or collect, but have different meanings as nouns such that tae also means “faeces” while ao refers either to clouds or as the respect form of one’s “head;”) tāeao also means “morning,” or “tomorrow” and as events, they are transported across generations through Samoa’s system of lāuga, oratory, performed only by the failāuga, orators, whenever matai, chiefs, meet. They are remembrances of heroic acts by individuals or a group of people from which they derive a certain degree of power. For instance, a person became a paramount chief because of a powerful act in the past, not unlike those of their counterparts in other societies, and they were usually acts of war, gaming expeditions, or the courting of the village virgin for marriage.

Six hundred years ago (circa 1350-1400 C.E.), a certain tāeao was in the making, one which was founded on the tears of a mother and daughter of whom my daughter ‘Alae and I are namesakes. This dissertation then is a tribute to the tāeao of Luafatā’alae and her daughter,

---


4 This dissertation joins the search for an indigenous reference advocated by Tui Ātua Tui Atua Tamasese Ta’isi Efi, (henceforth identified as Tui Ātua), the Honorable Head of State of the independent nation of Sāmoa and eminent philosopher and scholar. I am fortunate that the development of this dissertation coincided with the timely release of Tui Ātua’s “search for indigenous references.” This text is instructive, confirming, and a gift of love for Samoans of all ages. See Tui Ātua Tupua Tamasese Ta’isi Efi, in Su’esu’e Manogi: In Search of Fragrance and the Samoan Indigenous Reference, ed. Tamasa’i’lau Suaalii-Sauni et al. (Lepapaigalagala: The Centre for Samoan Studies, National University of Samoa, 2009) [hereafter cited as Tui Ātua, in Su’esu’e Manogi, 2009.].

5 For a theoretical discourse on Samoa’s tāeao, mornings, see Jocelyn Linnekin, “‘Mornings of the Country’: Centering the Nation in Samoan Historical Discourse,” in Narratives of Nation in the South Pacific, ed. Ton Otto and Nicholas Thomas, (Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1997), 189-211.

6 I used Augustin Krämer’s and Asofou So’o’s formulae to approximate the pre-literate dates in this dissertation. For details, see Augustin Krämer, The Samoa Islands: An Outline of a Monograph with Particular Consideration of German Samoa, Volume 1, trans. Dr. Theodore Verhaarren, (Auckland: Polynesian Press, 1994), 643, and Asofou So’o, Democracy and Custom in Samoa: An Uneasy Alliance (Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, USP, 2008), 205-7. Krämer decided on 30 as the number of years per generation while So’o opted for a “conservative” 25.
Taeolalo’u’a, the founders of the *Nu’u Pa’ia*, sacred village, the *Nu’u o Teine*, of Sāoluafata, and whom I honor in the above *lāuga*, oratory.

The performance of *lāuga* in this project is significant for a variety of reasons: first it acknowledges the importance of Samoa’s socio-political or chiefly system, the *Fa’amatai*, in all its glory and celebratory nuances, in its roles and responsibilities in keeping law and order, and ensuring safety and security for its people. It speaks to the power of titles and the relative positions of holders to that power. Additionally, it celebrates those men and women who are deserving of the titles because of their unconditional *tautua*, service, an attribute which until about thirty years ago, was the highest criterion for people aspiring to be chiefs. Prior to that, being heir to family lands and titles was not sufficient for one to be vested with a title.7

Second, relationships among participants are established and orators are careful of their choice of language, gestures, and tone in order that peace is sustained during and when the gathering disperses. Failure to do so often results in ill-feelings towards them and their supporters. In the case of this dissertation, the above *lāuga* is a tribute to the professors/

referees of my dissertation committee, themselves chiefs or heads of their respective departments; moreover, the study is about the power of chiefs and chieftesses of Sāmoa and Sāoluafata, some of whom will presumably read this study and feel obligated to comment on it. It is the right thing to do to acknowledge them with deference and humility.

As a descendant of the village, I know that the women have been remembering this study in their *tapua’iga*, prayers. In the Samoan fashion, a son or daughter embarking on a quest for

---

7 Conversations with various chiefs and chieftesses of Sāoluafata during fieldwork, July and December 2007, January 2008, January 2009, and via the Internet throughout the duration of this writing. I have also observed this development over at least the past twenty years as titles became important signifiers of identity and socio-economic status in Sāmoa and abroad; as titles became people’s surnames thus the scramble to establish connections to important ones. This is reflective of the naming practices of the Samoans which I elaborate on later in this chapter. For an illuminating study of Samoa’s political developments since Independence, see So’o, *Democracy and Custom*, 2008.
knowledge, money, or fame does so in the context of a *tapua'iga*, prayers and blessings, of his family, village, and nation. As far as I can remember, scholars and athletes have primarily demanded a national *tapua'iga*. Secondarily, it invites other descendants and, of course, other students to take this study as food for current commentary or as a platform from which to launch future research. During fieldwork in Sāmoa in December 2007 and January 2008, I was afforded one of the highest honors—a chiefly title. In this light, employing chiefly diplomacy and ceremonial registers to address both professional and traditional statuses of the parties involved in the viewing of this dissertation, is the right thing to do; anything less would diminish the essence and the dignity of this study.

Third, using oratory as the opening act of this dissertation is a tribute as well to Samoa’s ancestors whose mythical beginnings have been models structuring and guiding Samoans’ cross-cultural encounters in a world constantly in flux and often hostile to newcomers. It also reflects my belief that my culture’s thought-motifs, relayed by ancestral tools, are and should be valid even in the halls of academia. Claude Levi-Strauss suggests that “. . . for each scholar and each writer, the particular way he or she thinks and writes opens a new outlook on mankind.” I stand on the shoulders of all scholars whether pre- or post- modern and poststructuralist who have beaten a path for the inclusion of “other” ways of representations, a “different outlook” on humankind.

Finally, this Samoanized beginning asserts that Samoa’s oral traditions are credible sources of knowledge about the past, on par with the written accounts of eye-witnesses and the hermeneutics of secondary sources, given these traditions’ survival rate amid the hegemony of

---

8 This was reminiscent of Vilsoni Hereniko’s comments regarding being immersed in his culture during his own journey home for doctoral research, while at the same time relying on “white colonial accounts to illuminate the way that would lead to a better understanding of [his] Rotuman culture.” See *Woven Gods: Female Clowns and Power in Rotuma* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1995), 7.

other traditions. It validates mythical beginnings as structures of historical encounters.\textsuperscript{10} It illustrates Alagoa’s belief in “oral linguistic texts” as containing a “philosophy of history,”\textsuperscript{11} and Tui Ātua’s claim of indigenous references as the mind and soul of a people.\textsuperscript{12}

In sum, each time we lāuga, the past and present are blurred and the interlocutors and audience are conscious of the etiquettes of space and time as shaped by verbal symbols and sounds, and non-verbal signs. The audiences for this dissertation have been recognized, their sanctity and relations acknowledged. The divine tribute, duly established, allows the orator to lay out the purpose of the reading/gathering. The tāeao at Evaloa-cum-Sāoluafata, so long in the making, is about the women of Sāoluafata. Tulou!

\textbf{E tala lasi Sāmoa: the “I” of the text and Disclaimer\textsuperscript{13}}

Every story is written from the bias or the point of view of the teller. Thus this history neither purports to be the universal truth about the women of Sāoluafata, nor is it a presumptive speech on their behalf. Who am I to think that? In Sāmoa, every telling is a political act, thus, whether engaged in oratory, academic writing, or in informal conversations, speakers beg an audience’s indulgence in case any part of the presentation is discordant. I would be remiss to think that this study will not raise challenges from other heirs of Luafatā’alae and members of the academy. I welcome any contribution to improve upon this narrative, therefore, I ask fellow

\textsuperscript{12} Tui Ātua, in \textit{Su’esu’e Manogi}, 2009.
\textsuperscript{13} There are multiple versions of any story, thus the teller must acknowledge that his/her version is his/her own, and should be accepted as such. A skilled teller anticipates challenges from the audience, hence the need to provide such a disclaimer.
descendants and others to join in the telling and to improve upon it, after all, *e tala lasi* Sāmoa, each story has multiple versions.14

It is critical that this etiquette in Samoan rhetoric is established at the beginning of an event in order to avoid confrontation, and to make the audience feel included. However, potential contestations should not discourage people, particularly the custodians of family pasts, from sharing family lore with their extended kin. Tui Ātua cautions against custodians not relaying *tapu*, taboo, knowledge before they pass away, but also warns of a “... need to tread carefully when engaging in *tapu* knowledge ... [and to] ... ensure that this knowledge continues through to the next generation in a manner and form that preserves its integrity.”15

This history is from my point of view only; it is my version of Saoluafata’s past in particular, and an examination of how power is gendered in Samoan society.16 It is what Nicholas Thomas calls a “partial text” which is concerned with bridging the disconnect between writing as an essentializing, distancing, and isolating mechanism, and the discursivity of the lived pasts of the *Teine* of Sāmoa. Hopefully, this writing addresses issues of postmodern forms of writing which according to Thomas, have strategically “preclude[d] recognition and even apprehension of the political meanings and values that do persist, to our evident discomfort, in the postcolonial Pacific.”17

There are two ways in which I am implicated in this study. First, both my maternal grandparents were from Sāoluafata. My grandfather Simanu Fagumoega Olive Tuiloma was of the Sa Tagaloa family; my grandmother Tilau Talatai’ina Filipo was of the Sa Sāgapolutele family. They left the village in their youth to join the mission as *faife’au*, pastors, for the

15 Tui Ātua in *Su’esu’e Manogi*, 2009, 118.
London Missionary Society (LMS) at the village of Sātalo.\textsuperscript{18} However, instead of a complete crossing-over as natives of other lands were subjected to during their conversion, they stayed true to their Fa’asāmoa and fulfilled family obligations whenever there was a fa’alavelave, obligatory event.

I was neither born nor raised at Sāoluafata, but there were numerous childhood visits during the 1950s, sporadic ones throughout the 1970s, and a few times since fieldwork in December 2007 and January 2008. I have not lived in Sāmoa since 1978, but have been a frequent circular traveler since.\textsuperscript{19} My mother, ‘Aumua Mata’itusi Simanu, was also not born there, but she spent significant chunks of time at the village as a young woman and later as an educator. She is one of my main (re)sources for this study and to whom I shall refer as ‘Aumua.\textsuperscript{20} She was evidently an active member of the Nu’u o Teine from 1959 to 1961 when she was teaching at the Anoāma’a District School. In numerous conversations throughout the life of this dissertation, she reminisced about working closely with Afioga Teu’ialilo Malavai, the paramount chiefess of the Sa Sāgapolutele family and one of the two leaders of the Nu’u o Teine. ‘Aumua is 90 years old and remembers vividly the workings of the Nu’u o Teine before urbanization and migration brought in rapid changes in the demographics of the village.

\textsuperscript{18} The LMS became the Congregational Christian Church of Samoa, CCCS which, in the vernacular, is the Ekālesia Fa’apotopotoga Kerisiano a Sāmoa—EFKS. See Kenape Tepa Faleto’ese, O le Tala Faasolopito o le Ekalesia A History of the Samoan Church, [L.M.S.] (Malua: Malua Printing Press, 1959).

\textsuperscript{19} Calling myself a “circular traveler” echoes Murray Chapman’s characterization of migratory movement to and from the home countries as circular—members leave and return at will or as circumstances demand it, and keeping the tensions between metaphors of roots=tree and routes=canoe to signify grounding and mobility as vibrant and necessary human activities. Since the modernization of transportation and communication technology, Pacific islanders have been active travelers within and beyond ancestral shores. See Murray Chapman, “Pacific Island Movement and Socio-Economic Change: Metaphors and Understanding,” Population and Development Review 17-2 (1991): 263-292.

\textsuperscript{20} In Fa’asāmoa, the Samoan Way, once an adult becomes a matai, chief, he or she must be addressed by his or her title.
Second, I am a matai, chief, of the Sa Tagaloa family, a status acquired during my second
research trip. I have asked relatives in the village about how my status as chief in the men’s
council would affect my access to the Nu’u o Teine, and I was assured that I would always be a
daughter of the village and could use my title in either council. The implication of this double
access could be fascinating and also useful given the challenges the Teine are now facing in their
relationships with their male counterparts and their spouses. I elaborate on this matter in
subsequent chapters.

Naturally, this new status has affected to a certain degree my approach to this narrative—
that is, with a tremendous sense of responsibility to both the village and the academy to ensure a
fair representation of both to each other and to see that the integrity of both is not compromised.
The thirst for new knowledge for the academy should in no way disrupt peace at the village, or
that in the effort to keep such peace, academic analysis fails in its role to inform and instruct.

In December 2007, I spent a month at Sāoluafata visiting with the Teine, some on a one-on-
one basis or as a group. At that time, my family and I hosted the council to a luncheon meeting
during which I distributed a questionnaire and facilitated a conversation about the status quo at
the council and plans for its future. Unfortunately, the two paramount chieftesses—Teu’ialilo
Malavai and Tululautū Fuea—were absent. The former had relocated to New Zealand while the
latter was spending the Christmas season in American Samoa. This state of affairs is apparently
quite normal, thus indicating that the rest of the council is often without leadership. This begs
the question, where does the real power lie in the scheme of things regarding this council?

As will be revealed later in this study, it appears that significant shifts in institutional and
gender relations at Sāoluafata have affected the council in certain ways. An air of nostalgia was
evident during the luncheon as the members reminisced about the taimi o Sipi, my Aunt Sipi’s
time, and how the girls’ *pule*, authority, and *mamalu*, dignity, were in jeopardy. Yet, despite this obvious uncertainty and lasting nostalgia, the members appeared optimistic that their *nu'u*, council, could and would never be defunct. “*E leai se isi e mafai ona 'aveesea le pule a teine*, no one can take away the girls’ power” was the attitude echoed at the luncheon.²¹

Basically, the *Nu’u o Teine* of Sāoluafata has survived the “tics” and “toes” of the river of time.²² It has survived the pestilence of war, the confusions of cross-cultural encounters through western colonialism and urban migration, and it has weathered intra-village, church, and gender conflicts. In the *longue durée* of the socio-political structure that is the *Nu’u o Teine* of Sāoluafata, the main curiosity for this writer is: What has made it possible for this all-female council in Sāmoa to last as long as it has? Will there still be one in six hundred years?

²¹ Talk of ineffective leadership was on the lips of various members of the council and it appears that they were talking about the *Teine* of the days gone by who made decisions and conferred with their counterparts in the men’s council over capital improvement projects, and laid out rules to sustain a peaceful existence for everyone at Sāoluafata.

²² Calvin Martin uses these spellings of “tic” and “toc” in his illuminating text, *In the Spirit of the Earth: Rethinking Human History* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992).
CHAPTER 1:  
FRAMING THE HISTORICAL QUEST  

Introduction: Challenge, Purpose, and Significance  

Ancient Samoan socio-political organization is ideologically ordered along genealogical and gendered lines. Samoans maintain that within this structure, men and women have shared a bilateral relationship that manifests itself as the *feagaiga*, sacred covenant, between *tamatāne*, male relatives, and *tamafafine*, female relatives, in a family, and in the rights of *suli*, heirs, to family titles and lands. Within the vā, space and time, of *feagaiga*, men and women ostensibly share *pule*, secular authority, and a complementarity of roles.¹ The women’s claim to titles on the basis of their being *suli* places them in what Bradd Shore calls a symmetrical relationship with their brothers; he characterizes this relationship as competitive and aggressive and in direct opposition to the complementary nature of the *feagaiga* which is mutually beneficial and peaceful.² From this standpoint, Samoan women have laid claims to positions of relative strength within their extended families and villages, exercising as much, and sometimes more, political and economic authority than their brothers. In fact, in spite of the numerous challenges posed by the forces of colonialism, neo-colonialism, and neo-liberalism, it is still their belief that with *feagaiga* and *suli* as sources and mechanisms of power, they exercise their *pule*, invoke their *mana*, spiritual power, flaunt their *mālosi*, economic power, and uphold their *mamalu*, reverence and dignity, or social power, even if they are not *matai*, chiefs, of the family.³  

---  
² Ibid.  
Yet, within the last twenty years, economic and political realities in the nation and around the globe have resulted in some fascinating transformations in the networks and mechanisms of power. These shifts are reshaping the dynamics of power relations at both village and national levels, particularly where women are concerned. Since the early 1990s, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of women who have become matai and who have mapped themselves into national politics and leadership positions in the village and the work force.\(^4\) This trend appears to have coincided with mounting pressures from international women’s organizations that advocate the elimination of discrimination against women and the observance of human rights,\(^5\) and an increase in the number of women graduates mapping themselves into all tiers of the professional work force.\(^6\) Additionally, redefining the role of women in development discourse has made possible a national recognition of the ina’ilau a tama’ita’, the women’s row of thatch, the ancestral-cum-postmodern work ethic, and the establishment of the Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development (MWCSD). The phrase has become the metaphor signifying the economic prowess of women, which for all intents and purposes has been exploited by the traditional and modern political systems of governance and the Church.

The research on complementary roles and bilateral relationships in Sāmoa reveals that much focus has been directed at the complementarity of roles and relationships as coded in the

---

\(^4\) According to the UN Report on the status of women in leadership positions in Sāmoa, as of March 2011 20 percent of Sāmoa’s matai were women, a significant increase from the less than 10 percent in 2000. “Status of Women in Sāmoa, Report to the United Nations about the Status of Women and Women’s Empowerment in Sāmoa,” *Samoa Observer*, March 9, 2011; Serge Tcherkézoff, “Are the Matai Out of Time?” in *Governance in Sāmoa*, ed. Huffer and So’o, 2000, f. 9, 128.


feagaiga; however, the symmetry of power relations of suli as constitutive of the body politics in Sāmoa has not garnered much scholarly interest. Furthermore, a study of the effects of women as matai on the dynamics of feagaiga, on family and village affairs, where these women are situated, and on their involvement with their respective village organizations has not yet emerged. What benefits, if any, have been evident and what challenges have been posed or are likely to occur in the future their descendants?

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine the changes and continuities in Samoa’s gender and power relations from the aso o le vavau, days of the beginnings, through faigafa’apapalagi, European way, to faigafa’aonaponei, these here nights, commonly referred to as “the present.” This study spans a period from the fourteenth century to the present, and it attempts to provide explanations and a hermeneutics of Samoan notions, theories, principles, and exercises of power in the family, village, and nation. This study uses as a site of investigation the Nu'u o Teine, council of chieftesses, of Sāoluafata, a village on the northeastern side of the island of ‘Upolu in the independent nation of Sāmoa. The major goal here is to discuss how Samoa’s “networks and mechanisms of power, its trajectories, its techniques and tactics, have been and are invested, colonized, used, inflected, transformed, displaced, [and] extended, …

---


8 Daughters and sisters of a village have their own organization called the aualuma. From this base, the leader, known as taupou or sa’otama’ita’i, is bestowed a title that is of equal, if not higher, rank than the paramount chief who is perhaps her father, brother, or uncle. This position has often been misrepresented in the literature and reduced in importance as one merely of ceremonial status; however, the position has tremendous economic and political utility for the village. Hence, while not every woman of age becomes a taupou, or sa’otama’ita’i, a title comes with great expectations and responsibilities. Family interests are vested in it.
increasingly by general mechanisms and forms of domination.”⁹ In this study, “general mechanisms and forms of domination” refer to national, *Fa’apalemene*, parliamentary, and international systems of governance on the one hand, and *Fa’amatai*, system of chiefs, and the *Lotu*, church, on the other. I posit that a study of the socio-political past of Sāoluafata has broader implications for a nation convinced that *Fa’asāmoa*, the Samoan Way, is an essential part of modern development.

It is pertinent then to ask, first, what cultural ideologies govern gender and heritage politics at the Samoan village and national levels, and how these have changed across time; second, what the relationship is between the concepts and institutions of the *Nu’u o Teine* and *feagaiga*, and how this relationship has evolved over time; third, in what way female access to traditionally male-only chiefly titles has affected decision-making dynamics across time in Sāoluafata specifically and in Sāmoa generally; fourth, how such access has affected interpersonal relationships between brothers and sisters on the one hand, and sisters and wives on the other, and finally, how the transformations in the ideology of the *Nu’u o Teine* have been reflected in village and national discourses of power across time.

Significantly, there is much to learn from the characteristics of our female ancestors that could help young women today deal with the working world of men. I think men too can learn from this research by rediscovering and respecting the characteristics that were once induced to make women strong and respected. It behooves Saoluafata’s *Teine* to revisit age-old *aganu’u*, national or universal traditions, and *agaifanua*, customs and traditions pertaining to a certain village, that provide moral and spiritual compass in a world penetrated by lethal diseases such as HIV-AIDS and drug addiction.

As noted in the research, *Fa’asāmoa* has been deemed by various Pacific scholars as perhaps one of the few traditional systems that have persisted in spite of western contact. This is perhaps due to its ability to filter waves of change throughout their cross-cultural experience. *Fa’asāmoa*, in my view, has survived because of the pragmatism with which its people deal with incoming forces, and in its syncretizing nature which welcomes elements that either improve life and political might, while at the same time resisting those elements that do not serve their purpose. The malleability of Samoa’s traditions allows for a structure that makes possible a negotiation of the old and new, the local and exotic, the familiar and the strange; it accommodates (ex)changes mutually agreed upon by participants.

Given this attribute, providing historical explanations of Samoa’s cross-cultural experiences may help Samoan society to effectively filter external forces such as international laws on discrimination against women which ostensibly see local traditions as a threat to the application of human rights.12

This study is also designed for Pacific and Samoan islanders abroad, particularly those who speak with pride about ancestral lands that they can return to should the migration experience fail. Moreover, this study is for the younger generations who see *Fa’asāmoa* as the “well-spring” of their identity but need a functional articulation in places like New Zealand, Australia, Hawai‘i and the United States Mainland.13 In the words of Edward Burke, society is a partnership not “only between those who are living, but between those who are dead and those

---


who are to be born…. The young should be willing to look to the old for models, and older people should see themselves as in the service of future generations.”

_Fa’asāmoa_ has been regularly targeted by academic and development discourse as the root cause of perpetual underdevelopment of its people, the reason for a high youth suicide rate, high birth and mortality rates, and domestic violence. In spite of such stereotypes, recent scholarship and governmental reports, most by Samoan scholars, favor _Fa’asāmoa_ as a critical ingredient for conflict resolution, identity formation, and cultural survivability. As a socio-political system, _Fa’asāmoa_ has survived on the maintenance of kinship connections, on the designation of its women at the apex of its social structures, and on the tangible manifestations of gender vis-à-vis kinship relationships. I would argue in this study that age-old alternatives, when put in proper perspective, can help stem the rush to blame tradition as the cause of all ills in a society which sustains itself syncretically. Jerry Bentley maintains in his seminal text, that “syncretism blended elements from different cultural traditions in such a way that a foreign

---


15 See Huffer and So’o, ed. _Governance in Samoa_, 2000. One of the pragmatics of _Fa’asāmoa_ is the remitting nature of its people. _Fa’asāmoa_ requires family as an economic base and as that, the standard of living in Sāmoa is relatively high. Cherrel Jackson relates that approximately 20 percent of Samoa’s GDP comprises remittances; yet, while they have their benefits, foreign aid and development alone cannot help Samoans modernize. However, remittances have apparently been declining in spite of an all time high in the Pacific region. For details, see Cherell Jackson, “Samoan economy already stimulated, says PM; Central Bank Governor forecasts declining remittances” _Pacific On Line_, [http://pacificbusinessonline.com/ samoa/story/13456/samoan-economy-already-stimulated-says-pm-central-bank-governor-forecasts-declining](http://pacificbusinessonline.com/samoa/story/13456/samoan-economy-already-stimulated-says-pm-central-bank-governor-forecasts-declining); and “Business: Remittance Level Drops For Samoa,” _Island Business_, [http://www.islands-business.com](http://www.islands-business.com). There is a strong sense in support of _Fa’asāmoa_ by Samoan scholars and politicians, many of them chiefs in their own rights. However, there are also pervasive mumblings among young Samoans about the chokehold of their parents’ culture on their creative imaginations. A preference for using English as the language of communication among Samoa’s youth is indicative of the paradoxes of modernizing cultures. A lecture in support of _Fa’asāmoa_ as a key ingredient of modernization was presented by the former Deputy Prime Minister, Honourable Misa Telefoni Retzlaff before a group of law students in Auckland, New Zealand. See “Pacific States and Development: The Role of the new Good Governance Agenda,” (paper, Auckland University, August 2, 2004).
tradition could become intelligible, meaningful, and even attractive in a land far from its origins. Ultimately, it had the potential to produce altogether new cultural configurations.”  

Hopefully, this dissertation does justice and adds insights to those it follows. Perhaps this history adds to, adjusts, and offers a new way for Samoa’s women to (re)think their positions in both national and village politics in the interest of catering to both the humane and the personal. Engaging in these activities is not necessarily in opposition to each other, but could be balanced in a way that satisfies both the need to improve humanity and to better one’s status in a society that is increasingly becoming middle-class and individualistic. As Caroline Ralston puts it, it is a narrative “that combine[s] the symbolic, [political] sic, and sociological approaches” to studying. On a global scale, this study adds to the growing volume of women’s history, itself a recent addition to the academy.

Gaps and Silences in the Regional Literature

By and large, much of the historiography of the Pacific has focused on regional histories, but very few of them have been devoted to a history of women. Yet, this lack of attention is not unique to the Pacific. In fact Linda Kerber and Gerda Lerner, pioneers of women’s history in the twentieth century in the United States, have been instrumental in moving the bar along where a women’s history as a field of study in American universities was concerned. Thus, it is safe to say that Women’s History as a subject and an academic field is a recent phenomenon. In the final chapter of her landmark publication, *The Creation of Feminist Consciouness*, Lerner conveys that European women were unfortunately in such a subordinated position when History
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was being created that they had no impact on it until late eighteenth century. Women were ostensibly deprived of an education and were so conditioned by a patriarchal system that “their roles, behavior, and sexual and reproductive lives were defined by… men.” Even in America, women’s history sputtered along until the 1960s and 1970s when civil rights and the second wave of feminism moved the country toward better conditions for minority groups and women. Caroline Ralston stresses that historians were generally resistant to studying women’s pasts, largely due to their focus on political and military histories, their dependence on written records, and, technically, to their not knowing how to “frame questions” about women’s pasts. Given this perspective, one can safely say that Pacific women are not too far behind in terms of having an impact on historiography—although, it still trails other Third World regions like its Southeast Asian neighbors. One could argue, however, that in Samoa’s orality, and in the Pacific more broadly, women appear to have been in positions of strength, given such institutions or tools as the feagaiga in Sāmoa and the fahu of Tonga, to name but a few. Here, the sisters in both societies have continued as powerful voices in gender relations since the Vavau, and who often outperformed their brothers and families during celebrations or commemorations.

Ralston situates the initial studies of women in the Pacific—albeit white (missionary) women—in the late 1970s. If mentioned in the narratives, women were characterized as “bit players in the imperial game.” Nonetheless, these bits and pieces are useful flotsam and jetsam to add to a history of (Samoa’s) women in the nineteenth century. As noted by Doug Munro and Brij V. Lal, Pacific historiography did not begin until the early twentieth century, when J. W.
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20 Gerda Lerner, ibid.
21 Ibid.
Davidson’s trailblazing shifted the focus of history to a history of “culture contacts,” “multicultural situations,” and “indigenous initiatives.” In fact, many of the texts about local or indigenous pasts were doctoral dissertations originally published in the *Journal of Pacific History*, which was co-founded by Davidson and Maude in 1966 and co-edited by them for some time. Munro and Lal deem the journal as a “publication outlet, a symbol of identity, a badge of respectability, and, most important of all, a vehicle with which to influence the research agenda.”

On the challenges of a regional or local history on women and power, the Pacific region is geographically huge and culturally diverse; thus, efforts to write a comparative history of gender and power relations could easily be a daunting task. Much of the existing research has focused on the Melanesian women of Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, and New Caledonia. Ethnographic studies by Weiner, Strathern, Jolly, and others range from women in their gardens to women’s bodies—arguably noble efforts which imply female agency or voice.

Historically, Pacific women have been subjected to the ambiguity and contradictions of earlier conceptualizations, and have been stereotyped as “wild, passive or active, queens or slaves, mindless pawns in male intrigues or subverters of men’s interests, oppressed drudges or powerful Amazons, devoted mothers or callous perpetrators of abortion and infanticide.” Women have also been muted by their exclusion by notables such as Malinowski, Firth, Kelly, and Labby. In Australia, Aboriginal women were either “wielders of digging sticks,” or “oppressed drudges;” in Sāmoa, virginity was “carried to a greater extreme than in any other
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25 Ibid., 2.
culture known to anthropology.” Moreover, says Sharon Tiffany, women in Micronesia were “politically dominated by men;” while women in Polynesia, “regardless of rank, [were] politically and economically peripheral, and relations between the sexes in Melanesia [were] uniformly characterized by opposition and hostility.” She concludes that such women only became “subjects of anthropological inquiry when they pose a problem for men.” Knowledge in this context was “male knowledge,” and “anthropological understandings and conclusions about women derived from exclusively male discourse.”

Very much an influence on women anthropologists of the Pacific, the explosion of the feminist movement of the First World into the Third World in the 1950s and 1960s reflected the struggles of Western women at home and the dissatisfaction with the outcomes of modernization both at home and abroad. It was a time when more women anthropologists were traveling on their own academic merit instead of as *de facto* research assistants for their spouses. Perhaps fueled by their discontent with male representations of themselves at home, the thrust of their scholarship was about dislodging indigenous notions of culture and power, for example, and about seeing their “Other” in the spirit of sisterhood. In the words of Immanuel Wallerstein, these women anthropologists have certainly done an impressive job of “unthinking the social sciences.”

As far as a history of women is concerned, scholarship that targets women and power in the Pacific vis-à-vis Sāmoa has been scant and in passing. In fact, most of the studies discussed above hardly delve into indigenous notions of power, the receptacles of such power, how it is
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27 Tiffany, *ibid.*
transported, and its ramifications or effects on the individuals through which it passes.\textsuperscript{29} Above all, none of the studies traces the evolution of power relations across certain periods since the settlement of the islands.

However, in all fairness to the erudition of these prominent Pacific scholars, their studies imply that women in the Pacific certainly had control of their traditional roles on the farms and within their own political enclaves—a position which the descendants of women subjects in the above ethnographies made clear in their discourse on Pacific women and development. For instance, Atu Emberson-Bain and Peggy Fairbairn Dunlop contribute to the anthropology of gender in the Pacific. Specifically, their scholarship over the past decades provides an historical layer in the study of change and continuity in power and gender relations in the Pacific in general, and Sāmoa in particular.\textsuperscript{30}

Henriette L. Moore defines the anthropology of gender as the study of gender in the context of culture. This is different from feminist anthropology, which is the study of gender within the context of the larger realm of life. The anthropology of gender in the Pacific reflects a departure from the traditional approach of pre-1970s scholarship, which focused on isolated communities and on themes concerning the societies of scholars. In this paradigm, the “Other” is represented by the anthropologist. Since the 1970s, however, scholarship has emerged that

\textsuperscript{29} Foucault, \textit{Society}, 2003. Foucault treats power as only as good as the individuals and institutions through which it passes and functions. That is, without these mechanisms, power does not exist.

gives agency to the people being studied, which has meant a “thinking out of the box” approach in which the anthropologist closes the distance between him/her and the subjects. Ruth Behar leads this charge by interrogating positivist approaches to studying other communities—although, women writing culture through life story narratives have had their share of criticism, especially when one’s “Other” becomes one’s own ethnic community.31

While the anthropology of gender appears prolific in Melanesia and Polynesia, the same cannot be said of Micronesia. For a place that has experienced about five centuries of Euro-American hegemony, discourse on Micronesian and Guamanian women has been abysmally lacking. However, this does not diminish the usefulness of historical and anthropological works by scholars like Kimberly Kihleng, Susan Falgout, Lin Poyer, David Hanlon, and Francis X. Hezel, even though none of them focuses specifically on women’s pasts.32 In the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, native voices like Laura Sauder, Anne Perez Hattori, and Keith Camacho had begun to emerge; not to mention the outstanding contribution of Vince Diaz on historiographic approaches and methods. Very much involved in historical and contemporary issues for Guam, Sauder has been adamant about the importance of Chamorro women networking as a way to reclaim indigenous rights and power. Sauder and Diaz produced histories displaying the effects of militarization and urbanization on the populations on Guam and the Mariana Islands. Hattori unravels the “discourses on sanitation and disease on Guam” and the “dis-ease” that plagued relations among national, naval, and military factions on island. Camacho on the other hand explores the “social construction of memories of the war in the

Marianna Islands, and the degree to which they are informed by the politics of colonialism, indigenous cultural agency and ... commemoration.”

Notwithstanding, the study of Pacific islands women and their counterparts from the West focused on them in the context of their villages, farms, and trade. In their “reworking of women’s lives,” O’Brien and Tiffany reveal women as being in control of their daily activities within both the privacy of their homes and the public sphere of men. Strathern sets out to dislodge from the nature/nurture (cultural) dichotomy a Hagen woman who is very much a part of the decision-making in her society. On a different tack, McDowell indicates the complementarity of the Bun woman’s role relative to her husband’s and concludes that relationships were not about oppositions and binaries, but about partnership.

In her essay on the Lusi women of PNG, Dorothy Ayers Counts reveals that women have access to all the resources and tools that men have and that they use suicide as an expression of power when they have exhausted every conflict resolution alternative. Lorraine Dusak Sexton, in her study of Eastern Highland women, indicates that as a way to become involved in modern development, the women formed networks or collaboratives on matters such as savings accounts.

---


In a different publication and genre, Fay Calkins (Ala’ilima,) portrays a non-Samoan woman’s experience with her husband’s culture. A delightful read, *My Samoan Chief* illustrates how Calkins penetrated and tamed jungle land in Sāmoa by introducing the concepts of “cooperatives” (or “co-ops, known in Sāmoa as *sosaiete*, which literally means “society,”) and credit unions, among others, to the plantation workers in Sāmoa and later in American Samoa, where she and her husband, Lei’ātua Vaiao Ala’ilima, worked for a while. From my own memories, these economic activities were quite popular in Sāmoa in the 1950s and 1960s, but went by the wayside as more and more Samoans left the villages for work and play in town.36

Margaret Jolly and various associates have been prolific in their studies on women and their role in nation-building and cultural maintenance. From birthing in the Pacific to sexual desires, Jolly and others reveal the politicization of women’s indigenous beliefs and values, as well as the erosion of their traditional roles as midwives as their nation-states made them “agents of the nation” and “tools of the state.” Jolly remarks on how development policies have affected women’s rights of reproduction, birthing, border crossings, and so forth. Fortunately, women’s voices are being heard, even as modernization and institutionalization threaten practices such as the burial of the umbilical cord and the afterbirth. Jolly argues that while mortality rates have declined as the result of modern medicine, policy makers ought to consider the ramifications of ignoring indigenous women and their traditions on cultural maintenance and sustainable development.37

The tone of the research on Polynesia is similar to that of Melanesia. Underscored by Jocelyn Linnekin, Penelope Schoeffel, Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, and Aiono Fanaafi Le Tagaloa,
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the common implication is that the power of women is derived from the execution of their roles within society. Linnekin argues that in spite of the kapu system, Hawaiian women may be viewed historically as “placeholders” of the land for the male heirs, as was the case with low-rank women, or the high-rank women as decision makers and as heirs of chiefly titles.\(^{38}\) In other words, Linnekin rejects earlier characterizations of women as polluters, disruptive, and evil. Similarly, Liliakala Kameʻelehiwa claims that Hawaiian women derived their power from the goddesses who controlled precontact Hawaiian society. Hawaiian goddesses, insists Kameʻelehiwa, were the source of their intellectual and sacred power, the source of their mana. For her, Hawaiʻi was the domain of the Akua wahine, goddesses.\(^{39}\)

Elsewhere in Polynesia, Helen Morton’s study on socialization points out that regardless of rank, the self is socialized to recognize and deal with biases of rank, the authoritarian nature of parents, and the eventual ability to become an independent self. If this is in place, implies Morton, a Tongan woman is secure in her role as sister, wife, or widow. Perhaps one of the more fascinating tensions of being a Tongan woman has to do with land rights. Historically, the Tongan widow did not have a right to her husband’s land after the burial; however, she could return to her family’s land where her brothers were obligated to take care of her.\(^{40}\) There is a similar practice in Sāmoa in that the widow is formally “fetched” by her brothers or family chiefs through an exchange of fine mats and food soon after the husband’s funeral. Alternatively, she may choose to stay with her children in their paternal village and adopt the role of a member of the aualuma. I discovered at Sāoluafata that most of the members of the Nuʻu o Teine were widows who have returned home.


Perhaps of most value to a history of the Samoan woman, or what David Hanlon calls “the other side of yesterday,” are the accounts and ethnologies of the missionaries, merchants, literary luminaries like Robert Louis Stevenson, and anthropologists. The fictionalized history of Salamasina by Krämer is a marvelous weaving of the political and social intrigues of Samoa’s chiefs and women around the love story of Samoa’s most beloved monarch.41 Albert Wendt has inverted that approach as historical fiction. The Mango’s Kiss, Ola, and The Leaves of the Banyan Tree are fine examples of how academic disciplines can be woven to produce stories that are historically sound and personally entertaining.42 Otherwise, since Margaret Mead’s Coming of Age in Samoa, studies about Samoan females have been few and far between. Mead’s anthropology on Samoan society is useful since it provides a view of Fa’asāmoa between the war periods, not only where female adolescents were concerned but also in terms of the psyche of a particular Samoan community of the time. For what it’s worth, Mead’s texts are another window into the changes and (dis)continuities of gender dynamics and sexual practices of Samoa’s women since the early twentieth century.43

In Sāmoa, the divide between the sacred and the profane is well documented in Penelope Schoeffel’s dissertation thesis, “The Daughters of Sina.” Here, Schoeffel discusses the feagaiga, between brother and sister and the fact that the woman, in dealing with her movements between being a sister and wife, was often torn between her duties as sister of her brother and the subservience demanded by her husband’s sister and mother. Schoeffel captures well the tensions in this dual nature of the Samoan woman’s relationships; today, many Samoan women,

41 Augustin Krämer, Salamasina: Scenes from Ancient Samoan History and Culture (Apia: Association of Marist Old Boys, 1928).
especially the professionals, prefer to stay with their own families early in the marriage, or decide with their husbands to buy freehold land from the government and establish western-styled and western-run households. The ability to do so has resulted in certain behavioral and attitudinal shifts toward traditional culture on the one hand, and a politics of the new millennium on the other.44

By the 1990s, an increase in the volume of indigenous voices was hailed more by the literary arts than by anthropology; although the latter and other disciplines (geography and political science) appeared to be yielding studies about leadership and governance, women in development, and increasing participation in, if not a return to, their much celebrated roles as chiefs and farmers. Thus, while early twentieth century anthropology had focused more on cultural ways of a particular time, late twentieth century scholarship celebrated native or local scholarship, the emergence of local representation, and a better understanding of the emic perspectives of those being studied as well as their desire to shape a new identity. In other words, literary writers like Albert Wendt and Epeli Hau’ofa challenged and eventually broke free of the bonds of a one-size-fits-all Western academy and the misrepresentations of Pacific peoples in Euro-American literary and academic writings.

Images of Pacific women by Euro-American males began during the Age of Discovery. Since Cook’s and Bougainville’s stops in Tahiti in the late eighteenth century, the perceptions and roles of the Pacific women have been dramatically altered. Women’s sexual roles took on different meanings: from reproduction to hula, and from gardens to trade. In the process, Pacific women have had to suffer the humiliation of being regarded as people with loose morals, sexual objects, or political pawns. Euro-American representations of Pacific people in the movies,

novels, and travel writing have deemed island women as “dusky maidens” in Polynesia and “ugly drudges” in Australia. Hollywood has not been exempt from the blame. In his account on representation of Pacific people in film, Vilsoni Hereniko speaks to the absence of a representation of Pacific voices by producers and directors. In academia, while women might have been misrepresented in some islands, they were definitely excluded from certain studies. Thus, while focusing on Samoan adolescents, Mead ignored the role of mothers, aunts, sisters and wives in the socialization of their daughters who by tradition, were raised as the sacred half of the *feagaiga*. In opposition to Mead, Derek Freeman opted to expose Samoa’s disposition toward violence and debunk Mead’s romantic notions about Samoan teenagers’ sexuality. Thus, while sex and violence are human therefore global themes, the raging controversy on whether Samoans were either “sexed” or “violent” perhaps explains why there has not been much research on gender in Sāmoa. Bradd Shore extrapolated a position from the debate against the binary oppositions incurred by Mead and Freeman, and argues that both anthropologists should have focused on the Samoan ways of knowing. But then, Mead and Freeman were of a time when Western epistemologies and ontologies dominated the discourse in urban settings. While we can probably excuse these earlier writers and scholars as products of their time, there is no excuse any more for the lack of representation and for ongoing misrepresentation to continue.

In the mid twentieth century, reimagining an “indigenous” identity was easier said than done as native scholars at regional and local institutions such as the University of the South
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Pacific (USP) and the University of Papua New Guinea (UPNG) used poetry and fiction to address issues of representation, colonialism, and development. Themes of power and gender and above all, the currency of local epistemologies and ontologies, dominated local writing, an indication of a reawakening of interest and responsibility in things indigenous. Academic and literary responses against the persistence of colonial misrepresentation, even in the postcolonial Pacific, were certainly supported by luminaries like Roger Keesing. In reference to the Kwaio women of the Solomons, Keesing saw the interplay between women and language as an important one, particularly since language could either benefit or hinder efforts to give women a voice, thus noting Kwaio women behaving differently when men were around. Whether Keesing saw this as acceptable is not known, but he certainly echoed the importance of local knowledge and methodologies in research projects particularly in settings where traditional and modern systems of governance could benefit from their juxtaposition. Native scholars like David Watson-Gegeo and Asofou So’o have been pursuing such a vision in their own scholarship.47

From Sāmoa, studies by Asenati Liki-Chan and Tina Tauasosi focus on the rootedness of women and work in ‘aiga, family, and wife abuse respectively.48 Sporting for a geo-history from below, Liki-Chan gives agency to fellow Teine uli, black girls, of Samoan and Melanesian ancestry, and their journey which is illustrative of the labor movement of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Tauasosi’s sociology on wife abuse in Sāmoa is revealing of the fact that it is not just the uneducated Samoan woman that is stuck in abusive households; professional women also find themselves in similar situations, an illustration that addiction of any sort is non-

discriminatory and a societal problem. Finally, in her analysis of Samoa’s *Teine* and
development, Masami Tsujita concludes that young women in factory work need to be heard in
order for them to achieve a goal of “enlarging their life by… their own hands… [and that] their
voices are not loud, but not negligible.”

Though these three studies portray the issues and
trends affecting the contemporary woman, they are useful as specific contexts for this
counterfactual history of Saoluafata’s vis a vis Samoa’s *Teine*.

**Methods and Motifs**

The process for authenticating the knowledges of custodians included
participation in rigorous debate. Custodians would meet to share and argue
about different historical events, facts and/or theories. Each custodian would
be obliged to prove their arguments or facts by triangulated references to known
nomenclature, genealogies, historical time periods, existing place names, and
so on. Each argument or claim of fact had to hold up against common sense rules
of logic and evidence. But implicit in both the detail and the telling of all these
custodial knowledges was an overriding belief that they were God-given; that
the origins of all knowledges, all power and status, of all that is successful and
good is God-derived and God-oriented.

*Tui Ātua*

The primary goal of this study is to examine power and gender relations in the village of
Sāoluafata with a focus on those that shaped or were shaped and manipulated by the *Nu’u o
Teine* from its inception in the days of the *Vavau* (ancient Sāmoa) to 1998 when my Aunt Sipi
passed away, and with an afterthought on the years since. On its face, this may seem like a
daunting task given the lengthy span of time, limitation of sources, and changing circumstances
at the village while this dissertation was being constructed. These issues therefore demanded a
research approach reflective of the challenges that emerged and capable of exploring every
possible source and content of information regardless of meeting Western criteria of validity and
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49 Masami Tsujita, “Becoming a Factory Girl: Young Samoan Women and a Japanese Factory” (masters’ thesis,
University of Hawai‘i-Mānoa, 2001), 182.
51 Tui Ātua Tupua Tamasese Ta’isi Efi, “Whispers and Vanities in Samoan Indigenous Religious Culture,” (paper,
World Parliament of Religions, Melbourne, Australia, December 3, 2009), 3.
commensurability. For instance, given the dearth of written records about Samoa’s past prior to contact, exploiting Samoan orality—from oral traditions salvaged by early colonial anthropologists and government officials to Samoa’s memories, archived in its oral arts and performed at every fa’alavelave, obligatory event—proved extremely priceless.

Earlier in 2010, I received a free copy of Tui Ātua’s Su’esu’e Manogi from the distributor who had solicited my help in advertizing the book in Hawai‘i. A treasury of Samoan “fragrances,” the book is remarkable for its rich and sensitive treatment of the “nuances and metaphors” of culture as references of thought and praxis, of history; at the same time, it is Tui Ātua’s honest rendering of even the “warts” and “lows” of culture which he understood would inevitably provoke an internal dialectics. It is a timely resource for the purposes of this study.\textsuperscript{52}

However it was not always the case that oral traditions and local artifacts were credible sources for historians across the world. In fact, indigenous knowledge was largely subjugated by colonial history, and as a result, much of it was lost. Much appreciation therefore must be directed at a certain pioneer, J.W. Davidson, whose field experience in Sāmoa prompted him to problematize traditional methods, themes, and subjects of historiographies in the Pacific. His concern has been echoed in postcolonial enclaves of academia where the idealist approach to research and narrative has ruled for centuries and continues to be emulated by the die-hard followers of empiricist and imperial methodologies.\textsuperscript{53} In recognition of the limitations of archival sources and the fact that Pacific history, as it was known then, muted Pacific peoples while lauding European and American expansionism, J. W. Davidson envisioned a Pacific

\textsuperscript{52} Tui Ātua, in Su’esu’e Manogi, 2009, 28.

\textsuperscript{53} I. C. Campbell, “Culture of Culture Contact: Refractions from Polynesia,” Journal of World History 14-1 (Christchurch: University. of Canterbury, 2003): 63-86.
historiography that included the pasts of Pacific islanders.54 In contrast, Pālagi history was a heroic kind of history with colonial heroes as protagonists;55 thus Davidson’s recommendation was for an island-oriented history which was clarified by Howe as a cultural interaction, which necessarily meant studying both sides. The Islanders were brought into the picture: their communities were now credited with having histories of their own that were worthy of serious academic study. Modern historians of the Pacific islands have concentrated on the social, economic, political, and intellectual changes experienced by island societies as a result of their ever increasing interaction with Europeans and Western influence generally.56

The task of Pacific island historians, therefore, was to “supplement the usual archival research with fieldwork in island communities, and to familiarize themselves with the relevant findings of prehistorians, linguists, demographers, and anthropologists. Pacific islands history became a somewhat interdisciplinary subject.”57

Citing the Merriam-Webster online dictionary, historiography is “the writing of history based on the critical examination of sources, the selection of particulars from the authentic materials, and the synthesis of particulars into a narrative that will stand the test of critical methods.”58 Davidson’s vision for Pacific historiography was a “participant history” in which the historian was involved in the making of history more in the tradition of anthropologists and others in the social sciences. Combining the ethnography of the anthropologist and the personal writings of an eyewitness, the historian would embark on a historiography that included

56 Davidson in K.R. Howe, Where the Waves Fall: A New South Sea Islands History from First Settlement to Colonial Rule, (Honolulu: Center for Pacific Islands Studies & University of Hawai’i Press, 1984), xii.
57 Ibid.
fieldwork, archival texts, and secondary sources. However, for a historiography involving the past before contact, or what Samoans call the Vavau, the historian would inevitably need to extrapolate and infer the past by considering oral traditions and other receptacles of local pasts such as fauna and flora, and material culture during research in any of these places.

Davidson’s approach is synonymous with what Lisa A. Guion and Vince Diaz call a “triangulation,” a method which requires the employment of a variety of methods to study a single phenomenon.59 Hopefully, the intended outcome of this triangulation is a healthy discussion, or what Wendy Olsen calls a “dialectic of learning” about assumed notions of power and its appropriations in both town and village societies—specifically between traditionally authoritarian and communally-bounded villages and the emerging individualism of the middle class, and generally between traditional and national systems of governance. Wendy Olsen concludes that

triangulation is something we do to get dialectic of learning. Triangulation means mixing approaches to get two or three viewpoints upon the things being studied. The resulting dialectic of learning thrives on the contrast between what seems self-evident in interviews, what seems to underlie the lay discourses, what appears to be generally true in surveys, and differences arise when comparing all these with official interpretations of the same thing.60

In this study, a triangulation or what Samoans would call a su’ifefiloi, medley, of archival and secondary sources, community participation, and oral traditions employing in-depth, semi-structured interviews, life history, and oral histories made possible a narrative of Saoluafata’s past interpreted against the larger canvas of Sāmoa and beyond.61 Data from archival sources

and from field work were collected respectively through textual analysis and interviews, group discussions, questionnaires, and participant observations.

This dissertation is also informed by various postcolonial and ethnohistorical theories and approaches to the study of culture and history. For instance, postcolonial theory allows me to examine the constitution of the “multiple bodies, forces, energies, matters, desires, and thoughts” that have influenced life in Sāmoa particularly during and since Independence, and the degree of difference in the responses between the people in both rural and town areas. 62 For example, Albert Wendt notes in his master’s thesis that colonial rules were binding, largely for the Apia municipality in the early twentieth century. 63 Perhaps this explains why Samoans were able to sustain a subsistence livelihood based on land and ocean resources. My own childhood memories, on the other hand, are of a village life very much dictated by the tides and the sun. Though formal education imposed an eight-to-one school day and altered the work schedule for most children, the rhythms of rural life were fairly constant. Any evidence of colonial influence was in the machete, axes, cotton clothing, and cash. The mood and tenor with which life was


carried out largely adhered to age-old values and beliefs; that is, communal sharing and maintenance of vertical and horizontal relations.

Given my close proxemics to the subjects of this study, the use of postcolonial labels such as “Other,” “hybridity,” and “gender” is counterintuitive and begs the question of whether there is now a need to define a post-postcolonial position from which to perceive the past, present, and future of Sāmoa. Feminist voices such as those documented in Behar and Gordon set a precedent for experimentation with Samoan motifs and labels, and to insist on the use of Samoan notions of their pasts as context and text for this historiography.64 From where I stand and sit today, relative to the people I met and interviewed during fieldwork, this discourse is not about an “Other” since there was no referencing of papālagi, Euro-Americans, as the perpetrator of their shortcomings or motivators of their successes. In fact, where power was concerned, much of the Teine’s discontent with village politics was of a gendered nature: that their counterparts, the Nu’u o Ali’i, were trying to exert control over their council. If anything, I was the one who felt an “otherness,” particularly when I had my notebook and pencil in my hand asking questions.65

Ethnohistorical approaches, however, were still useful for an analytical examination of changes and continuities over a long period of time as experienced, in this case, by the Teine of Sāoluafata. For example, the direct historical approach was employed in this study, using the method of “upstreaming” to envision Saoluafata’s “lived past” and the effects of internal and

---

65 Since independence and the introduction of big-time development, the postcolonial experience has been a process of cultural revival in an evolving market economy. Two generations later, Samoa’s post-postcoloniality comprises a palate of McDonalds and palusami, baked taro leaves and coconut cream, mutton flaps, and Chinese cabbage; attires of puletasi, woman’s top and bottom of the same material and pattern, and pumps for shoes; open houses with corrugated roofs and television sets line the main road from the airport at Faleolo to Apia town, and men in dirty shirts selling Oscar de la Rente perfume in front of the department stores along Beach Road.
external forces on its networks and mechanisms of power over time. Upstreaming, according to Fenton, operates on the following premises:

(1) Major patterns of culture tend to be stable over long periods of time, so that one should watch out lest he commit the fallacy of assumed acculturation; (2) “upstreaming” proceeds from the known to the unknown, concentrating on recent sources first because they contain familiar things and thence going to earlier sources; (3) a preference for those sources in which the descriptions of society ring true at both ends of the time scale.”

Much of my search for explanations on the evolution of the Teine’s power was conducted through numerous conversations with my informants at Sāoluafata and elsewhere, and in the recordings of ethnologists such as Turner and Krämer, and family historians such as Tu’u’u and ‘Aumua. Data gleaned from these sources made possible a detailed exegesis of Samoan concepts and ideologies, which have been a critical starting point to delve into six hundred years of existence for a village that was founded by women and has survived male hubris in the family, village, and nation. In the preface to the second edition of *Ambivalent Conquests: Mayan and Spaniard in Yucatan, 1517-1570*, Inga Clendinnen suggests a method of accommodation which focuses on the subjects’ “gestural and verbal language through changing contexts” in order to discover their intentions and desires. At the same time, she argues that it is important to interpret the gaps and silences contained in primary and secondary sources, and then to engage readers in an honest conversation regarding the efficacy and limitations of one’s historical sources. I hope I have done in this study exactly what Clendinnen has ordered.

Between the “Tics and Tocs” of Time: Data Collection

Two types of data were collected for this history: archival records and community-generated data. I also acquired pertinent documents from the Research and Policy Office of the

---

Ministry of Women, Community, and Social Development. One of these documents is a copy of the law establishing the MWCSD. The Hamilton Pacific Collection at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa and family journals were also of tremendous assistance in the creation of this narrative. In addition, data were also garnered from the Public Service Commission (PSC) about the number of women in public employment—particularly those in leadership positions—and the kinds of jobs to which women gravitated. I interviewed, both in person and by email, a records clerk at PSC who kindly shared their government hiring and firing policies, their rationale, and most importantly, the number of women in top government posts.68

Writings by missionaries, anthropologists, and colonial administrators reveal very little about women’s position in national politics; thus, an effort has been made to uncover the gaps and silences in these writings to make possible a (re)construction of the living past of the Teine of Sāoluafata. In particular, this (re)construction aimed to reveal the nuances of daily life that both made possible the survival of their pule in village affairs, and allowed them to weather the structural challenges they encountered over the years, especially at this time.

The second type of data was developed through interviews with Teine at both village and national levels. These included phone and email conversations with Teine residing in New Zealand and American Samoa during the summer of 2007 and 2008. Data from conversations with the Honorable Fiamē Naomi Matā’afa, Afioga Luagalau Foisaga Schon, and Fa’asili Mase, minister, chief executive officer, and assistant for Research and Policy respectively, at the MWCSD have been analyzed and applied to this study.69 A most valuable source of data was  

69 Fa’asili Mase at Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development kindly offered me copies of the following reports and plans that their department had carved out for Sāmoa: Village Profiles of Upolu Island (Apia: Government of Sāmoa, 2004), First Annual Report of the Ministry of Women, Community, and Social Development: For the Period of July 01, 2003 to June 30, 2004 (ibid., 2004), Corporate Plan 2004-2007: “Men, Women and
from conversations with a few leaders of Sāoluafata: one of the two paramount male chiefs, one of the two sa’otama ’ita’i, paramount chieftesses, and two tulafale, orators, of the Nu’u o Teine.\(^{70}\)

During my final research trip to Sāmoa in January 2009, I learned that the current holder of the Sāgapolutele title, had stripped Malavai, of the paramount chieftess title, Teu’ialilo.

Although she had not been actively involved with the Nu’u o Teine for some time, she was still the legitimate holder of the paramount title. In April 2009, a conference trip to New Zealand provided me with the opportunity to meet with her for an update on her status and future plans, and to solicit her reaction to the decision by her counterpart in her absence.\(^{71}\)

Information from the 2001 and 2006 national censuses and community observations were also useful in the construction of in-depth semi-structured questionnaires administered in December 2007. Questions focused on women’s historical knowledge of their village in terms of the “everyday” of their lives and the significant events that might have changed or solidified village political and cultural systems. Preliminary data revealed that of the 181 females residing in participants’ households in Sāoluafata at the time of the research, only 62 were members of the Nu’u o Teine. At least 224 resided elsewhere in Sāmoa or abroad. Eighty-two of the 181 women were wives.\(^{72}\)

---

\(^{70}\) In July 2007, ‘Aumua and I visited with Afioga Teu’ialilo Malavai at her residence at Vaivaseuta. Her niece, Nua, who is also my first cousin, was taking care of her at the time. A few days later, I met with Luafaletele Poto and Samalā’ulu Mata’itusi at Sāoluafata, to let them know of my wish to live among them for some time later in the year. A second visit to Sāoluafata during the same period led us to Afioga Tululautū Fuea. I did not talk with her, but ‘Aumua did and collected some information from her about the status of the Nu’u o Teine. It was difficult to coordinate when we could be in Sāmoa at the same time. We also met with Susuga Tagaloa Donald Kerslake, the paramount chief of the Sa Tagaloa family, at his office in the Lands and Titles Court. He is the president of that court. Unfortunately, data from the archives at Mulini’u were not possible due to a breakdown in communication with the workers. Fortunately, I found alternative sources for the same type of information.

\(^{71}\) This meeting took place in Auckland, New Zealand. Her Afioga was bedridden with a cold at the time.

\(^{72}\) Data were from a survey questionnaire conducted on December 31, 2007, during a luncheon meeting with the Nu’u o Teine at Samalā’ulu Mata’itusi’s residence.
I also talked with a cross-section of men and women at the village, including some chiefs of the village councils, men and women of all ages and rank, and professionals with connections to the village, such as church ministers, judges, scholars, and politicians. There were also insightful and forward-thinking conversations with professional women in both private and public sectors regarding the role of mataihood in their careers. Their familiarity with research agendas enriched my discussions of power relations at various levels of Samoan society. I approached many of these people during previous visits and through email discussions, Facebook, and phone conversations. Additionally, an email-driven questionnaire on the institution of *feagaiga* administered to a random selection of students and scholars from American Samoa, Sāmoa, New Zealand, and Australia revealed useful information on the current trends within this tradition.

Community observations came from a core group consisting of relatives from within and outside the village. The above-mentioned paramount chieftesses, orators, and wives provided tremendous assistance. As befitting Samoan protocol for entering village space, getting leaders and elders involved in one’s *sāvali*, visit, implies safety and security in addition to access to critical information. Thus, this fieldwork was framed by the precepts of *Vafealoa‘i*, the Samoan respect system, in that interpersonal communication was determined by deference to village laws, mindsets, emotions, and my sense of moral obligation to both kinship connections and research dignity. A detailed discussion of *Vāfealoa‘i* is provided in the next chapter.

*Su‘ifefiloi, Threading the Scents of the Past: Cultural Schema or Oral Traditions as Methodology*

The rehabilitation of oral traditions as accepted sources of Pacific pasts does not mean a total purging of the scientific approach. In fact, such an either-or approach for this study would have been counter-productive. Thus, I took an eclectic approach, one that followed the essence
of Samoa’s art form known as su’ifefilo, or a medley of objects and styles stitched together with needle and thread, choreography, or melodies to create a new whole, be it an ‘ula, lei, siva, dance, or pese, song. Sia Figiel also uses this method of synthesis in her writings.32

A su’ifefilo is similar to, yet more nuanced than J. W. Davidson’s vision of the interdisciplinary approach. Su’i means to sew and fefilo is to mix; in lei making a su’ifefilo is the threading together of two or more different kinds of flowers into a beautiful and colorful garland. Where leis were concerned, a su’ifefilo accommodated the fact that Samoans did not grow flowers commercially; thus, there was rarely an abundance of a single variety of flowers to string into a uniform lei.

Typically, plants in a Samoan yard were largely grown for social purposes, such as village beautification, personal jewelry, and lei greeting. Samoans believed that a plant was not worth the soil it fell upon if it did not have a social function, if it was neither edible nor ornamental. Herbs and flowers were therefore for cooking and entertainment respectively. In dance and music, su’ifefilo condensed different subgenres into a whole.

This dissertation then is a su’ifefilo of data from a variety of sources, threaded into a narrative of gender and power relations at Sāoluafata, in particular, and in Sāmoa, in general, across time and space. Informed by political and social theories, historical anthropology and ethnographic history, feminist and gender theories, subaltern and third world studies, insights into and knowledge of Saoluafata’s past have emerged through in-depth semi-structured interviews, life history, and biographies.73 It privileges cultural memories and traditional

32 See Figiel’s interview with Subramani in Girls in the Moon Circle (Suva: Mana Publications, 1996).
73 On power, see Michele Foucault, Society, 2003; for a hermeneutics of the past of the Nu’u o Teine, I have tapped into Richard J. Bernstein, Beyond Objectivism and Relativism, 1983; David Swartz, Culture and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1997); Renato Rosaldo, Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis (Boston: Beacon Press, 1993); Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo, Louise Lamphere, and Joan Bamberger, Women, Culture, and Society (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974); and subaltern scholars such as Chandra Talpade Mohanty, “Introduction, Cartographies of Struggle: Third World
knowledge conserved in oral receptacles or “oral historical genres” such as lāuga, oratory, taeao, events, alagā’upu, adages, gafa, genealogies, solo, poetry, pese, music, and various artifacts such as ‘ietoga, finemat, siapo, tapa, and fishing, farming, gaming, and war implements. These are remembrances of generations of Samoans across approximately six hundred years and are given shape and form by the exigencies of each generation. Oral traditions and academic sources complement each other in this su ‘ife filoi. The value of each cannot be subordinated by the other.

A su ‘ife filoi, with all its scents and smells and at once both resilient and fragile, is a manifestation of a cultural consciousness of a people often labeled as “primitive” and “authentic.” It embraces a diversity of tellings that existed in Sāmoa before knowledge became fixed in writing. Levi-Straus redemptively makes the case for “primitive” to mean “without writing;” 74 it also counters the assumption held by some that Pacific therefore Samoan people lacked culture and are “authentic.” Such a notion, argues Jolly, is nothing more than “specters of inauthenticity.”75
In her contribution to the debate on customs and traditions in the Pacific, Jolly warns against claims that Pacific islanders were not conscious of the concept of culture, that “authentic” culture referred to pre-colonial understandings, and that islanders did not become conscious of culture until contact with Europeans. I would argue here that Fa'asāmoa before and since colonialism has thrived on the tensions that exist in the universals of national aganu’u, commonly known as Fa‘asāmoa, and of village agaifanua, the customs and traditions applied locally and on a daily basis. There is a plethora of evidence that the Samoans were conscious of culture in all its manifestations and transformations prior to westernization. Oral traditions captured in texts by Krämer, Tui Ātua, Tu’u’u, Moyle, Brother Henry, Stuebel, Aiono, Simonu, and Tanuvasa, and in the literary and academic writings of Wendt and Figiel, to name a few, speak as evidence that Samoans were conscious of their culture long before western contact.

Evidence of this consciousness may be found in the concepts of the vā (the space that is both physical and temporal and is manifest in vavau, or the material, environmental, and linguistic evidences of events and people that have come to pass) and in fa‘avavau, or what are the ways of the Vavau in the present—the longue durée of the Samoan experience. Fa‘avavau is Samoa’s.

---

78 Vavau denotes the ancient past of Sāmoa since the birthing of its cosmos by Tagaloa-a-lagi. A chat with John Mayer suggests the Vavau as that period before Pili, a descendant of Tagaloa-a-lagi who was banished from heaven.
past in the present, commemorated every day at a funeral, wedding, title investiture, or at a
dedication of a church building through oratory, material exchanges, and feasting. In the
Christian sense, the term *fa‘avavau* means “eternity.” In this study, I employ its etymological
base to mean “like the ways of, or in, antiquity.” Samoans did not believe in life after death;
instead, people’s spirits went to Pulotu, a place in the sea in the western end of the Samoan
archipelago, accessed through two blowholes at Tufutafoe, Savai‘i—one for the chiefs and the
other for the rest of the people.80

Self-consciousness of culture is manifest in Samoa’s notions of *tu ma aga*, tradition and
custom, respectively, in which culture is both fixed and flexible depending on the situation,
season, and generation. Thus, Samoan understanding of change is captured in the saying, *E sau
lava le fuata ma lona lou*, or “each season comes with its own harvesting stick.” It illustrates
further a consciousness of patterns and differences which shaped individual village or district
understandings and identities.

The *su‘ifefilo‘i* motif is illustrative of David Hanlon’s optimistic view of a decentered
history of Oceania, which “… involves a reclamation or reassertion of Oceanic pasts by the

---

79 Details of this concept will be developed in the main paper. I am coining it in the following lexicon: *fa‘a*, or “to make or to be like,” and *Vavau*, or “antiquity;” as opposed to *lumana‘i*—*luma*=in front of, *na‘i*=emphasis.
available online at Echo Library, 2006, (Echo Library [www.echo-library.com](http://www.echo-library.com)). For images of these ancestral
gateways to Pulotu, a concise docu-history of Sāmoa called *Samoana* is available on DVD and may be purchased
online or in outlets for Sāmoan food and artifacts. For people in Hawai‘i, these are usually sold at the Korean Stores
in Kalihi and Waipahu.
peoples of Oceania; and reclamation or reassertion that… should be assertive, defiant and independently produced….” Admiring the “persistence and creativity of nativeness,” Hanlon argues for a Pacific history that privileges “local knowledges and epistemologies which inform the many varied and particular practices of history in the region.” The motif could also provide a synthesis for Houston Wood’s three research perspectives which he has revealed to be prominent in Oceania; namely the disciplinary, interpretative, and practice approaches which are emphasized more or less and to a certain degree by different researchers depending on preference or the availability of sources. Symbolic of social realities, individual or group motives drive preferences for approaches, shifting sources in and out of focus depending on the demands of the moment of study.

From a Samoan perspective, sources and evidence are important flowers in the construction of genres for narratives; however, once the story is uttered, ownership is irrelevant and the product assumes new ones. Thus the search for fragrances of Samoa’s past has been made difficult by the disciplinary approach’s agitation for footnotes and citations. Nevertheless, local knowledge and epistemologies can work together with academic sources to provide a text that reflects the discursivity of real life and gives “agency” to the orality of Pacific cultures. The tactics employed in this construction reflect the ambiguities of the sources, as well as the

81 I prefer the term “recentering” to suggest that Sāmoa was a decentered space during colonialism.
84 Works by Vilsoni Hereniko and Rob Wilson, Inside Out: Literature, Cultural Politics, and Identity in the New Pacific (Cumor Hill: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1999), Epeli Hau’ofa, We Are the Ocean: Selected Works (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2008), and Albert Wendt, “Towards a New Oceania,” Mana Review 1-1 (1976): 49-60 and others confirm this need for melding perspectives and approaches in the construction of knowledge. Aiono shared at a conference in American Samoa in 2000 that Samoan chiefs, the creators of knowledge, also engaged like academics in dialectics by challenging each other about their sources. Drawing from the journals of Reverend Thomas Powell while researching in London, Aiono claimed that the reverend observed chiefs calling, ‘O le ā le lagi soifua, or “Where is the living/real evidence?” The chiefs used this process to transmit the Solo o le Vā (the story of Samoa’s cosmogony), which they gave to Powell during his stay in Manu’a in the last decades of the 1800s. For an insightful dialogic on Samoa’s Vā, see Fanaafi Aiono-Le Tagaloa, Tapua’i: Samoan Worship (Mālua: Malua Printing Press, 2003).
generative and transforming nature of Samoa’s oral traditions. I would argue that no matter the kind of contact, whether pre- or post-, cross-cultural encounters reflect all or a permutation of the elements of the human spirit, such as collaboration, conflict, and fatal impact. Oral traditions, once their layers have been peeled, reveal Oceanic societies very much aware of these issues since they, too, were curious explorers, hegemonic tui, kings, and murderers.

The use of su’ifefiloi makes sense for this history. In here, I thread together family records and elders’ memories, oral traditions, archival records, and secondary sources. Much appreciation is owed to Krämer for his salvage ethnography of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Without his seminal work on Samoan pedigree, much of what has been constructed about Saoluafata’s past would not have been possible. As well, the texts relating years of living Fa’asāmoa by Tui Ātua, Tavale, and ‘Aumua have been thoroughly mined for this purpose. Additionally, literary constructions such as the fiction, poetry, and music of Europeans such as Robert Louis Stevenson⁸⁵ and Fay Calkins (Ala’ilima), as well as by Samoans noted earlier, have all contributed to make possible this ‘ula, garland, of history that aspires to be technically brilliant and aesthetically stunning.

Framing the Chapters

In seven chapters, the primary concern is to trace the evolution of the power relations at Sāoluafata in terms of how they have been shaped, manipulated, distorted, or weakened not only by the descendants themselves, but also by colonial and postcolonial forces of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In this chapter, laying out the geography of this journey requires a periodization of six hundred plus years into what the Samoans perceive as Vavau (1300 – 1800 C.E.) when the village was founded through first contact, Faigafa’apapālagi, the European Way

(1800 -1962), and Faigafa’aonaponei, the ways of these here nights (the present from the acquisition of independence in 1962 to 1998). This last period is one of decolonization and recolonization by cultural pressures, migration, and individual desires.

Naturally, this study involves a different ontology and epistemology; therefore, in chapter two, “Indigenous References and Historical Beginnings: Conceptual and Theoretical Underpinnings,” I establish an exegesis on the key concepts of pule, tama’ita’i, woman, and tagata, self, in the context of Fa’asāmoa, Fa’amatai, and western concepts of Fa’apalemene, a western parliamentary system of governance, and Fa’alelotu, church culture. These systems thread a hermeneutics of gender and power relations at village and national levels and beyond to where Fa’asāmoa has traveled, and the kinds of encounters it has had with other systems. Since this dissertation is about women and power, Samoan understanding and practices of these ideas are juxtaposed and interpreted in light of Samoans’ experiences with Western systems. These experiences involve the challenges against the position of women in (Samoan/Sāoluafata) society that have been imposed by the hegemonic disciplinary powers of nineteenth and twentieth century social institutions such as health and education, safety and security, economics, agriculture, and politics. This conceptualization is laid out through what Richard Bernstein calls a “subtle dialectical interplay” between “the experience-near” and “experience-far” which the informant and ethnographer use to define the above.86 Clifford Geertz claims that the informant, having the former, “‘naturally and effortlessly… define[s] what he or his fellows see, feel, think, imagine, and so on, and […] would readily understand when similarly applied by others.’” The ethnographer, having the latter, uses a different “grammar” to advance his/her aims.

Incidentally, while Geertz refers to a context whereby the informant and researcher are from two

totally different cultures, my situation is unique in that I am of the culture I am studying. At the
same time, I am also of the culture of academia, which demands a different protocol in its
presentation, one that must analyze and interpret the informant’s layers of understanding in
comparison with others.

My job then is to forge a working partnership between two different social and cultural
paradigms, a partnership that transcends the either-/or-ness of binary oppositions and recognizes
differences as critical in the birthing of new alternatives and a better understanding of both the
subjects and the academy. Chapter two is where I attempt to “figure out what the devil… [the
Samoans]… thought… [they were]… up to;” moreover, I seek to perform a “dialectical tacking
between the most local of local detail and the most global of global structure as to bring both into
view simultaneously… to turn [us]… by a sort of intellectual perpetual motion, into explications
of one another.” Thus the onus is on me to employ both concepts to explain a certain
incommensurability between the two cultures.

As both the informant and researcher, the task may appear quite manageable; however,
things are easier said than done. Nevertheless, the task could very well define “me” and the
academy perhaps in terms of possessing “floating gap[s]” of understanding, created by being
either, being there, or not, or both. Although used by Jan Vansina to articulate the “[t]raditions
of origins and genesis,” I find his explanation of a “floating gap” aptly applicable here. Says
Vansina, “The gap is not often very evident to people in the communities involved, but it is
usually unmistakable to the researchers.” As the researcher, the trope floats well as an
illustration of the difficulty of piecing together a history about six hundred years long with very

---

87 For an understanding of the thesis of incommensurability and Clifford Geertz’ contribution to anthropology or
ethnography, see Richard Bernstein, *ibid.*
88 Geertz in Bernstein, *ibid.*
few sources. In the village genealogies, the recent past and origins are run together by the
subjects as though they were by, of, or for a singular generation.89

Asofou So’o provides an apt rationale as to why chapter two is also critical to this study.

So’o notes that

although much has been written about the fa’aSāmoa and Fa’amatai, most of it
has had an institutional, systemic, or procedural focus. Relatively little has been
written about the principles that underpin the system. Important concepts such as
pule, authority, or political power; soālaupule, joint decision making; ‘autasi,
consensus; alofa, love, compassion, care; fa'aaloalo, respect; mamalu, dignity;
fāautaga, tōfā, and moe (all refer to wisdom), and many others, have not been defined
extensively, and yet they constitute the basis of indigenous Samoan institutions. It is
therefore necessary to carry out much more work, in collaboration with communities,
in the area of Samoan political thought, philosophy, and ethics, not with the intent of
promoting an idealized version of the fa’aSāmoa but with the aim of rethinking
contemporary political and socioeconomic arrangements to enhance governance. As
Morgan Tuimalaleali’ifano stated in his thesis, "If Samoans continue to invoke fa’aSāmoa
without defining more clearly what they are invoking and for what purpose, fa’aSāmoa
will continue to be faigatā, difficult and ambiguous, and fa’alavelave, a burden. When
meanings are clearly established, it should be possible to put a finger on the pulse of
their transformation and thereby determine the course and direction of change.90

If anything, this study hopefully enhances understanding of both Samoan and Western
conceptions of gender and power relations as I migrate back and forth between both worlds and
not worry too much about contributing new knowledge, but “to make what we already know
analytically accessible.”91 In this chapter, cultural schema are historicized across the broader
canvas of national and international tensions at various points of contact from the deep past to
the present. Here, the narratives of Sāmoa before and since the Tongan occupation, such as the
stories of the pi’ilua, or Siamese twins, Taemā and Tilafaigā, Nāfanua, Salamāsina,
So’oa’emalelagi, and of course Luafatā’alae and Taeolalopu’a, are summarized to illustrate how

90 Asofou So’o, “Beyond Governance in Samoa: Understanding Samoan Political Thought,” TCP 17-2 (Fall 2005):
311. Italics are the author’s. Note also the difference between So’o’s spelling of fa’aSāmoa, as opposed to
Fa’asāmoa which is consistent with how I have used the prefix “fa’a-.” The jury is still out on a standard spelling.
91 Marilyn Strathern in Annelise Riles, The Network Inside Out (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press,
2001), 18.
women in the *Vavau* (1300-1800) rose to such dominance in a society mired in war, and how their contributions to the constitution and workings of gender relations before contact with the West have survived as models for the contemporary woman.

Having explained what the Samoans were thinking as they were constructing cultural schema, the next four chapters focus on Saoluafata’s women and what they were doing from the thirteenth generation, circa 1350 C.E. to 1998. In these chapters, I examine Samoa’s power and gender relations based on the various manifestations known to the Samoans, namely *pule*, *mālosi*, and *mana* and *mamalu*. Inescapably, the extended temporality and geography of the study necessitated the treatment of *pule* in two chapters. Chapter three, “*Pule Fa’avae*: Conceptualizing and Historicizing the Constitutive Power of Luafatā’alae and Heirs, 1350 to 1800 C.E.,” is an archaeology of the sources of the power of Saoluafata’s women and an interpretation of why their village has continued to be called a *nu’u pa’ia*, sacred village. Through a reconstruction of village genealogies, I examine how the mechanisms of *feagaiga* and *suli* shaped the politics of the *Vavau*, not only at Sāoluafata, but across the Samoan archipelago.

The themes resonating throughout this study are those of political and moral legitimacy—respectively *pule ma le mamalu*—of Saoluafata’s leadership. In the final analysis, I conclude that Saoluafata’s women derived their legitimacy from its allegiance to all the paramount families of Sāmoa through their dual involvement as paramount sisters and wives. This foundation knowledge, if known, may contribute to an understanding of why Saoluafata’s *Teine*, girls, might have agreed to extend their *pule* to their men folk; moreover, it might clarify what happened as Saoluafata’s vis Samoa’s women negotiated the incoming forces of colonialism, capitalism, Christianity, and postcolonial migration.
It is unknown when Saoluafata’s *Teine* began to share their *pule* with their brothers. However, through numerous searches in Krämer, ʻAumua and Tuʻuʻu, it is possible to locate such activity in three distinct periods: first, as emerging during the initial centralization of power under the rubric of the *Tafa’ifā*, paramount titles, held by a singular person—Salamāsina, second, construction of two-pronged polity for the men when Tupua Fuiavailili’s descendants married Teu’ialilo and Tululautū, circa late eighteenth century and third, consolidation as a mechanism dealing with nineteenth century encounters with Christianity and capitalism. Therefore, chapter four, “*Pule*: Shared and Shifted,” tracks the transformation of the Teine’s *pule* before and since contact with a totally different set of people—the *papālagi*, sky-bursters, from Europe and America circa 1722 – 1998. It focuses largely on uncovering the make-up of the men’s council, or the *Nu‘u o Ali‘i*. Archival and secondary sources reveal a dialectic on the effects of Christianity, colonialism, and modern governance on gender politics at Sāoluafata and at the national level. An examination is necessitated by the influence of the missionaries and church, colonial administrators and traders, and contemporary politics and culture on the women’s *pule* in the village and family. Within and against this discourse, questions are posed about the anomalous nature of gender politics at Sāoluafata and whether such difference reflects a difference from maintenance strategies and gender relations across the archipelago. Of what benefit is this ancestral difference to the *Teine* and their border crossing between village and national networks of power? It appears that the tenets of *feagaiga* have been greatly challenged throughout history by government policies and church practices. Consequently, the increasing popularity of the *suli*, heirs’, legacy which is “mataihood” for women, is a revealing change although it appears not to have caught on at Sāoluafata.92 Nevertheless, the benefits of women

---

92 Historically, only four women have received titles from the men’s council; however, all of us reside abroad. The oldest—Telea Luafata, recently passed in New Zealand. She was the first *Teine* to receive a title from the men’s council
double-dipping as feagaiga and sulì are not yet obvious although women claiming their rights to titles for their own children has had some interesting effects on families.\textsuperscript{93} Only time will tell whether democratic principles on the one hand and cultural ideologies on the other, can continue to coexist albeit in dialogic and dialectic fashion, and create a cultural synthesis which could still be called Fa’asāmoa; or whether their incommensurability will result in something else. At the village level, the girls claimed that they had the power to do whatever they wanted, without the pule of the men’s council; yet, if they were excluded from the collective management of village affairs, as was witnessed even as this dissertation was being written, how could they continue to claim political legitimacy? Issues of leadership are addressed throughout this study.

Historically, the forces of colonialism, postcolonialism, and globalization made women, agents of change, yet, to a certain extent, they failed, as such, to own the transformations in the fa’avae, foundation, of their power. The fa’avae for Saoluafata’s women had been threatened by competing professional, cultural, and personal priorities; by a lack of knowledge of village pasts; by a pragmatism of daily existence in the village, and a presentist notion that each generation was capable of shaping its own future.\textsuperscript{94} At the same time, descendants that want to emulate “authentic” traditions often find ancestral grasslands less green than the turfs of urban society, where a variety of Samoanness needs to be invented for economic, if not political expediency. I would argue that while (re)inventing tradition for the convenience of the present may be

\textsuperscript{93} I observed this situation during fieldwork whereby the title ‘Aumua had been bestowed by another family faction on more than one member thus illustrating a total violation of protocol for title bestowment. Other factions contested this action in the Lands and Titles Court in 2007. The government quarterly publication, Savali, publishes new holders for a particular title; it is bizarre how one title can have at least forty investitures. The government allows all relatives connected to a particular title a window of ninety days to contest the eligibility of people listed.

\textsuperscript{94} A cousin of mine who now resides in New Zealand gently scolded me for asking too many questions about the village. She believes that each generation will have their own interpretations. Her comments speak to the pragmatism with which Samoans deal with their pasts and presents. Basically, for daily living, who cares where anything came from? (Tilau Sialava’a, pers. comm., Wainuiomata, April 2009).
justified, there is something more preferable about knowing the roots of and stories behind these traditions—from “what was” or “what happened” to “what it might have been” or “who cares”--that sets apart the real gatekeepers of cultural pasts from the convenienists.  

At the national level, a bone of contention unearthed was the fact that the women’s traditional titles, such as those for the taupou, or sa’otama’ita’i, have not ever been registered as chiefly titles in the annals of the Lands and Titles Court at Mulinu’u. The term sa’otama’ita’i (sa’o=straight up or upright; tama’ita’i=tama is child and ta’i means first to be given, hence the child to whom the best of Fa’asāmoa is first presented) refers to the honorific or formal address for the paramount daughters or sisters whose social roles include modeling correct moral and social behavior, maintaining peace, and advising male relatives on village politics.

A sa’otama’ita’i is the village feagaiga upon whom the utmost respect is afforded and to whom the best service, food, and other protocols are given. Unfortunately, this very important woman in the village was not extended an invitation to join her feagaiga, the paramount chief, in the creation of a new political system as Sāmoa was moving towards independence after World War II. Penelope Schoeffel has written extensively about the decline in the power of the feagaiga as a result of changes in religious and political systems. The feagaiga appeared to have been marginalized by new political and religious forces during the Christian conversion and colonial periods of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries respectively. More recently, Tcherkézoff traced the transformations in Samoan society including the shift in powers from the sister (as feagaiga) to pastor (as fa’afeagaiga). Joseph Dehli noted in the early 1930s that the

---

95 That is, from people who are Samoan by convenience instead of at heart.
96 Both terms are used interchangeably to refer to the paramount chief’s daughter or sister who has been selected to lead the organization of daughters and sisters known as the aualuma. A detailed definition is available in chapter two.
Samoan woman had no hope of being elected to national politics since “political offices were elective and not hereditary, and women had less chance of being elected.” The only acknowledgment on record, if it is any consolation, is found in the texts on national honorifics where their titles are appendages to those predominantly enjoyed by the men. These titles are not eligible for inclusion in parliamentary politics. Obviously, one could argue that the chiefly titles recorded in the Lands and Titles Court reflect where the power lay in each village.

There appears to have been a gross presumption by the men involved in the shaping of the new nation in the middle of the twentieth century, that since the power in the village was vested in the matai, chiefs, and since the men were traditionally the chiefs, it was logical that the men should therefore hold all the power. Sure, the traditional application of the feagaiga roles had historically relegated the sister as supporter in the privacy of the family and within village boundaries; however, I posit that the shaping of the modern nation of Sāmoa played into colonial and church notions of gender relations, thus the Western idea of man as the head of the family, therefore head of a nation, went unchallenged. The egalitarian nature of the feagaiga seemed to have been un-thought of as Sāmoa moved towards a new system. As it were, the Samoan woman became a unidimensional entity who, in adulthood, was faletua, “wife” as back of the house. It is fair to note that the domestication of the woman’s power in Sāmoa by colonial and church policies has produced an ambivalence in gender relations and a presentist outlook on life.

After a generation or two of missionization and colonization, it was obvious that the power of


Samoa’s *sa’otama’ita’i* hence *feagaiga*, had become ambiguous. One wonders, however, if nation-building would have been different had women’s titles been registered and their participation had been at the same level as that of their brothers. Surprisingly, this state of affairs went unchallenged at Sāoluafata. The women of Sāoluafata—who prefer to be addressed as *Teine*—have had *matai* titles since the founding of the village many centuries ago; however, these have not ever been registered in the Lands and Titles Court as chiefly titles. Whether a fluke of history or an intentional act of colonial government and Samoa’s chiefs, *sa’otama’ita’i* titles, for example, those of the chieftesses of Sāoluafata, do not have any traction at all in national politics. The obvious question is, why not?

Chapter five, ‘*O le Ina’ilau a Tama’ita’i*: Economic Power, is an attempt to address the issue of whether the *Nu’u o Teine* can sustain its *pule* in village politics amid rising dissent from their male counterparts. Perhaps the more legitimate question is, can the women sustain their political power with the *mālosi*, strength, of their economics, of their materialism? This chapter explains in detail the historical basis of the women’s *mālosi*: the *ina’ilau*, row of thatch, which I refer to as Samoa’s primordial model for a work ethic. The power of the *ina’ilau a tama’ita’i* is evident across the Samoan archipelago and abroad. How does the ancient victory over thatching a roof have any relevance to today’s very different economic system? Or does it? How has this idea and practice been exploited by contemporary society and individuals in the village in order to achieve family, village, and national goals and legitimacy? Viewing ancestral *Teine* in their

---

102 *Teine* is the Samoan equivalent of girl. It lexically means female child, but also used by adult females to mark their identity as sisters and daughters of the village. One of the mandates in the *Nu’u o Teine* is that its members should always be addressed as *teine*, not *tama’ita’i*, regardless of age. In Samoan society, the category *tama’ita’i* is now understood as embracing all adult women in a village including wives, e.g., *aualuma*, or in Saoluafata’s case, the *Nu’u o Teine*, and *komiti a tama’ita’i*, women’s committee, or *komiti tumamā*, health committee, established during the colonial era. The *Nu’u o Teine* cannot be confused with the *Nu’u o Tama’ita’i*, which is present in every village of Sāmoa. When women come together to participate in governmental initiatives, the label *tama’ita’i* is used. Thus at Sāoluafata, a sister or daughter could be a member of the *Nu’u o Teine* as well as the *Nu’u o Tama’ita’i*; a wife on the other hand cannot be a member of the former.
bushes of flax and mulberry, for example, projects a canvas upon which to imagine what Saoluafata’s Teine engaged in production activities for family and village consumption.

Since contact, ideologies, execution, and challenges concerning the gendering of economic activities and economic prowess reflect a modernization or development ideology. This chapter interrogates the contribution of women to the modernization of Sāmoa particularly during the political upheavals of the early twentieth century and the transitions in leadership and personnel since Independence in 1962. The lifestories of a group of Teine in this chapter illustrate the diversification of work due to shifts in economic activities over the last two centuries. A discussion about the effects of migration on gender roles in village politics, particularly leadership, is also included. Obviously for Sāoluafata, migration has resulted in a leadership vacuum for the Nu’u o Teine. When this study began, one of the paramount chieftesses had migrated back and forth between Sāmoa and New Zealand. In 2008, she moved to New Zealand; however, due to some problems with immigration, she relocated back to Sāmoa. She was about eighty years old. The other paramount chieftess mainly resides in American Samoa and visited the village periodically. She was in her nineties.103

Movement both far and near is explored through themes such as church materialism, remittances, and world systems. In terms of the latter, is it possible that the Samoan experience has inverted core-peripheral relations so that the former colonial powers have become the periphery, with Sāmoa as the core? Are Fa’asāmoa and world system economics commensurable? Works by Cluny and Leavasa Macpherson, Asenati Liki-Chan, and Melani Anae on Samoan migration and remittances are explored against theoretical underpinnings.

103 Obviously, Samoan elders have become vulnerable to the stress of uprooting from their homes as their caretaker children seek opportunities in the urban areas such as Apia and abroad. For Saoluafata’s chieftesses, their status as sa’otama ‘ita’i and pule of the village have been compromised. Whereas in the past, they depended on the village or extended family for their sustenance and the material upkeep of their status; today, that care giving is limited to their own immediate families.
expounded by Murray Chapman and Robert Franco on circular movement and migrants in Hawai’i and the U.S. Mainland respectively.104

Besides political and economic powers, perhaps the most critical aspect of power for Samoa’s and Saoluafata’s Teine is that of mana and mamalu, spiritual and social powers. In Chapter six, “Mana ma le Mamalu: Spiritual and Social Powers,” women as sacred and revered subjects/objects of men’s desires and as sources or producers of family wealth are historicized, psychologized, and problematized. Issues concerning the gendering of virginity, the ironies of incest, and the politics of sexual orientation and how they have influenced or are sanctioned by the politics and economics of the land are addressed. Other areas worth examining as they come to affect the mana and mamalu of the Teine include the tatau, tattoo, la’ei, clothing, lauulu, hair, and taumafa, food. The politics of clothing and food is worth examining here particularly as they come to bear on individuals in both public and private spaces, and as they affect the third

sex in Sāmoa—the fa'afāfine, men that are womanlike, and fa'afātama, women that are manlike.105

Historically, virginity has been a moral, political, and economic aspect of a woman’s life in Samoan society. Tcherzékoff has provided numerous analyses of the politicization, if not demonization, of sexual orientations and conjugal practices of the Samoans before and since Christianity, and of the subsequent sanctions imposed by the church on the one hand, and men on the other.106 This chapter also asks specifically about how the church has affected the sanctity of the Nu’u o Teine at Sāoluafata, particularly its hegemony over local beliefs and practices. Conversely, how has the indigenization of Christianity affected attitudes towards the sexuality and sexual orientations of Samoans? I make the assertion that Samoan and Christian notions of morality are often at odds with each other; I believe that while the former sees morality as situational and should not demonize the individual violating social and cultural beliefs, the latter deems it an absolute sin and a damnation on the individual’s soul. Historicized here as the politics of the hymen, this chapter takes a look at the sources of virginity and Samoa’s beliefs and practices then and now.107


During the initial contacts with European explorers, Samoan women, as was the case for those of other Polynesian islands, were perceived as “mistresses of their own favors.” A derogatory phrase, this Western stereotype has necessarily been kept alive by an academic preoccupation with the virginity rites of the Samoan women. A case in point is the Mead-Freeman debate which has been recycled by a few die-hard Samoanists who appear reluctant to just let the dead die. Like everything else, a historical sketch often leads to some clarification. From a native who grew up at a time when virginity was greatly moralized for reasons not clear to me until later, this chapter hopefully lays to rest some of the misconceptions if not demoralizing attitudes by both natives and non-natives towards Samoan women’s ownership of their own favors.

Thus historicizing the women’s mana and mamalu compares and contrasts the mythical and legendary spiritual and social relations between the men and women of the Vavau, with the imagings and imaginings by Euro-American men since contact. It revisits the role of the women as pae and auli, peacemakers, for families and villages and examines the evolution of attitudes towards and beliefs in virginity, marriage, and divorce, against the reality of high birth- and (infant) mortality rates and spread of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) on the one hand, and high migration rates which drains villages of human resources on the other. Jeannette Mageo’s work on the gendering and sanctification of Samoan hairdos lends well to a discussion on the attitudes of the genders towards hair, particularly as more Samoan women of note are

111 According to the *CIA World Fact Book*, Samoa’s birth rate ranks 54th out of 221 countries with 28.6 births per 1000, 167th with 5.6 deaths per 1000, and 89th in infant mortality rates with 24.22 deaths per 1000, a number lower than only five other Pacific island nations. See the Mundi Index (Online, 2010) [http://www.indexmundi.com/g-/r.aspx?c=ws&v=29](http://www.indexmundi.com/g-/r.aspx?c=ws&v=29) (accessed July 8, 2010).
opting for the pre-Christianity short hair, as teenage Samoan boys reshape their “Polynesian” identity by donning the tattoo and long hair on the other.  

The study finally comes to rest at my Aunt Sipi’s grave. She was evidently a quiet force in the Nu’u o Teine. Aunt Sipi died in 1998 at age 80 while she was on her way to bury a fellow Teine. According to eye-witnesses, Aunt Sipi’s funeral space was inaccessible to the village men. From the guarding of her body from evil spirits as she lay in state overnight in her house to the lowering of the casket into her grave the following day, the Teine afforded her a memorable send-off, thus engraving in the minds of those in attendance the power of tradition and its significance as both a tool of cultural critique and a structure along which the old and the new converge and hopefully birth new possibilities both materially and spiritually.

Aunt Sipi’s story is a reflexive tool with which to address some of the “what ifs” and overarching issues engendering power relations in the village and nation. For Sāoluafata, questions of political and moral legitimacy, brain and labor drain, loss of traditional skills, and a sense of political dislocation have been raised, as are suggestions for a redirection of the Nu’u o Teine. In the case of Sāoluafata, the likely consequences of Teine in unconventional activities such as becoming chiefs in the Nu’u o Ali’i, marrying village men, and migrating abroad are discussed as these activities have affected the credibility of the Nu’u o Teine for upcoming generations. Personally, my becoming a chief in the Nu’u o Ali’i is a case in point and begs the question, what will be the fate of the Nu’u o Teine if those at the village opt for the national trend of joining the men in the village council? In a nation where women are repositioning themselves in a body politics that is largely driven by kinship affiliations, by a national economy that is meritorious at the professional level, by an economic system that is needs-based at the family and village levels, and by national infrastructures that are aid-dependent, the more consequential

questions that arise are: Will the *Nu’u o Teine* suffer a fate similar to the many *auluma*, organization of sisters and daughters, elsewhere in the archipelago? Can it survive another six hundred years? Culturally, what are the potential threats for and by women as *matai* on the sacrosanct creed of the *feagaiga*?

On the broader canvas of national and global politics, one must also ask whether chiefly status is a worthy bonus for services rendered, or whether it is a reflection of a false halo created by a materialism incurred through capitalism; what of the notion that the complexities of Samoa’s political systems made manifest in part by the increase in the number of women acquiring *matai* titles across Sāmoa while perhaps abandoning the *auluma*? Does this illustrate the malleability of Samoa’s customs and traditions—its *Fa’asāmoa*?

Chapter seven, “‘A *Malu i Fale, E Malu Fo’i i Fafo*, Checking the Petals of the *Su’ifefiloa: Analyses and Reflections,*” is a place to lament and reminisce, to further celebrate, and to ask: Through their ambitions and desires to gain politically and economically in a Samoanized version of democracy—or at least a democratized version of *Fa’asāmoa*—will Samoa’s *Teine* be able to say, “‘*A malu i fale, ‘e malu fo’i i fafo,*” if they are safe at home, they will also be safe outside? The dissertation concludes that the power of past women’s contributions may be learned and made transportable if, and only if, successive generations understand the foundations and utility of women’s traditions from previous generations. Intentionally, this historiography of Saoluafata’s *Nu’u o Teine* addresses the gaps in the memory of the village people regarding the origins, principles, and networks of power that have shaped their *tulāgāvae*, footholds, in their society.
Tope Tepatasi, Reflections

Constructing a history of Saoluafata’s women was almost impossible given the paucity of and an imbalance in the volumes of the different kinds of sources. This is understandable given the more recent introduction of literacy in the Pacific compared to other parts of the world, and the persistent orality of Pacific cultures in spite of two centuries of the written word. Not surprisingly, for example, an account of pre-Christian Sāmoa was limited to the interpretations of the journals of sailors and traders in secondary sources on the one hand, and the ethnology of mythical, legendary, and historical pasts by missionaries, colonial officials, ethnologists, and family chiefs on the other. The value of oral pasts for a study such as this cannot be overstated. To reconstruct Saoluafata’s past before literacy, I depended extensively on the “salvage ethnology” of Augustin Krämer and the retellings of Samoa’s past gleaned from family journals and their own experiences by Tui Ātua, Aiono, Tu’u’u and ‘Aumua Mata’itusi Simanu.

In the literature, very little analysis has been done on the history of networks and mechanisms of power in the Pacific in general and of Samoan villages in particular. The written historiography of Sāmoa includes the works by J.W. Davidson’s Samoa Mo Samoa, Malama Meleisea’s Making of Modern Samoa and Lagaga: A Short History of Western Samoa, and two recent theses about the role of Samoan women in the Mau movement of the 1920s.113 There is also a growing body of yet-to-be-published local histories compiled at national universities by islander scholars who are very interested in compiling deep histories of their people. Ethnologies and ethnographic studies on Sāmoa, however, provide valuable data and insights

into Samoa’s pasts vis-à-vis women in various localities and time periods: from the extreme simplifications of the Samoan psyche if not epistemology by Margaret Mead and Derek Freeman, through the more thoughtful and balanced narratives by Schoeffel and Shore, and the discourse on modernization/development and migration by the Macphersons, Fairbairn-Dunlop, and Shankman. For the academy, this study can only enhance the validity of local knowledge, or what Foucault calls “subjugated knowledge,” which suffered a silencing during colonialism.\(^{114}\)

The lack of a narrative about Samoan women in history is not unique. In fact, as noted in the literature review earlier in this chapter, women’s pasts had been historically ignored in academia, and women’s history as a field of study has been a recent phenomenon across the globe—hardly a hundred years in the making. This is true for places like Europe and later America, where history as a discipline was invented and had been long-established, and where, “[w]hen women figured in historical narratives they were an odd and disruptive force, from the witches of Salem in the eighteenth century to Communist sympathizers….\(^{115}\) The Pacific region as the final frontier for a historiography of women, therefore, has much catching up to do in terms of documenting village pasts that are disappearing as fast as the few elders with some such knowledge pass on. Noted also as the final frontier for global forces such as colonialism, decolonization, and postmodern and postcolonial development, the Pacific region in general did not get its first historiography until the twentieth century. Even then, the narratives were mainly

---

\(^{114}\) These studies however provide much historical data with which Saoluafata’s history can be examined. I have noted earlier Krämer’s records of Samoa’s genealogies and Margaret Mead’s accounts of Sāmoan society. Felix Keesing’s texts are worthy of note; they provide, perhaps, the most comprehensive account of Sāmoan society in the first half of the twentieth century. c.f. Mead, *Coming of Age in Samoa*, 1973; Keesing, *Modern Samoa*, 1934; Derek Freeman, “Some Observations on Kinship and Political Authority in Samoa,” American Anthropologist, New Series 66-3 (1964): 553-68; Penelope Schoeffel, “Social Change,” in *Tides of History: The Pacific Islands in the Twentieth Century*, ed. K. R. Howe, Robert C. Kiste, and Brij V. Lal (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1994), 350-80; and Bradd Shore, *Sala’ilua*, 1982. See also Cluny Macpherson, “Pacific People in Aotearoa, 2006; and Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, "Women's NGOs within the New Governance Agenda: Are They Still Based on Alofa?" in *Governance in Samoa: Pulega i Sāmoa*, ed. Huffer and So'o, 2000, 97-112.

about the activities of the Euro-Americans and the chiefly classes in the islands.\textsuperscript{114} The unsettling of this practice by scholars at the Australian National University (ANU) towards the middle of the twentieth century has made possible the inclusion of local epistemologies and ontologies. Of course, one could argue that it was a sign of the times when post World War II mandates from the United Nations called for a decolonization of the colonies. New nations and new identities emerged and with that, challenges to western imaging of the islanders as “primitive” and “savage.”\textsuperscript{115}

Finally, \textit{talanoaga}, conversations, with the elders, chiefs and chieftesses, professionals, and government leaders supplied rich context for certain customs, traditions, beliefs, and sanctions, some of which no longer exist. Fieldwork yielded much of what Tui Ātua claims as “indigenous references,” “cultural schema,” or certain versions of certain stories. These concepts and theories are the petals for this su’ifefiloi. Chapter two, therefore, is an exegesis of Samoan notions of power, of Saoluafata’s idiosyncratic socio-political structure, its mechanisms and functions, and its transformations across three time periods: the \textit{Vavau}, pre-contact, \textit{Faigafa’apapalagi}, Euro-American way, and \textit{Faigafa’aonapōnei}, ways of today, the present.

\textsuperscript{114} Caroline Ralston, *Grass Huts and Warehouses: Pacific Beach Communities of the Nineteenth Century* (Canberra: Australian National University, 1978), 1.

\textsuperscript{115} Levi-Strauss, *Myths and Meaning*, 1979, 4. He defines “primitive” as peoples without writing, not as inferior beings; he does not give a definition for “savage.”
CHAPTER 2:
INDIGENOUS REFERENCES AND HISTORICAL BEGINNINGS:
CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS

For me culture is a frame of knowing and doing, referenced on mythology, history and living customs and the laws, practices, protocols and systems that originate from that. To lose one’s cultural identity is to lose access to this frame of knowing, doing, speaking, seeing and feeling. Many of our young people today have not lost their culture, they lack it. That is, they have not been given it, or shown it or been told that this is your culture and this is why we should hold on to it.

Tui Ātua¹

Introduction: Framing Samoan Epistemology and Ontology

Two days after I arrived at Sāoluafata for fieldwork in 2007, it became evident after talking with my hosts that the power of Saoluafata’s Nu’u o Teine had apparently been in rapid decline since 1998, the year my Aunt Sipi passed away. She was the chief orator who spoke on behalf of paramount chieftess Teu’ialilo Malavai, of the Sāgapolutele family. Her own title was Nu’ualiu, but in the above capacity, she spoke as Eva, the orator-designate for her Afioga, Paramountcy.² Needless to say, since much of the knowledge about village pasts was not apparent in the Nu’u’s discourse, many of them displayed a frustration that their counterparts, Nu’u o Ali’i, men’s council, were attempting to titina, choke, their legitimacy. At the time, both the paramount leaders, Teu’ialilo Malavai and Tululautū Fuea, were residing abroad. Obviously, the absence of leadership for the Nu’u o Teine might have something to do with the seeming lack of credibility for the council, a situation perpetuated by a lack of foundational knowledge about the history of their pule. The girls admitted to this lack of knowledge and to a vulnerability to

¹ Tui Ātua, in Su’esu’e Manogi, 2009, 145.
² The highest honorific one can have in the village is Afioga or Susuga, which is comparable to “highness” in the sense of English royalty; however, I hesitate to use it here since there is some level of incommensurability between the two.
the condescension of their male counterparts and wives and the hegemony of national mandates on traditional social structures and involvement.  

It is therefore the moral imperative of this study to provide the Teine of Sāoluafata with different if not extended knowledge of the foundations of their village and its development. However, this foundational knowledge was not created in isolation; rather, it emerged from within the larger scope of Samoa’s cosmogyny and epistemology, and their accommodation of incoming tides of change across a huge spectrum of time and space. These beginnings shaped Fa’asāmoa; they formed the foundational structures upon which Samoa’s ways of knowing, or epistemology, managed to survive some of its application and/or abuse by its various agents across generations. Thus, giving thought to the origins and development of a place and its people requires thinking about how they think, a metacognitive event necessitated by a shaky sense and potential loss of identity. My intention here is to explain and interpret elements of social and political thought relevant to the study of women and power through Samoan lenses, in comparison with what exists in other parts of the Pacific and beyond. For example, Benedict Anderson’s search for “the idea of power in Javanese culture” provides insights that appear relevant to a discussion of Samoa’s conceptualization of gender politics in both historical and contemporary contexts. Ideas of “accession and succession,” and relationships between the “rulers and ruled” appear comparable to Samoan experiences to a certain extent; however, while Anderson does not focus on women per se, the attributes of a powerful Javanese leader

---

3 Asofou So’o notes in an essay on human development in Sāmoa that quite often, the national agenda for women and communities largely prompted by international policies and initiatives has infringed on the village woman’s appropriation of her time for her family and traditional responsibilities. For an elaboration, see So’o, “Governance and Rendered Services,” Samoan National Human Development Report: Sustainable Livelihoods in a Changing Samoa, 2006 (Apia: National University of Samoa, May 2006), 168.

enumerated in his illuminating essay provide a way to frame a similar explanation of chiefly attributes in Sāmoa—essential elements for one to exercise and sustain.⁵

To ask how certain things came to be in Sāmoa and Sāoluafata requires a double threading of the su’ifefilo (multi-flowered garland) with knowledge petals from the recesses of the human and spirit worlds of the deep past—both aganu ‘u, cultural practices, and agaifanua, customs particular to a village affecting power and gender relations—and their conjunction with incoming forces both near and far. As James Clifford would agree, it is extremely pertinent that particularities of a culture—in this case, Fa’asāmoa (an “indigenous longue durée” of “ordinary people” often left out of national discourse and “lost in postcolonial projections”)⁶—are understood in order that the Teine of Sāoluafata, for instance, may be convinced that some solutions to their predicament are contained within the very structures of which some of their own are attempting to discard.⁷

The larger question is how Fa’asāmoa is an epistemology, a process, and a product of the longue durée of daily living. How is Fa’asāmoa relevant to a (re)production of knowledge for the Teine of Sāoluafata?

Sandra Harding defines epistemology as a “theory of knowledge… [which] answers questions about who can be a ‘knower;’ what tests beliefs must pass in order to be legitimated as

---

⁵ Ibid.
⁷ Manu Aluli Mayer, “Remembering our Future: Higher Education Quality Assurance and Indigenous Epistemology,” in World Indigenous Nations Higher Education Consortium (WINHEC), http://www.winhec.org/?q=node/33. Mayer challenges the one-size-fits-all articulation of modern-era ideology that “advancement” is made possible only by “standardized mechanisms.” Although she was addressing an audience about a fit between quality assurance and indigenous epistemology in higher education, her point is relevant to support the attitude of this study that solutions to many problems in culture lie within it; hence the need to stop and reflect on all possibilities, not just a particular one, which was the prevalent approach of colonial education. She is of the view that knowledge and excellence need not be one-but multi-sided. This certainly falls in line with Clifford’s alternative to ethnographic representation, which he claims should be polyphonic, heteroglossic, and conjunctural, not as an essence of a particular culture. Michel Bakhtin and Julia Kristeva introduced and developed this idea in mid-twentieth century Europe.
knowledge... what kinds of things can be known ... and so forth.”

Thus, to the extent that there is such a thing as woman’s power in Samoan or Saoluafata’s society, it is critical to scrutinize native conceptualization of power, woman, and praxis. In particular, their sources and gendering as feagaiga and suli, heirs, are manifested, exploited, or protected in the Fa’amatai, chiefly system, throughout three major chunks of time and space: the Vavau, distant past, Faigafa’apapālagi, skybursters’ or Euro-American way, and Faigafa’aonaponei, the present. The triangulation of these periods reveals fluctuations in the levels and exercise of authority and the rights of men and women along a bio-social spectrum of (double) standards and sanctions which frame sexual practices (e.g. virginity rites), tautua, service, and fāiā, kinship relations.

In other words, what this chapter seeks to explain is the relational nature of the body politics of Fa’asāmoa and the demands on men and women as individuals or groups engaged in labor, love, and leadership. Fa’asāmoa is not the fixed entity many people, both Samoan and non-Samoan, have claimed it to be; rather, it is a number of things. Metaphorically, Fa’asāmoa is often compared to an i’a iviivia, bony fish, that is difficult to debone, as evident in Samoa’s succession/identity politics. It is also a coconut tree that is resilient against strong winds and currents despite the fragility of its root system and environments. Wherever its nuts fall, many of them emerge as new trees to perpetuate the species, as is captured by the wish, la fia tele le niu (“May the coconut tree fruit abundantly”) toasted to newlyweds. Fa’asāmoa is also an onion with multiple layers of scents, tastes and textures, its fumes threatening to induce tears should it be cut incorrectly and, like the coconut tree, sprouts wherever it may fall.

In this spirit, this dissertation does three things: 1) it explains the bones, kernels, and scents of Fa’asāmoa relevant to understanding pule and women, 2) it interprets these

---

components in their various layers and contexts, and 3) it digs up fragments not yet discovered or
that have been subdued for a variety of reasons.9 Genealogically, the role of this chapter is to
disrupt dogmatic and ideological tendencies of Faʻasāmoa that reflect what feminists view as a
“power to” and “power for” instead of a “power with” process.10

To explain is to define concepts in their lexicon, to reveal their etymology. Once that is
done, the next step demands a hermeneutics of how Samoans have worked or applied them in
various topographies and timeframes. Hermeneutics is about the development of a “historical
consciousness” of a people, which, in this narrative, requires a genealogy of “subjugated
knowledge” to unearth the origins of some of the attitudes, behaviors, and practices where
women are concerned.11 Foucault defines genealogy as a
coupling together of scholarly erudition and local memories, which allows us to
constitute a historical knowledge of struggles and to make use of that knowledge in contemporary tactics…. [It] is not a matter of contrasting the abstract unity of
theory with the concrete multiplicity of facts. It is… not a matter of form or… of
scientism that disqualifies speculation by contrasting it with the rigor of well-
established bodies of knowledge…. It is a way of playing local, discontinuous,
disqualified, or nonlegitimized knowledges off against the unitary theoretical
instance that claims to be able to filter them, organize them into a hierarchy,
organize them in the name of a true body of knowledge, in the name of the rights
of a science that is in the hands of the few.12

---

10 See Máire A. Dugan, “Power” in Beyond Intractability, ed. Guy Burgess and Heidi Burgess (Conflict Research Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder), http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/Power. Concepts of “subjugated knowledge” and “genealogy” were coined by Foucault in Society, 2003, 8-9. As far as conventional understandings and praxis of Faʻasāmoa, I am challenging not just colonial responses to Faʻasāmoa, but also the postcolonial excesses placed upon it by the caretakers up and down the power hierarchy in Sāmoa. The Samoan government has been trying to redirect these excesses through ongoing dialog with its people as spearheaded by the Office of the Pulenuʻu (village representatives in government).
11 Hans-Georg Gadamer in Richard Bernstein, Beyond Objectivism and Relativism, 1983, 112. For an understanding of hermeneutics in history, see Bernstein, “From Hermeneutics to Praxis,” ibid., 111. Also, Bernstein claims that historically, “hermeneutics… was developed in the nineteenth century, [and] was intimately related to the study of history and the nature of historical knowledge…. [It] began to appear among historians who were reflecting on the status of their discipline,” Ibid.
Taking her cue from Foucault, Ferguson interprets genealogy as a “disruptive approach to knowing which seeks to challenge old ideas about a certain subject… [It is] always historical, [and] working to denaturalize categories and destabilize all meaning claims, and is good at calling attention to the will to truth that inhabits inquiry.”\(^\text{13}\) As a research methodology, genealogy “finds behind every set of appearances another set of appearances; there is no stable ‘there’ out there, it is appearances all the way down.”\(^\text{14}\) Genealogical intentions in this study seek to unsettle fixed perceptions of a woman’s place and role in Fa’asāmoa through a historicization of the institution of feagaiga, which has increasingly become ambiguous, and as sulī suffering the expensive nature of pursuing public office, particularly in parliamentary elections. Contemporarily, while the woman appears to be faring better as a career or professional woman in both public and private office, her elevation to the highest positions in the nation and church (that of prime minister and pastor, respectively) has taken too long, particularly at a time when she is adamantly reclaiming her right as sulī of family titles and land, a criterion necessary for the inheritance of both.

This chapter then strives to peel the complex layers of being woman in Samoan society in her various dualities, like being wife and sister in the context of her newfound voice as heir or as chief. Above all, this chapter seeks to establish Samoan women in all her historical and cultural glory, as well as in her less glorious relegation in certain spheres. A contextualization of woman and power in the wider scope of history and geography is the focus of the next section. Here, geographic background of Sāmoa is provided into which are mapped three waves of migration and settlement: Austronesians/Lapita, Tongans, and Europeans. I then weave into this mix the transformative nature of the women’s contributions to the shaping of the periods of the Vavau,\(^\text{13}\) Ferguson, “Handout,” 2002.\(^\text{14}\) During Ferguson’s course, the metaphor of pealing an onion was used to understand the process of hermeneutics or interpreting a text.
the Faigafa ‘apapalagi, and the Faigafa ‘aonaponei. The primary idea that this study wishes to promote is that women did not just play a supportive role in the making of Fa ‘asāmoa; rather, they made and manipulated the Samoan landscape into a malleable political and social system which has managed to survive each incoming tide of change. Works by Krämer, Tupua, Aiono, Tu’u’u, ‘Aumua, Meleisea, Tuvale, Schoeffel, and Davidson largely inform this analysis.

_O le Atumu’u, the Row of Islands: Historical and Contemporary Geopolitics_

Figure 1. The Samoan Islands. Note: Western Sāmoa changed its name to Sāmoa in 1997.\(^{15}\)

The Samoan islands have been described as mostly volcanic in nature and lying between approximately 13° and 15° south latitude and 168° and 173° west longitude. Within these tropical parallels, the islands are hot and humid between the months of November and March, and relatively cool and dry between April and October. ‘Upolu and Savai’i islands are protected

from high surf by extended barrier reefs. In contrast, Tutuila has mostly fringing reefs and a beautiful landlocked harbor, which was the prize for American expansionism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. There are eleven inhabited islands in the Samoan archipelago and they stretch from Ta’u, Ofu, and Olosega in the far east to Savai’i in the far west. Between them from east to west, are Aunu’u, Tutuila, ’Upolu, Manono, and Apolima. To the north are two atolls, one of which is Rose Island and the other Swains. Rose Island is a bird sanctuary under the jurisdiction of the United States of America’s Parks and Recreation department; Swains Island on the other hand is part of the territory of American Samoa. Traditionally known as ‘Olohega, Swains was once the fourth atoll in the Tokelauan archipelago, a dependent of New Zealand. There are also many smaller uninhabited islands or huge rocks with very little vegetation, although holding much significance to local traditions.

Sāmoa is about five flight hours from Hawai’i, three and a half from Auckland, and at least two weeks by boat from Long Beach, California. It is the last place on earth to see the sun rise and set although the upcoming change in dates and times might affect this unique status in world affairs. Prior to first contact, the Samoans travelled by either canoe or longboat between the islands, or by foot inland. The current road system on ‘Upolu was ostensibly built along old footpaths running north to south and east to west on the island.

---

16 For details on the colonial construction that is Swains Island, see Betty Ickes, “Expanding the Tokelau Archipelago: Tokelau’s Decolonization: An Olohega’s Penu Tafea in the Hawai’i Diaspora,” (doctoral dissertations, University of Hawai’i at Manoa, 2009), 36-67.
17 Many of the ships that travel to Sāmoa leave from Long Beach harbor. I learned this when I was helping my daughter load a truck in Long Beach for Hawai’i, 2006.
18 Keesing, Modern Samoa, 1934, 21. This was confirmed through my eavesdropping on the conversations between ‘Aumua (b. 1921) and Uncle Uluiva (b. 1923), Spring 2008 and Fall 2009 in Kunia and Kaneohe, Hawai’i. They were born and raised at Sātalо, Fale‘ili, and, in their youth, apparently walked everywhere, even long distances to school in Apia and Leulumoega, respectively. When they were in their thirties, buses went as far as Lotofaga, Sāfata on the southside of ‘Upolu, and as far as Falefā in the northeastern side. To protect their feet, they transformed dry coconut husks into shoes.
previous century, electricity and piped water finally reached around the islands; since the rebuilding of the country after cyclones Ofa and Val in 1990 and 1991, respectively, tar-sealed roads have made travel around the islands easier, faster, and more comfortable.

Such physical ruptures and subsequent transformations in infrastructure did little to keep the human spirit depressed. Unfortunately, natural disasters often transform if not erase the bases of certain customs and traditions. In light of this understanding, a historical account of how Samoans remember their past is rendered; thus the next section introduces Samoa’s periodization of time and space as experienced by internal and external identities, those of moa fanua, literally, chickens native to Sāmoa, and moa folau, literally, sailing chickens from other oceans. Three major temporal divisions are also noted: Vavau, Faigafa’apapālagi, and Faigafa’aonapōnei.

**Vavau: Cosmogyny, Establishing the Social and Historical Vā, and Periodization**

_Vavau_ comprises two words: vā and vau. When combined, there is no macron or stress on the first syllable. The noun vā means the time and space between at least two points within or between seasons, events, or people. Vau means to mold, mix, or snatch. Sewn together, _Vavau_ is the molding and mixing of the limits of the Vā, of gendered roles and responsibilities, and of appropriated power. For Samoans, _Vavau_ was a period of boundary setting and apportionment. _O Sāmoa ua uma ona tofī_, or “that the Samoan people had already been

---

19 _Vavau_ is also the plural form of _vau_, although this vavau signifies a forceful snatching away of something from somebody’s hands. The George Pratt dictionary defines _Vavau_ as “ancient times” (n), “lasting, perpetual” (adj.) and “from vau, to pound or bruise a person” (v). See George Pratt, Rev. _Samoan Dictionary: Samoan and English and English and Samoan, with a Short Grammar of the Samoan Dialect_ (Malua: London Missionary Society, 1862).

20 According to oral traditions, the demigod Pili had four sons with Sinōletava’e: Tua, ‘Ana, Saga, Tolufale and Si’umumugagitau. When they came of age, Pili dispersed them to various parts of the island of ‘Upolu: Tua to the eastern side, Ana to the west, and Saga in the middle. They were each assigned a role, which to this day is still observed/executed when the whole nation comes together for important events. For details, see Krämer, _The Samoa Islands_, 1994; Tu’u’u, _Rulers of Samoa_, 2001; Penelope Schoeffel and Gavin Daws, “Rank, Gender and Politics in
assigned their socio-political roles and statuses,” is a precept often contested when women and individual rights are at odds with village or group rights. Nonetheless, it means that individuals and/or villages have primordially ascribed statuses relative to family, district, or national politics.

The *Vavau* is about Samoa’s past before history. Here, I refer to the period from the birth of the islands to 1830 when the London Missionary Society (LMS) brought Christianity and literacy to Sāmoa. Samoa’s traditions and ideals were structured during such time and, although they have been vulnerable to nuances in interpretation and exploitation across the ages, certain structural features have remained intact. Moreover, although Sāmoa and its people became historicized in first contact histories, the Samoans did not begin documenting their own pasts until the introduction of writing by the London Missionary Society (LMS) missionaries in the early nineteenth century.

Samoans remember people and events in the past through its ensemble of *vavau*. These are linguistic, cultural, historical, and physical evidences—e.g., proverbs, oratory, names, stories, trees, and rocks—of certain events, both natural and human induced. There appears to be consensus among the traditionalists that a family and/or village that displays or provides physical or linguistic evidence of a particular past owns that past. ‘Aumua, for example, regards the names of places, people, events, trees and rocks as *vavau*. Aiono refers to them as *lagi soifua*, living evidences, of the past. Both writers recognize that interpretations of a past event are tied to through this phrase during a social gathering; it is often used as ideology by people who do not want to change the status quo; however, it is also used as a deterrent in anticipation of one’s opinion becoming contested.

---


21 The division of ‘Upolu by Pili and his sons is alluded to through this phrase during a social gathering; it is often used as ideology by people who do not want to change the status quo; however, it is also used as a deterrent in anticipation of one’s opinion becoming contested.

22 “History” here refers to the written past.

numerous and varied, and agree that the power of the *vavau* cannot be underestimated.\(^{24}\) This does not mean that other versions are discarded; they are just less credible and are likely to be contested. Many of Samoa’s oral traditions and *vavau* were in place by the time the first wave of *moa folau*, sailing chickens, emerged from afar, namely the Austronesian/Lapita migration from New Caledonia, the Tongans from the southwest Pacific, and recently, the *papālagi*, skybursters, of Europe and America.\(^{25}\) These metaphors are often used to emphasize difference during all sorts of encounters such as sports and war. It implies a warning to natives or locals that it is shameful to lose a war or game to guests.

Samoa’s *foafoaga*, cosmogyny, depicts that the Samoans did not come from anywhere, but from within its *lau’ele’ele*, soil or land; thus, their ancestors were the rocks and earth.\(^{26}\) By the nineteenth century, each island had laid out its own version of creation as captured by George Turner in his ethnology, *Samoa, A Hundred Years Ago and Beyond*. First, the cliff and soil united and birthed Moa, the center of the earth. The god Salevao brought water to wash Moa, thus making the water holy, or *sā*. The most popular origin is as follows:

*Tangaloa of the heavens had two children—a son called Moa, and a daughter called Lu. Lu married a brother chief of Tangaloa, and had a son, who was named Lu after herself. One night when Tangaloa lay down to sleep, he heard his grandson singing—*

*Moa Lu,*

*Moa Lu,*

*After a time, he changed it to—*

*Lu Moa,*

*Lu Moa.*

*Tangaloa was annoyed at the presumption of the lad, as if he wished to be above Moa the firstborn. He feigned an errand, and called the boy to come and scratch his back. The boy went to perform the operation, but on stretching out his hand was seized by his grandfather, and beaten with the*

\(^{24}\) *Vavau* is the period of Samoa’s past before Western contact; *vavau* (in lower case) refers to the manifestations of this past in terms of objects, names, stories, etc.\(^{25}\) See Simanu, *Fāa Fā’atūmua*, 2011 and Le Tagaloa, *Faasinomaga*, 1997.\(^{26}\) Krämer, *The Samoa Islands*, 1994, 26.
handle of his fly-flapper. Lu made his escape, came running down to the earth, and named it SĀMOA.27

Once on earth, Lu turned around and banned Moa from his new domain. A popular version however claims Lu raising moa, chickens, and sanctifying them; hence, the name Sāmoa, or sā ia moa, sacred to moa. One day, while away from his chickens, a group of boys from Tagaloa-a-lagi’s family ate them. Lu flew into a blind rage and a chase ensued from the first heaven toward the tenth where Tagaloa-a-lagi resided and where the boys were heading for refuge. Just as Lu reached the ninth heaven, Tagaloa-a-lagi stopped him and offered his daughter, Amoā, carried, later renamed Lagituavalu, Eighth Heaven, as ransom for his chickens. It is worthy of note here that as Samoa’s progenitor, Tagaloa-a-lagi, whether inadvertently or not, laid out the now defunct tradition of the Samoan woman as tausala, the sacrifice, offering, or price for family crimes. Aiono professes that it was not uncommon in pre-Christian Sāmoa for virgins to be offered as sacrifice on behalf of the family. Today, the terms tausala and taupou are used interchangeably to signify virginity, and to symbolize the virtues of grace and dignity.28

Turner also notes that each island had its own version of the peopling of the archipelago. Manu’a believed in Tagaloa-a-lagi as the supreme God who peopled the earth by transforming creepers into maggots and then to humans; meanwhile, ‘Upolu claimed that Tagaloa-a-lagi was in a union with a demon woman which issued forth Pili, the lizard. Much later, Pili’a’au, a great, great, great grandson of Tagaloa-a-lagi, sealed the fate of Sāmoa.29

27 Turner, Samoa, a Hundred Years Ago, 1884, 11. Sā means taboo or sacred; it is also the umbrella term for ‘āiga potopoto comprising multiple lineages, i.e. ‘Āiga Sā Tupuā, or all the lineages connected to Tupua Fuīavailili, one of the tafa ‘ifā, kings of Sāmoa. The others were, in the order of their appearance: Before Tupua—Salamāsina, Fonoti, and Muagututi’a; after Tupua—‘Afoafouvale, Galumalemana, I’amafana, and Mālietoa Vainu’upo. There are two major families of Sāmoa today: Sā Tupuā and Sā Mālietoā.
29 Albert Wendt, The Songmaker’s Chair (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2004), 8.
Savai’i proffered that the red and brown soils combined to create Papatū, the standing cliff. He mated with Papa’ele, the cliff soil, and had Papatea, the white cliff. Papatea married Papaana, a cavern, and they birthed Lagi, song, Fati, melody, Elo, stench, and Taufalematagi, fresh breeze, which united with ‘Alao, the lake in the mountains, to create the two aitu, demons, Saolevao, sacred to the forest, and Saveasi’uleo, the half human, half eel guardian of Pulotu, the spirit world.\textsuperscript{30} I refer to the people of this creation as moa fanua, the chickens of the land, or indigenous chickens, as opposed to moa folau, in-sailing chickens from other shores.

**Moa Fanua: Chickens of the Land or the Children of Tagaloa-a-lagi**

Samoan world view operates in circular or cyclical fashion to reflect the various plant and animal seasons, and the dome of the sky. Within this dome evolved environments in which geological and biological elements combined to birth its moa fanua. Samoa’s creation is believed to have happened in the $V\tilde{a}$, the physical, social, and mental space between at least two places, $v\tilde{a}$ $i$ $mea$, or vāimea\textsuperscript{31}, or the temporal space between two seasons, $v\tilde{a}$ $i$ $tau$, or vāitau, of crops (taro or breadfruit), fishing, or years (tausaga, or the cycle of seasons/life; a year). The word $tau$ also signifies weather and climatic variations. The most well known seasons or cycles were associated with harvesting, such as vāitau, season, of the palolo.\textsuperscript{32} vāitau $o$ le atule, the

\textsuperscript{30} Krämer, *The Samoa Islands*, 1994, 26. Saolevao and Saveasi’uleo loom large in Samoan mythology as the progenitors of certain paramount families of Sāmoa.


\textsuperscript{32} Palolo (*Eunice viridis* or “*Eunice viridis* is also known as *Palola viridis*. It falls into the Phylum Annelida, Class Polycehaeta, Order Aciculata, Family Eunicidae.” This and more information about this Samoan delicacy may be found on the website SeaPics.com, “Palolo Work Pictures,” http://seapics.com/feature-subject/marine-invertebrates/palolo-worm-pictures.html. Samoans believe that the palolo worms are attracted to the surface by the scent of the moso’oi flower and by music. Thus on the nights when they are expected, groups of catchers line the shores with their props and hope for a successful catch. In the past, palolo was shared near and far among relatives and neighbors. Some believe that the seeming shortage of the larvae in Sāmoa may be attributed to its increasing commodification, which went against Samoan beliefs of reciprocity. The palolo has been angry, some say, because of greed.
season of the fish, *atule*, and *vāitau o le toto o a’e o la’au*, season of the blooming of the trees.

Other temporal designations were determined by the sun, moon, and wind. Today, people have substituted *tau* (weather or climate) with *taimi*, time.

The terms *moa fanua* and *moa folau* were and are still used as informal references to distinguish hosts from guests when a *malaga*, group of visitors, arrives for a series of engagements, usually sports or pageantry. For instance, when the Samoans were not at war, they were engaged in sports and entertainment, or all sorts of expeditions; courting parties could be included in this mix. Cricket was perhaps the largest institutionalized sport of Sāmoa during the *Fa’apālagi* era; it often mobilized chiefs, women, and children—anyone who could travel with the village team to a tournament elsewhere. Cricket, however, was not the only competition in evidence; many social relationships resulted in another kind of competition—marriage. Whatever the nature of the relationships, the hosts held themselves to a standard of performance to ensure that guests did not win or take every prize regardless of their social value.

It was not pleasant to lose to the *moa folau* when one had home advantage. Young males knew

---


34 *Itulā*, the side of the sun facing the earth, designates the different “hours” of time: *vaveao* means “quickly day” or “daylight is quickly approaching;” *taeo* defines daylight from morning until noon, but is also the term for tomorrow or a “significant event in the past;” *aoauli* is the afternoon; while *afiafi* means evening; *pogipogi*, dusk; *pō*, night; and *valuapō*, the wee hours of the morning. From a lunar perspective, the moon, *māsina*, orients time. The lunar terminology is adjectival in nature such that *māsina fou* is the new moon, *māsina falao* is the waning moon, and *māsina ‘ātōa* is when the moon is full. The month and moon share the same name of *māsina*. In a gendered sense, menstruation is known as *ma’i māsina*, or “monthly disease.” The story of how the moon got its name Māsina is about Sina and her child during a famine. One night, the mother watched in hungry disgust at the huge ball of light ascending above the horizon. It appeared to be teasing them, so she cursed it. Consequently, the ball swooped down and snatched them upward to the heavens. *Sina* was *mā*, ashamed, and since that night a long, long time ago the moon got its name, Māsina.

35 Cricket was introduced by missionaries in the nineteenth century and was soon localized to suit Samoan temperament and resources. It became the national sport in the twentieth century and was sometimes attributed as the cause of food shortages since the men preferred play over work in the plantation. Cricket spread across the Pacific and, today, there are professional leagues in New Zealand. See Iulia Leilua, “Superific Kilikiti Tournament,” in *Connecting the Pacific Website*, [http://www.eventpolynesia.com/events/Samoa/archive/NZ3_page_superifickilikiti02.htm](http://www.eventpolynesia.com/events/Samoa/archive/NZ3_page_superifickilikiti02.htm).
this well and suffered ridicule and cynicism from the community for losing their game, including their women.\(^{36}\)

**First Wave of Moa Folau, First Sailing Chickens: Austronesians, Lapita, and “Transported Landscapes”**

If we accept the premise that Samoans were created with rocks, soil, and worms, then Sāmoa was inhabited when the descendants of Austronesians arrived circa 1000 B.C.E. Sir Peter Buck, also known as Te Rangi Hiroa, from New Zealand, told the chiefs that the Samoans were descendants of a people known as Austronesians—migrants from southeastern China.\(^{37}\) The Samoans rejected this notion and argued that they were created by the god Tagaloa-a-lagi from rocks and worms. The persistence, however, of linguistic and archaeological evidence has sustained western scholarship’s theory of migration and the peopling of the Pacific for more than three thousand years. Hence, the Austronesians moved in an east-southeasterly direction through the Malay Peninsula, and across Sundaland into Sahulland and Australasia.\(^{38}\) The Papuans had

---

\(^{36}\) A *malaga* entailed massive accumulation of food and wealth and normally lasted a week. Malaga were usually motivated by capital improvement projects requiring funds for materials and compensation for the builders. Today, these trips are church-driven since churches are constantly building and organizing. For colonial perceptions on Samoan *malaga*, see Keesing, *Modern Samoa*, 1934, 327; see also Richard Philip Gilson, *Samoa 1830 to 1900: The Politics of a Multi-Cultural Community* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), and F.H. Grattan, *An Introduction to Samoan Custom*. Apia: Samoa Printing and Publishing, 1948.


already mapped themselves into the continent of Australia by this time, as well as into the islands of Papua New Guinea and its immediate neighbors.\(^{39}\)

It is highly probable that marriage between Austronesians and Papuans took place and for a variety of reasons their descendants scattered across the western Pacific, with some braving the deep waters of the vast Moana, or the remote Pacific.\(^{40}\) Some landed on volcanic islands where fauna and flora were abundant and others, perhaps late arrivals, made do with the meager fruits of atoll environments. However, people on the atolls were adept in shaping the waters for their sustenance and recreation. Their boats were sophisticated and solid and their navigation skills superb, as witnessed in the remarkable talents of Mau Pialug and the people of Satawal in Micronesia.\(^{41}\)

Regardless of what these early encounters constituted, additional archaeological and linguistic evidence suggests that these people settled in Fiji, Tonga, and Sāmoa and were themselves the ancestors of today’s Polynesian race.\(^{42}\) Circa 2950 B.C.E., this group of people known as Lapita, from Vanuatu (formerly the New Hebrides) and New Caledonia brought with

---

\(^{39}\) Bellwood, ibid.

\(^{40}\) There has been much written about the peopling of the Pacific from Sāmoa and Tonga; thus I do not elaborate on that here. For a concise explanation of the migration and settlement patterns in the Pacific, see Brij V Lal and Kate Fortune, ed. The Pacific Islands: An Encyclopedia (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2000), 53-117. For detailed studies on the same topic, see Kirch, Roads of the Winds, 2002; Oliver, Polynesia in Early Historic Times 2002; Patrick V. Kirch and Roger C. Green, Hawai‘i, Ancestral Polynesia, 2001; and Valerie J. Green, and R. C. Green, “An Accent on Atolls and Approaches to Population Histories of Remote Oceania,” in The Growth and Collapse of Pacific Island Societies: Archaeological and Demographic Perspectives, ed. Kirch P. Vinton and Jean-Louise Rallu (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2007).

\(^{41}\) See “The Navigators: Pathfinders of the Pacific [videorecording],” produced and written by Sam Low and directed by Boyd Estus and Sam Low (Watertown: Documentary Educational Resources, 2009), 1 videodisc (59 min.). For a history of the Polynesian Voyaging Society, see website: http://honoolulu.hawaii.edu/hawaiian/voyaging/pvs/.

them their way of life and several artifacts and plants, including lapita pottery and the kava plant \textit{(Piper methysticum)}. They ventured farther east into Remote Oceania, into Fiji, Tonga, and Sāmoa, thus giving root to their “transported landscapes” while colonizing new ones. Shards of their pottery were the \textit{vavau}, evidence, used by archaeologists to validate migration theories of an eastward-bound people, the Austronesians from southern China and what is now Taiwan. Incidentally, kava would play a crucial role in the political order of Sāmoa. Significantly, women featured largely in the kava culture as chewers and later mixers of this drink for the chiefs. Oral traditions provide evidence that before western colonialism, Fiji, Tonga, and Sāmoa shared ancestries and cultures, and at times traded barbs with each other, shifting alliances as the exigencies of the time required it.

These \textit{moa folau}, like their ancestors, had to tame the receiving environments, including potentially hostile populations who were there ahead of them. Alternatively, they may have sent existing populations into the caves while they took over these early settlers’ lands and crops. At first, settling the different islands of Sāmoa was probably done by small groups of families. As they blended with the \textit{moa fanua}, they adopted local gods and worship, or forced the receiving communities into adopting their own to suit their new homes. They mapped themselves out across the islands—space abound and there was room for everyone in the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[45] Kirch, \textit{Roads of the Winds}, 2002, 95-96. Kava, interestingly, has remained the drink of the Samoan chiefs; however, it has not become a popular social drink among Samoans the way it has in other islander groups.
\item[47] There is in Paia, Savai’i, a cave in which lived “little people” who the villagers believed were spirits. Discovered in the \textit{Vavau}, the little people and the chief Maua’i met and in order for their identity to remain obscure, they begged the chief not to tell others about them. In return, Maua’i would become a very rich man. This overnight wealth made the other villagers suspicious and eventually convinced Maua’i to reveal the source of his fortunes. The little people were never seen again. For the full story in both Samoan and English, see Paul Wallwork, ed. “The Village of Dwarves,” in \textit{Samoa Ne’i Galo, Samoa, Lest we Forget: Tala Tu’u ma Tala o le Vavau a Samoa, A Compilation of Oral Traditions and Legends of Sam, ed. Paul Wallwork (Apia: The Ministry for Youth, Sports and Cultural Affairs, 1994), 113-17.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Samoan islands—and they had a chance to give their new space names. An examination of Samoa’s naming system indicates that people’s names and those of their villages reflect those of their founders and/or some of their deeds. Sāoluafata, for example, was named after its founder, Luafatā’alae. ‘Upolu was named after the couple ‘U and Polu who discovered it. The title ‘Aumua derived from the legend of Fiti’a’aumua, the Tui Manu’a who ruled the Polynesian kingdom from Manu’a. Brother Henry, however, claims that the identity of Sāmoa originated at the beginning of the Tongan occupation circa 900 C.E. and that each island had its own name and its own paramount chief.

Figure 2: A Samoan canoe of the 1920s

To settle, labor was needed, thus chiefs perhaps welcomed newcomers from near and far, and even rehabilitated those enslaved as the spoils of war. Since the days of Pili’s sons, Sāmoa is known to have engaged in incessant sibling wars; thus, populations were probably quite
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48 Turner, Samoa, One Hundred Years, 1884.
49 People from Rarotonga, Tonga, Fiji, and neighboring Sāmoa paid tribute to him until toward the end of the first millennium C.E. See Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 1984; Tu’u’u, Rulers of Samoa, 2001; and Simanu, O Si Manu A Ali‘i, 2002.
50 Henry, Tala Fa’asolopito o Samoa, 1958, 26.
mobile as victors and losers exchanged statuses. As populations grew, there was probably a need to organize and keep order.

Each pui'āiga, immediate family, was headed by the father, who, as head of household, was given a chiefly title to symbolize and remember an event or a role performed impressively by the recipient. He ordered his meeting house built in the dome shape of the sky, propped up by a single post in the center and by a circle of posts at the rim. Tagaloa-a-lagi, supreme God and father of the Samoan race, thatched his house with red feathers and called it, the Fale’ula. Under the post was a magālafu, fire pit, housing live embers which were revived into flames during prayer. Such flames were known as fanaafi o fa’amalama. Men, women, and children were ranked and placed in groups. Heads of households met periodically or whenever the need arose to decide how to keep the village fed and safe in anticipation of famines and invasions.

![Figure 3: A maota, high chief’s guest house in Pago Pago, 1894](image)

---


Eventually, as peace prevailed, the founder made himself paramount chief of the village or district, and incorporated the heads of households as representatives of their families in *a fono*, council, or circle, of chiefs.

To gain a seat in the circle, the head had to be matai himself.\(^{54}\) Such was the way in which the *nu’u māvæ*, foundation villages, were shaped.\(^{55}\) Many of the founders became *tulafale ali’i*, orator chiefs, who had both the right to govern and the role of administrator. As succession protocol became an *i’a iviivīa*, a bony fish,\(^ {56}\) subsequent holders sought links to royal families or lineages of Sāmoa.\(^ {57}\)

Families and villages around Sāmoa duplicated the model; the founder as paramount chief had a round *maota*, meeting house, while his *tulafale* as executor had the oblong shaped meeting house called *laoa*. The chiefs were thus perceived as Tagaloa’s representatives on earth, and were therefore granted the power to impose law and order and appropriate family resources and responsibilities.\(^ {58}\) For centuries, as communities evolved, these ancestors established law and order and various social institutions to enforce and execute daily life, lead fishing

\(^{54}\) Tcherkézoff posits that Samoa’s *fa’amatai* is a recent development in Samoa’s history, more a response to colonial efforts to eliminate *Fa’asāmoa*. Yet, the Bible has the term *matai* in it, and it was translated early in the nineteenth century which would make it safe to conclude that the term had been around for some time. See Tcherkézoff, “Are the Samoan Matai ‘Out of time’?” in Samoan Governance, ed. Huffer and So’o, 2000a; also in “The Samoan Category Matai (chief): A Singularity in Polynesia?” *JPH* 109-2 (2000): 151-90.


\(^{56}\) The metaphor is used by orators to acknowledge the fact that Samoan affairs are like a bony fish which is hard to debone—particularly useful to calm an audience’s nerves as genealogies and past events are recited. See Simanu, *Fa’atūmua*, 2011, 87.

\(^{57}\) For a clear listing of the ten families of Sāmoa, see Simanu, *ibid.*, 2011, 85-141.

expeditions, provide boundaries for courtship, organize people into rank and status, and allocate labor according to age, gender, and skill. Skirmishes over boundaries surely erupted periodically; however, given the size of the population of Sāmoa at the turn of the twentieth century, approximately 35,000, it is doubtful that land was a common reason to go to war.59

As time passed and as Tagaloa-a-lagi’s heirs scattered around the archipelago, the days of convening with the *atua*, spirits, and *aitu*, ghosts/demons, evolved into a more secular order, and the village emerged as the basic unit of government. When Sāoluafata was founded, approximately 1350 C.E., the island of ʻUpolu had already been divided into the three districts of Ātua, Ā’ana, and Tuamāsaga. The western half of Tutuila had been incorporated into the Ātua district. Being established in Savai’i at the time was a father and daughter powerhouse; Saveasi’uleo and his daughter Nāfanua had control of Savai’i after defeating the eastern half, A’ea i Sasa’e, and freeing their own people in the western half, A’ea i Sisifo. They resided in Faleālupo where some of Samoa’s customs and traditions originated.60

Some scholars believe that this distribution marked the first colonizing experience of the Samoan people, hence a new political order on ʻUpolu.61 But there was no peace and harmony among Pili’s heirs since not long after Pili departed for Pulotu, the brothers squabbled over boundaries. Samoa’s *Vavau* from that point forth would be characteristically violent as siblings from different “bushes” rivaled over paramount titles and land. Saoluafata’s *Nu’u o Teine* began

---

59 Keesing, *Modern Samoa*, 1934, 32-33. According to Keesing, Captain Wilkes of the 1839 United States expedition estimated the native population of Sāmoa at 56,000. In 1930, it stood at 40,722 in Western Samoa and 8,926 in American Samoa. Keesing also includes the fifth of the population that perished during the 1918 Spanish influenza epidemic. The population then was approximately 35,000.

60 Nāfanua was instrumental in the reconstitution of the power matrix of Sāmoa in the early 1500s. This was when her priest Tupā’i, also of the Tonumaipe’a lineage, bestowed all the paramount titles on Salamāsina, his sister So’oa’emalelagi’s adopted daughter. See Tu’u’u, *Rulers of Samoa*, 2001, 349-406, for a comprehensive account of Nāfanua’s role in creating and controlling Samoa’s politics during and after her death. For other explanations on this new political era, see Malama Meleisea, et al., *Lagaga: A Short History of Western Samoa* (Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, USP, 1987), 28-33. It was also from Faleālupo that the work model for women hailed. This is the *ina ilau a tama ita’i* which is treated in more detail in chapter five.

with one such war. However, before presenting details of Saoluafata’s past, the focus of this study, there are two more waves of moa folau to explicate: those from the southwestern corner of western Polynesia, and then much later, those from north of the equator.

Second Wave of Moa Folau: the Tongan Chickens from the South

The Samoan word for south is “toga.” It is also the name of the only kingdom still in existence in the Pacific: Tonga. Brother Henry situates the Tongan invasion and occupation of Sāmoa between 950 C.E. and 1250 C.E. One could speculate how the Tongans could have subdued the Samoans for that long, but that is a different discussion for a different time.

Notwithstanding, I would support Tu’u’s premise that many of the Tongan tui, kings, presumably found the Samoan islands expansive and resource-rich, and launched numerous invasions. For the most part, claims Tu’u, these invasions were rejected by Samoa’s Tui Ātua and Tui Ā’ana forces until the middle of the twelfth or thirteenth century when Tui Tonga Talaife’i’i (Talakaifeiki) managed to subdue them and establish headquarters in Savai’i. However, his purported cruelty did not endear him to the Samoans; thus, according to Tu’u, his reign between 1164 and 1169 C.E. ended in violence and brought to a close the supposedly longue durée of Tongan invasions and occupation. However, Tonga’s influence on local politics lingered on, if not in practice, at least in the genes. An extended discussion of this premise appears later in this chapter; meanwhile, a briefing on perhaps the most transformative
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62 The concept “bush” is used when people—chiefs who are often compared to lupe or pigeons—converge for an important meeting, hence, “O lupe sa vao’ese’ese, a’o lenei ua fuifui fa’atasi, Pigeons from different bushes are now clustered in one.”

63 Henry, Tala Faasolopito o Samoa, 1958, 2.

64 Tu’u, Rulers of Samoa, 2001, 189-90. Based on Krämer’s method for determining generations and his assertion of at least 500 – 700 years of historical probability, Tala’ife’i’i does not occupy until early fourteenth century. See Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 1994, 642-43. See also Henry, Tala Faasolopito o Samoa, 1958, 29-34.

65 Oral traditions point to an active relationship among the Tongans, Fijians, and Samoans deep into the primordial past. A useful source about this relationship is a publication by Shawn S. Barnes and Terry L. Hunt, “Samoa’s Pre-Contact Connections in West Polynesia and Beyond,” in The Journal of Polynesian Society 114, no. 3 (2005), 227-66.
flock of moa folau is in order. Enter the papālagi, skybursters from different oceans: the Europeans and Americans.

Third Wave of Moa Folau: Papālagi Chickens from a Different Ocean

The second period of tremendous significance in the sorting of Samoa’s pasts is what Samoans call Faigafa ‘apapalagi, the skybursters’ way, henceforth called the Euro-American or Western way. This wave of moa folau was of a very foreign disposition. From Europe and America, they burst through the horizon—quite literally known as the papālagi (pā=to burst, lagi=heaven). They were explorers, whalers, convicts, merchants, traders, missionaries, literary and fine artists, adventurers, opportunists, and colonialists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Some were armed with guns, others with cloth and beads, still others with bibles. They killed, clothed, and converted the populous with awesome albeit deadly technology and cunning. They capitalized on native divisions by competing for chiefly favors, including, as the Tongans before them had done, chiefly brides. Their motives were both noble and savage; their favors, conditional; and their currency more tempting.

Explorers, Beachcombers, and Merchants: First Contact

First, the explorers came in the eighteenth century. Then the rest brought in the nineteenth century capitalism (merchants and colonial officials), organized religion (missionaries), and a philosophy that encouraged individualism against Samoa’s communalism. Initial encounters were mixed; exchanges of beads and iron for basic supplies were, for the most part, peaceful. Their perceptions of each other, however, were colored by

---

their respective ideologies. They sought what Richard White regards as a middle ground for negotiations of material and spiritual differences.\textsuperscript{67}

Dutch navigator Jacob Roggewein was the first European to be recorded as having sighted Sāmoa in 1722. A crew member offers a view of the Manuans as follows: “They are friendly in their speech and courteous in their behavior, with no apparent trace of wildness or savagery. They do not paint themselves, as do the natives of some other islands, but on the lower part of the body they wear artfully woven silk tights or knee breeches. They are altogether the most charming and polite natives we have seen in all of the South Seas…”\textsuperscript{68}

French navigator Louis Antoine de Bougainville, Comte de Bougainville (1729 - 1811) reached Sāmoa in 1768 after a stop in Tahiti and though he did not make landfall, he thought the Samoans were great navigators, hence his naming of these islands the Navigator Islands.\textsuperscript{69} However, a view of Sāmoa turned negative with the arrival of John Francis Galaup de la Pérouse, or Lapérouse, of France in 1787.\textsuperscript{70} His expedition was the first to land on Samoan soil—at the village of Aasu on Tutuila; his encounter with the villagers ended tragically. Twelve of his men and a few Samoan men were killed. Thus, for a while, Europeans avoided these islands and it wasn’t until the turn of the century that beachcombers washed ashore and settled in the islands. Some of them crossed inland and took up residence with Samoan women some of whom were members of the paramount families. Soon after their arrival, merchants and traders


\textsuperscript{69} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid.
emerged and many were caught up in the intrigues of the civil wars plaguing Samoan society at the time.

The advent of Christianity transformed Sāmoa into a relatively peaceful environment, thus making it attractive to capitalists needing a benign atmosphere in which to incur profits. For more than two centuries (1722 to 1962), these fowls transformed Samoan culture and environments in many respects. Perhaps the most affected by these changes were the women in the village and subsequently in national politics. In the nineteenth century, two British missionaries of the LMS were stationed at Sāoluafata.

Missionaries and Traders: Bibles and Bullets

By 1830 the second wave of Europeans had arrived—these were the missionaries and traders. John Williams of the London Missionary Society—presently the Ekalesia Fa’apotpotoga Kerisiano i Samoa (EFKS)—sailed his “Messenger of Peace” into the waters of Sapapāli‘i in August 1830. Six Tahitian and Rarotongan teachers and their families, and a Samoan couple whom they picked up in Tonga, accompanied him. Faueā was supposedly related to Mālietoa Vainu’upō, the king or paramount chief of Tuamasaga (‘Upolu) and Savai‘i at the time; he was a great help as interpreter between Williams and Mālietoa who immediately accepted the new faith. In 1835 the Methodist church arrived; ten years later in 1845, the Catholic mission set foot on Savai‘i. In a span of fifty plus years, the Samoans had incorporated Christianity into their animistic beliefs and accepted the writing system.

---

71 Ibid.
Merchants and traders shaped the port town of Apia. In 1838 the “first written agreement between Sāmoa and a foreign country, the Commercial Regulations [was] drawn up between the Apia Chiefs and H.M.S. “Conway.” A year later two significant events happened: the U.S. Naval Expedition led by Commander Wilkes reached Sāmoa and John Williams was killed at Eromanga (present day Vanuatu). In 1841, Mālietoa Tavita (formerly Vainu’upō) died and was succeeded by his brother, Taimalelagi; in the same year, Captain Hudson of the Wilke’s expedition burned Sāoluafta and its sub-villages as retribution for the murder of a sailor a year earlier.

The second part of the nineteenth century was a time of heightened European penetration. Amid the civil wars of succession to traditional titles between the various districts in Sāmoa, the first theological college was established at Mālua in 1844; soon after, Papauta Girls School was built at Vailima. The former L.M.S. missionary, G. Pritchard was appointed the first British Consul two years later. W. Pritchard, his son, established the first permanent store in Apia (1849). A U.S. commercial agent was appointed in 1853 and in 1855, J.C. Goddefroy and Sons of Hamburg, Germany appointed August Unshelm as their agent and started trading.

In 1860, Unshelm drowned in Fiji and Theodore Weber replaced him; Weber became Consul for the City of Hamburg. Goddefroy and Sons were bankrupt in 1870 and were bought out by Deutsche Handels-und Plantagen Gesellschaft, commonly known as D.H. & P.G. Weber was involved with the signing of the contract in 1877 with the Sāoluafata chiefs for German ships to use Saoluafata Bay as a harbor.

---

73 Ibid.
For the rest of the century, says Wendt, Samoans and Europeans were actors in a theatre without a common cause. Chiefs and warriors, merchants and traders, beachcombers and laborers pursued their own brand of self interest. The Samoans refused to provide plantation labor; instead they became traders in their own right. They were enthralled by the exotic European goods. They appeared to view God and goods as part of the exoticism of worlds beyond the horizon. Nonetheless, despite the reality of guns and exile, the Samoans would not unite under someone else’s chief. New Zealand, as a British agent, wished to annex Tonga and Sāmoa but was denied; American and British agents made an effort to centralize power in Sāmoa with one of the paramount chiefs as king. A case in point was Mr. Steinberger who wanted Sāmoa to become an American territory. He resigned his position as an agent, raised the U.S. flag next to the Samoan flag and made himself prime minister in Malietoa Laupepa’s government. However, Steinberger was discovered to be double crossing the Samoans over a land deal; Laupepa was then forced to deport him and he was taken away by the H.M.S. “Barracouta.” Eventually, settler populations requested legal if not military support from the home countries. In a three-way consul, the British, Germans, and Americans established a municipal government in Apia.

Colonizers and World Systems: Competing Governance and Economics

Few though they may be, studies about Samoa’s colonial past characterize it as a period of alternating war and peace and revealing of the types of men and the decisions they made and executed. For the Samoan, the argument has been made about his zest for custom and tradition made manifest in the ietoga, finemat, and his royal lineage, his identity. The adage, O Sāmoa ua uma ona tofi, Sāmoa has already been apportioned, promotes an ideology that outsiders find hard

78 Ibid.
to comprehend in light of global initiatives for individual vis a vis gender equality. The Samoan is psychologically grounded in this ideology since it forms the basis of his fa\'asinomaga, identity. It is an identity transported by titles and land throughout the ages and loyalty to both is vital.

To the various *papālagi* who found the beaches and people less hostile than those in other places, Sāmoa was the idyllic paradise to be gotten by any means at their disposal. Wendt characterizes “pre-partition” Sāmoa in the latter half of the nineteenth century as a period of political exploitation by the three European powers of Germany, America, and Britain in the interest of protecting the settlers’ economic enterprises. Says he,

The foreign governments and consuls, concerned about their plantation and trading interests, strove to establish a strong Samoan government that would protect these interests. This task became more urgent when New Zealand attempts to force Britain into annexing Sāmoa grew more pronounced, and as the Samoans and missionaries pleaded with Britain (and America) to annex the territory. The consuls (and their governments), in this attempt to safeguard their interests in Sāmoa, signed treaties with various chiefly groups. In 1877, the Germans obtained exclusive rights to Saluafata harbour. The U.S.A. followed suit, in 1878, by gaining similar rights to Pago Pago harbour. Britain was guaranteed equal privileges in 1879. In these attempts to checkmate one another, these Three Powers became inextricably involved in Samoan affairs. Apart from the treaties, Apia was made a separate and neutral municipality governed jointly by the three consuls of Germany, Britain, and America.79

Unfortunately, peace was short-lived after this agreement, due to the sudden death of Mālietoa Talavou, the ruling chief at the time. Subsequent disagreements among the Samoan factions over the rights of succession and “political supremacy” ensued thus prompting the Europeans to move towards annexation. Wendt claims that the majority of Samoa’s elite favored a British or American annexation. Both declined such wish and since Germany ostensibly had the most to lose, it was in its interest to pursue this course of action. The hurricane of March
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1889 delayed annexation and Sāmoa was declared “neutral territory;” a decade later, the Berlin Treaty of 1899 finally sealed the fate of the Samoans. Partition took place between the Germans and Americans; the British bowed out of the equation. Ironically though not surprising, this decision excluded input from the Samoans, although they (Samoans) attempted to do so through their representative, a temperament which eventually led to organizing into the Mau movements in both Western and American Samoa.  

In 1900 all the islands west of the 178 degree West parallel came under German rule; those east of it became American and have remained so to this day. Germany lost Western Sāmoa in 1914 at the outbreak of World War I; New Zealand, under a League of Nations mandate, resumed the colonization of Sāmoa until independence on January 1, 1962. Since then, Sāmoa has evolved into a thriving democracy--that is, Samoan-styled democracy.

The effects of the Fa’apapālagi on Samoan ethos and psyche are well documented; however, the tone of doom and gloom did not bear out in the earlier ethnologies and historiographies of Sāmoa. In fact, the persistence of Fa’asāmoa and its fa’avavau, ways of the Vavau in the present, is testimony to the fact that Samoans were not willing to adopt lock, stock, and barrel the Fa’apapālagi, European way. The case of the Samoan women is evident of this resilience, which is the topic of the ensuing sections.

Impact of Tongan-Fijian Connections and Euro-American on Samoa’s Women

Oral traditions strongly suggest that a major motivation for Tongan and Fijian kings to come to Sāmoa were its women. Many accounts of Samoa’s Vavau reveal an active role for

---

kings with magical powers from Fiji in the shaping of local traditions. Some of their legacies have lingered on in certain villages and districts. A prominent god in Samoan mythology was the *fe’e*, octopus, who was believed to have been a Tui Fiti, Fijian king, who transformed himself when on land. There is a forest in Savai’i which is known as the Vaosā o le Tui Fiti, or “the sacred forest of the Tui Fiti.”

As well, there is ample evidence to confirm that marriages between Samoan women and Tongan *tui* were frequent. Krämer presents a composite of Tongan-Samoan relationships from Tregear’s and Bastian’s Tonga pedigrees, dating back to generations 10 and 11, the era of Saveasi’uleo and his daughter Nāfanua, also known as the goddess of war. Thus from Nāfanua (1240 C.E.) to Lauflilota (1840 C.E.), Krämer reveals that generations of Tui Tonga, Tongan kings, wove themselves into Samoa’s gene pool well into the nineteenth century, and occasionally in the twentieth century. Who were the women who won the hearts of these *moa folau*, and of what significance were their Tongan connections?

Perhaps four of the most popularly known women in the *Vavau* who shaped Samoan politics during and after the Tongan era were Nāfanua (1240 C.E.), Leutogitupa’itea (1390 C.E.),
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81 The famous legend of Vaea is a reminder of how Vaea, a Samoan giant, was challenged by Fijian brothers who were sent by their father, the Tui Fiti, to kill Vaea. The Fijian king did not want any other person of comparable strength and power. Vaea heard of the plot and, while the brothers were asleep, he lifted them up, canoe and all, and placed them atop a tree. They begged for mercy and offered their sister ‘Apa’ula, who had accompanied them, as wife. When she was with child, her father asked for her to come and have the child in Fiji. On the way, she had the baby who was then killed by her brothers. ‘Apa’ula returned to Sāmoa, but found that, except for his head, the rest of Vaea had turned to stone. Aggrieved by his son’s fate, Vaea gave her instructions on how to avenge his son’s murder, and then his transformation was complete. Broken hearted, ‘Apaula wept for days and her tears were the origin of a stream which flows at the foot of Mt. Vaea. This link to Fiji is memorialized in *Vavau* such as Mt. Vaea in Apia and the river that runs along its foothills. It is called the Loimata o ‘Apa’ula, tears of ‘Apa’ula. Robert Louis Stevenson chose this area for his famous residency in Sāmoa in the late nineteenth century. He is buried atop Mt. Vaea. See Paul Wallwork, ed. *Samoa Ne’i Galo* (Apia: The Ministry for Youth, Sports and Cultural Affairs, 1994), 23-27.


So’oa’emalelagi Le Vālasi (1510 C.E.), and Salamāsina (1540 C.E.). Nāfanua was the daughter of Saveasi’uleo (1210 C.E.), the hybrid ruler of Samoa’s spirit world under the sea called Pulotu, and Tilafaiga, one of Saveasi’uleo’s nieces.

Leutogitupa’itea looms large in Samoan politics as the progenitor of Savai’i’s paramount titles, Tonumaip’e, Tau’ili’ili, and Tilomai. She was married to Tui Tongamānaia, but had no heirs from him. Krämer presumes that she was a contemporary of Nāfanua’s and that they were married to the same Tui Tonga whom he lists as Tuitogamānaia. However, there appears to be a discrepancy in his dates since he situates Leutogi in the fifteenth century and Nāfanua earlier in the thirteenth. Unless there was a later Tui Tongamānaia, it is highly unlikely that
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84 Dates are approximations based on Krämer’s formula. Compilation of data for The Samoa Islands occurred between 1897 and 1899. Krämer claims that Samoa’s traditions could be traced back to as far as 700 years; thus, an approximation could be made from 1899 or 1900 at intervals of 30 years. Samoa’s pedigree, according to Krämer, could be traced back with “absolute certainty” for more than 500 years. Therefore, if Mata’aafa Iosefo (1832-1912) was Tafa’ifi at around 1900, then we have an acceptable date from which to count backward in thirty year-intervals. Thirty years, according to Sydney Poitier, is the length of time that it takes a generation to begin to replace “the one that came before it.” See Life Beyond Measures: Letters to My Great-Granddaughter (New York: Harper Collins, 2009), 231.

85 He was half eel, half human. His brother was Ulufanuasesee’e, the youngest sibling who escaped his older brother’s cannibalism, but from whence the mavaega i le onetai, farewell at the tides, originated. Briefly, Saveasi’uleo warned the younger boy, Ta te toe fetaia’i i i’u o gafa, “we will meet again in our children.” The mavaega memorializes the incest between uncle and niece.

86 The legend of Leutogitupa’itea is a well known one among my generation. Briefly, she moved to Tonga and lived as part of Tui Tonga’s household. However, she did not have children by him and therefore became the butt of the teasing by the other wives. One day, she accompanied a fellow wife and her son to the bathing pool. There she was handed the son while his mother bathed. The unsuspecting mother heard the baby scream once and then silence. Leutogi had apparently pierced his fontanelle, or crown, with a coconut rib and killed him. Tui Tonga ordered her tied to the fetau tree (Calophyllum inophyllum) and burned. The next morning, when the servants appeared to clear the place, they were greeted by a cheerful Leutogi with what has become a popular and respectful way to greet adults: Ua tatou fetaia’i i maga fetau ola, “we meet at the fiery branches of the fetau.” During the night, a flock of bats from Sāmoa had urinated and put out the fire. Their decision derived the title Tonumaip’e (tonu =decision, mai =from, pe’a =fruit bats). This time, the king ordered her sent to an uninhabited island for the demon Losi to devour. Instead, Losi just tilotilo (peered) at her; hence the title Tilomai, looking here. Leutogi was hungry so she made an umu (above ground oven) to cook breadfruit; however, there was nothing with which to cover it. The pe’a once again came to her rescue by bringing ‘ili’ili, tiny pebbles, as tau,, covering for the food; hence the title Tau’ili’ili. One day, as Tui Uea (King from Wallis Island) sailed by, Leutogi managed to lure him ashore. He then took her to Uea as his wife and subsequently had a son named Fa’aasega. When he came of age, his mother sent him to visit her family in Savai’i and with him were the abovementioned titles.

87 Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 1994, 124. Yet, a discrepancy exists in the pedigree in that Nāfanua is placed at generation 11 c1200, while Leutogitupa’itea is located at generation 15, about a 150 years later. However, it is possible, that there are intergenerational overlaps such that if a generation is about 30 years long, based on Krämer’s calculations, then age may not matter since some people lived to old age which at the time, might have been a bit more than 30 years.
anyone lived to be more than one hundred years old, which is the suggested distance in years between Nāfanua and Leutogi. Nevertheless, other prevalent Tongan connections were those of So’oa’emalelagi’s grandfather, Sānālala, and Salamasina’s mother, Vaeitofaga (1510 C.E.), who was the daughter of a Tui Tonga and a Savai’i woman.  

Obviously, as granddaughters of the royal houses of Tonga and those of Tui Ā’ana, Tui Ātua, Tonumaipe’a, and Mālietoa, So’oa’emalelagi and Salamāsina strengthened their credibility among those they ruled. They were the powerhouse for about three hundred years after the Tongan era, a time when Sāmoa was riddled with succession wars, even well after the advent of Christianity. Four of these wars came to define the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries and they were known as the wars of the pāpā, paramount titles, the Tui Ātua and Tui Ā’ana, legacies of Pili’s era, and Gato’aitele and Tamasoāli’i, legacies of the Mālietoa family. The first two were male titles while the latter two were female. The female titles were created by Mālietoa Uituūlagi in honor of his granddaughter Gato’aitele, and great granddaughter Vaetamasoāli’i. Nafanua’s assistance was sought during these wars, but at a price—that is, the victors would also be stripped of their titles. Why Nāfanua took the titles is not clear in the ethnologies; however, there is speculation in Krämer and Tu’u’u that perhaps the Tonumaipe’a family in Savai’i was concerned that ‘Upolu was losing control of its affairs; moreover, there was a sense that their descendants, So’oa’emalelagi and Salamāsina were in danger from all the warring.

---

88 Yet, the end of the occupation did not end the marriages between Tongans and Samoans. In fact, as recently as the 1980s, one of the late Malietoa Tanumafili II’s granddaughters, ‘Ula Jungblut, married a Tongan prince. I met ‘Ula in Honolulu through the Samoan Service Providers Association’s (SSPA) office in 1989. She had come to us to help her find a job. She had just moved from American Samoa where her parents still resided. Soon after starting a job-training program, she was called back to Sāmoa to marry King Taufa’ahau’s son. She was apparently widowed after her husband’s fatal accident (Amelia Pasi, pers. comm., UH Manoa, Fall 2004).

Thus, through her priests Tupa’i and ‘Auva’a, Nāfanua united Sāmoa by decreeing all the four titles above to be bestowed upon So’oa’emalelagi. However, weary from years of enduring the manipulation of her husband, Tui Ātua Mata’utia, by his body guards, and still heartbroken over his assassination, So’oa’e pleaded with Tupa’i to vest the titles on her niece, Salamāsina, notwithstanding the fact that the latter was still a very young person. Salamāsina became Samoa’s first Tafa’ifā, or the individual upon whom all the four titles were vested. In other words, Salamāsina took the woman’s ina’ilau to the top in 1540.

War weary, one could safely surmise that Sāmoa was ready for a new political order. So’oa’emalelagi and Salamāsina would feature prominently as the central power of this new era. Initially, the brother’s choice of who was to receive all the four paramount titles was their sister So’oa’emalelagi; however, weary from years of enduring the manipulation of her husband Tui Ātua Mata’utia, paramount chief or king or Ātua, by his body guards, and still heartbroken over his assassination, she pleaded with Tupa’i to vest the titles on her adopted daughter Salamāsina, notwithstanding the fact that the latter was still a very young person. The latter became Samoa’s first Tafa’ifā, or the individual upon whom all the four titles were vested. In other words, Salamāsina has taken the woman’s ina’ilau to the top. Her genealogical connections to Saoluafata are noted in chapters three and four of this dissertation.

Krämer and Schoeffel present detailed narratives of Salamāsina, including her life as sovereign, and her royal links to paramountcy. Clearly, she was a suli of the Tafa’ifā titles; moreover, she was heir of the titles Mālietoa (Tuamāsaga) and Tonumaipe’a (Savai’i). She was

---

90 So’oa’emalelagi was married to her cousin, Tui Ātua Māta’utia. He was the son of her mother’s brother, Lalovimamā, and wife, Sefa’atauema III. So’oa’e’s mother was Lea’togaualetuitoga. Her aunt, Vaetamasoali’i, was Salamasina’s paternal grandmother. See Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 1994, 644-45, and Salamasina, 1958, 46-49; and Schoeffel and Daws, “Rank, Gender and Politics in Ancient Samoa, 1987, 179-94.

91 So’oa’emalelagi was married to her cousin, Tui Ātua Māta’utia. He was the son of her mother’s brother, Lalovimamā, and wife, Sefa’atauema III. So’oa’e’s mother was Lea’togaualetuitoga. Her aunt, Vaetamasoali’i, was Salamasina’s paternal grandmother. See Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 1994, 644-45, and Salamasina, 1958, 46-49; and Schoeffel and Daws, “Rank, Gender and Politics in Ancient Samoa, 1987, 179-94.
also of Tongan royalty, a feature not to be taken lightly. After all, royal blood connotes divine if not wealth. There is no reason to believe, however, that even without the Tongan connection, she would not have become Tafa’ifā. Her mother, Vaetoifaga, a daughter of the Tui Tonga, feared for her life and left, thus leaving Salamāsina in So’oa’emalelagi’s care. Because the latter did not have children of her own, her devotion to Salamāsina was unmistakable.92 Krämer also suggests that So’oa’emalelagi and Tamaalelagi, her first cousin and Salamasina’s father, were very close and that she was his sa’otama’ita’i, or his female counterpart commonly regarded as the taupou, ceremonial village virgin.93

So’oa’e’s brothers—Tupa’i and ‘Auva’a, Nafanua’s priests, eventually acquiesced that Salamāsina would be the Tafa’ifā, Queen or the paramount king of Sāmoa. So’oa’emalelagi naturally assumed the role of prime minister.94 It is the conventional wisdom today that under both women, Sāmoa experienced a lengthy period of peace and prosperity. Villages and districts vied for visitations from the royal duo; Sāoluafata, according to an informant, was a popular stop for reasons revealed later in this chapter and in the next.

Evidently, the Tafa’ifā matrix lacked a holder after Salamasina’s passing until her great, great grandson, Fonotī, defeated in a succession war his half-brother, Va’afusu’aga, and half-sister, Samalā’ulu.95 Needless to say, there would be three more Tafa’ifā holders before and two

---

92 So’oa’emalelagi was expecting when her husband Tui Ātua Māta’utia was murdered by his valet; she miscarried and the aborted fetus—known as Tuimavave—was buried at Sālelesi, a subvillage west of Sāoluafata.
94 Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 1994, 317; Tu’u’u, Rulers of Samoa, 2001, 220. It is not unheard of for young heirs of other kingdoms to have proxies to manage their affairs: Queen Ka’ahumanu made herself kuhina nui, prime minister, to the young kings Kamehameha II (Prince Liholihio) and Kamehameha III (Kaukauelouli) until the latter were of age. The former king died after ruling for a very short period. For details, see Linda K. Menton and Eileen H. Tamura, History of Hawaii - Student Edition [Hardcover] (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1999), 4
95 Her daughter Fofoaivao’ese inherited the Tui Ātua and Tui Ā’ana titles which were passed down to her daughters Taufau and Sina, and the latter’s son, Faumuinā. For the heartbreaking story of Salamāsina and her lover, Alapepe, son of a lesser chief, see Krämer, Salamasina, 1958, 51-58.
more after the advent of Christianity in 1830. Interestingly, none of these subsequent sovereigns was a woman.  

**Early Papālagi Images of Samoan Women**

First contact literature reveals that the papālagi perceptions of Samoan vis a vis Pacific island women in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were mixed, although for the most part, not very complimentary. Some papālagi found women “fair;” while others described them as “ugly,” “disagreeable,” and, as Lapèrouse wrote, “mistresses of their own favors.”

Tcherkézoff has analyzed these early observations in amazing detail, generally disputing their misinterpretations by scholars such as Côté and Williamson, and criticizing their dependence on Bouganville’s accounts as a basis for their own representations. In the nineteenth century, observations by missionaries like John Williams and adventure writers like Robert Louis Stevenson reflect the significance of the South Seas as, in the words of Roger Ebbatson, a “fictional construction upon which European repression, erotic fantasy and desire for domination was projected.”

However, Ebbatson continues, “this was a paradise tainted, in the Eurocentric

---

96 For details on the Tafa’ifā holders, see Krämer, *The Samoa Islands*, 1994, 645-46, and Tu’u’u, *Rulers of Samoa*, 2001, 263. Briefly, they were Fonotī, Salamasina’s great, great grandson (1660), his son Muāgututia’ (1690), and then Tupua Fuiavailili (1720), who was the latter’s adopted son. If chronological calculations are to be accepted, then it is possible that when the papālagi explorers appeared along Samoan shores, the Tupua family would have been in power. Tupua Fuiavailili’s son, ‘Afoafovaluā inherited the titles, but lost them in a battle with the younger brother, Galumalemana (1750). Galumalemana’s sons, Nofosa and Fonoasaefā (1780)—held the titles in trust for his younger brother, l’amafana, but very briefly due to his assassination. Tafa’ifā l’amafana then held the titles until his death which ended the dominance of the Sa Tupua family when he was succeeded by Māietoa Vainu’upō (1810). It was Vainu’upō who welcomed John Williams and Christianity to Sāmoa. He decreed that the titles be buried with him. However, this did not materialize although the Tafa’ifā powers would be terribly undermined by local factions, European planters, and German and New Zealand administrators. Upon Vainu’upo’s death, the office of the Tafa’ifā would be buried for good when Matu’a Iosefo passed away during the German period in the early twentieth century. Nonetheless, the titles Tui Ātua and Tui Ā’ana have since been revested in various holders since. Today, the Head of State and a deputy HOS hold the titles Tui ‘Ā’ana and Tuimalaeali’ifano respectively. For details on succession politics of Sāmoa, particularly on the rule of the Tafa’ifā, see Krämer, *The Samoa Islands*, 1994, 1958, Tu’u’u, *Rulers of Samoa*, 2001, Schoeffel and Daws, "Rank, Gender and Politics in Ancient Samoa,” 1987, Meleisea, *Making of Modern Samoa*, 1987, and Simanu, *Fā‘a Fa‘atūmua*, (2011).


imagination, by the practice of cannibalism.” Nonetheless, Rupert Brooke, Stevenson’s
contemporary, writes fondly of the Samoan woman as pleasant and polite, and not at all prone to
promiscuity and other behaviors mentioned in other publications.100

Undoubtedly, port towns like Apia are a mirror of European escapism on the one hand,
and domination on the other. It is noted in Rhys Richard’s account of whalers in Sāmoa that by
the mid 1860s, there was a significant number of hybrid Samoans especially in Apia.101 These
fair skinned Samoans must have been a sight for sore eyes for sea-weary whaling and trading
ships. Depictions in Hollywood movies such as “Return to Paradise” and velvet paintings of
nineteenth and early twentieth century island women102 are not much different from academic
representations of Samoan adolescents as promiscuous and stress-free in spite of traditional
custom and church teachings on the virtues of abstinence and virginal marriage. Margaret
Mead’s study on Ta’ū’s girls in the early 1920s popularized Sāmoa as a society against which
civilized ideals about adolescence were contrasted, reinforced, and perhaps transformed.103

Nonetheless, the question that this study poses now is, what of the Nu’u o Teine of
Sāoluafata? What kind of evolution did it experience since its founding in approximately 1350
C.E.? How did the above history of the Samoan islands, particularly its politics, affect its
development?

Notions of Women and Power

The question as to what constitutes the power of a Samoan woman, not so much in
opposition to her menfolk, but as an articulation of how power functions in kinship and gender

100 In J.C. Furnas, Anatomy of Paradise: Hawai’i and the Islands of the South Seas (Philadelphia: Curtis Publishing
Co., 1847), 90-91.
102 See Sima Urale, director, “Velvet Dreams” [videorecording] (Wellington: Top Shelf Productions, New Zealand
On Air, 1997), a witty portrayal of racism, colonialism, and sexism in nineteenth and twentieth century art.
relations in Fa‘asāmoa has been addressed and illustrated earlier in this chapter. This section presents a historical analysis of how power and gender relationships in Samoan society evolved notwithstanding obstacles and/or limitations to their development since the time of Nāfanua. I have established that in the birthing, peopling, and protection of the islands prior to Western contact, the power of women was at once at the forefront of, at par with, and/or complementary to that of their menfolk and in their exercise of sulī and feagaiga in both physical and metaphysical fashion. Rights of access and succession to the titles appeared to follow the tradition of ali‘i o ʻāiga, the first born or the eldest sibling regardless of sex; however, it was not uncommon for dying holders to bypass the right of the first born and choose, instead, through a māvaega, dying wish, a favorite heir further down the line or through adoption. Salamāsina was her father’s youngest child from his tenth wife. His son, Tuala, was definitely denied his right as first born to inherit the titles. As it were, Salamāsina would become the first paramount ruler of Sāmoa, but then, as already mentioned, she would be the last female to do so. Why was this the case? To try and answer this question, perhaps what is in order is an examination of the concepts of sulī and feagaiga as manifestations and vehicles of power in Sāmoa. But first, what is “power” in the Samoan ontology and epistemology?

Power: Pule, Mālosi, Mana, Mamalu

The term power does not have a direct equivalence in the Samoan vernacular, although the derivation, paoā, is popularly used today to refer to electrical, political, or social power. First, Hubert M. Blalock perceives power as an implication that one or something has the ability to change a situation or the condition of something. Unfortunately, he comments, “the concept of ‘power’ is both exceedingly slippery to pin down and yet indispensable in enabling one to

---

104 Witness the sibling wars among the descendants of Salamāsina from 1500s to the pre-colonial times: Fonofī against Va’afusu’aga and Samalā’ulu; Tupua Fuia’vailli’s sons ‘Afoafouvale and Galumalemana; Nofoasaefā and I’amafana to name a few. See also Tui Ātua, in Su’esu’e Manogi, 2009.
analyze...." Paoā is popularly used because it has a neutralizing tone, which people prefer to the direct if not potentially confrontational sound of the meaning of its native term, pule.106

To pule (v.) means to rule or govern. Pule functions vertically and horizontally along the socio-political structure known as the Fa'amatai.107 At home, the apex of such structure is the matai. He or she is the one upon whom a family title is bestowed, and attached to it is a piece of land for him to oversee and safeguard. At the village level, these matai are heads of households, and they are ordered according to status and rank. At its apex is the Sa’o (paramount chief) of the village, whose title symbolizes the ancestral founder. All the titles of lower ranks were either invented, incorporated through marriage, or gifted. At the district level, there are individuals with multiple paramount titles who have ultimate pule over a number of villages and sub-districts. Most, if not all, of these chiefs are male—villages have yet to increase the participation of women in the council. It is worth noting, though, that men and women are heirs of these titles and thus have the right to them as heirs and holders. The right to political power in Sāmoa is not based on gender; although historically, the women have deferred becoming chiefs to their

106 Paoā is an adjective that means “powerful.” Its Samoan equivalent is a phrase, e tele le pule (“much power there is”) or e malosi le pule (“power is strong”). In essence, it is much more convenient and safer to use the derivative, which is also obviously easier to pronounce. Finally, the derivation paoā is not, nor has it ever been used, at least to my knowledge, as a verb. One cannot say, ‘Oute paoaina le ‘aiga, “I am powering or controlling the family.” On the other hand, the term pule is both noun and verb: ‘Oute pulea (v.) mea’ai, “I control the distribution of food,” or O a’u o le pule, “I am the boss/leader/chief, etc.” To share in decision-making is to soālaupule; to oversee resource distribution such as food is to fai lau pule; people who set the laws in the village or in parliament are the faipule; in the church, God has the pule faito’atasi (sovereign power), and the person who abuses power is fiapule. Furthermore, to plan or conspire is to taupulepule something or an organization is pulea (passive form meaning “controlled”); and pule’aga or pulega is the act of governing (n.). A pule is the principal of a school, or chief executive officer. “Power,” understood in its political connotation, means the ability to exercise pule (authority) in the family, village council, company, school, or government. This pule is exercised through and by a man or woman upon whom the ’āiga potopoto, extended family, has bestowed a matai, chiefly, title.
107 For a comprehensive explanation and interpretation of Fa’amatai, see Le Tagaloa, Faasinomaga, 1997, 11-16.
brothers as principled by the *feagaiga*, sacred covenant, between *tamafafine*, womenfolk, and *tamatane*, menfolk.108

Relationships in the village are governed by the principles of *Vāfealoa’i* (the respect system). This system dictates behavior in a *feagaiga* relationship. The most sanctioned relationships are between brothers and sisters, *ali‘i*, high chief, and *tulafale*, orator/executive, church pastor and congregation, and elders and youth. The most important of these *feagaiga* for the purposes of this study is that between a brother and sister, Taeolaloopu’a and Fatumanavao’upolu. The politicization of this *feagaiga* led to the founding of the village of Sāoluafata. What happened to this *feagaiga* and what were its consequences?109

In sum, pule in Samoan society is concretized in *matai* titles that belong to the founders of a particular community. As more and more people arrived and established households among earlier arrivals, the need for law and order increased, and modeled after Tagaloa-a-lagi’s *fono ma aitu*, council of spirits; hence the emergence of the *Fa’amatai* and the ordering of titles. However, a title itself does not mean automatic legitimacy; it has to be granted with the consent of its heirs and with an understanding that there are shared values and beliefs wrapped in it.110 Samoans believe that once an individual is titled, he must exercise his *pule* with *mana*, *mamalu*, and *mālosi*. Without these, one’s *pule* is ineffective and one is in danger of being stripped of one’s title.

These are attributes that work on the following principles: first, *mana*, spiritual power, manifests itself in knowledge, kindness, generosity, and wisdom. Naturally, a kind chief is well reciprocated; a selfish one suffers a distancing that in today’s world of fast travel and fast bucks

---

109 Extensive discussion on the *feagaiga* is found in chapters four and five.
leaves him to depend solely on his immediate heirs to serve him. In the literature on Polynesian
\emph{mana}, Hawaiian and Maori understandings of \emph{mana} situate it as the foundation of their
worldview.\footnote{Ministry of Justice, “Mana and Tapu,” Part I. Traditional Maori Concepts, in \emph{He Hinatore ki te Ao Maori A Glimpse into the Maori World}, \url{http://justice.govt.nz/publications/global-publications/h/he-hinatore-ki-te-ao-maori-a-glimpse-into-the-maori-world/part-1-traditional-maori-concepts}. Alissa Strong, “The Maori People and Their Legal System,” \url{http://www.daviddfriedman.com/Academic/Course_Pages/legal_systems_very_different_06/final_papers_06/Maori/Maori.html}.} In Sāmoa, \emph{mana} refers to spiritual or divine power. It is reserved today for the

The term \emph{mamalu} is both noun and adjective: when one is \emph{mamalu}, it means one is
respected and displays \emph{aga fa’atamāli’i}, chief-like behavior. This is akin to the Javanese sense
of \emph{halus-ness}, which connotes spirituality and dignity, a characteristic which Anderson claims to
have diminishing visibility among contemporary rulers with individualistic tendencies and
flamboyant lifestyles. \emph{Halus-ness}, in the Javanese context, is achieved through an ascetic
existence; power without it is meaningless and not legitimate.\footnote{Anderson, “The Idea of Power in Javanese Culture,” 2007.} Similarly in Sāmoa, one also
has \emph{mamalu} because of one’s lineage and, as such, is expected to have \emph{aga fa’atāmali’i}: courage,
compassion, generosity, respect for people of all ages, and composure in moments of passion.
For these reasons, a chief can also accumulate economic \emph{mālosi}, strength, and therefore power,
since his people would reciprocate in elaborate ways, like donate generously to \emph{fa’alavelave},
obligatory events or obligations. The concept of \emph{mālosi} connotes economic or war power and is
realized through the ability of an individual or a group to produce and utilize resources for family
or village sustainability, or to exert physical might in times of conflict. Through the
\emph{fa’alavelave}, or obligatory system, Samoans demonstrate varying degrees of service and those
with merit and wealth are more likely to be richly rewarded than those who are neither productive nor generous. Rewards (such as chiefly titles) were more merit- and service-based rather than lineage-based. Unfortunately, this is not much of a case today. In fact, it appears as though the rush to obtain titles by various factions of suli is a topic for future research since no one has explored the psychology behind it. The excessive splitting of titles is not yet prevalent at Sāoluafata; however, unless the village fa’avae, founding principles, is revisited, there is no guarantee that splitting will not get to this point. Title splitting is evident in both the Nu’u o Teine and Nu’u o Ali’i for lesser titles, and appeals have been reported for some of these cases in the latter. Appeals are not available for the titles in the Nu’u o Teine. Nonetheless, locating titles in time and space across six hundred years, once known, may help communities determine the efficacy of current practices; identifying genealogical links and evidence of involvement across time could help rescue the dignity of the Fa’amatai, hence the Fa’asāmoa over the long run.

**Locating Sāoluafata’s Teine: The Politics of the Pute, Belly Button, and Naming Traditions**

When I asked the… faatosaga about whether there are any tapu on burying the placenta and umbilical cords, she replied: “[Our] cultural claim to any land or earthly inheritance is premised on a genealogical connection with the earth – this is tapu and is recognised by adherence to the ritual. [O le faavae o le mau nei, o le sootaga ma le ‘ele’ele]. The sayings, o le ‘ele’ele o lea e tanu ai lou pute (literally, ‘the land where my pute is buried’); and tama o le ‘ele’ele (literally, ‘man of the earth’) signal the ancient connection between man and earth.”

The Samoan sense of identity cannot be dissociated from a sense of place. The politics of the pute, umbilical cord, signifies this. The pute is the marker of separation between the mother and her baby at birth. Once it falls off, it is immediately buried on family land, not thrown in the

---

114 (Samalā’ulu Mata’itusi, pers. comm., by phone, January 2011).
garbage disposal for a different destination. This was a common practice before the advent of modern communication and transportation. Tupua claims in the above quote that the pute

Figure 4: Satellite view of Sāoluafata village from Saoluafata Bay (known to the villagers as Faga'ese Bay) on the west to the village proper running north along Cape Utusi’a through which snakes the Main East Coast Road. The village spans the contours of the cape and is separated on the eastern side from the village of Lufilufi by a smaller bay known as Mulinu’ā and towards the mainland cutting south to the first road adjacent to the main one. My family residence is the fourth house from the bottom left hand corner of the map and immediately after a rectangular clearing ending at the road.116 Google Maps, http://maps.google.com/maps.

“signal[s] the ancient connection between man[, woman] and earth.” Since then, the term has become a metaphor for the challenges on the authenticity of one’s claim to certain family lands and titles. When one’s affiliation with an ancestral village is challenged, one could argue about where one’s ancestors’ pute were buried. Thus the village-born believe that regardless of where one chooses to reside, one could always return to or relocate to one’s ancestral homeland if or when the goals of migration prove unattainable.

116 From Google Maps
The *pute* of some of my ancestors are buried at Sāoluafata, at the northwestern end of the traditional district of Ātua.117 On a good traffic day, Sāoluafata is approximately forty-five minutes by bus east of the capital town of Apia. Just before reaching the village proper is the Faga’ese Bay, also known as Saoluafata Bay, to which Germany gained rights as a harbor in 1877. Faga’ese Bay was “a contractual harbour of German sailors… [and it] was often used for a more or less lengthy stay by German warships,” two of which were the *Adriadne* and the *Albatross*.118 “Saluafata [sic],” continues Krämer, “is east of Saluafata bay, [and] is divided into two parts by a stream which drains a somewhat large lake-like brackish lagoon: to the north the village *Tagaloa*, to the south the village *Sagapolutele*.”119 Amazingly, the stream still flows, the village still comprises *itūvai*, side of the stream, or political divisions, and the lagoon is still brackish. What is different today is that the government road runs through the village, flanked by guest houses and village stores. A long seawall, constructed in the 1990s and running from the most western end of Sāoluafata and north toward the promontory *Utusi’a*, has a break in it in order to allow drainage for the stream.120

In the 1950s, when on more than one occasion my grandparents and I visited Sāoluafata, I recall that there were few houses, most of which were traditional *fale*, open houses, with

---

117 For details on the story of Pili and his sons, see footnote 20 above.
118 Krämer, *ibid.*, 356. Krämer’s spelling is “Saluafata” which is what people hear. Part of his explanation of the village’s origins are contradicted by ‘Aumua’s account described earlier in this chapter. “Saluafata” could easily mean “forbidden *Luafata*,” whereas Sāoluafata means those things which are “sacred to/for Luafatā’alae.” The difference is more than semantics in nature. Furthermore, the village people prefer Sāoluafata. Also Krämer suggests that the taboos were made by Luafatā’alae for her son Fatumanava’upolu. A possible interpretation of this is that the taboos were installed to spite the older son, ‘Aumua’afaga, Tui Ātua Tologataua’s choice for the Tui Ātua title.
119 Krämer, *ibid.*, 350.
120 The wall was constructed after cyclones *Ofa* (February 1990) and *Val* (December 1991) which destroyed much of Samoa’s coasts and annihilated several villages on the different islands. See a report on Saoluafata’s vulnerability to climate change by Karen Sutherland, Barry Smit, Violet Wulf, and Taito Nakalevu, “Vulnerability in Samoa,” *Tiempo* 54 (2005): 13-15. Note that Black Sand Beach at *Solosolo*, about two miles west of Sāoluafata, was a popular recreational spot for both locals and tourists. It was completely destroyed during the typhoons. For information on the effects of the above cyclones, see Thomas Elmqvist et. al., “Effects of Cyclone *Ofa* and *Val* on the Structure of a Samoan Lowland Rain Forest,” in *Biotropica* 40-1 (1994): 384-91, [http://www.jstor.org/pss/2389232](http://www.jstor.org/pss/2389232).
thatched roofs. At the time, the only palagi-styled, Europeanized structures belonged to our family and to Tagaloa Siaosi Kerslake, one of the paramount chiefs. Since then, every family dwelling includes mixed architecture with most houses made of imported materials like concrete, tin panels, glass louvers, and nails. Even cooking structures have concrete floors and tin roofs now. Except for the faletalimālō, chief’s guest house, which still reflects the openness of a Samoan open dome, a family dwelling typically consists of a rectangular front section that is open, and a fa’aase’e, walled-in extension in the back. When I was a young girl, ablutions were either outhouses along the oceanfront or in the bushes for inland families. Today, indoor plumbing is common.122

---

121 His son, Donald, is the current holder of the Tagaloa title.
122 I was a sophomore at high school when the first Peace Corps volunteers to (Western) Sāmoa arrived in 1967 and were charged with improving the health and hygiene of the Samoans. Consequently, all the outdoor toilets along the beaches were banned and outhouses with concrete toilets and floors were built and called fale fa’apisika, or Peace
Sāoluafata is part of the political district of Anōāma’a, so called for its very rocky and mountainous terrain (ano, short for anoano, means “numerous”; ma’a means “rock” or “stone”). People use the name Ma’ā more commonly to refer to their district. Anōāma’a is a subdistrict of the larger political and traditional jurisdiction of Ātua. In the Vavau, Ātua was ruled by Tui Ātua. The title eventually became one of the four pāpā, or one of the paramount titles of the Tafa’ifo.

At the time of Saoluafata’s founding, this land area was known as Evaloa (eva means to “hang out” and loa, “long or lengthy”). Topographically, Evaloa was a range of mountain spurs and valleys, limestone cliffs and rivers, and streams sourced by waterfalls that flowed especially in the hot and wet months from November to March. Today, the same landforms are still obvious; although, communities have built on and around them, and erosion has weathered them down some. Perhaps as population grew, tension developed over boundaries and resources, as those in power became weakened by the constant bickering of their kith and kin. Evaloa eventually splintered into small political entities identified today as Sāoluafata, Sōlaua, Sālelesi, Fusi, and Eva. Some people include the villages of Solosolo, Luatuānu’u, and Leusoa’li’i in this mix.

**Demographics: District and Village Populations in the Twenty-first Century**

Politically, the Anōāma’a district is divided into east and west sub-districts: Anōāma’a i Sasa’e and Anōāma’a i Sisifo, respectively, with Sāoluafata located in the latter sub-district. The census counts of 2001 and 2006 placed the population of Sāoluafata at 674 and 753, respectively, with a reported increase of merely 79 people. According to the Ministry of Statistics’ report, in
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Corps designed-toilets. This was a major transformation in Samoa’s environment. Eventually, indoor plumbing became commonplace as resources were made possible particularly with remittances from relatives abroad.
2001, there were 374 males and 300 females; in 2006, the males numbered 385, while the female count was at 368.\textsuperscript{123}

Politically, the Anoāma’a district is divided into east and west sub-districts: Anoāma’a i Sasa’e in the east and Anoāma’a i Sisifo in the west, where Sāoluafata is located. According to the 2006 census, Sāoluafata had the third largest population in the Anoāma’a i Sisifo district with a population of 753 people (385 males, 368 females)—a mere increase of 79 people from the 2001 census. In comparison, the total population of Sāmoa in 2006 was 179,186, an increase of about 2,476 people from 2001. Outside the Apia urban area and northwest ‘Upolu, Anoāma’a i Sisifo had one of the highest populations for ‘Upolu and Savai’i. The total population of the Anoāma’a i Sisifo district was 4,792 in 2006, with 2,515 males and 2,277 females.

The increase in the populations of Sāoluafata and the district reflect an insignificant increase across the nation. The low population growth may be attributed to out-migration rather than low birth rates. Although the census reports did not include an analysis of the demographics, it is common knowledge that Sāmoa has had for quite some time one of the highest birth rates in the world; however, this high birth rate is offset by the outmigration of at least one thousand Samoans leaving the islands annually for the urban centers of New Zealand, Australia, and the United States of America.\textsuperscript{124} Sāoluafata has been no exception to this migration. If national trends are an indication, it is feasible that there are more natives of Sāoluafata residing abroad today than at home. Many of these migrants are sisters and daughters who left for better education and employment opportunities.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[124] It is fair to note that after the immigration raids of the 1970s and 1980s in New Zealand, American Samoa became a popular destination for those seeking jobs in the west. The tuna canneries attracted many of these migrants who were willing to work for less than US$3.00 an hour. I worked in American Samoa for eight years in the 1970s and 1980s and witnessed an influx of workers from (Western) Samoa in the canneries.
\end{footnotes}
A survey of the members of the Nu’u o Teine in December 2007 reveals fewer females living in the village than those residing elsewhere in Sāmoa and in New Zealand. Many of them took their parents with them. While Sāoluafata is a medium sized village, it is nonetheless significant when it comes to its historic participation in national political, religious, and commercial activities.\textsuperscript{125}

Names as Historical Tools: Origins and Meanings of the Name, Sāoluafata

If pre-European Samoan history was not written, it was nevertheless recorded by honorifics, words and names, or specifically their origin.\textsuperscript{126}

The preponderance of oral traditions in people’s daily lives makes their past a daily discourse. Perhaps the most current of all these traditions is that of names and naming. Samoa’s way of naming and ordering the world, including its people, is an inherent tool for forging a philosophy of history. Other traditions important in establishing a Samoan philosophy of history are, according to Tui Ātua: “camouflage, succession and propaganda, genealogy, honorifics, propaganda and political partisans, omission, sanitization, and mythologizing.”\textsuperscript{127} All fit aptly

\textsuperscript{125} Of 40 questionnaires distributed, 32 were returned. Findings: 1 respondent was in the 20-30 age group, 16 were between 31 and 60; 8 between 61 and 70, and 4 had no age specification. Of the 32, 5 were males, 18 females, and 9 had no designation. Four identified themselves as high chiefs either in the men’s or women’s council, 6 as orators, 7 were untitled, 1 was an incoming husband, 6 were incoming wives, 12 were teine of Sāoluafata, and 15 had never been married. The group not represented in the survey was the teine married to village boys. However, 5 have been reported as being married to village boys. 16 respondents were members of the Nu’u o Teine, 2 of the Nu’u o Ali’i, 5 were faletua, high chiefs’ wives, and tautu, orators’ wives, and 5 were untitled members in the Nu’u o Teine. 29 belonged to the EFKS (Christian Congregational Church of Samoa, CCCS), and 2 were of the Seventh Day Adventist (SDA) denomination. Only 7 identified as members of the Teu’i lailig group, while 3 for Tululautū; 9 of the members belonged to the church’s Mafutaga a Tinā, of the EFKS; 6 declared membership in the Komiti a Tama’ita’i, the government affiliated women’s committee. A few indicated family members in various careers and professions: 1 was a pastor, 2 were teachers, 1 nurse, 1 government clerk, 2 members of parliament, and 1 did not specify. From the Nu’u o Teine, 12 teine were ali’i, high chieftesses, while 8 were tulafale, orators; 3 were untitled. The total number of females in the teine households participating in the survey was 181; however, 74 teine were listed as residing elsewhere in Sāmoa. One hundred fifty of their female relatives resided abroad. 62 of the in-village girls were members of the Nu’u o Teine, and about 82 wives were members of the teine households. Finally, the average number of years each teine had been a member was 10.

\textsuperscript{126} Tui Ātua, in Su’esu’e Manogi, 2009, 23.

\textsuperscript{127} Tui Ātua, \textit{ibid}. 
under the umbrella of what ‘Aumua calls *vavau paepaesolo*, evidences of the past strewn about.\(^{128}\)

Names are engravings or inscriptions signifying the past; they are abbreviated records of land history, genealogical transference or omission, and the origins of titles. Samoan names are concise histories of people, places, and events. Names mean what they actually say—no more, no less. They can trigger memories of (political) acts, and, for certain names and events, the political nature of their origin conjures embarrassing reminders of the past, making them banned from usage. These names become *‘upu popo*, banned words/subjugated knowledge.

The origins of most of the titles of Saoluafata’s chieftesses are easily available through their signification, which is done in more detail in chapter three. To demonstrate the utility of this historical tool, I illustrate here names as linguistic signs and cultural symbolism. The title Teu’ialilo, for instance, is a contraction of the command, *Teu ‘ia lilo au tagi*, hide well your tears; Tululautū, the other chieftess title, comes from two verbs: *tutulu*, to cry, (respect form) and *tū*, to stand. The name Luafatā’alae, for example (*lua*=two, *fata*=shelf or platform, or carrier, *‘alae*=the name of Luafata’alae’s ancestor) refers to the two platforms of ‘Alae: her father, according to Tu’u’u, and her great, great grandfather, according to ‘Aumua.\(^{129}\) However, this last point could be argued since Luafatā’alae was herself a paramount daughter whose union with Tui Ātua could only have been possible through formal arrangements.\(^{130}\) Sāoluafata (*sa*=taboo; Luafatā’alae=name of the founder) means “sacred to Luafatā’alae.” The name Taeolalopu’a is an elision of the phrase *tae i lalo o pu’a* (*tae*=gather, *lalo*=under, and *pu’a*=Chinese lantern).\(^{131}\)

There could be two meanings to this name: first, a common activity in the village was for the
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129 In Hawaiian, *alae* refers to the red salt crystals used for food and medicinal values.
131 *Hernandia nymphaefolia*. 
young children to *tae*, pick up, *pu’a* leaves and other trash strewn around the yard. The *pu’a* tree grew in abundance along the coastal areas of Sāmoa and its leaves littered the yards, much to the chagrin of the young pickers. However, this is too tame an explanation for someone of her status. A dilemma in interpretation occurs here since *tae* is a negative and cynical metaphor referring to how the girl might have been conceived—perhaps under the trees. The name could thus mean “the girl was born under the *pu’a* trees,” perhaps prematurely (her mother might have been working outdoors), or under illegal circumstances, hence the metaphor *tae* (faeces/semen/child of the paramount chief, Tui Ātua Tologataua). Cynicism cloaks the naming practices of the Samoans and names such as Taeolalopu’a, which, while its denotation is undesirable, portrays how names became markers for the origins and importance of people, places, and events. However, I have not known of anyone that has been named after Taeolalopu’a. Then again, I know of very few *Teine* who are namesakes of Luafatā’alae. It is possible that not many people have heard of these two women; thus, the importance of examining who she was, what she was up to, and what happened in subsequent years.

**Rocky Beginnings: The Founding of Sāoluafata**

It was the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries; the waning years of Tongan occupation. It is plausible that much of Evaloa was still thickly wooded, not easily passable on foot or from the ocean. To get from place to place, people either beat paths with their feet and stone axes through the forests, or sailed by canoe. Evaloa was a vast and wild expanse of alternating hills and valleys between the ocean and the east-to-west mountain range splitting ‘Upolu lengthwise north and south.
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132 Natural disasters in recent years have altered the constitution of Samoa’s beaches and consequently its vegetation. The *pu’a* tree is not as prevalent as it was before.

Sāoluafata was founded by Luafatā’alae and Taeolalopu’a after Tui Ātua Tologataua granted the title Tui Ātua to his older son, ‘Aumuatāgafa. Tui Ātua Tologataua’s decision prompted the only logical course of action for Luafatā’alae and her children; that is, to depart from Lufilufi, especially after Fatumanava’upolu’s effort to strip his brother of the title failed. Prior to this failure, he had challenged ‘Aumuatagafa in war and won. It is believed that once Luafatā’alae and her children moved to Evaloa, she quickly imposed bans against the new Tui Ātua on behalf of her son.

The choice of ‘Aumuatagafa as heir to the title indicates an upholding of tradition whereby succession followed the order of birth. From a traditional perspective, there was nothing unusual about Tui Ātua Tologataua’s decision, since chiefs of old commonly had more than one usuga, marriage—hence multiple heirs—and because the practice of fa’a’au le ‘ula, passing the lei/title to the next holder was almost always to the eldest child who was almost
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134 Brother Henry claims that Tui Ātua Tologataua had been a weakened tuī, king, during the post-Tongan reconstruction. There is no other explanation about him except the incidence of his birth, which is detailed in chapter three. See Henry, Tala Fa’asolopito, 1958, 36.

135 According to Tu’u’u, Fatumanava’upolu did not stay at Evaloa but moved to Si’umu, where, as heir of Mālietoa Gagasavea, Sāveatama, and ‘Alae, he became a powerful chief of that area. He was known as Fatumanava’upolu Tagaloa Tologataua.

136 As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the first-born became the ali’i o ‘āiga, chief of the family. This title should not to be confused with the title tama a ‘āiga, which was not imagined until much later in the mid-eighteenth century when Tupua Fuiāvailili of Salani and Falefā was chosen by his father, Tafa’ifā Muagututi’a, to be his successor. See Henry, ibid., 144, and Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 1994, 270, for the confirmation of Tupua Fuiāvailili as the next Tafa’ifā. Through a process known as the saesaega‘aluafa’i a tumua, (literally the stripping of banana leaves as tally marks), seven tumua or orator chiefs from various malae, centers, sought to confirm the eligibility of Tupua to be the next Tafa’ifā. Each one acknowledged a link to Tupua through a public display of their lafo or fine mats; thus by virtue of such evidence, Tupua was called a tama a ‘āiga, or the boy/son of all the paramount families. This event is memorialized in the saying, o le fetuatuana ‘iga o malae o tūmua, “the backings of the courts of tūmua. For an account on the institutionalization of the office of tama-a-‘āiga of Sāmoa, see A. Morgan Tuimaleali’ifano, O Tama a ‘Āiga: The Politics of Succession to Samoa’s Paramount Titles (Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, USP, 2006).
always male. Yet, on many occasions, a predecessor favored the son or daughter from a favorite wife regardless of the marriage chronology. This was a common cause of war among heirs across the centuries, and even in spite of the promotion of peace in the nineteenth century by Christian missionaries, the capitalist enterprise of traders and merchants, and the subjugation of colonial administrators, succession wars continued to dominate Samoa’s eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth century politics. In the twentieth century, succession wars shifted indoors to the Lands and Titles Court, a colonial construct which sometimes yielded unintended results.

Krämer believes that the initial bestowal of the title on ‘Aumuatāgafa took place at the wrong malae, district center; therefore, his right to it should have been forfeited. However, through the manipulation of Leifi, one of the executors of the title Tui Ātua, ‘Aumuatāgafa regained his inheritance. The ambiguity of information leaves multiple gaps in the
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138 The institution of marriage in Faʻasāmoa was first and foremost a political and economic one among paramount families in that the chiefs’ spokesmen, known as tulafale, were constantly on the lookout for paramount daughters for their paramount chiefs. These unions brought much wealth to the orator families in the form of ietoga, fine mats, siapo, tapa cloths, and working implements. Paramount daughters were socialized to understand that marriage meant the production of heirs for the paternal families, although it is impossible for every heir to become the holder of the paramount title. For a detailed accounting of marriage in Sāmoa, see Schultz, *Samoan Family Law*, 1953, 22-26.

139 Tafa’ifā Muagututia selected his younger adopted son Tupua Fuivailili to succeed him as Tafa’ifā. Tupua’s son Galumalemana chose his youngest son, I’amafana, from his fifth wife to be the next Tafa’ifā. I’amafana willed the titles to Mālietoa Vainu’upō, a cousin who accepted John Williams and Christianity in 1830 and willed the titles to be buried with him, thus ending the traditional kingship as the Samoans knew it. Colonialists wished he had appointed a successor, presuming a much easier colonization later. Note also that Salamāsina was not Tamaalelagi’s first born, but the last. Yet, when So’oa’emalelagi, her aunt, was offered the Tafa’ifā titles, by Nafanua’s representatives Tupa’i and ‘Auva’a, she decided to bestow them upon her niece, Salamāsina. For further details on pre-contact politics in Sāmoa, see Krämer, *Salamasina*, 1958, 46, and Tu’u’u, *Rulers of Samoa*, 2001, 264-65.


141 A malae is the meeting place of the chiefs. It is traditionally encircled by the guesthouses of the paramount chiefs and considered a sacred place. During the colonial period, the government road dissected the malae thus imposing new boundaries between seaside and mountainside directions.

142 Krämerclaims this chief’s name was changed to Leifimouloto, or “Leifi of the changing heart.” See *The Samoa Islands*, 1994, 384. It is not clear what other malae there could have been. It is however logical to say that perhaps
development of a sound interpretation of this tension; thus, it is unclear which *malae* was the right one for the bestowal of the paramount title. What is clear is that at this time, according to Krämer, Tui Atua’s headquarters and residence had been at Lufilufi for a few generations, and the capital *malae* was and is still called Lalogafulafua. At this point, it could be ascertained that Tologataua and his second family had resided at Mulinū’ū, Lufilufi, the cape across from Cape Utusi’a. When they decided to settle at Evaloa, they did not move very far. Evaloa was a stone’s throw from the Mulinū’ū peninsula.

By moving to Evaloa, it is only logical to conclude that this region was her ancestral land. But who was Luafatā’alae? She had to have come from somewhere. People of Si’umu who know about their connections to Sāoluafata often claim that Luafatā’alae was their ‘*augafa’apa*e, leader of the *auluma, feagaiga*, sacred covenant, and *taupou*, village virgin. ‘Aumua and Tu’u’u are kindred spirits as heirs of Luafatā’alae, ‘Alae, and Semalamaalagī. They both agree that Luafatā’alae was a descendant of Semalamaalagī, whose hand in marriage was won by ‘Alae of Si’umu during the breadfruit contest. They differ, however, chronologically; thus as the two diagrams below indicate, Tu’u’u (Fig. 6a) situates Luafatā’alae as the daughter of Semalamaalagī and ‘Alae, themselves as descendants of Tui Ātua Pulutua, Tui Ātua Sāgapolutele, and Tui Ātua Tuālemoso much earlier in the pedigree. Further, Tu’u’u points to the fact that Tuālemoso was a brave warrior of Ātua who defeated the Tongans during many
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105

143 The name derived from the division of a shark by Selelimalalei, a youth of the village which got its name Lufilufi--to divide--from the carving of the fish under a *fu afu’a* tree (kleinhovia hospital). Tui Ātua then distributed the parts: the head to Āleipata, hence their identity as the Ao o Ātua; the uso (midsection) to the Anoa’a, hence the Uso o Ātua; and the i’u, tail, to Falelilili and Saga, hence the I’u o Ātua,

144 It is still the case today that Lufilufi is the *malaefono*, meeting headquarters, of Ātua.

145 The description of ‘Alae was given to me by a lady of the village of ‘Ulutogia who resides in New Zealand. She is of the Sāgapolutele family from there. ‘Ulutogia (*ulu*=breadfruit; *togia*=thrown) became the name of the village where the contest took place. The village has become an enduring legacy of this contest. ‘*Ua togi, pa, tau i le ‘ave,* “it is thrown, it hit the stalk,” is a proverb derived from this contest. It compares the intensity of God’s wrath to the deadly accuracy of ‘Alae’s throw which brought down the breadfruit. The origin of this saying is detailed in the next section.
invasions. Evidence of this is found in certain adages and songs.\textsuperscript{146} ‘Aumua (Fig. 6b), on the other hand, identifies Semalamaalagī as a direct descendant of Tui Atua Faigā, many generations earlier.

\textsuperscript{146} It is from Tuālemoso that we get the saying, \textit{Ua muā muā le aso e pei o le upu ia Tuālemoso}, “today is first and foremost a significant day like the word of Tuālemoso. It has often been the first line in a song of greeting when Samoans perform during special celebrations. See Tu’u’u, \textit{Rulers of Samoa}, 2001, 122.
Regardless of the discrepancy in timeframes, these people are genealogically connected. Most importantly, the rights of Luafatā’alae to the piece of land she chose as her new home are quite obvious: Tui Ātua reigned supreme over all lands in the district. Logically, since Luafatā’alae was either daughter, or great, great, great granddaughter, she was an heir of Tui Ātua, Sāgapolutele, and Tagaloa—the latter two are current paramount titles of Sāoluafata.

Mythical Beginnings and the Politics of the Breadfruit

‘Ua togi, pa, tau i le ‘ave. “It was thrown, bang, it hit the stalk.”

Semalamaalagī had accompanied her father Sāgapolutele of Evaloa on a fishing trip to a remote beach on the southeastern side of ‘Upolu. She was quite unprepared for its outcome. A beautiful young woman of fair skin and unusual height, Semalamaalagī was popularly wooed by mānaia, paramount sons, from around the country. Some of them even followed her on this trip. There was a breadfruit tree laden with mature fruits growing not too far inland from the beach.

147 Samoan proverb.
and at the very top dangled a ripe one, which Sāgapolutele wanted for his lunch. In a brainstorm, he called a contest to see which of the beaux could bring the fruit down without bruising it. Perhaps, he thought, this was a good way to find out which of these young men was most suited for his daughter. There were only two rules: first, use a rock once, and second, failure meant vacating the premises, never to be seen again.

As the day progressed, the beach was emptying out fast as contestants disappeared in accordance with the second rule. It so happened that as the sun was casting long shadows eastward, a little man sailing by in a canoe spotted young men at such an unmanly task of throwing rocks at a breadfruit. Children did this sort of thing, he thought with disgust. He beached his canoe and introduced himself. Sāgapolutele did not think ‘Alae (as his name was) had a prayer’s chance—he was lame and dark and quite unbecoming for a paramount daughter. Thus, when ‘Alae asked if he could throw, Sāgapolutele agreed, albeit nonchalantly. Semalamaalagī did not think the man had hope either; in fact, she was quite repulsed by his dirty disposition. But, as they say, do not judge a breadfruit by its skin. In a blink, the fruit was in Sagapolutele’s hand and ‘Alae went home with the prize. To the father and daughter, the breadfruit had suddenly lost its appeal. ‘Aue!

Having established Luafata’alae’s progeintors, and as far as this story is concerned, she was hardly a damsel in distress; instead, she was probably more an angry woman exiled into the swamp at Cape Utusia, not too far from Mulinu’ū at Lufilufi. In retrospect, her vision was clear—if her children could not have immediate access to their inheritance, then she would create for them a legacy that would last forever; hence, the Nu’u o Teine of Sāoluafata.

Genealogical Links: “Roots and Routes”
The legacy of ‘Alae and Semalamaalagī lives on in the Nu’u o Teine of Sāoluafata.

Imagine how joyful Sāgapolutele and Semalamaalagī must have been once they learned that ‘Alae was no small fry himself; that he was a descendant of the Mālietoa family, who was himself the great grandson of the Mālietoa Savea, the first of Fe’epo’s grandsons to hold the title Mālietoa. After the contest, ‘Alae took his bride home to Si’umu, a village west of where the contest took place and where Sāveatama, ‘Alae’s father (if we are to follow Tu’u’s version), was sent to live after disobeying his father, Mālietoa Gagasāvea. North of Si’umu on the other side of the island of ‘Upolu spread Evaloa, which was regarded as the land of the Sāgapolutele family; the honorifics of the hamlets of Fusi, Salelesi, and ‘Eva reflect this belief (some believe Evaloa extended to as far west as Luatuānu’u). The aitu, spirit, of Tuālemoso apparently roams there. Perhaps he is the same Moso, a ghost listed in Turner.

Family lore provokes the notion that Luafatā’alae was not the first person to settle at the headlands. According to ‘Aumua, Evaloa was initially settled by Fa’autagia, a tapuāfanua, or the founder and first settler of a village. Fa’autagia is believed to have been a sauali’i, shape shifter. Customarily, the names of these tapuāfanua became paramount titles. However, for some reason, the title Fa’autagia was reduced from that of a tulafale ali’i, orator chief, to that of a lesser ali’i, high chief, and subsumed as a member of the Taufia, brotherhood of chiefs, of the Sāgapolutele title.

Nevertheless, the choice of Evaloa as Luafata’alae’s new residence made sense for these additional reasons: first, as a descendant and wife of a Tui Ātua, Luafatā’alae had, by tradition,
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149 Fa’autagia’s pedigree is unknown although ties to the Sāgapolutele and Sa Tupuā families are duly noted. Ties to the Tagaloa family were made obvious in the nineteenth century when one of Tagaloa Loau’s grandsons, Fagumoega, married Fa’autagia’s daughter, Taufāoa, and had Simanuali’i, my grandfather. More information on this connection appears in the next chapter. From unpublished family records compiled by ‘Aumua in the 1980s and 1990s.
every right to settle anywhere in the Ātua district. As suggested in the above genealogy trees, she was *suli* to the title and land belonging to the Tui Ātua. Who would have dared deny her the privilege? She could have returned to Si’umu, her father’s village (presuming that she grew up there). And even if this were the case, she might not have wanted to be constantly reminded by envious relatives of the fact that her children had lost the title. Besides, why return to a place where she would have no real power to control her own affairs? Surely, being wife of the Tui Ātua must have come with a certain degree of control over her entourage and other village/district people.

Second, she was no longer a virgin and it would be a matter of time before a young replacement was available to receive the office of ‘*augafa‘apae* or *sa‘otama‘ita‘i* if she were to return to Si’umu. On the other hand, starting anew at Evaloa was an attractive option, a new life for herself and a legacy for her children. For them, the best thing to do was to get as far away from Lufilufi, the center of the Ātua government, where they did not care to be wards of the half-brother, ‘Aumuatāgafa.\(^{150}\)

Luafatā’alae decided on the promontory east of Saoluafata Bay. Cape Utusi’a was probably the biggest piece of flatland in the Anoāma’a district, close enough to the ocean where food abounded in the form of *sea*, innards of a sea cucumber, *tuitui* and *vaga*, sea urchins, and numerous other species of sea creatures. Moreover, every year, the whole of Evaloa plain celebrated the hatching of the *atule*, bigeye scad fish.\(^{151}\) It was obvious during fieldwork that her ladyship had definitely chosen the best spot in the neighborhood to impose her *pule as sulī* of the paramount families of Sāmoa.


\(^{151}\) The catching of the *atule* is no longer an annual activity at Sāoluafata due to the fact the fish no longer spawns there; I have heard that the sub-village of Fusi still engages in it annually.
As wife of a powerful chief, Luafatā’alae presumably did not have much trouble getting a set of houses built and into which she sorted her relatives. For more than six centuries (from 1350 to early 1900s) wars were frequent; daily life must have been significantly affected since Sāoluafata had allegiances to all sorts of paramount families, one of which was the Mālietoa family, whose men probably went to fight most of the time. As mentioned earlier, Sāoluafata was one of the villages burned by Wilkes’ expedition in 1841.152

Given these alliances, the village center must have been built like a huge fort, hence its foundation name, ‘Olotelē. As more and more relatives moved in, the need to impose law and order arose, thus giving rise to the establishment of more taboos or sā, one of which was the banning of Tui Ātua ‘Aumuatāgafa from Sāoluafata. The lady also had the power to impose conservation rules on the atule; thus, until the last two or three decades, the Nu’u o Teine was in charge of policing its harvest. Because of these sā, the name Evaloa was eventually replaced by Sāoluafata, the taboos of Luafatā’alae.

Initially, the men had no political clout in the village. However, as will be shown in chapter four, the Teine decided at a certain point to share power with their menfolk. It was most likely the result of sons and fathers wanting an alignment with other villages in the archipelago where public discourse was the domain of the men. At the dawn of western contact, the shift in power was perhaps necessary for protection of the Teine from the waywardness of beachcombers, convicts, and other lowly characters joining the mix in the bay to the west.

Today, village governance is shared by two councils: the Nu’u o Teine, council of daughters and sisters under the jurisdiction of Teu’ialilo and Tululautū, and the Nu’u o Ali ‘i, which consists of two sub-councils, one under the jurisdiction of the paramount title Sāgapolutele, and the other under that of Tagaloa. How do these four powerhouses function relative to each other?

It was discovered during fieldwork that the four paramount chiefs rarely met; therefore, decision-making is largely done through or by their orators. On rare occasions, such as hosting or traveling as a malaga, an official trip, the four paramount chiefs share the space. Unconditionally, it is the chieftesses that are served first, be it food, kava, or gifts. They also receive most of the wealth acquired along the way. It is also the case that when visiting dignitaries arrive at the village, the Teine welcome them first with their own performance of the kava ceremony, after which the Nu’u o Ali’i and their ‘aumaga, untitled men, take their turn.

In Sāmoa, the daughters and sisters in the village belong to the organization known as the aualuma. They have comparable power to their fathers and brothers although they are still under the jurisdiction of the village council which is predominantly male. Sāoluafata, on the other hand, does not have an aualuma; they have a fono, council--the Nu’u o Teine. In this sense, the Teine are the lawmakers, enforcers, and judges. Naturally, Sāoluafata manifested its unique agaifanua, Nu’u o Teine, within the structures of Samoa’s aganu’u, culture, or Fa’asāmoa. It evolved in accordance with its local resources and environments, personalities, and intra- and interpersonal gender relationships. Since its founding, each generation of heirs has maintained their right to rule according to the village’s founding principles, an evolving constitution, and the compromises made between them and the men’s council. Their laws were binding for all the village people—men, women, and children. The same has been true of the men’s council. However, where village space was concerned, it was the Teine who dictated who entered and exited.

153 When the village hosts a malaga, ‘ava ceremonies are performed. The Nu’u o Teine performs its ceremony before the Nu’u o Ali’i. For the most part, the ceremony typically employs conventional protocol except for one major aspect: the paramount chiefs are equal. Therefore, all must be served simultaneously. This requires two kava cups and two distributors. Timing is very critical in order for the kava carriers to avoid punishment.
Finally, the political, religious, and economic impact of the *papālagi* in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries cannot be overstated. Saoluafata Bay was attractive to German ships, thus becoming an alternative harbor for European ships in Sāmoa.154 Sāoluafata was also rich in land, hence it was attractive to German experimentation with growing rubber trees. The village leased much of their land in the Sōlāua area for this purpose and continues to lease it for government projects today.155 At the turn of the nineteenth century, Sāoluafata was apparently the only village in Sāmoa to have had an abundant supply of food; thus escaping hunger during a huge famine in the archipelago in the nineteenth century.156 The village shared its bounty which supposedly saved many lives around ‘Upolu. Consequently, the village hosts a *lotu fa’afetai*, thanksgiving service, every year to commemorate this part of its history.157

*Toe Tepatasi, Reflections*

It has not been an easy task trying to match names and dates; however, perseverance has yielded a contextualization of Sāoluafata in history and geography, in politics and culture. I have situated its founding against the larger context of Samoa’s cosmogyny, the era of Pili and his sons, the Tongan era, and the early days of Western contact. I have provided in this chapter explanations and interpretations of Samoan notions of “power” and “woman,” the themes of this study. Historically, Samoa’s women had been powerful movers and shapers of the socio-political infrastructure of the islands. From Nāfanua to So’oa’emalelagi to Salamāsina, their birthrights empowered them to be involved at the forefront of local and international politics, to march as warriors, or to stand in front of their warring brothers and fathers during battle.158

155 (‘Aumua and Nu’uali’iu Onosa’i, Sāoluafata, December 2007).
156 There was a famine in 1854 in the wake of a very severe hurricane. See Tavita, *Samoa Entry*, 2006, 66.
158 According to Robert Louis Stevenson, young women often marched in front of their fathers and brothers during war; they were not allowed to be killed. See *A Footnote to History* (Rockville: Serenity Publishers, 2009), 11.
Their royal Tongan connections enhanced local politics, which made them all the more attractive to other royal lines, expanding possibilities for their own descendants in generations to come. On the other hand, the papālagi appear to have threatened this power as women’s roles were redefined according to new ideologies, from the high status of the feagaiga as sisters to supporting roles behind the scenes as spouses. Nonetheless, Euro-American perceptions of Samoan women were initially negative if not ambivalent, but improved with time as both sides gained better understanding of each other.

This chapter concluded with locating Sāoluafata in the present and a briefing on its founding and initial roots. Luafatā’alae, its founder, was determined to have been a descendant of Pili’s oldest son, Tua, the receiver of the planting stick and skills to farm and fish. He was, according to Tu’u’u, the initial Tui Ātua. Luafata’alae’s own immediate parentage locates her securely in most, if not all, of Samoa’s paramount āiga, families. Various generations of daughters acquired for themselves royal or paramount marriages across the centuries, thus enhancing the sanctity of the village. Ironically, these connections often resulted in brothers and sons being frequently sent away for war; for instance, the wars of the pāpā over the Tafā’ifā titles, circa thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.¹⁵⁹

It appears that the sharing of power in the village a few centuries later coincided with an increasing population of Europeans and Americans. Saoluafata Bay was a popular harbor for German ships in Sāmoa in the nineteenth century. Evidently, Germany obtained contractual rights to the harbor through an agreement with the chiefs in the 1877.¹⁶⁰ Since the papālagi

---

¹⁵⁹ (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Kane’ohe, March 18, 2011). ‘Aumua explains that the concept of pāpā encompasses pule, mana, and mamalu manifested in the holders of the paramount titles, and should not be confused with the concept of Ao, which also means paramount, but not yet ordained as a pāpā.

¹⁶⁰ See Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 1994, 356, and Meleisea, Modern Samoa, 1987, 38. Meleisea notes that Theodore Weber of Goddefroy and Sons obtained a treaty from the Puletua which granted the Germans the right to use Sāoluafata Bay as a harbor, legitimacy of German land claims, exemption from Samoan laws, and protection of commerce, and the importation of labor to Sāmoa. Weber had apparently thrown his support behind the Puletua, or
dealt mainly with the men, the Teine might have acquiesced to their menfolk, organizing a council to mirror the Samoan model of a fono a matai, chief’s council, in order for them to deal with the missionaries, merchants, and colonial officials, who were all male. At a more personal level, it is highly likely that many conjugal liaisons between sailors and village girls took place--perhaps the beginning of out-migration. Thus, it is fair to conclude that in spite of the long journey through wars, invasions, and changes (some of which were beyond their control) the girls of Sāoluafata in particular and Sāmoa in general have heroines to celebrate—although there is still much work to do to ensure another six hundred years of power. In chapters three and four, I will try to make a convincing case about the power of Samoa’s women through the lens of Saoluafata’s Teine, a lasting power in spite of centuries of threats to their rights, dignity, and grace. I argue then that the Samoan woman has two main sources of political power: being suli of chiefly titles, and being feagaiga, or sister in a sacred relationship with her brother.

In conclusion, explaining and interpreting Saoluafata’s founding against the backdrop of archipelagic, political, physical, and cultural landscapes has been the thrust of this chapter. What happened since its founding in terms of pule and why the Teine are pa’ia (sacred) are the topic of interrogation in the next two chapters. Chapters three and four will deal mainly with a discourse on political power and what the literature says about it, as it may bear on an accommodation of competing ideologies and praxis. Chapter three examines the Teine’s political power in the Vavau; chapter four will make the case, through the explication of the men’s titles, for the divine sources of women’s power, hence Saoluafata’s status as a nu’u pa’ia, sacred village, and the actual shifting of power to the brothers in order to protect their pa’ia and mamalu, sanctity and dignity respectively.

the government of Mālieota Talavou; one wonders, if the Germans would have gotten the harbor contract had the government remained in the hands of the Tumua and Faipule.
CHAPTER 3:
PULE FA’ AVAE: CONCEPTUALIZING AND HISTORICIZING
THE CONSTITUTIVE POWER OF LUAFATĀ’ALAE AND HEIRS
1350 C.E.- 1800 C.E.

In village governments *pule* or authority is divisible into *pulefaavae* or constitutive authority, *pulefaasoa* or distributive authority, *pulefaaaoga* or exploitative authority and *pulefaamalumalu* or protective authority. Vested in the founders or founding entity or the whole village is the *pulefaavae*. All village property or banishment of villagers can be effected through the exercise of *pulefaavae*. Matai of the family entity exercise *pulefaasoa* to land and other family property. Acceptance or admission of new matai into the village council also comes under this authority. The authority to exploit or *pulefaaaoga* is vested in those who have been allocated the right to occupy land. Authority vested in the whole village and its inhabitants to render protection—a shield and not a sword—to the village estate is *pulefaamalumalu*.

Saleimoa Va’ai¹

Introduction: Quest for Answers, the Teine’s Pule in the Vavau

Since the 1300s, generations of Saoluafata’s Teine have flaunted the fact that their village was founded by women and that this foundation grants them the authority to set policy and regulations, allocate living and working space, and ensure order and peace for all families. Founded by Luafatā’alae and her daughter Taeolalopu’a, the village of Sāoluafata has been understood as a village owned and operated by women, a position which is unique in Sāmoa. Yet this knowledge is known only to a handful of people, a factor perpetuated by its absence in most *tusi fa’alupega*, books of honorifics. Assertively, this study argues that if every village constitution in Sāmoa grants *pule* in all its manifestations to whomever founded it, then it is only logical that Luafatā’alae should be at the beginning of the honorifics. As it were, only one of

¹ Vaai, *Samoa Faamatai*, 1999, 42.
these texts recognizes this logic—one compiled by a woman, a descendant of Luafatā’alae, Afioga, Professor ‘Ai’ono Fanaafi Le Tagaloa.2

Traditionally, the sisters and daughters of a Samoan village operate as the aualuma, an organization headed by a sa’otama’ita’i, or ‘augafa’apae, who is usually the sister of the paramount chief. However, the aualuma is still answerable to the village fono, council of chiefs, which is predominantly male in composition.

Sāoluafata has had a gendered political structure comprising three entities: the Nu’u o Teine, Itūvai o Sāgapolutele, and Itūvai o Tagaloa. On a daily basis, the two men’s councils normally oversee the affairs of their respective itūvai, side of the stream, also a political divide; however, they merge as the Nu’u o Ali’i when matters concerning the government and church arise. Unanimously, those that have informed this study agree that Sāoluafata is a nu’u pa’ia, sacred village; yet, the roots of this sacredness has been narrowly understood as the workings of the institution of feagaiga, itself a mechanism of power which the women use to either elevate their brothers to positions of power, or curse them and their wives when they violate their vatapuia, sacred space. This chapter reveals that the basis of this woman-power is more than the feagaiga; in fact, the notion of Sāoluafata as the nu’u pa’ia is due to the fact that the Teine, by virtue of their paramount beginnings, attracted like statuses in marriage. And as enumerated in the next chapter, to ask “who’s who” at Sāoluafata and how they came to be there is to discover a web of connections that, while not novel to Sāmoa, has not been mapped out for or ignored by the suli of Luafatā’alae.

This chapter, therefore, pursues a reconstruction of the structural origins of both village organization and the various dimensions of the Teine’s pule in the Vavau. It is particularly

---

2 ‘Ai’ono assertively situates the Nu’u o Teine at the beginning of the honorifics of Sāoluafata. See Le Tagaloa, Faasinomaga, 1997, 161.
concerned with the “when” and “why” of power sharing, which has been memorialized in the title, Nu’ualiu (nu’u=village, liu=change). ³ The task here is to uncover the genesis of the Teine’s power and how events around the archipelago in the early centuries of its development affected it. A counterfactual process is utilized for this purpose not so much to answer whether the Teine had the authority to rule and operate daily life, but how they exercised such a right from generation to generation since the fourteenth century until the shift to share power with their brothers. Contemporary structures and practices thread together the “what ifs” and “how comes” of power sharing and its consequences.

Here then is a quest for answers to the following questions concerning the journey of the Nu’u o Teine--the nu’u pa’ia of Sāoluafata: What did the pule a Teine (girls’ power) look like from its inception to first contact with the European moa folau? What led to the Teine sharing pule with their brothers?

First of all, the paucity of sources made the execution of this task a daunting one. Nonetheless, to share what little has been found suffices to construct a narrative regarding the origins, development, and status quo of the Teine’s pule. In other words, to show how the Teine’s pule became possible, the successes and limitations of its exercise, and why certain methods were possible and others not helps to determine the evolution of this pule. Obviously, this exercise is by no means the be all and end all of possible explanations and interpretations of Saoluafata’s past and the Teine’s pule. It should be taken as an invitation for other heirs of Luafatā’alae and other interested readers to add their own meanings to it, after all, any particular text or piece of writing is fertile ground for all kinds of interpretations. Until then, it is rendered

³ This is a tulāfale (oratorical) title which resides in my family and is aligned with the Sa Sāgapolutele family. Family records reveal four holders in modern times. Using Krämer’s generational measure of 30 years, this places the first holder of this title in the late nineteenth to early twentieth century. The current Nu’ualiu holder received his title when his uncle died in the mid-1960s (personal calculations).
dead and one can never profess to know its author’s intended meanings. Thus, this reconstruction begins with an etymological explanation of the Teine’s titles and then peels the layers of their signification based on the cultural and historical contexts from which they were derived in the Vava’u. The benefits of this exercise could not be underestimated particularly as they come to bear on a reconstitution, perhaps, of village politics and a realignment of gender relations; one which is inclusive of ancient ways of knowing which may still be employed to prevent excessive abuse of power by those that yield it, and rethinks a more pragmatic approach to socio-economic development.

Thus, texts by a core of luminaries on Samoa’s oral past have been extensively mined, their fragments extracted, pieced together in a different fashion for as far or as deep as they would allow, and then analyzed against a backdrop of Saolufata’s and Samoa’s contemporary issues and envisioned futures. For a history of Sāoluafata vis-à-vis Sāmoa, certain memories have been etched in written texts. The Samoa Islands is a rich webbing of the gafa, genealogies, fa’alupega, honorifics, and stories of origin for all of Sāmoa. According to Krämer, this information was gathered through an insistence upon his chief informers, and a genuine interest to save what appeared to him as a rapidly changing culture.4

In his determination of Samoa’s pedigrees, Krämer temporalizes the Vava’u by using 30 years as the length of each generation, subtracting it from the year 1000 for as far as 700 years, and then adding to it toward the present.5 Hence, The Samoa Islands is a remarkable contribution to scholarship and is a noteworthy encyclopedia of Samoa’s past, regardless of

---

5 Ibid., 642-43; for Asofou So’o’s approach, see Democracy and Custom, 2008, 205-07. I decided to use the more liberal number of 30 years used by Krämer for approximating years. I started by subtracting 30 years from 2010 with the current holder of the Tagaloa title, and then worked backward to the first known official Tagaloa (Loau Pu’u, according to ‘Aumua’s family genealogy). See Simanu, Mafutaga a le Au Simanu, Family Reunion 2007 (unpublished text, 2007), 25.
whether it may be flawed or biased.” Thus, it would be naïve to think that this ethnology captures everyone’s story, because it does not. Nonetheless, it would be counterproductive to dismiss Krämer as not credible because he was not Samoan. For this study, Krämer’s texts have been priceless, particularly when fieldwork findings fell short of expected outcomes. His account of Samoa’s lineages, footnotes, and indices have been critical sources, confirming or countering claims in other collections and family records about Saoluafata’s past. His texts either support or contradict the memories of sources earlier and subsequent to his; for instance, ‘Aumua’s compilation, ‘O Fāīā Fa’atūmua, largely based on family journals, travel, and work experiences around Sāmoa, clarifies the nuances of Samoan psyche and politics. Likewise, Tu’u’u’s chronicles of the rulers of Sāmoa made possible by his grandfather’s texted memory of Samoa’s pedigree, also serve to expand and confirm, if not contradict Krämer’s records. Brother Henry’s history of Sāmoa, Tala Faasolopito o Sāmoa, though heavily dependent on Krämer, contains useful insights into and framing of the periods of Samoa’s past. Perhaps a most detailed and illuminating account of the laws of the land is that by German scholar, Dr. E. Schultz’s Samoan Laws Concerning the Family, Real Estate and Succession, which he compiled during his tenure as the second colonial governor of Western Sāmoa in the early 1900s. His explanations of the laws governing kinship relations and conduct historicize marriage practices of Sāmoa at the turn of the twentieth century.

Krämer also did not have all information or versions of the stories; for instance, his speculation as to the gafa, genealogy, of Luafatā’alae does not make sense. He claims that she is

---

6 For example, my branch of the Tagaloa family of Sāoluafata is not included in there. Family journals have filled this gap.
7 Suffice it to say, the text is now available in English, although these versions, copied verbatim by Krämer from his informants, have always been available in Samoan and in the German original. Krämer notes that he and his assistant, Fred Pace, spent numerous days and hours copying the journals which the chiefs brought in, wrapped in their lavalava, wrap-around. They were pressured to get this done before the chiefs changed their minds, or before relatives demanded their return. See Krämer, The Samoa Islands., 1-7.
8 Schultz, Samoan Family Laws, 1953.
a descendant of Luafatāali‘i of Manono, yet nowhere else in his text (or in others) is there any supporting evidence. However, other sources have been helpful in filling in some of these gaps. The memories of the elderly, such as ‘Aumua, Teu’ialilo Malavai, and Samalā’ulu Mata’itusi, have been invaluable. Luafata’alae’s parentage was mapped out by ‘Aumua in her text, ‘O Fāia Fa’atūmua, and by Tu’u’u in Rulers of Sāmoa, a compilation of his father’s memories in family logs. Tu’u’u’s work is one of tremendous courage and loyalty. Like ‘Aumua, he has braced himself against the Samoan conventional belief, “E lē a’oa’ia e Laupu’ā, Tamafaigā,” which rejects the audacity of anyone to teach others ancestral knowledge. The memory of his father, Tofaeono Mano Siolo II (1901-1996), has been etched in this text, from which certain links to Sāoluafata are found. Marvelously, I discovered a link between Tui Ātua Tuālemoso and ‘Alae Sāveatama of Si’umu who were the progenitors of Sāoluafata, circa 1290 – 1320 C.E. These were the early years of post-Tongan Sāmoa and the emergence of the Mālietoa lineage. Sāveatama, according to Tu’u’u, was one of the six sons of Mālietoa Gagaosavea and the father of ‘Alae, the paternal progenitor of Sāoluafata. The latter married Semalamaalagī, a great daughter of Tui Ātua Tuālemoso, the son of Tui Ātua Matatua Sāgapolutele and Luafaletele of Saga on the south side of ‘Upolu. Luafāta’alae was the child of this marriage.

Supportive texts of a primary nature include the missionary Turner’s Samoa, A Hundred Years and Beyond, in which he reconstructs Samoa’s cosmogyny in amazing detail. Perhaps the most obvious limitation of his text, however, is the fact that he used very few of the Samoan

---

9 Krämer, ibid., 1994, 382. One could argue that it does not mean that an extension of this notion exists in the family journals of those directly connected to this line of argument. Rather, the only logical explanation, and the one with which all the three above sources are in agreement, is the one framed in this study.


12 Ibid.

13 See genealogy trees in chapter two.

14 The name Luafatā‘alae (in Tu’u’u) means two shelves of ‘Alae. Shelf here connotes a platform from which a chief speaks in the village council.

15 Turner, Samoa, A Hundred Years Ago, 1884, 1-9.
terms and translations, which would have been more helpful as a record of how such concepts might have evolved. Turner’s “old English” style makes his explanations dense at times. Nonetheless, his work is to be lauded for his insights into the condition of Samoa’s way of life, particularly its vulnerabilities to and hopeful triumphs over the world of the aitu, earthly spirits.

Finally, this narrative is also a threading of the “everyday” lived experiences of the Teine of Sāoluafata, as witnessed during fieldwork and subsequent contact on cyberspace. Such experiences occurred both inadvertently and planned in the spaces between the “tics and tocs” of official history; some experiences had even survived the tyranny of official texts which often and deliberately obscures the pasts of those in subordinate positions. Samoan scholars such as So’o, Va’ai, Le Tagaloa, Va’a, Wendt, Fairbairn-Dunlop, Meleisea, and Tui Ātua provide excellent explanations and critiques of indigenous institutions and references such as Fa’amatai and Fa’asāmoa. These scholars have scoped the broader political and social contexts within which to compare and confirm the relevance or the futility of this agaifanua—the Nu’u o Teine—in a postmodern landscape. Using the “ordinary,” or what I call fa’avavau, the past in daily life, they guide an upstreaming of speculation and logic, or the lack thereof, toward the past. In this fashion, I use contemporary settings as checkpoints through which to imagine ancestral thinking and practices. For instance the Nu’u o Teine still operates under a system of sā, taboos, yet nearly none of these resembles those practiced in the original village.

Teary Beginnings and Sibling Rivalry: Grab for Pule

Foucault’s notion that power is knowledge and vice versa would be in line with the Samoan belief in tu’ua, elder orators, as powerful keepers of ancestral knowledge—e.g.,
genealogies, oratory, poetry—and consequentially of *pule* in the village. Likewise, their elder sisters as village *feagaiga* should also possess such knowledge. The historical shift from the village as a learning institution to a modern classroom led to a tremendous loss of knowledge of many of Samoa’s pasts. Colonial education excluded non-western ontologies and epistemologies from its curricula. Moreover, what information has been salvaged by ethnology and family journals is not ubiquitously accessible. It is therefore safe to presume that those village people who are still able to access this knowledge are well positioned to becoming respected, if not future *pule*. I would add that one needs also to be knowledgeable of one’s position in the village in order to provide a defense against challenges concerning one’s eligibility to titles and lands.

Toward the end of chapter two, I laid out the geography and politics of Sāoluafata from the period of the *Vavau* to the present, including information about its founders. In this chapter, I contextualize the invention of *pule* for the trio who had been denied it by Tui Ātua Tologataua, and I explain the connections that could confirm or discount the claim that Sāoluafata was a *nu’u pa’ia*, sacred village. Perhaps the biggest challenge of this study concerns the legitimacy of the beneficiaries of such a claim. It begs the question as to whether the Teine’s *pule* was real and foremost in a village whose men and their wives appear to be marginalizing it.

At approximately 1330-1360 C.E., a new jurisdiction for Luafata’alae’s children was being created, one that was similar, albeit on a micro scale, to the one they had just left behind.

---

16 The chief known as the *tū’ua* possesses the ranks and status of *ali’i*, high chief, and *tulafale*, orator. His title connotes the name of the founder of the village. He is therefore the highest ranking chief. There are some villages in Sāmoa that no longer have *tū’ua*, such as Sāoluafata, whose *tū’ua* was once Fa’autagia. This title dates back to the original founder of Evaloa. It is possible that its power diminished once the *Nu’u o Teine* took hold. It is now part of the sector known as the Taofia (or Taufia, brotherhood of high chiefs) in the *Itūvai o Sāgapolule* of the *Nu’u o Ali’i*.


18 In the nineties, my family was involved in a court case over the title Tagaloa of Sāoluafata, during which some village people claimed that we were not of the village. ‘Aumua, as the oldest person there and representing our faction provided winning narratives and documents before the courts. ‘Aumua’s presentation in the case is identified by the number *L.C. 1646*. 
Tui Ātua Tologatau and his older son and successor, ‘Aumuatāgafa, held the power over the district of Ātua. It was a sovereign power manifested in a tributary system, with Lufilufi as the core and villages far away from it as the periphery.19 Tologataua’s younger son, Fatumanava’upolu,20 and daughter, Taeolalopu’a (the children of Luafatā’alae), were so outraged by the decision that the former waged war on his half-brother, but lost. Taeolalopu’a wailed unashamedly, which prompted an order from her father to teu ‘ia lilo au tagi, “keep hidden your tears!” Inevitably, Luafatā’alae and her children had to leave. Needless to say, from these tears came the paramount title, Teu’ialilo (teu=to keep; lilo [adj.]=hidden, buried). Later, another namesake of the same tears emerged in the paramount title Tululautū (tutulu=respect form of tagi, to cry; tu=custom, or stand).

The trio moved to Evaloa, the northwestern end of the district of Ātua. Obviously, by today’s measures they did not move very far.21 Assuming that they had been living at Mulinu’ū peninsula (part of the village of Lufilufi where the Tui Atua’s residency and seat of the Ātua government were situated), they either walked south to where the inlet ended and then westward along the foothills of Sāoluafata mountain, or they may have paddled around the promontory

---

19 Though not of the same scale, Immanuel Wallerstein’s metaphor of core-periphery illustrates what this tributary system might have looked like. Although Wallerstein’s analysis refers to northern European countries and their colonies around the world as a world system, I take Janet L. Abu-Lughod’s challenge that other world systems existed before the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, what Wallerstein defined as the beginning of the world system. See Jane L. Abu-Lughod, “Introduction: Studying a System in Formation,” in Before European Hegemony: The World System A.D. 1250-1350 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 3-40. It is about this time that the Tongans, Samoans, and Fijians were exchanging and trading with each other in spite of intra- and interisland warfare. The Samoan fine mat, as the currency of exchange and trade, had come into existence in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; Sāoluafata had come into being towards the latter part of the period under Abu-Lughod’s analysis. For a narrative on how a tributary system in Sāmoa might have looked like, see Unasa L.F. Va’a, “Local Government in Samoa and the Search for Balance,” in Governance in Samoa, ed. Huffer and So’o, 2000, 152-54. Tu’u’u, ibid., (2001) and ‘Aumua, Fāiā Fa’atūmua, (2011) speak about a kingdom of the Tui Manu’a to whom the neighboring islands of Sāmoa, Fiji, Tonga, Rarotonga, Niue, and Tokelau paid tribute until circa 950 C.E., a time which coincided with the era in which the Tongans ostensibly began their occupation of Sāmoa. See Brother Henry, Tala Faasolopito o Samoa, 1979.

20 As a reminder, the older son, ‘Aumuatāgafa, was the successor of the Tui Ātua title circa 1380 C.E.

21 The map below shows that Mulinu’ū peninsula is just a stone’s throw away from the eastern part of Cape Utusi’a and that the two landforms are separated by a stream through which the brackish lagoon at Sāoluafata drains.
Utusi’a into Faga’ese Bay (also known as Saoluafata Bay) and finally beached at Utusi’a’s southwestern end. For a small band of relatives led by a woman, the promontory Utusi’a, the deeply wooded hills at its neck, and the Sōlaua plains lying further inland, provided ample space and fertile soil for cultivation and recreation. The absence of archaeological digs or written records renders impossible an estimation of the population density of Sāmoa at that time. Nonetheless, population estimates of protohistoric Sāmoa suggest that the population was much higher between 1790 and 1830, after which noticeable declines were witnessed due to diseases imported in the mid-nineteenth century. One could conclude that population density was probably low enough so that people were able to move around without much obstruction or rejection from earlier settlers. Even the founders of villages, for instance, the first settlers of Evaloa, Fa’autagia and his family, could not have minded the new arrivals.

Figure 7. Cape Utusi’a: A. Itūvai/Political Sphere of Teu’ialilo & Sāgapolutele; B. Itūvai/Political Sphere of Tululautū & Tagaloa; C. Mulin’ū, Lufilufi—(ancestral) residence of Tui Atua and headquarters of the Atua district; D. Swamp.
Luafatā’alae chose an amazing piece of real estate to settle. Cape Utusi’a was spacious enough for her to establish a home. Coconut and toi trees grew abundantly at the cape and they made great building materials for houses, medicine, and soap. In 1897-98, Krämer noted during his hikes that the northern part of the cape (the name of which he did not know) was “not flat and inhabited as in Apia, but rocky and uninhabited.” He was obviously referring to the very head of the promontory, which today has been leveled for various village projects.

But imagine what the cape might have been like in the 1300s. Textual records and field observations unveil a stream flowing into and out of a pool further inland. It is called Vaitu’olo (vai=water; tu=stand; ‘olo=fort). Up until the mid-twentieth century, the pool was a gathering place for drinking, bathing and laundering, particularly at low tide when only freshwater remained. Drinking water was provided by the underground puna, springs, noticeable by their bubbles at the head of the pool and separated from the washing area by a rock wall. The underwater springs were part of the water table fed by waterfalls from the hills abruptly rising above the headlands. When the tide was in, however, the pool turned completely brackish; pity the family that did not refill their water reservoirs before high tide. Today, the pool has lost its utility, but it is still being kept clean by the komiti a tama’ita’i, women’s committee.

Further east and a stone’s throw away from the Mulinu’ū peninsula on the northeastern side was an abundance of toi trees which would later be cleared for the Faletoi (house made of toi), the malae, headquarters, for the Sā Tagaloā family. The satellite map above indicates a lake-looking body of water in the mid-western portion; this was and is still a natural swamp.

---

22 *Alphitonia zizyphoides*: toi is a native of Sāmoa and other islands in the South Pacific. It grows well in the lowlands and at the margins of the closed forests. It has multiple uses such that it is an excellent wood for the construction of rafters and canoes, a source of fuel, medicine, and soap. For further information about the toi, see Craig R. Elevitch, ed. *Traditional Trees of Pacific Islands: Their Culture, Environment, and Use* (Holuloa: Permanent Agriculture Resources [PAR], 2006), 58.


24 See “B” on the map in the previous page for location.
flushed by the tides streaming in and out through an opening on the southwestern section of the cape. The stream is barely visible today, but ‘Aumua remembers canoes going in and through it to get to the other side of the village in her youth.\(^{25}\)

At first the village might have been just a collection of small *fale*, open houses, clustered close to the pool and along the beach. Between them was a coconut grove which was cleared earlier for the *malae* Faleniu (house of coconut), the center of the Sā Sagapolutele polity. The two *malae*—Faleniu and Faletoi—are not as noticeable today. Once active centers of politics and economics, the two *malae* have degenerated at a different pace: Faletoi, for example, has been the site for school and church facilities for some time, while Faleniu still has the contours of a *malae* as witnessed on the lower left hand side of the above map. During fieldwork, both *malae* lay dormant in contrast to the hustle and bustle of Bingo games sponsored by the Church, which appears to have become the socio-economic center of the village.\(^{26}\)

In the fourteenth century, to distinguish her residence from the rest, Luafata’alae’s house was built upon a foundation of rocks which came to be called ‘Olotelē, Big Fort.\(^{27}\) At this location, the hills behind it cast morning shadows across the *malae* and seaward to where incoming *moa folau* could be spotted for miles. The bay was probably vulnerable to invasions; however, on a daily basis, it was a great source of food and recreation, and it was seasonally blessed with schools of *atule* which sustained a growing population for a while. Thus, it was at the base of Cape Utusi’a that Luafatā’alae created the *Nu’u o Teine* and called it Sāoluafata, sacred to Luafata. Donning the title Teu’ialilo, a derivative of Taeolalopu’a’s tears, it was here

\(^{25}\) (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Sāoluafata, July 2007).
\(^{26}\) According to ‘Aumua, the Sāgapolutele faction has gone through a succession of short-term holders in the last half of the twentieth century.
\(^{27}\) It is better known today as the *tūlāgā maota a* Sāgapolutele (foundation of Sagapolutele’s guesthouse).
that she exercised her powers as a mother, and eventually, as a paramount ruler. She and subsequent chieftesses were a force to be reckoned with as they imposed sā, taboos, and created new ones for subsequent generations. Eventually, the polity took shape and Sāoluafata became acknowledged as a member of the Faleātua, House of Ātua, a political alliance in times of war. Krämer notes that in the nineteenth century, whenever the Ātua district met, Tui Ātua sat on a tapa’au, or laupolapola, crude mat made of coconut leaves, while Teu’ialilo of “Saluafata” resided on the fala, mat. It is not known what kind of mat, but it was most likely one akin to a sleeping mat, or perhaps even the sacred ‘ietoga, fine mat.

Thus from ‘Olotelē, Luafatā’alae and Taeolalopu’a ruled with austerity, imposing certain sā, which Krämer claims were established on behalf of her son, Fatumanavao’upolu, and appeared to have perpetuated the tensions between them and the half brother who was now the reigning Tui Ātua. ‘Aumuatāgafa was, ostensibly, prohibited from setting foot in Sāoluafata.

Conversations with ‘Aumua raised the following questions: first, did Luafatā’alae establish a council soon after settling at Cape Utusi’a? Second, for what purpose was there a need to organize? And third, from where did the council members come, or how were these titles created? ‘Aumua assuredly related that it was important for Luafatā’alae to set down rules and regulations in order to control her growing collection of relatives. It was customary for someone of her status to have an au tautua, servers, to develop the land and provide security. As

---

28 There is no reason to believe that Luafatā’alae did not coin the title Teu’ialilo as soon as she established power over a collection of relatives who were eventually ordered to reflect a nation-wide system of chiefs, the Fa’amatai. 29 There were seven villages which made up the Faleātua: Sāoluafata, Solosolo, Luatuanu’u, Samusu, Lotofaga, and Lepā. See Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 1994, 352. 30 Samoans sat on all kinds of mats even after centuries of pālagi chairs. There were mats of coconut leaves that served as the first layer closest to the pebbled floor and mats of pandanus, paogo, leaves which were for daily use. At night, sleeping mats, fala lili’i, made of flax were laid out. These were a finer weave than the day-mats. The most precious mat, which held a different social value, was the ‘ietoga, fine mat, woven with the finest of strands of flax and treated and transformed into a silky texture. This was Samoa’s currency before money became prominent and, in many cases today, the preferred currency of exchange. The weave of the fine mat that is used today has become less fine and the flax used less silky. It is more a symbolic gesture for kin maintenance amid Fa’asamoa’s materialism.
founder, her *pule* was multidimensional: in addition to possessing constitutive and distributive authority, she also had the power to use or deny rights and to expel renegade relatives from her village. Furthermore, since her space was sacred due to her birthrights as *suli* and *feagaiga*, her male relatives, regardless of distance, could not enter it. As many of her counterparts elsewhere in Sāmoa then and now, paramount chieftesses entertained a status of *Teine matua*, elder lady, which in the case of *Luafata’alae*, would have guaranteed for her constitutive and distributive power.

Thus it was imperative for Luafata’alae to organize and develop the talents, skills, and courage of other women in the village, and to assign sisters and daughters as representatives of their households in the *fono*, council, while their husbands and sons provided the labor force to work and harvest the land. *Feagaiga* precepts were presumably second nature, and while the men fished, farmed and shaped respective tools, the *Teine*, as they preferred to be called, wove the mats, transformed the mulberry bark to make *siapo*, and took care of the children—all of them resources considered as the *tamāo’aiga*, wealth, of the village. Each household was designated a title, and as the population grew or diminished over the centuries, titles were either added or relegated to more, less, or dormant status depending on the ability of their heirs to strengthen or abuse them.

*Nu’u o Teine: Imagining the Original Council of Titles*

In 2007, I asked two of my key informants during fieldwork, Samalā’ulu Mata’itusi and Seumālō Meripa, to assist me in the construction of the tables, and to share their knowledge of their origins. Unfortunately, both *Teine* had scanty knowledge of such, thus I have had to resort to etymology and the possible contexts from which they were derived. An enlightening task, the linguistic analysis was a good place to start. Significantly, understanding the genesis and their
cultural and historical contexts will hopefully provide the *Teine* with much needed knowledge of their family origins with which to face any eligibility challenge.

Table 1. Active Titles of the *Nu’u o Teine*³¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Itūvai/Political Sphere of Teu’ialilo</th>
<th>Itūvai/Political Sphere of Tululautū</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ali’i, High Chieftesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Aimatāfagamaleva’a</td>
<td>Tauata’ese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liutautai</td>
<td>Sulufale’ese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Imoaalegau</td>
<td>Tili’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumu’aga</td>
<td>Fānene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samalā’ulu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagitagia’au</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foa’imea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tofoipupū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luafaletele</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tulāfale, Orators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>Pa’ū’ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āmio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālaiaola</td>
<td>‘Āmialelei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mototino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaoololeloa</td>
<td>Fatumanavao’upolu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu’ualiu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seumālō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afesulu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 above reflects the current ordering of the *Nu’u o Teine* titles under the shared leadership of the *sa’otama’ita’i*, Teu’ialilo and Tululautū. In turn, each Teine or Afioga, ladyship, has a specific collection of high chiefs and orators of various ranks and through which she can exercise her power. Admittedly, very little is known about the origins or meanings of the Teine’s titles; however, their origins and eventual positioning in socio-political structure are

---
³¹ By “active,” I mean titles which had holders or had recently been active at the time of fieldwork in Sāoluafata in 2007 and 2008. At this time, some titles had multiple holders (e.g. Leao and Tilia). This implies that the *Teine* did not need to be heads of a household, but that they could be members of the council. There are some indications as well that the age in which one was to enter membership in the village did not matter. Tilia Fua Seumanutafa relates that she was only five when she was initiated into the *Nu’u o Teine*. She left the village in 1981 when she was of college age. (Tilia Fua Seumanutafa, facebook comm., January 18 and 22, 2011).
determined albeit narrowly by the chronological order in which the titles of the *Nu’u o Ali’i* might have arrived in the village. It would be very easy to argue that if this were the case, then Sāoluafata must have begun with Sāgapolutele and Tagaloa; however, there is no reason to believe that the corresponding titles in the *Nu’u o Ali’i* might have determined their counterparts in the *Nu’u o Teine*, hence favoring the men with ownership of the village. On the contrary, it is worth reminding that the village name was derived from the sā, taboos, established by Luafatā’alae. This is consistent with the naming practices around Sāmoa whereby most villages are the namesakes of those that founded and settled them. Sātalo means sacred to or taboos of Talo o le Ma’agao, the orator-chief.32

Table 2 below, however, reflects the alignment or juxtaposition of the Teine’s and their menfolk’s titles. Evidently, lesser titles are organized as either the Taufia o Ali’i, anchor chiefs, of the Teu’ialilo jurisdiction, or Usoali’i, brotherhood of chiefs, in that of Tululautū. Further divisions are signified as the Falefā o Ali’i, house of four chiefs, or Faletolu, house of three, in the former, and Nofo a Falelua, seating of two houses, in the latter. The *Nu’u o Ali’i* mirrors this structure as well.

‘Āiga Sā Teu’ialilo

The first four titles in Teu’ialilo’s council make up the Taufia o Ali’i (aka Taofia a Taiai or Fuatino), or the anchor chiefs with the titles ‘Aimatāfagamaleva’a, Liutautai, ‘Imoaalegau and Sumu’aga. They correspond to the titles Fa’amau, Pimoe, Talatā’ina, and Tuala in the *Nu’u o Ali’i*. There is no record of whether the Teine’s titles were invested before or after those of their counterparts. Nevertheless, upon examination, the Teine’s titles reflect some of Samoa’s

---

32 According to Krämer, *The Samoa Islands* 1994, when Tafo’a Salamāsina visited Faleālili, she met with Tafa’i Salamāsina who fed her talo from the ma’agao—rocky fields where the taro roots yielded a marvelous crop. She then renamed the chief Talo o le Ma’agao, hence, people were forbidden from using the word talo to identify the food, but to use the word fuāuli instead.
fishing traditions. ‘Aimatāfagamaleva’a means “to eat at the beach and in the canoes” and it signifies an old fishing tradition whereby the fishermen shared their catches at the beach upon their return from a fishing expedition. At that point, according to ‘Aumua, each fisherman threw a fish into a common canoe from which they fed before going ashore.

Table 2. Aligning the Titles of the Nu’u o Teine and Nu’u o Ali’i, December 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teu’ialilo</th>
<th>Sāgapolutele</th>
<th>Tululautū</th>
<th>Tagaloa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taufia o Ali’i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Usoali’i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Aimatāfagamaleva’a</td>
<td>Falea o Ali’i</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nofo i Falelua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liutautai</td>
<td>Fa’a’amu</td>
<td>Tauala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imoaalegau</td>
<td>Fīmoe</td>
<td>Tīli’a &amp; Fānene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumu’aga</td>
<td>Talatā’ina</td>
<td>Leao &amp; Leao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Samalā’ulu          | Fa’amatū              |                   |                 |
| Tagitagiā’au        | Toilolo               |                   |                 |
| Foa’imea            | Fa’autagia            |                   |                 |
| Luafaletele         | Matua O Foutanu       |                   |                 |
|                     | & Aiga Sa             |                   |                 |
|                     | Foutanu               |                   |                 |
| Tofoipupū           | Taamai                |                   |                 |

Sāoluafata: Tulufale, Orator Titles (Fa’asāoluafataga)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mototino</th>
<th>Eva36</th>
<th>Amialelei</th>
<th>Pa’ū’ū37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaoloooleloa</td>
<td>Palea’e</td>
<td>Mapu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu’ualiu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fatumanavao’upolu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seumālō</td>
<td>Seumālō</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afsesulu</td>
<td>Afsesulu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālaiaola38</td>
<td>Pale’a’esina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saifiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 Technically, the men stay in their canoes just inside the lagoon and have a meal. (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Saoluafata, 2007).
34 Table 3 reflects the titles which had holders in both villages. Clearly, many of those in the orator group in the Tagaloa side of the Nu’u o Ali’i do not have counterparts in the Nu’u o Teine. When asked about this situation, some of the Teine suggested that there may have been a reluctance on the part of some parents to allow their daughters to participate in Teine affairs. It demonstrates a negative evolution for the Nu’u o Teine from compulsory participation to voluntary, which in my opinion will be detrimental to the survival of power for Saoluafata’s teine.
35 Interestingly, the counterparts to the holders of the titles Vaivao and Mao, Fu’e and Leumu, and Tanoi in the Nu’u o Teine shared the same title, Leao. These Teine did not attend our luncheon meeting on December 31, 2007 due to prior engagements.
36 Orator for Sāgapolutele; it is also assumed by she who speaks on behalf of Teu’ialilo. The title Mototino is the counterpart for the title Eva, although the Nu’u o Teine also utilizes the latter at certain times.
37 Orator for Tagaloa; Tululautū’s orator also uses this title, although there is used on a daily basis, and that is ‘Amialelei.
38 This title is supposed to be directly linked to Teu’ialilo. It means a living curse (Nua Opetaia, pers. comm., Vaivaseuta, July 2007).
Ostensibly, failure to share part of one’s catch reflected poorly on the fisherman and his family.\(^39\)

As well, the fisherman in charge, known as the *tautai*, stood to lose his credibility and his *pule*. In such instance, his authority is *liliu*, transferred, to another *tautai*. The title *Liutautai* (“change the lead fisherman”) signifies this loss of repute and power. Historically, fishing expeditions incurred particular principles and each one was its own tradition involving all levels of society.\(^40\)

The third title, ‘*Imoaalegau*, involved much crisscrossing between the two words *imoa* and *gau*. The term *imoa* is a euphemism for *isumu*, rat, while the noun, *gau*, signifies an edible variety of sea cucumbers. The *imoa* looms large in Samoan fables, but as a metaphor, the name signifies paramount connections for certain locales and often memorializes a fight or curse.\(^41\)

Needless to say, a logical origin for Saoluafata’s case could be placed at the village of Sale’aula, Savai’i. *Imoa* was the title of a talented orator chief who was a jester in Salamasina’s court, circa 1540 C.E.\(^42\) The title is still honored at Sale’aula as the apparent voice of the government.\(^43\) A direct link to Sāoluafata could be argued since residing in the same council at Sale’aula was the chiefly title *Fepulea’i*. Here, Krämer connects Sale’aula to Tui Ātua Fepulea’i, whose son Tui Ātua Tologataua married Luafatā’alae. As a reminder, Tologataua’s mother was Utufa’asili, daughter of Funefe’ai, the first Tagaloa of Sāmoa, circa 1360 C.E. Perhaps it is a stretch to forge

\(^39\) (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Sāoluafata, July 2007).
\(^40\) Such was the case with the *atuale*, big scadeye fish, which spawned in the Saoluafata Bay. Traditions such as the *i’a *mua*, first fish, was guarded by Teu’ialilo and Tululautū and managed by orators and the ‘*aumaga* under the distributive authority of village orators. Village *fa’alupega*, honorifics, recognize the significant role which the orators play in managing village affairs; the distribution of goods and labor is known as *fa’asaoluafata*, the ways of Saoluafata’s orators. *Tiugamalie and aloga atu*, shark and tuna fishing respectively also come to mind. (‘Aumua, *ibid*).
\(^41\) A rat was once the bat who relinquished his wings to a rat who took off, never to return to the ground. A rat is also believed to have excreted on the octopus’ head as the latter was transporting the ungrateful rodent to his home after being stranded in high tide across the bay. These stories are ubiquitously popular in Sāmoa and are not to be regarded as having origins at Sāoluafata.
\(^42\) The title was included in Sale’aula’s *fa’alupega* (honorifics) in the nineteenth century. See Krämer, *The Samoa Islands*, 1994, 68.
this connection; however, the title was genealogically within Saoluafata’s vicinity in the
fourteenth and sixteenth centuries. Since all members of a village are related either cognatically
or agnatically, it is not too far-fetched to believe that the title, *Imoaalegau* ("the rat of/for the sea
slug") signified a relationship which perhaps resorted to verbal violence and subordinated the
subject as a “rat” offered to a slug. Other chiefs with the same title or a variation thereof, appear
elsewhere, but perhaps this connection makes sense because of Saoluafata’s links to the Tui Ātua
and Tafa’ifā Salamāsina, which will be elaborated upon in the next chapter.44

Finally for this group is the title Sumu’aga, a derivative of the fish *sumu*, known in
Hawai’i as the *humuhumunukunukuapua’a*. Sumu'aga was perhaps a fishing method that
involved spearing the *sumu*, and thus is symbolic of the act of throwing or in flipping an object at
someone or something. Sumu'aga may also be a derivative of a title from somewhere else in
Sāmoa. There is a Sumuane title with connections to the title Tofoipupū, the name of a
descendant of Tole’afoaiolo of the Salamāsina lineage circa 1690 C.E.45 Sumu’aga could
therefore be a corruption of the Sumuane title. Alternatively, it could be symbolic of the act of
throwing (as in pitching a cricket ball) or the act of throwing—*sumu*—an object (e.g. knife) at
someone or something. Whether a fishing method, a derivative of another title, or an act of
violence, Sumu’aga is still a title with chiefly currency at Sāoluafata.

Fishing was an integral part of *Fa’asāmoa* in the past and fishing traditions abound until
migration to New Zealand for education and employment lured the able-bodied from the village.
Fishing was also gendered activity and while the men normally went beyond the bay for deep-
sea fishing, the *Teine* stayed close to shore. The promontory teemed with sea urchins, sea

---

cucumber, and sea slugs for the evening meal; the Bay to the west provided schools of fish
around which many traditions were built.

The next cluster of titles is the *Faletolu o Ali‘i* and it comprises the titles Samalā‘ulu,
Tagitagia‘au, and Foa’imea. Their counterparts are Toilolo, Fa‘autagia, and Tamapolu in the
*Nu’u o Ali‘i*. The Samalā‘ulu title corresponds to that of Toilolo in the *Nu’u o Ali‘i*. There are
several ways in which this title might have arrived at Sāoluafata. It appears to have its origins in
the Manu’a group—she was daughter of the Tui Manu’a (c. 1480 C.E.).\(^{46}\) She was an ancestor
of Fineitalaga, a member of the Sāgapolutele family. The title is also associated with Fa‘autagia,
whose daughter Samalā‘ulu married Fānene of Faleālili and had three children: Oilau,
Avaioalisa,\(^{47}\) and Te‘o na po ai le nu‘u.\(^{48}\) Oilau married Fuimaono of Salani and had a son
named Fuiāvailili who was also known as Tupua Fuiāvailili, the Tafa‘ifā, circa 1720. He was
the origin of the ‘Āiga Sā Tupuā. In tracing the ‘Afoafouvale pedigree, Simanu ‘Afoa’s third
usuga was with Samalā‘ulu, Faumuina’s daughter and half sister of Fonoifā, the second Tafa‘ifā
of Sāmoa, circa 1670 C.E.\(^{49}\) Samalā‘ulu is also attached to the title Toilolo of the Salemuli‘aga
family of Taga, Savai‘i.\(^{50}\) Currently holding this title at the *Nu’u o Teine* is Samalā‘ulu
Mata‘itusi, my host during fieldwork. Samalā‘ulu comes under the protection of Toilolo. The
late Toilolo ‘Auina was her great uncle. Clearly, the Faletolu o Ali‘i in both councils denote
paramount links, and the agency of descendants over the centuries.

---

\(^{46}\) Details regarding this connection are outlined in chapter four. Briefly, Fineitalaga of the Teu’ililo and
Sāgapolutele family married Foloolelā, a granddaughter of Tui Manu’a and Manu, daughter of Lu of Uafata and
Lagifetaupe’ai. They would be the progenitors of the female pāpā, Gato’aitele and Tamaso‘ali‘i. See Krämer, *ibid.*, 394.

\(^{47}\) Vavaio’alis in family genealogies.

\(^{48}\) The daughter of Faumuina le Tupufia, and Tu‘umaleuela’iali‘i was Samalā‘ulu, who fought her brother Fonoifā
for the Tafa‘ifā titles. Fonoifā was Faumuina’s firstborn by a different wife, Talaolemalie, daughter of Vaovasa of
Gataivai, Savai‘i (also of the Salemuli‘aga line). See Krämer, *ibid.*, 224-25.

\(^{49}\) ‘Afoafouvale (c. 1750 C.E.) was Tupua Fuiavailili’s oldest son and heir to the Tafa‘ifā titles. Krämer, *ibid.*, 239-40.

\(^{50}\) This title appears to be a transplant from Savai‘i, which was and is still aligned with the title Samalā‘ulu. My host
uses the title Samalā‘ulu in the *Nu’u o Teine*. 
A case could be made for the power of superstition to explain that which could not be empirically determined. It is not hard to imagine how the Teine must have lived with fear of an inexplicable crying from offshore; it was important or threatening enough to warrant its commemoration in a title. One could say that the title, Tagitagia’au, requires a metaphysical approach to its explanation. The name literally means crying or cries from a reef, probably from off the headlands of Utusi’a and is currently complemented by the title Fa’autagia in the Nu ‘u o Ali’i. Tagitagia’au situates the narrative in the supernatural. Tala o le vavau, ancient stories, indicate that for some obscure reason, a cry was heard coming in from the ocean; it was believed to be that of a female; but here, the story abruptly ends. One can speculate, however, that during a time when human beings were shape shifters, it would not be difficult to imagine supernatural forces at work. In line with the tala fa’afāgogo, terna’/fairy tales, Samoa’s heroes had premature beginnings, thus, the cry from the reef might have been a discarded placenta transformed into a human being.51

Also part of the Faletolu o Ali’i is the title Fo’a’imea which simply means “to give away things.” As in the previous title, no one knows or remembers its origin, but the lexicon points to acts of generosity. One of the ways to increase one’s social power was to share one’s resources regardless of the degree of necessity. On the other hand, a person who inappropriately gives of his or her things in order to garner favors was considered fialelei and could never gain respect. Nonetheless, this title is aligned with that of Tamapolu, which was once part of Tagaloa’s jurisdiction in the early twentieth century; in fact, according to Krämer, what is now the Faletolu

51 Nāfanua and Maui were our most famous blood clots: Nāfanua was the war-goddess with ties to a half eel and a half human, Saveasi’uleo, who guarded the spirit world Pulotu. Through her human representatives, Tupa’i and ‘Auva’a, Nāfanua reshaped Samoan politics in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Maui was a blood clot discarded by his mother Ti’eti’eatalaga, but later evolved into a strapping young hero. He wrestled an ogre for fire—a gesture which resulted in Samoans eating cooked food. Maui also features prominently in Tongan, Maori and Hawaiian mythologies. See Tu’u’u, Rulers of Samoa., 2001, and Simanu, O Fāiā Fa’atumua, 2011. See also C. Stuebel, Tala o le Vavau: Myths, Legends and Customs of Samoa, trans. Brother Herman, ill. Iosua Toafa (Auckland: Pasifika Press, 1989) new edition.
o Ali’i in the Sāgapolutele polity was once part of the Tagaloa’s brotherhood of chiefs. There is no indication from the sources on when this realignment took place, but one could wager on marriage as a reason for such a move; these titles were still with the Tagaloa group during my grandfather Simanu’s youth, thus supporting Krämer’s findings.\(^{52}\)

Then there is Luafaletele, the name of an ancestor of Luafatā’alae. She was from Saga in southern ‘Upolu and was married to Tui Ātua Matatua Sāgapolutele, the twenty-sixth ruler of the Sāmoa Islands.\(^{53}\) The title Luafaletele means “two big guest houses.” It is aligned with the titles Foutanu and Ta’amai, and the honorific, Matua o Foutanu. Finally, the title Tofoipupū locates the name as that of the daughter of Ta’amai of Sāoluafata who married Mālietoa Toatuilaepa, circa 1660. Incidentally, Tofoipupu’s mother was the daughter of ‘Ae Maneafaiga of Nu’uuli, Tutuila. Tofoipupu’s son, ‘Ae’o’aonu’u, was cannibalistic; her daughter To’oā married into the Salevālasi family.\(^{54}\)

The next group of titles under the political sphere of Teu’ialilo are orator titles: Amio means “behavior, mannerisms, or conduct.” Mototino literally means “raw/green body,” where moto refers to green or unripe fruits and connotes the naiveté of youth. Gaolooleloa is about the rubbing of the red fruits of the loa, a cosmetic plant that was used to provide lipstick and facial paint for ceremonial purposes. Loa also means “tomb,” and gaolo means “rumble.” What could be rumbling from within a tomb?

Seumālō is also an orator title which means “to drive a victory this way”. During fieldwork, Seumālō Meripa was the lead orator from the Teu’ialilo’s council; however, she has since left the council for New Zealand. The title Afesulu (afe=stop by; sulu=shine, or seek refuge) could mean to dive into the protection or security of a protector. Finally, the title

---

\(^{52}\) Krämer, *The Samoa Islands*, 1994, 357.

\(^{53}\) Tu’u’u, *Rulers of Samoa*, 2001, 121.

Mālaiaola means “living curse,” suggesting that Teu’ialilo’s curse was to be avoided at all costs. Finally, the title Nu’ualiui is of paramount significance in the history of Sāoluafata since it signifies the shift in powers between the Teine and their brothers. It is the evidence that such a move actually took place and I extend this discussion in the next chapter.

What this orator group of titles signifies, I would suggest, are events in and attributes of the people and environments of Sāoluafata. Some of these events perhaps originated somewhere else and were transplanted in Sāoluafata through gafa or genealogies. Nevertheless, taken together, they appear to speak to or caution against certain amio, behavior, which could unsettle interpersonal relations in the village, thus resulting in unwanted curses of the paramount Teine. These titles also correspond to orator titles in the Nu’u o Ali’i

‘Āiga Sā Tululautū

Extensive scrutiny of ‘Aumua’s and Krämer’s texts reveals that the title Tululautū could not have been part of the initial Nu’u o Teine until a few centuries later. To illustrate, the title Tululautū does not appear in Krämer until about 1780 when Simanu ‘Afoa, ‘Afoafouvale’s son, married Tululautū of Sāoluafata. The table reveals that Tululautū’s council appears to have just one-third the number of those in Teu’ialilo’s council. One ought to exercise caution, however, and not misconstrue this observation as having any bearing on the legitimacy and constitutive authority of the title, Tululautū.

As mentioned earlier, at least three of the titles which used to be in Tululautu’s and Tagaloa’s courts are now in that of Sagapolutele’s—they are Samalā’ulu, Tagitagia’au, and Foa’imea. As well, the title Tuala in Sagapolutele’s court today was once in Tagaloa’s. Nonetheless, Tululautu’s titles are ordered as the sisterhood of chiefs or Usoali’i. And then they are organized as Nofo a Falelua or Nofo i Falelua, seating of/in twos. The search for origins

55 Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 1994, 357.
begins with the chiefly titles of Tauata’ese (“of a different image”) and Suluifale’ese (“seeking refuge in a different house”); these are linked to the Loau and Telea titles. Krämer locates Suluifale’ese at Vailoa, Āleipata, the home of the title Tuālemoso. Vailoa is ten miles from ‘Ulutogia, the place where ‘Aloa and Semalamaalagī met during the breadfruit contest. There is a natural connection here to Sāoluafata. As established in chapter two, Tuālemoso was the name of a Tuī Ātua who ruled Ātua in the deep Vava’u. Incidentally, Tuālemoso at this village had five children—Sasaumalu, Utu, Tagitagi, Amiatutolū, and the girl Sulu’ifale’ese.56 Suluifale’ese is the sa’otama’ita’i title for Loau at Fale’ula; it is also the counterpart of the same title at Sāoluafata. While there is no explanation for Tauata’ese and Tili’a, the title Fānene may be traced to Faleālili, circa 1630 C.E. He married Samalā’ulu of Sāoluafata, who ‘Aumua claims to have been a daughter of Fa’autagia.57

The final title in this group is Leao, which Krämer indexes as belonging to Fagaloa, the district east of Sāoluafata, which is honored as the Va’a o Fonofi, “the boat/fleet of Fonofi,” in the national honorifics.58 Leao was one of the foursome associated with the title Talamaivao, Ola’aiga and Laumea.59 Whether this was the origin of the title in the Nu’u o Teine is a matter for others, particularly its heirs, to dispute. Let it suffice as a provocation for Saoluafata’s Teine to confirm or reset records as they see fit.

56 Krämer, ibid., 370.
57 Fonofi was one of Faumuina’s children. The other two were Va’afusu’aga Tole’afoa and sister Samalā’ulu. The latter two waged war on the former over the Tafa’iifā titles. All three siblings ostensibly held the Tafa’iifā titles, in spite of the fact that they were defeated. Faumuina was Salamasina’s great grandson; he inherited the Tuī Āana and Tuī Ātua titles from his mother’s sister, Taufau, who had inherited them from her mother, Fofaiva’ese, who was Salamasina’s daughter. As Taufau lay dying, she wanted to give the titles to her son, Tupuivao. However, he defied her orders to come away from his pigeon hunting and hear Taufau’s mavaega (dying wish). Taufau then disinherited him and gave the titles to Sina and wished her and her children good fortune with the titles. The famous axiom, ‘Ua tafea le utu a Taufau, originated from this mavaega. It means, “Taufau’s line (as in Tupuivao) has lost their right to these titles.” Tupuivao was exiled to Tutuila after he tried to reclaim such a right. See Simanu, O Si Manu a Ali’i, 2002. Tupuivao’s link to Sāoluafata is traced through one of his half brothers, Toilolo, of the Sāapolotule family. Details in the next chapter.
58 Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 1994, 252, 393
59 Krämer, ibid., 362.
The orator titles for Tululautu’s council are Amialelei and Fatumanavao’upolu. The former means “a successful acquisition,” or “fetching someone or something;” the latter was the name of Luafata’alae’s son and Taeolalopu’a’s brother. He did not live at Sāoluafata, but rather relocated to Si’umu on the south-side of ‘Upolu where Tu’u’u honors him as the “powerful Tui Ātua king of Ātua and Tutuila named Fatumanavao’upolu Ulutautogia Pouoalae (c. 1350), a son of Tui Ātua Tagaloatele Tuitologataua… a great descendant of Sāveatama, son of Mālietoa Gagaosavea,” who was the son of the first Mālietoa.60 A mountain is ostensibly named after him.61

It is at this point in the research that information cannot be confirmed as to when these titles were actually initiated into the Nu’u o Teine, or when the latter became organized as a socio-political entity with significant functions in the district if not national politics. However, Krämer has provided a sense of chronology through generational calculations, thus locating the genesis of the village in the mid fourteenth century and subsequent titles’ arriving at Sāoluafata through genealogical mapping. Nonetheless, an argument could be made based on faith and the implied logic of contemporary practice. The past has spoken to us through various mediums, and its members and my key informants have been adamant that there was an ancestral village with the sa’otama’ita’i, paramount chieftesses, Teu’ialilo and Tululautū, as the nexus of authority and governance. Their tulāfale, orators-cum-managers, were given administrative, distributive, and exploitative authority to execute and monitor village affairs. In this sense, Sāoluafata, in its early development, resembled the structure and functions of a one-man/woman

60 See Tu’u’u, ibid., 2001, 411.
61 The Tagaloa title came to Sāoluafata by way of Tui Ātua Tologataua whose mother was Utufa’asisili the daughter of Funefe’ai of Savai’i. Funefe’ai was given the title Tagaloa by Tagaloa-a-lagi in exchange for the former’s wife. Tagaloa also gave Funefe’ai eight tafa’i, orator chiefs, and the honorific, Taulauniu.
rule to whom all subordinates swore allegiance and tautua, service, in exchange for protection and sustenance.

However, this should not in any way be equated or compared with the social and psychological effects of the manorial system of the European Middle Ages whose serfs did not have kinship connections to the lord of the manor the way the Teine of Sāoluafata did and still do. Like the other foundation villages and districts of Sāmoa, the Nu ’u o Teine was a family operating hierarchically under the pule fa’avae, constitutive authority, and pule fa’amalumalu, protective authority, of the founding family. The chieftesses exercised parental rights to every family in the village; more importantly, as feagaiga, sacred covenants, they undoubtedly had the upper hand in demanding respect and services of the brothers and their families, while at the same time flaunting the power of the curse.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the Nu ’u o Teine was a critical component of the Faleātua. Teu’ialilo had a special seating when the council met; while Tagaloa prepared the kava for them, a role typically performed by a sa’o’aumaga, paramount son. There is no mention of Sāgapolutele or Tululautū as participants. What could be deduced from this observation is that the protocol of the Faleātua might still have existed at the time of, if not too long before Krämer’s visit. If such were the case, then one could conclude based on existing evidence—flimsy though it may look—that power sharing by the Nu ’u o Teine only happened as recently as the eighteenth century. This coincided with a rough estimate of the number of holders of the title Nu’ualiu (o le nu’u ua liliu, “the village which turned”), which, according to family genealogies, stands at four and, by my estimation, locates the power sharing with the brothers in 1880.62

---

62 The current holder of the Nu’ualiu title is still alive and in his seventies. He received the title soon after the previous holder passed away in 1976. His predecessor could be placed in 1946, the previous one at 1910, and finally, the first holder, insofar as our family is concerned, in 1880. Cautiously, there is nothing conclusive about this premise since it is possible that this name was not vested as a title prior to 1880.
There is no knowledge in the village or any other written record to confirm or refute the possibility that there may have been holders of the Nu’ualiu title before. What is understood, however, is that the title Nu’ualiu is an emblem of the restructuring of the politics of Sāoluafata, a triangulation of the Teine’s pule to include the two male polities: Itūvai o Sāgapolutele and Itūvai o Tagaloa. The question, then, becomes, why restructure?

This supposition could still be challenged and an argument could still be made that the power sharing occurred much earlier as a result of two major political shifts in archipelagic politics in the Vava’u. Hints of an earlier move could be detected in the fourteenth to early sixteenth centuries after an extended period of sibling rivalries in Sāmoa. The most renowned of these rivalries were known as the Taua o Pāpā (wars of the paramount titles). There were four of them and at the end of which the victors were stripped of their paramount titles by the war goddess Nāfanua.63 Needless to say, instead of returning the titles to their original holders, Nafanua’s priests, Tupa’i and ‘Auva’a, bestowed them on her niece, Salamāsina.64

It was probably around Salamasina’s era that the offices of tūmua, first standing orators, of the Tui Ātua and Tui Ā’ana districts and the laumua, orators, for the Mālietoa were identified. The two sets of tūmua had headquarters at Lufilufi and Leulumoega respectively, while the laumua, were at Afega and Malie in the Tuamāsaga district. The Tafā’iifā titles were served by these classes of orators, who were responsible with organizing service and tribute to the central power headquartered at Leulumoega.65 Unasa Felise Va’a captures this well when he said that traditional governance in pre-Christian Sāmoa was centralized and embodied in the sovereignty

63 Hence the link to the Tonumaipē’a title in Savai’i. See Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 1994.
64 See Krämer, Salamasina, 1958, for details on the wars of the pāpā and subsequent negotiations concerning who should get the titles.
65 It is worth pointing out that each Tafā’iifā title had two tafa’i (chiefs) who resided on either side of the paramount holder and who had the power to bestow or sanction the holder if or when the latter violated protocol consistent with the status of the paramount title(s).
of a king or queen; however, it was the *tulāfale* who managed a tributary system for which it was necessary to organize the villages and forge a mechanism with which to supervise the flow of tributary to and from the central government.\(^\text{66}\)

The transformation of Saolualafata’s political order and the sharing of power with the menfolk, might also have occurred when the heirs of Tupua Fuiāvailili (1720), the Tafa’ifā at the time of contact.\(^\text{67}\) married the holders of Teu’ialilo and Tululautū, circa mid-1700s. It is the position of this study that the current political infrastructure might have emerged, if not strengthened during the Tupua era when Tupua’s son, Galumalemana, and grandson, Simanu ‘Afoa, married the paramount chieftesses of the time, circa 1750 C.E. However, I posit that it would not have been the paramount husbands who sought power at Sāoluafata, but rather their sons who might not have taken too kindly to the fact that the men or sons of other villages had *pule*, but not them. As is detailed in the next chapter, the ordering of a men’s jurisdiction at Sāoluafata appeared imminent as a very different force sailed into Samoan shores: Euro-American trade, religion, and colonialism of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries respectively.\(^\text{68}\) I would reiterate that the title Teu’ialilo reigned supreme, particularly as Sāoluafata was incorporated into the Faleātua. However, based on Krämer’s chronology, I would assert that the second paramount title Tululautū appears not to have been created until the triangulation when the two male paramounts were established and each one needed a


\(^{67}\) Krämer, *The Samoa Islands*, 1994, 646.

corresponding feagaiga or sā’otama’ita’i.69 The titles Sāgapolutele and Tagaloa, according to all evidence gathered in this study, appear not to have come into prominence until this time.70

Reflectively, caught up in political centralization during the long durée of Salamāsina and her heirs between 1500s to 1800s, the Teine might have realized or were forced to understand that the demands of the tributary system to and from Leulumoea, or wherever the Tafa’ifā happened to be, were too strenuous for them. They could have felt that national politics was perhaps not a place for their sacred covenants. On the other hand, it was perhaps psychologically damaging to the public image of the men to be serving at the pleasure of their sisters, notwithstanding the fact that at the family level brothers waited on their sisters.71 Whatever might have prompted the shift, the Teine deferred some, if not most, of their power to the brothers, who have since become the public face of the village, while the Teine have been confined to village politics. This dichotomy became evident in modern governance and church politics where the men continue to enjoy the pule fa’asoasoa, distributive authority, and pule fa’aaogā, exploitative authority, more so than their sisters. The men’s sphere of influence is cast far and wide within and beyond the village.72

Speculation aside, it is fair to say that given its longevity, the Nu’u o Teine appears to have been very much in charge of family and village affairs at least until the turn of the twenty-first century. In the next chapter, the origins of the men’s titles and their alignment with the Nu’u o Teine are explored. Here, I seek to explain and interpret how such political change

---

69 In this case, confusion is likely to occur since these two concepts refer to the sisters or daughters of paramount chiefs chosen as their counterparts in women’s affairs. Traditionally across Sāmoa, the feagaiga vis-à-vis sa’otama’ita’i are under the jurisdiction of the village council, which continues to be male dominant. In the case of Sāoluafata, the Teu’ialilo and Tululautū do not serve at the pleasure of the male council.


71 (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Kanehoe, 2010). Le Tagaloa (1997), Shore (1982), and Schoeffel (1979) exhaustively discuss the dynamics, manifestations, and consequences of the brother-sister feagaiga.

72 (Nu’ualiu ‘Onosa’i, pers. comm., Sāoluafata, December 2007). Speculation on dates about the possible shifts in power at Sāoluafata is made possible by cross-referencing indexes in Kramer, The Samoa Islands, 1994.
became the structure or the base upon which the village people, particularly the councils of Sāoluafata, controlled daily life and participated in district politics; this section also deals with the German moa folau sailing into Saoluafata Bay and their influence on life in the village in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Meanwhile, having dissected the origins and evolution of the political structure at Sāoluafata, the next section imagines what daily life might have looked like across the longue durée of six hundred or more years. It interrogates how the Nu’u o Teine was able to sustain the efficacy of its sā for such a long time.

Manifestations of Pule: Sā iā/Sacred to Luafata’alae, Taboos in the Vavau

During fieldwork, the Teine did not know about most of the ancient sā until ‘Aumua shared them; only a few remembered the sā of the atule, but could not explain why that disappeared, particularly when it seemed that it had survived all the way into the twentieth century. The pertinent question to ask then regards the constitution and generation of the sā.

Another word for sā is tapu. When something is absolutely forbidden or sacred, it is sā taputapu. Violation of the sā in the Vavau often resulted in death penalties or threats thereof. A common threat was death by the aitu, ancestral demons, since even sanctions by the chiefs were not enough to curb crime. If not manifested in death, the fear of supernatural punishment was carried over to some type of bodily distortion or rearrangement. Most Samoans still acknowledge their superstitions and often recite the saying, E le sālā ’upu mai anamua, “the words of the first days are never wrong.” With this in mind, the Teine of Sāoluafata continue to observe certain sā, although none of them resembles any of the original ones.

The first sā was certainly against Tui Ātua ‘Aumuatāgafa, Luafata’alae’s stepson. He was not allowed to trespass or spend the night at Sāoluafata. One wonders how this woman

73 See Turner, Samoa: A Hundred Years Ago, 1984 (Reprint), 16-77.
dared to ban the paramount chief of the Ātua district from any space in his jurisdiction; however, things are never as they appear to be. It is possible that Luafata’alae’s ban did not reflect the land system during the Pili and post-Tongan eras which probably did not include land appropriations; after all, it appears that most of the battles fought in Sāmoa were over the titles and the status to which they appealed. Given the fact that founders or foundation titles had *pule fa’avae*, constitutive power, over their land, no evidence exists to suggest otherwise. Some of these founders supposedly had supernatural powers; Fa’autagia, for example, is believed to have been the first settler of Evaloa and a *sauali’i* (ghost chief or shapeshifter). Second, one also wonders whether this prohibition was against just Tui Ātua ‘Aumuatāgafa, or whether it was also against subsequent Tui Ātua.

Nonetheless, having laid out such a ban, Luafatā’alae made it incumbent upon herself to be the first announcer of Tui Atua’s death. This was the basis of the second *sā*, which stipulated, according to ‘Aumua, that Teu’ialilo had the sole responsibility of announcing the passing of a Tui Ātua. At that moment, she beat her *lali*, wooden drum, which demanded complete silence across Ātua. It is possible that this *sā* was neutralized once Sāoluafata was initiated into the

---

74 Krämer notes that these bans were on behalf of her son, Fatumanava’upolu, who had relocated to Si’umu, his maternal grandfather’s village. See *The Samoa Islands*, 1994, 356.
75 Note the practice of naming villages and islands mentioned in earlier chapters based on what was banned or deemed sacred to the founders; that is, whoever reached a certain area first, owned it. Hence, the vast area of Evaloa was claimed by Luafatā’alae as the new village of Sāoluafata. This practice is still reflected in court cases today whereby a paramount chief is sometimes reminded that he does not necessarily have jurisdiction over all the lands and titles in his or her district, but that he has the *pule fa’amalumalu*, protective authority, to ensure that the land was appropriately utilized. Reports from my relatives at Sāoluafata speak to this explanation from recent court cases between the paramount chief Sāgapolutele and some of the titles under his jurisdiction. He has apparently been told that his protective authority was symbolic and not appropriative. (Samali’ulu Mata’itusi, phone comm., December 2010).
76 Krämer and Brother Henry suggest that before the title Tui Ātua was taken by Nāfanua, circa early 1400s, the power of the Tui Ātua had already been weakened. At the time of the wars of the pāpā, the Tui Ātua title was split between a mother and daughter who were in dispute over the mother’s husband, who was also the daughter’s lover. This was the war between Fogāniutea and Fogāoloni. The mother won, but the title Tui Ātua was taken by Nāfanua. The wars appeared to have happened around the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries when Tui Ā’ana Tamaelagi, Salamasina’s father, was still alive. For a delightful narrative about Salamāsina and her predecessors and heir, see Krämer, *Salamasina*, 1923, 1958. Tui Ātua, in *Su’esu’e Manogi*, 2009, 16-17.
77 (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Sāoluafata, December 2007).
alliance of the Faleātua. It is also possible that she was regarded as Atua’s feagaiga, whose role it was to guard her brother’s body from spiritual invasions before burial. In this situation, the funeral space was rendered taboo. This death ritual is still observed today.\textsuperscript{78}

The third sā was not unusual to Sāmoa. A common conservation ban imposed by Samoa’s chiefs on their environments concerned planting, hunting, and fishing. This was often instituted when a village was expecting a malaga (visiting dignitary), or when a chief wanted the preservation of a certain species of plants, fish, or bird. For Sāoluafata, such a sā concerned the fish, atule, which annually entered the bay to spawn. This was a busy time as villagers looked forward to an easy catch. Luafatā’alae, and later Teu’ialilo, imposed the protocol known as the “first crop,” which, in this case, the i’a mua (initial catch) was served to Teu’ialilo, who then disbursed her tulāfale to distribute subsequent catches evenly among the families. There was much superstition attached to this sā; thus, no one dared to eat any of it even in secrecy.\textsuperscript{79}

Unfortunately, the harvesting of the atule has become a thing of the past. Some of my informants speculated that the fish disappeared because people decided to sell it for cash.\textsuperscript{80} Traditionally, the atule was shared among relatives far and near; today, it has decided to go somewhere else.\textsuperscript{81} Some suspect, and I gravitate towards this opinion, that the construction of concrete breakers along the seashore inevitably resulted in a redirection of ocean currents and, naturally, a disruption of its ecosystem. The severe cyclones ‘Ofa and Val in 1990 and 1991 undoubtedly contributed to this demise by affecting the food supply and spawning grounds.

Apparently the atule is now evident in Fusi, the sub-village farther west of Sāoluafata.

\textsuperscript{78} (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Kaneohe, March 2011). When Aunt Sipi died in 1998, her funeral space was taboo to Saoluafata’s males.

\textsuperscript{79} The first harvest of the taro crop is called the talomua. Many villages in Sāmoa have revived this tradition; for example, during fieldwork, Sāvaia, Lefaga was having its Talomua celebration during which the first basket was given to the paramount chief, Tusani Fa’aolo Reti Simanu.

\textsuperscript{80} (Nu’ualiu ‘Onosa’i, pers. comm., Saoluafata, July 2007).

\textsuperscript{81} Samoans often grant animals and events metaphysical status to explain why certain things occurred. The personification of non-human elements speaks to this as in the phrase, Ua sola le atule, “the atule has run away.”
Obviously, taboos were only as effective as the people or systems monitoring them, or as relevant as the demands of a certain era. Evidently, mere vestiges of these bans have survived the ages; although the sā on the atule appears to have lasted only into the first half of the twentieth century, as witnessed by ‘Aumua and some of the older Teine at Sāoluafata.\textsuperscript{82} ‘Aumua remembers how eager they were to eat the fish and then how quickly they tired of it. She also remembered how the catches were equally divided among the families of Sāoluafata: after the first catch was dispensed to Teu’ialilo and Tululautū, the manner of the tradition was about equal distribution and observing sanctions. Moreover, the harvesting was done by the master fishers and the young men of the village, not by the women. There is no memory that women were part of the harvesting. Finally, fa’asalaga, sanctions, often resulted in a loss of livestock, mostly pigs, uprooting of taro patches, and loss of a share of the atule.\textsuperscript{83}

\textbf{Evolution of Taboos Since the Vavau}\textsuperscript{84}

To recap Saoluafata’s past in the Vavau, first, the major changes in Saoluafata’s politics before and since the European era involved the renaming of the village after the founder’s name (from Evaloa to Sāoluafata), and the extension of the Teine’s pule to their brothers. Additionally, what was once Evaloa was later subdivided into distinct political entities, which the church also adopted. Fusi and Salelesi became hamlets or sub-villages whose fa’alupega, honorifics, still reflect ties to Sāuluafata. Over the years, however, the sub-village of ‘Eva

\textsuperscript{82} Many of the Teine participating in our luncheon session at my host’s place on December 31, 2007 remembered the atule, although none had given much thought as to why the annual spawning stopped.
\textsuperscript{83} Here, it is fair to assume that sanctions across six hundred years of Samoan history remained constant in spite of the introduction and adoption of certain palagi rule and regulations of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. In other words, village councils still imposed punishments which reflected the deprivation of families of their livestock, food crops, and volumes of fine mats, long after the imposition of individual sanctions by the colonial governments of Germany and New Zealand.
\textsuperscript{84} The main sources of information for this section were ‘Aumua and the Teine who attended our luncheon meeting on December 31, 2007. ‘Aumua and I invited them to our host’s house where we conducted the survey mentioned in chapter 2.
became attached to Solosolo; while the physical and political boundaries of the *Nu’u o Teine* involved just the promontory of Utusi’a.

Second, certain circumstances since its founding resulted in three councils juxtaposed as parallel spheres, with the paramount chiefs and chieftesses crossing paths periodically. This is still true today in that the paramount leaders mainly communicate through their orators. The three councils (*Nu’u o Teine*, Itūvai/Nu’u o Sagapolutele, and Itūvai/Nu’u o Tagaloa) operate within these boundaries. The latter two merge as the *Nu’u o Ali’i* particularly when the government or church requires them, or when presenting new title holders to the other side.

Third, interpersonal communication between the genders was governed by the protocol of *vātapuia*, sacred space, of the *feagaiga*. This sanctioned space spurred the need for another layer of leadership: the *tulāfale* collectively honored as *‘O ‘oe, Saoluafata*, “You, Sāoluafata.”

Fourth, when issues or problems within or between councils could not be resolved by the orators, then the matter was deferred to the paramount chiefs who then decided on a course of action. Decisions were possible through consensus and they often took some time to forge; however, once achieved, the orators relayed their *finagalo ‘autasi*, unanimous decision, to the paramounts for their approval or veto.

Fifth, I was told that the protocol for cultural or ceremonial events was facilitated by the *Nu’u o Teine*, while events for government and church affairs were facilitated by the men.85 This practice can easily support an earlier premise that the *Nu’u o Ali’i* only became possible if not strengthened by the *Fa’apapālagi* era.

What of the actual taboos? Ancestral *sā* or vestiges thereof are evident in the gendering of social space; first, when hosting *malaga*, the *Nu’u o Teine* welcomed the visiting dignitaries

---

85 (Samalā’ulu Mata’itusi, Nu’ualiu Onosa’i, Tilia Lafalafa, Seumālō Meripa, Eseta Sape, pers. comm., Sāoluafata, December 2007).
with the ‘ava o le feiloa’iga, welcome kava, before the Nu’u o Ali’i offered their own. The Teine prepared and performed it in its entirety. There were to be none of the brothers and nephews within the vicinity; if males were evident, they were most likely the spouses.86

Second, when Teu’ialilo needed to gather her village, she beat the lali, wooden drum. Today, that lali has been replaced by a western bell or a biscuit tin. This practice became controversial two years prior to my fieldwork. The Nu’u o Teine and Nu’u o Ali’i had had some lengthy negotiations over the issue of how to convene their groups. The men demanded that they stop using the church bell; while the Teine argued that they had always used the church bell to announce a meeting regardless of the topic or event and that it seemed the men had suddenly become confused. Some were apparently upset, particularly the men who felt that using the church bell to call people for a Teine-sponsored Bingo game was counterintuitive. Fortunately, a compromise was reached in that the Teine tolled the church bell just for business meetings, but beat the tins for Bingo games.87 Although the lali is a thing of the past, it would have made much more environmental sense to keep it; however, daily life commands convenience. It is easier to fetch a biscuit tin than to keep a wooden drum free of rain or termites.

Third, the Nu’u o Teine has maintained its matai titles, although they have adjusted their sā, taboos, tulafono, laws, fa’asalaga, sanctions, and most importantly, their own projects to accommodate the exigencies of the time. Some of these rules, according to their traditional fa’avae (constitution, founding principles), include the fact that the council has jurisdiction over all the female children born in the village and those of the sisters and daughters residing elsewhere.88 In other words, wherever the sisters and daughters choose to live, they are still

---

86 Ibid.
87 Cabin biscuits are sold in tin cans. Original cabin biscuits were from New Zealand.
88 I use the term “constitution” loosely here to refer to what is still an oral text. It is my understanding that most, if not all of the village councils in Samoa continue to pass down their fa’avae orally. This is perhaps why village
descendants of the village and may become active from afar and are expected to rejoin the council upon return. Meanwhile, step-daughters cannot become members.89

Fourth, when the Nu’u o Teine meets, Teu’ialilo and Tululautū reside at the matuātala, sides of the falefono, meeting house.90 Their brothers’ and/or sons’ wives are not allowed inside the meeting house; they stay outside to prepare the meals. Ironically, they get to serve their own daughters if they are in a meeting—hardly a comfortable situation for people who strongly believe that adults should be waited upon by the youth regardless of context.91 The only males that could enter the Teine’s space are their husbands, who may assist them in work that is physically demanding, such as carving a pig or fetching rocks for a building project.

Fifth, when addressing the female high chiefs, the term afioga is used. For example, Teu’ialilo and Tululautū are addressed as Afioga, the honorific for high chiefs. This is in sync with how paramount leaders or those of the ali’i class in the country are addressed and honored. On the other hand, the two male paramounts and every other male ali’i at Sāoluafata are addressed as Susuga. Thus, it is Afioga Teu’ialilo and Afioga Tululautū, but Susuga Tagaloa and Susuga Sāgapolutele.92

decrees are more practical and “in the moment” when there is a need to impose changes in their laws. Then again, this makes them also victims of ambiguities and arbitrariness, which does not allow for just decisions and continuity.

89 (Eseta Sape, pers. comm., Sāoluafata, December 2007).

90 The politics of the meeting house in Sāmoa are such that paramount chiefs, or the Sa’o, sit at the side posts and lesser chiefs and orators take the front posts and some at the back. Untitled men processing the ‘ava ceremony sit along the back part of the fale thus completing the circle. When not needed, the space is filled by even lesser chiefs. The front and back parts of a fale are determined by the malae or the road that runs through the village.

91 This custom is antithetical to a very important tenet of Fa’asāmoa, which dictates that children must serve their parents as soon as they are able. I have also heard that when both male and female councils meet, the paramount wives are often absent. Work is often cited as the reason for this absence; however, it has been suggested that educated wives or those who are taupou or augafa’apae in their own villages avoid this humiliating position as much as possible. (Samalā’ulu Mata’itusi, phone comm., July, 2010).

92 My title is from the Nu’u o Ali’i, thus I would be addressed as Susuga Loau. When/if I enter the Nu’u o Teine, I would be addressed as Afioga Loau. The terms afio and susū are the respect forms of the verbs sau, “to come,” and alu, “to go.”
Sixth, the paramount chieftesses eat before everyone else. This is a fascinating sā which appears to have lost its appeal. 93 I have also been told that when serving their Afioga either kava or food or when presenting gifts, they must be served simultaneously. One must not be served before the other since this would give the appearance that one was of a higher status than the other; the four paramount titles, Teu’ialilo, Tululautū, Sāgapolutele, and Tagaloa, are equal. What is a fascinating piece of ‘upu popo, banned knowledge, is that in the past, when Sāgapolutele and Tagaloa were served with food, the distributors threw their food at them in unison. Moreover, in the presence of Teu’ialilo and Tululautū, they ate facing out. The few who had heard of this did not know why this was the case; obviously, most of them had never heard of such a thing. 94

Finally, some of the contemporary sā include the sanctioning of gossip, pregnancies out of wedlock, and intra-village marriages. Evidently, when the Nu’u o Teine encounters difficulty resolving matters along these sā, it consults the Nu’u o Ali’i, which appears to have become the current locus of pule. As mentioned a few times earlier, Teu’ialilo and Tululautū, the paramount leaders of the Nu’u o Teine, are in their twilight years and live elsewhere. Because of the lack of on-site leadership, the Nu’u o Teine has experienced ridicule, disrespect, and exclusion from the komiti a tama ’ita’i, women’s committee, capital improvement projects,

93 Obviously, there has been an easing of this law, as was evident during my saofa’i (title investiture) when everyone in the house ate at the same time. My experience of the situation here came prior to this event when ‘Aumua and I visited our paramount chief Tagaloa Sale at his government residence in Apia in July 2007. During lunch, ‘Aumua told me to wait until Tagaloa had had his meal. She and I sat there and talked and watched the chief eat. I felt very uncomfortable at first, but realized later after a debate with my inner self that these were the things that made Sāoluafata different from any other village and that it was not about violating my democratic principles. Rather, this was a different situation in a different context; it should be valued for what it was/is/will be. There is really nothing demeaning about it. It was one of my multiple identities, or fa’asinomaga.

94 Unfortunately, I was unable to obtain a definitive explanation as to why the chiefs’ food was thrown at them; however, I can surmise that, even as recently as village memory carried it, the practice would reflect a lesser degree of influence than the male paramounts exercised at Sāoluafata.
and children’s education, and have been relegated to a less powerful position within village hierarchies.

Observations revealed that the above sā have been frequently violated, especially out-of-wedlock pregnancies and incest. At the time, five Teine who were wives of village men had been banned from the Nu’u o Teine. Unfortunately, these sisters, according to informants, have questioned the relevance of the Nu’u o Teine and have been instrumental in keeping them out of the women’s committee.95

**Toe Tepatasi, Reflections**

I began this chapter with a quote from Saleimoa Vaai with which to imagine what the Teine’s pule might have looked like between 1300 and 1800 C.E. By his definition, the descendant of Luafatā’alae, the founder of Sāoluafata village, had the pulefa’avae, constitutive power, or the right to sanction matters concerning land and titles. However, at Saoluafata’s inception, it is doubtful that she shared power with anyone; although later her descendants would do so within a fully-formed seating of chiefly titles reflective of modern councils. Prior to the Salamāsina era, perhaps the exercise of power was somewhat akin to that of medieval Europe whence the lord of the manor dictated daily life, sanctions, and security. In this case, Luafatā’alae reigned dominion over the promontory which she and her relatives had settled. Having drawn boundaries establishing Sāoluafata against earlier settlers at Cape Utusi’a, she laid down the law for her people, including living and working spaces for everyone. Thus, she had pulefa’asoasoa, distributive power, and pulefa’aaogā, exploitative power. And since her space was part of a larger area known as Evaloa, an area believed to have belonged to the Sāgapolutele

---

95 (Eseta Nu’ualiu Sape, pers. comm., Sāoluafata, December 2007). I had multiple conversations with Eseta about this tension and she claims that it was Saoluafata’s own women who vehemently propose that the Nu’u o Teine be removed from the village constitution.
title, it is not unimaginable to say that her power extended across a huge area; after all, she was of the Sāgapolutele family and the larger one of Ātua.96

As the population of Sāoluafata increased, and as sibling rivalry and civil war dotted the post-Tongan, post-Salamasina, and Tupua eras, it is possible that the Teine had to acquiesce to a sharing of power with their brothers. Such a shift also required a delineation of power between that of the ali‘i and tulafale. However, this change appears not to have affected the power of the Teine to dictate, punish, and even curse their counterparts; at least, not until the last two hundred years when strange forces penetrated and challenged their legitimacy, their pule. Unlike other villages where the Fa’amatai reflected a male dominance, the Fa’amatai of Sāoluafata was triangulated into three councils, two of which were male and under the jurisdiction of Sāgapolutele and Tagaloa, and the third Nu‘u o Teine under Teu‘ialilo and Tululautū.

Evidently, the island of ‘Upolu had political houses known as the Faleā’ana and Faleātua. In the Ātua district, the Faleātua consisted of certain villages who came together to discuss warfare and other crucial issues concerning the district; Sāoluafata was one of these villages. Krämer claims that when the Faleātua met, Sāoluafata was responsible for preparing Lalogāfu’afu’a, the malae at Lufilufi, for the meeting; Teu‘ialilo of Sāoluafata ostensibly resided on the finemat while the Tui Ātua sat on the tapa’au or laupolapola, a mat made of coconut leaves. Such a practice indicated the high esteem afforded sisters, or feagaiga, in Sāmoa. In this case, the sister was also the founder of the village, hence the paramountcy of her position.97

Another noteworthy detail is the fact that the title Tagaloa was that of a sā’o’aumaga, a status given to the paramount son who led the organization of untitled men in the village. His role when the Faleātua met was that of kava preparer. There is no indication that Teu‘ialilo was

96 See Tu’u’u, Rulers of Samoa, 2001, 121. For comparison, see also Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 1994, 645, and Simanu, Fāā Fa’atūmua, 2011, 89.
97 Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 1994, 351.
treated as the *taupou* and therefore the kava mixer; although she would have been morally supported as one.\(^9\) Instead, she was in her own right the political leader of a member village. During the Sā Tupuā era, when Galumalemana’s sons were decreed as *aloaliʻi*, the titles Tualamasalā and ‘Afoafouvale came into vogue as the *sā‘o‘aumaga*, paramount leaders, of Saoluafata’s untitled men.

In sum, Sāoluafata sports a gendered political structure that is also a manifestation of inheritance politics. Gendered to the core, the men and women of Sāoluafata have separate *fono* with clear juridical and socio-political boundaries. While they mirror nation-wide models, their political structure is certainly unique. A system of *sā* (taboos) dictates the use of space, the distribution of food, interpersonal relations, and hosting. Although they no longer resemble the original *sā*, new ones have been necessarily instituted to accommodate the socio-political needs of the time.

In the next chapter, the causes of the political transformations at Sāoluafata are revisited, partially through an explanation of the origins of the men’s titles, and largely through the events leading up to and during *Fa‘apapaliʻaga* and postcolonial eras, circa 1830 through 1998. Meanwhile, it is logical to conclude this chapter with the premise that the urgings of the brothers and sons of Saoluafata’s *Teine* for a share of the *pule* and governance might have emerged with the centralization of power under Tafa‘i’efa Salamāsina, and further intensified by the confusion of extremely different religious and politico-economic forces that appeared to have favored the males. Moreover, notions of the *Nu‘u o Teine* as a *nu‘u pa‘ia*, sacred village, were perpetually challenged as roles were reversed and men evolved as leaders and decision

---

\(^9\) Royal kava ceremonies were/are prepared by the men. Even the mixer should be male; although a female of paramount status has mixed kava in Hawaiʻi when the Heads of State Mālietoa Tanumafili II visited in 1996 and Tui Ātua Tupua Tamasese *in 2008*. Today, a female (supposedly a virgin) mixes the kava. In the old days, kava was chewed by either gender. For expanded texts on kava protocol, see Krämer, *The Samoa Islands*, 1994., and Simanu, *O Si Manu a Ali‘i*, 2002.
makers at Sāoluafata in the first decade of the twenty-first century. It leads one to wonder whether this was the new trend, or whether it was an older one that only an extended ethnographic study could detect. It leads me to wonder what has happened to the first syllable of the name, Sāoluafata—i.e., sā, and whether anything is still sacred. Perhaps the answers lie within the next chapter.
CHAPTER 4:  
PULE FA’ASOA, POWER, SHARED AND SHIFTED:  
FROM SACRED VILLAGE TO MARGINALIZATION

While order may be time-bound, it by no means is constrained  
by people, cultures, or civilization.  It is both the anchor and the full  
sail of history.

Isenberg\(^1\)

Introduction: Predestined Status, Rank, and Role

In the space between the Vavau, Samoan antiquity and the wave of European explorers,  
sailors, missionaries, merchants, doctors, administrators, and academics in the eighteenth and  
nineteenth centuries, Sāmoa witnessed major shifts in who had pule to govern and to keep law  
and order in the archipelago.  These shifts manifested in what Va’ai considers as  
“appointments,”\(^2\) and the lasting belief that “Sāmoa has already been apportioned.”\(^3\)  
First, there  
was Pili’s colonization of ‘Upolu into the political districts of Ātua, Ā’ana, and Tuamāsaga, and  
their subsequent management by his older sons Tua, ‘Ana, and Saga respectively.\(^4\)  
The second  
shift took place with Fe’epō and Atiogie’s sons, Tuna and Fata, who led the purging of the  
Tongans in the twelfth or thirteenth century and the beginning of the Mālietoa line.\(^5\)  
The third  
was characterized by the designation of land and authority by the sons of Le’alali among the

---

\(^1\) Michael T. Isenberg, *Puzzles of the Past: An Introduction to Thinking About History*, (College Station: Texas  
A&M University Press, 1985), 56.


\(^3\) This mantra is often used by orators to remind the public and themselves of the dangers of violating the political  
boundaries above.  During national events, the roles designated by Pili in the legendary period are executed  
appropriately.  Stepping out of line could result in public humiliation.  In some cases, violence erupted when orators  
could not be reconciled.

\(^4\) Pili was Tagaloa-a-lagi’s great grandson whose union with Sinaetava’e of Ā’ana produced Tua, ‘Ana, Saga,  
Tolufale, and Si’umumugagita.  See *The Samoa Islands*, 1994, 26-30, for a detailed account about Pili’s origins,  
legacy, and the son’s treatment of such legacy.  For the pedigree of each son as well as their exploits, see Tu’u,  

\(^5\) Tu’u locates the defeat of Tui Tonga Talafei’i in 1169 C.E., while Brother Henry does likewise in 1250. Here  
Tu’u and Henry differ as to when and how long the Tongans were in Sāmoa as an occupying force.  The latter  
claims the Tongan occupation as 300 years long, from 950 – 1250 C.E.  Tu’u, on the other hand, claims that  
Talaifei’i reigned for only five years, from 1164 to 1169.  See also Henry, *Tala Faasolopito o Samoa*, 1958, 29-34.
people of Savai’i. Fourth was Muagutu’a’s choice of Tupua Fuiavai for his successor as Tafa’ifā and thus the start of the Sā Tupuā line. Fifth was Galumalemana’s designation of his sons as aloali’i, paramount sons or princes. The final period was marked by the fulfillment of Nafanua’s prophecy to Mālietoa Fitisemanu to tali i lagi sou mālō, or “wait for a kingdom from the heavens.” In August 1830, only a generation after the prophecy, John Williams sailed into Sapapā’i on the Messenger of Peace, where Fitisemanu’s son and successor, Mālietoa Vainu’upō, resided. The latter had just burned the villages and people of A’ana to avenge the assassination of Lei’ataua Lelologa Tamafaiga, the cannibal of Manono. When chiefs came together for an important event, whether as individuals or as a group, they came with knowledge of public protocol and space, and of where to situate themselves in the circle of authority in the various contexts of family, village, or nation.

These periods are useful insofar as a tool for sorting Samoa’s political past before history is concerned. Surprisingly, however, a very important appointment is missing: the bestowment of the paramount titles on Salamāsina and the centralization of power under a single individual, a

---

6 Circa 1270 C.E. His great grandsons, Lafai and Funefe’ai, organized Savai’i into various spheres of influence. Funefe’ai was the origin of the Tagaloa lineage; while Lealali’s sons founded the Puleono o Salafai, or “six authorities of Savai’i.” For details see Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 1994, 52-53; 107-14.
7 Galumalemana, Tupua Fuiavai’s son by his second wife, stripped the Tafa’ifā titles from his older brother ‘Afoa’ofuval of around 1750. Both are ancestors of Saoluafata’s Nu’u o Teine.
8 This story has been told numerous in other texts. See Meleisea, Lālaga, 1987.
9 John Williams, Missionary Enterprise, 1837, 337.
10 Because the country and/or districts rarely come together for cultural purposes, such as hosting malaga or traditional weddings, and due to the nature of contemporary politics and economics, future generations may have to rely on written texts about these protocols. Samoan communities abroad are dependent on the memories of the migrants and even challenge each other over the accuracy of information. In 2008, when the Samoan community in Hawai’i gathered to welcome the Head of State, Tui Ātu Tupua Tamasese Efi, the chiefs had different understandings of how the royal kava was to be performed. The elders won out, even though they had violated the protocol by having a woman mix the kava. This is illustrative of what Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger note as a (re)invention of tradition, or “a set of practices... of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past.” See Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds., The Invention of Tradition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
tupu, king, or Tafa’ifā. I reference this period as the Salamasina Era.\(^{11}\) Va’ai’s exclusion of the wars of the four pāpā, paramount titles, Tui Ātua, Tui Ā’ana, Gato’aitele, and Tamosoāli’i, and their consequential centralization was, perhaps, unintended. However, for Sāoluafata, this juncture is of critical significance as will be demonstrated by a parade of male titles which eventually became paramount. Moreover, the credence of this village as pa’ia, sacred, is dependent on the events of this period in which Sāmoa experienced a fairly new political concept: the centralization of power, circa 1530 C.E. Ironically, it is highly possible that at a time when a woman was at the apex of archipelagic politics, Saoluafata’s Teine might have recognized the need to share power with their brothers.

By numerous accounts, the constitution and reconstitution of the socio-political structures of Sāmoa across the spectrum of the Vava'u was by no means easy or peaceful. Knowledge of Samoa’s Vava'u as battle-worn and rife with shifting alliances and loose allegiances is well noted in the literature; however, the significance of these shifts for individual villages has often been lost amid the webs of royal-cum-national narratives. Consequently, the details about individual or group involvement in the shaping of major politics are often glossed over if not obfuscated, muting in particular the role of women in village politics.

The story of Sāoluafata, therefore, serves as a reminder that while these macro weavings were happening, the ingredients and processes affected local people who were distant from the center though drawn nonetheless to it by the often unanticipated results of forces big and small, internal and external, violent and subtle. In their own little cape in the north, Sāoluafata was being shaped by the events of these periods. Fortunately, they in no way diminished the paramountcy of the founding titles or/in the subsequent realignment of power to include the men.

---

\(^{11}\) For details on the wars of the pāpā and Salamasina’s reign, see Meleisea, Making of Modern Samoa, 1987; Krämer, Salamasina, 1958; Tu’u’u, Rulers of Samoa, 2001.
The questions for this chapter are: What did power sharing at Sāoluafata look like? What was the motivation behind the decision or demand to undergo such change?

This chapter then is an attempt to locate in time and place the origins of the men’s titles and to interpret the impact of their arrival on the politics of the Nu’u o Teine and gender relations toward the end of the twentieth century. Suggestions about when this pule became delegated across gender lines were provided in the previous chapter. What has not been addressed, however, are the “hows” and “whys” of the men’s titles. How did they make their way to Sāoluafata and why? Of pertinence also in this chapter is the answer to the question: Why is Sāoluafata regarded as the nu’u pa’ia (sacred village)? Does it have anything to do with the fact that the village was founded and owned by feagaiga? Or is it more to do with the kinds of links that the men’s titles secured?

Unfortunately, like the Teine’s titles, interest in those of the men also suffered the presentism of their heirs. When prompted, many of the informants residing in the village only began to wonder about their roots once the questions were posed. Otherwise, there was a lack of curiosity or interest as to how and why these titles ended up at Sāoluafata; perhaps it was to deny others access to what is considered as the “truth.” Family records generally backtracked to only a few generations to where one’s own flesh and blood were woven into a particular lineage. In my opinion, such attitude bodes poorly on families whose links are disrupted by a lack of heirs and/or wealth.

Given the sparseness of sources for the kind of information being sought, this chapter has been largely dependent on the lāuga, oratory, particularly the section on fa’alupega, honorifics, where the ingredients of history are archived. For the origins of the titles, Samoan oratorical traditions have been extremely critical. Thus the small band of ethnologists and culturalists
prevalent in the previous chapter is extensively mined in this one. Krämer, Tu’u’u, and Brother Henry are dominant as sources; ‘Aumua and key informants elsewhere provide an organic link to the village and alternative perspective to the conclusions in the literature.

But this chapter is not just interested in titles and where they ended up; it also seeks to explain and interpret their interface with nineteenth and twentieth century forces, most of which might have threatened the very existence of a village that is owned and operated by women. The impact of the ways of the papālagi or Fa’apāpālagi on Fa’asāmoa have been duly noted in the research. “First contact” literature makes available the perceptions of the Europeans and Samoans of each other in an era of Euro-American discovery and exploration, some of which is provided in chapter two. Evidently, the arrival of two very foreign concepts, Christianity and Capitalism, affected the Nu’u o Teine to such a large extent that its basic ideologies and practices have been reshaped so that very few of them bear any semblance to the originals. Therefore, primary and secondary sources offer sufficient assessments of the impact of church and colonial policies on gender roles and relations in Sāmoa, and a basis upon which to discuss the implications of such impact on Sāoluafata.

As this journey approaches Independence and the post-independence period, an observation is made about the extent to which national and international markets and social trends accelerated the decline in the pule of the Nu’u o Teine in the running of the village. However, perhaps what this chapter most alarmingly asserts is that in spite of the dramatic changes imposed by the papālagi for more than a century, the absence of leadership at the Nu’u o Teine today will likely lead it toward a self-induced death. Without clear leadership, the Nu’u o Teine lacks political legitimacy, hence its apparent marginalization by the Nu’u o Ali’i. Alas, the Teine’s pule in all its manifestations—pule fa’avae, authoritative power, pule fa’asoa,
distributive power, *pule fa’aaoga*, exploitative power, and *pule fa’amatamalu*, protective authority—has greatly been compromised. Perhaps as a reminder of who they are and from whence they hail, a discussion of one of the main sources of information about the past is warranted. In this chapter, Samoa’s oratorical traditions have never been more urgent as one of them illustrates this critical component in an historiography.

**Läuga as Epistemology and Historical Device**

Perhaps the most resilient of all Samoa’s oral sources are its linguistic texts: *läuga*, oratory, and “mannered allusive phrases,”¹² like *alagā’upu*, proverbs, and *muāgagana*, original sayings, *solo*, rhymes, *tini*, marriage chants, *pese*, songs, *tala*, stories, and *gafa*, genealogies. This chapter is dependent on Samoa’s oratory, or *faigäläuga*, as both a way of knowing and a historical source.

The term *läuga* is the noun from the root word *lau* which means “to read, recite, or publicize.” Here, the *läuga* is at once both a tool and an event. It is the formulaic act of publicly establishing genealogical connections, the purpose for coming together, remembering relevant pasts, and finally, for wishing good health and long life to all involved for the duration of the event and beyond it. This is critical since a gathering of any sort in *Sāmoa*, and academia for that matter, incurs its own dialectics that inevitably create certain levels of tension. In such cases, the *läuga* also becomes the tool with which to frame and maintain peace.

A *läuga* comprises six or seven sections or elements.¹³ The section most relevant to this discussion is the *fa’alupega* of the titles of a particular village. These titles are mnemonics of past events, people, or places. Behind each one is a story about the past, classified as *tala*

---

tu’umumusu, tales whispered, or tu’u gutu mai, tales handed down from mouth to mouth, or as talafa’asolopito, chronologicized events, according to cyclical or linear calendars. There are two subgenres of whispered stories: the fāgogo, fables according to the gogo, terns, and the tala o le vavau, myths and legends. The fāgogo signify human desires and foibles and are of a didactic nature. They bear witness to how humans and the natural world were either in commune or at odds with each other. Akin to Western fairytales and Aesop’s fables, fāgogo are instructive of the kind of behavior that human beings should display towards each other on a daily basis; they provide a moral base for Samoan interpersonal relationships.

The second group of whispered stories, tala o le vavau, is a collection of mythical or legendary tales of heroes or heroic acts signified in genealogies, honorifics, and taeao, historical events. In the opening lāuga of this study, the six taeao cited are referents for times of war and peace. Their inclusion is critical as a reminder of the evil in the days of pouliuli, darkness, and of toto masa’a, bloodshed.

---

15 Fagogo were a traditional form of entertainment as families bedded down for the night. As the young fell asleep, the adults continued into the wee hours of the morning with scarier stories, many of which were about aitu, spirits of dead relatives. There was talk of alao’o (spirit paths) through sections of the village along which aitu in spirit form sing and scream and, as they passed by, gathered up and kidnapped humans dumb enough to be in their way. There were also tales about Teine of great beauty and status taken alive by these aitu and later returned as lethal shape shifters. These girls, Sauma’iafe, Saipua’aelo, and Telesā, were paramount daughters of the villages of Sāle’imoa, Fale’ulu, and Lepea, respectively. They are still feared today and are effective disciplinary tools in their respective villages. It is common knowledge that these girls can fasi (possess) anyone, but can only be exorcized by a particular descendant who is either an elderly lady or a matai. These Teine are believed to be on flights with their relatives or victims to overseas destinations. In the 1970s, news of Samoan possessions was published in New Zealand newspapers. The fofō (healers) have found themselves engaged in this lucrative business since then. For extended discussions on fāgogo, see Tui Ātua, in Su’esu’e Manogī, 2009, 73-74, and Moyle, Fagogo, 7-50.
16 Samoa’s days of the Vavau are often glossed in modern discourse as the days of darkness. From a Samoan perspective, darkness connotes the times of bloodshed which were minimized when Christianity was adopted. Unfortunately, Western contact resulted in the loss of many of the beliefs and practices of Fa‘asamoa which sustained its people for thousands of years. The choice to memorialize certain events such as the taeao na i Sauā, taeao na i Samanā, ma le Aso na i Gamō is a constant reminder that Samoans do not want history to repeat itself since these events are reminders of violence, just as the juxtaposition of the dawning of the Tala Lelei (the Gospel) by the London Missionary Society (LMS) in 1830, Methodists in 1835, and Catholics in 1845 promoted peace. The stories behind the pre-Christian taeao are tala o le vavau; the ones about the arrival of Christianity obviously belong in the second category of stories, tala fu’asolopito.
Brother Henry (1983) coins the term *tala fa’asolopito*, which Reverend Tepa Faleto’ese translates as the *lauoneone o taimi*, “sands of time,” to refer to accounts of past events. 

Brother Henry divides Samoa’s past into five periods: 1) the deep past from 400 B.C.E. to 1250 C.E. when the Tongan occupation ended; 2) 1250 C.E. to 1830 C.E., the advent of Christianity; 3) 1830 C.E. to the Euro-American struggle for control of the Samoan islands; 4) 1870 C.E., when *Sāmoa* was under consulate administration to 1900 C.E., when the partition was formalized; and 5) from 1900 C.E. to 1958 C.E., the colonial period to the dawn of independence. The history of Sāoluafata takes into consideration these contexts with its beginnings in the second period, circa 1300 C.E. until 1998 C.E. when my Aunt Sipi died at Sāoluafata. When orators perform *lāuga*, they are mindful of the importance of selecting appropriate and relevant *tala fa’asolopito* or *taeao*; skilled or reputable orators provide a full recital of *taeaousu o le atunu’u*, cultural “mornings,” especially when welcoming dignitary.

Upon analysis, the contents, form, and performance of *lāuga* as an historical device in this dissertation may be incommensurable with traditional historiographic methodology; however, its employment illustrates the postcolonial acceptance of alternative ways of knowing and of being in the study of a people’s past, an inclusion which David Gegeo (2000) calls “historically silent voices . . . legitimate and deserving to be heard.”

---

18 Ibid., 2.
19 See Simanu, *O Si Manu a Ali’i*, 2002; Tu’i, *Lāuga*, 1987; Tavale, *O le Ala i le Pule*, 1999; and Amosa, *Fausaga o Lauga*, 1999. In Hawai’i, churches are places where Samoa’s oratory continues albeit in a highly abridged form. That is, the deacons are the surrogate chiefs and are expected to provide oratory when greeting or farewelling guests. Unfortunately, many are not skilled orators and thus have the tendency to ignore references to genealogy or to elaborate on the *taeao*; instead, the popular short cut is, *A o taeao o le atunu’u, ia nu’unu’u atu ia i faleupolu o tofiga*, “As for the ‘mornings’ of the nation, let us leave them to the chosen orators.” As a consequence, *lāuga* is reduced to an ordinary speech.
Lāuga implies a multilocality of the past of Saoluafata’s *Nu’u o Teine*. It adds examples of how the Pacific can be re-imagined and re-made to stem the negative stereotypes promoted by the doomsday scenarios of the donor countries into which many of its people have expanded their horizons. Hanlon and White insist on a re-imagining of the Pacific that reflects a diversity of geographies and cultures, a multivoicedness within each society, and a Pacific that is quite capable of re-thinking itself not in its “otherness,” but as a “region in which many local entities have interacted with . . . global forces—namely Christianity, colonialism, and capitalism—in varied, complex, entangled, and even messy ways.” It is also reminiscent of Wang Fengzhen’s hope for change, not for Utopia, but for improving the present conditions of our lives, for inventing new thinking, new theories, and a new culture of our own. This will be achieved from a convergence of popular initiatives, the mediating force of the indigenous intellectuals, and the solidarity of all progressive forces.23

The lāuga is also illustrative of Greg Dening’s notion of a “poetic for histories” in the sense that the lāuga is another way of describing and reflecting on the past; it is a “cultural artifact” that structures the “relationships we have with other texts that suffuse our lives.” In other words, it illustrates the intertextuality of Samoa’s oral texts—taeao, historical events, alagā ’upu, proverbs, muāgagana, quotes, māvaega, farewells, and fa’alupega, honorifics—thus establishing “relationality, interconnectedness, and interdependence” of the people involved, of the past as a reflection of Samoan sociality, and of forming and reforming groups and communities.

---

22 David Hanlon and Geoffrey M. White, introduction to *Voyaging Through the Contemporary Pacific*, *ibid.*, 3.
Intertextuality is a term coined for the first time by Julie Kristeva, a Bulgarian psychoanalyst in the early 1960s, to mean the dependence of a text—in our case, the lāuga—on earlier ones of the same or a similar subject to make sense of the world or the text in hand. The ultimate outcome for the orator is that his or her audiences understand their connections and the relevance of their participation as their identities are (re)texted and as certain generational and gender behaviors are reinforced or deleted.25

The lāuga is a “poetic for histories” where “object and subject, the known and the knowing, the said and the hearing, I and Thou and It, all are bound together.”26 It is a memory bank of a people that were once without writing, but are still dependent upon orality even with writing at their disposal. As Dening would undoubtedly support, it is a public record of a past, albeit an oral one that Samoans have used “according to their cultural and social systems.”27 As a Samoan schooled in the multifarious possibilities of a postmodern and postcolonial discourse, I would be remiss if I were not to recognize the lāuga as a record of Samoa’s past in the present and that each time there is a funeral, wedding, birth, hosting of malaga, ifoga (public apology), or a house dedication, Samoans engage in recalling human, spiritual, and environmental pasts for their relevance to the affairs of the moment.

For the purposes of this chapter, stories even older than history have been mnemonicized in lāuga. In this case, the honorifics of the chiefs and chieftesses provide clues for an archaeology and a narrative of the origins of Sāoluafata spun in a web of Samoa’s pedigrees. But here then lies a small dilemma. Why do our main sources—Krämer and Tu’u’u, for

26 Allen, Intertextuality, 2000, 349.
27 Ibid.
example—appear to focus on the pedigrees of the famous and the royal? Does this fact not perpetuate what Michael Isenberg calls the “supremacy of the rulers”?\textsuperscript{28} The Samoans themselves are just as guilty of biasing history to the side of those that mālō, win, or those who are in control. The pedigrees in Tu’u’u and Krämer are also guilty of this. On the contrary, in her own compilation, \textit{O Fāiā Fa’atūmuā}, ‘Aumua has tried to include families that might not have been privileged, largely because of the order in which their women wedded their paramount chiefs. For what they are worth, the value of \textit{fa’alupega} and genealogies in \textit{Fa’asāmoa} is that it affords its women a place in the tales; without them, there would be no record. Sadly, in the process of documentation, the women have been silenced or have been constructed as tools of the state, a factor which is counterintuitive to their positions and roles in traditional or pre-western society.

Though the sources have been few, my determination to comb the books page-by-page has in many instances yielded some unsuspecting connections. For instance, if links were not obvious through one’s maternal genes, then they were possible in the paternal ones—such was and is the complex nature of kinship politics. The honorifics of a village, a district, or the nation of Sāmoa are inclusive, and serve as confirmation that everyone is connected. This is hardly revelatory, but it is why Aiono asserts that there are no commoners in Sāmoa since everybody is linked to at least one of its ‘āiga pa’ia, sacred families.\textsuperscript{29}

Textual examinations indicate that Samoa’s seeming obsession with status and rank is historically rooted and politically routed, hence the significant role of láuga and \textit{fa’alupega}. This section then is a genealogy of how the men’s titles emerged at Sāoluafata. The concern is that the origins of village titles are largely unknown to most people of Sāoluafata, especially the
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women. I would argue that it was this knowledge that enabled past generations of Teine to rule with austerity even when they shared the pule fa’avae and pule fa’amalumalu with their menfolk. This knowledge afforded for them an air of superiority, an infallibility which often endeared them to their brothers and made them the nightmares of their wives. Sisters in the Vavau knew who was coming in and where they settled. This was important in order to keep everyone in line with the village’s founding principles and modes of operation.

It is no myth that the fa’alupega immediately locates one in the geopolitics of Sāmoa, in one’s fa’asinomaga, identity. However, as noted by Meleisea, fa’alupega are also vulnerable to the power structures of any particular time at both the village and national levels and have been made contestable by the introduction of writing in the nineteenth century by missionaries and academics; by their subsequent documentation by the church and government. Such documentation has been taken by many, both past and present, to be the authority on village and district fa’avae, constitutions. A comparative study of books from Krämer to Le Tagaloa reveals such trends, some of which are terribly significant to Sāoluafata.

To construct a narrative about these links, I have taken each honorific and title from the village fa’alupega and searched Krämer, Tu’u’u, and ‘Aumua for likely connections. Unfortunately, not all titles could be sourced; however, where needed, an etymological exercise is useful since each name is necessarily an elision or a logo of its origin.

Fa’alupega, Charter of Authority: Genealogy of Saoluafata’s Titles in the Nu’u o Ali’i

To fa’alupe is to fa’alagi, or sing the praises and honor the sanctity of the titles and their holders. It is an exercise in inclusivity and the importance of maintaining kinship connections.

30 “Genealogy” here means an uncovering of ‘upu popo, subjugated knowledge, or information known by only a few people in Sāoluafata. However, to heed Foucault’s caution, this genealogy should not be accepted as the truth; other possibilities undoubtedly exist with other descendants of the village.
During faigālauga, oratory, the fa’alupega are encased in figurative and historical terms and in stylistic tones that capture the attention of those in attendance, regardless of their level of understanding of the orator’s text.

Table 3 below is a composite of Saoluafata’s honorifics, made possible by the recordings of Krämer, Le Tagaloa, Tanuvasa, and Simanu, and by the compilations of the Ekalesia Fa’apotopotoga Kerisiano i Sāmoa (EFKS),31 and the Methodist Church. They are presented in lāuga format. They appeared initially in the oratory at the beginning of this dissertation.

Table 3. Honorifics of Sāoluafata31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Tulouna ‘Oe Sāoluafata, na fa’alagilagi i le Tu-i-Ātua ma Atuaifāgā.</th>
<th>Greetings to You, Sāoluafata who paid homage to the Tu-i-Ātua and Ātuaifāgā.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. I le afifio o Teu’ialilo ma Tululautū, ma lo luo Nu’u Pa’ia: o mamalu o Tofiga, Alo o le Taofia ma le Uso, ae mai se le Matua o Foutanu.</td>
<td>To the paramount chieftesses Teu’ialilo and Tululautū; various factions of the village; the dignity of the descendants of Taofia and Uso, and especially the Parent Foutanu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 E fa’a tulou foi i faigānū’a a ali’i: Susuga a ‘le e lu’a, Sāgapolulele ma Tagaloa, o tama a le mālō ma tapa’au fa’asina, o tūlāni o Ātua</td>
<td>Greetings to the men’s councils: the two finemats, Sāgapolulele and Tagaloa; the sons of government, the backbone of Ātua and your respective families of chiefs, Taofia and Usoali’i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ma le mamalu o lo luo Taofia ma le Usoali’i.</td>
<td>Greetings to the Brotherhood of Fuatino and Taiai—Foutanu, Ta’amai, Ufagafā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tulouna le Taofia a Fuatino ma le Taufia a Taiai – o Foutanu, Ta’amai, Ufagafā.</td>
<td>Greetings to the Elder, Fineitalaga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tulouna le Matua o Fineitalaga.</td>
<td>Likewise to the paramount sons, Tualamasalā, and the warrior Faiumu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tulouna Tualamasalā,</td>
<td>Greetings Afuvai,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. fa’aapea Oe le Apa’autane o Faiumu.</td>
<td>and You, Salelesi, the king’s valet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tulouna fo’i Afuvai,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ma ‘Oe Salelesi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 Also known as the Congregational Christian Church of Samoa (CCCS).
31 This is a composite of Le Tagaloa’s, Krämer’s and the EFKS books of honorifics, by Lealaiauloto Nofoaiga Kitiona and Fuataga Laulu Tauilili, O le Faavae o Samoa Anamua (Mālu: Malua Printing Press, 1985), 195-96.
The honorifics begin with a tribute to the totality of the village as addressed in verse one:

“You, Sāoluafata, who paid homage to Tui Ātua and Ātuafai‘ā.” It was established earlier in this study that Luafatā’alae was married to Tui Ātua Tologataua, but she herself was heir to the title as a descendant of Tui Ātua Sāgapolutele, Tui Ātua Tuālemoso, and ‘Alae; the latter was a grandson of Mālietoa Ganaosavea.32 Given this connection, Sāoluafata was a member of the exclusive club known as the Faleātua which convened at Lufilufi over matters of war. The implication of the first salutation is that Sāoluafata was a significant part of a bigger historico-political context: that of the district of Ātua. Krämer notes that during the Ātua district meetings, Teu’ialilo and her village were responsible for preparing and clearing Lalogāfu’afu’a, the malae at Lufilufi, the capital village of the Ātua district.

The second fa’alupega immediately hones in on the paramount chieftesses of the Nu’u o Teine, Teu’ialilo and Tululautū, and their sacred village. Etymological analyses of the two titles have been done in the earlier chapters; nonetheless, acknowledging the two ladies early in the protocol is historically and politically correct since their ancestors founded the village and they were very much in the midst of district building. Ironically, only one book of genealogies includes their fa’alupega.

In the third honorific, the male paramount chiefs, Sāgapolutele and Tagaloa, are honored as the ‘Ie e lua, two fine mats of the government or the winning side,” a reference to their link to multiple royal houses such as Sā Mālietoā and Sā Tupuā, both winning families of the modern era, and to their predecessors, Tui Ātua and Tui Ā’ana. They are compared to fine mats which

32 Tu’u’u, *Rules of Samoa*, 2001, 117. Sāoluafata was one of the six villages that made up the war party of the Faleātua; the other five were Solosolo, Falefā, Luatuānu’u, Sāmusu, Lotofaga, and Lepā. The Faleātua was the House of Ātua, the collective which decided on matters of war. Incidentally, Ātua comprises the eastern district of ‘Upolu and the western half of the island of Tutuila. The other two districts of ‘Upolu are Tuamāsaga and Ā’ana. These divisions were constituted during Tui Ā’ana Pili’s time, circa 1210 C.E. They have remained as boundaries in modern politics and to a large extent, as a convenience for managing the affairs of the EFKS. See Krämer, *ibid.*, 352. According to Tu’u’u, Tui Ātua Matatua Sāgapolutele and his son Tui Ātua Tuālemoso, were the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh rulers of Ātua respectively. See *Rules of Samoa*, 121
are symbols of beauty, sacredness, and bounty. They are also addressed as Tapa’auفا’asisina, a reference to the bottom layer of mats covering the pebbled floor of a Samoan house.32

The honorifics in verse 4 are of the Taufia o Taiai, the brotherhood managing the sister Taiai (also known as the Taufia o Ali’i, brotherhood of chiefs) of the ʻSā Sāgapolutele, and the Usoali’i, brotherhood, of ʻSā Tagaloa. The Taufia consists of two sets of high chiefs: the Fālefā, “four houses”, which consists of the titles Fa’amau, Pīmoe, Talatā’ina, and Tuala, and the Fāletolu, “three houses”, which carry the titles Toilolo, Fa’autagia, and Tamapolu. The Usoali’i are the brotherhood of chiefs for the Tagaloa and Tululautū, which are organized in sets of twos: Loau and Telea, Mulitalo and Asomua, Vaivao and Mao, and Fu’e and Leumu. There is also a final title Tanoi that, for some reason, could not be paired.

The fifth honorific references Foutanu, Ta’amai, and Ufagafā as the brothers of the ladies Taiai and Fuatino.33 The title Ta’amai perhaps gained prominence in the village when his daughter Tofoipupū married Mālietoa Toatuilaepa, circa 1660 C.E.34

The sixth is a most amazing honorific--Matua o Fineitalaga. Matua means “parent;” by Krämer’s records, Fineitalaga was the progenitor of the lineage of Gato’aitele and Tamasoāli’i, the two ʻpāpā titles of the Tafa’ifā. Details on this important family appear later in this chapter. Meanwhile, honorific seven locates another connection to the ʻpāpā titles: the ʻSā Tupuā family. Tualamasalā was the son of Galumalemana who was the second son of Tupua Fuiāvailili, the fourth Tafa’ifā. His mother was Teu’ialilo, daughter of Sāgapolutele.35

Finally, honorifics eight, nine, and ten acknowledge the royal connections of the titles Faiumu, the oven maker, and Afuvai, waterfall, and the Sālelesi family of Lesi and Lesi. The

---

first two titles also appear in the honorifics of Taga, Savai’i, and in the narrative of Salamasina’s rise to power. In the latter, it came to pass that when So’oa’emalelagi, Salamasina’s aunt and godmother, lost her son Tuimavave in a miscarriage, there was a scuttle by the “‘principal places’… to Lufilufi to bring someone in place of Tuimavave….” Salamāsina had apparently been bestowed the Tafa’ifā titles and “all the tūmua, orators, gathered around the tupu, [king], Salamāsina.” Tuisāmau of Malie nominated the boys Faiumu and Afuvai as successors; however, So’oa’emalelagi was steadfast in her decision to assign the Tafa’ifā titles, thus rendering Salamāsina the first king of all of Sāmoa.36

Throughout the mid-centuries of the twentieth millennium, paramount chiefs of different places continued to seek wives at Sāoluafata. In 1600, Tau’ili’ili of Papa, Savai’i took as his fourth wife Sualupe of Sāoluafata and they had the son, Toilolo, a title of high chief-status in the Faletolu o Ali’i, “three houses”, of the Sāgapolutele family.37 A generation later, circa 1630 C.E., Fa’autagia’s daughter Samalā’ulu married Fānene of Faleālili and had three children, one of whom, Oilau, married Fuimaono of Salani, Faleālili and had a son, Fuiāvailili.38 This boy, renamed Tupua, was adopted by Muāgututi’a and his wife Fenunuivao, the daughter of Le’atele of Falefā. Tupua succeeded his adopted father to the Tafa’ifā titles; his two older sons, ‘Afoafouvale and Galumalemana, made significant contributions to Saoluafata’s gene pool.39

About ninety years after the birth of Toilolo, another royal connection emerged by way of Fepulea’i and Lagi, the children of Tauamatu, the daughter of Toa of Sāoluafata and the second wife of the Tafa’ifā Muāgututi’a, circa 1690 C.E. 40 ‘Aumua suspects that Toa was none other

than Fa’a’autagia. In other words, Muāgututi’a influenced Saoluafata’s politics in a couple of ways: as the grandfather of Tupua’s sons, and as the husband of a daughter of Sāoluafata. Village links had become as lavelave, entangled, as the fie, creeper “morning glory”, on the beach.

Meanwhile, Galumalemana had five wives, his the third being Teu’ialilo Luafaletele, daughter of Sāgapolutele of Sāoluafata who bore for him the boy honored in the seventh honorific as Tualamasalā. This detail is contradicted by Tu’u’u whereby Galumalemana supposedly married his fourth wife, Tuliaioletele, who was the daughter of Foutanu, and who had a son, Tualamasalā, who was also called Tupua. Hence the fifth honorific, Tulouna oe Foutanu, is honored as a parent/elder, the Matua o Foutanu. Needless to say, having won the Tafa’ifā status from ‘Afoafouvale, Galumalemana then decreed that all his sons were to be called aloali’i, paramount sons; their status in the villages would be as sa’o’aumaga, leader of the untitled men, of the village. At some point, the title ‘Afoafouvale was also incorporated as an aloali’i title. Today, Tualamasalā and ‘Afoafouvale are sa’o’aumaga titles of Saoluafata’s Nu’u o Ali’i. They do not have counterparts in the Nu’u o Teine.

Nonetheless, having lost his title to Galumalemana, ‘Afoafouvale was exiled to Tutuila; he had two daughters and one son, Simanu ‘Afoa, from the same woman. In 1770 C.E., Simanu ‘Afoa married his second wife, Tululautū, whom Krämer claims was Tagaloa’s daughter, and

41 As noted in chapter two, Fa’a’autagia was known as the tapuāfānua, the first settler of Evaloa. A Fa’a’autagia purportedly married Taeolalopu’a. It might explain why in the current list above, Fa’a’autagia is in the Sā Sāgapolutele sub-village. According to ‘Aumua, her father’s father, Fagumoega, son of Fa’amanini Tagaloa, was married to Taufāoa, daughter of Fa’a’autagia, circa mid-nineteenth century. Her father, Simanu, was born in 1884. From Tusi o le Mafutaga a le ‘Au Simanu, Family Reunion Book (unpublished manuscript, 2006). Fa’amanini is not mentioned in the Tagaloa genealogies in Krämer. 
42 Krämer, The Samoa Islands, 1994, 228.
43 Tu’u’u, ibid., 279. It was through Galumalemana’s five sons from five wives—Nofoasēefā, Tupōlesava, Tuālaulelei, Tualamasalā, and I’amafana—that would spell a shift in who held the Tafa’ifā titles from the Sā Tupua family to the Sā Mālietoa. It is ubiquitously known that I’amafana decreed the four titles to Mālietoa Vainu’upō, a relative, who embraced John Williams and his missionaries in August 1830 at Sapapāli’i. For a first hand account of John Williams’ arrival and the adoption of Christianity in Sāmoa, see his manuscript, Missionary Enterprises, 1837, 326-62.
who called their son, Loau. Family records indicate that Simanu’s second wife was the
daughter of Loau Pu’u of Sāoluafata. Her son, Loau Leo’o, was possibly the first Tagaloa to
have taken the title to paramountcy, circa 1810 C.E. Family records list Tagaloa Leo’o as
having three sons, Leaituolalonei, Fa’amanini, and Tagataoleao, and a daughter Talia.

Loau Pu’u’s third usuga, marriage, with Samalā’ulu, daughter of Faumuinā, issued forth
Telea. Presently, the names Loau and Telea are ali’i titles of the Nu’u o Ali’i. These titles also
appear in the honorifics of the village of Fale’ula, the Mālietoa residence in the Tuamāsaga.
Incidentally, the titles Loau and Telea are believed to have come from Tonga.
Tongan mythology situates Loau as the son of Havea Hikuleo, the ruler of Pulotu. He was
ostensibly the progenitor of the Tui Ha’atakalaua lineage of Tonga.

An important piece of information that has evaded my search is when the Tululautū name
became a paramount title. It first appeared around 1770, soon after Tupua’s sons entered the
scene at Sāoluafata a generation earlier. Family records suggest that Tululautū’s father was not
Tagaloa, but Loau Pu’u, who was also known as Loau Fatuiavatele. Regardless of timing, it is
logical to assume that once the title Tagaloa became paramount, the title Tululautū also became

---

44 Krämer, *The Samoa Islands*, 1994, 240. Tupua Fuiāvailili had four wives but chose his first born, ‘Afoafouvale, as the next Tafa’iā. Unfortunately, ‘Afoa was not favored by everyone. Many people preferred his younger
brother, Galumalemana. When Tupua passed, the brothers fought and ‘Afoafouvale was defeated and lost the title. A Tagaloa Solo’ele or Fatumanava is listed in Krämer as having died in old age in 1895, the year he (Krämer) was
in Sāmoa.
45 (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Kaneohe, January 2009).
46 Leaituolalonei is Muliamu and Talia is Tululautū in Krämer, *The Samoa Islands*, 1994, 240.
47 Krämer, *ibid.*, 241. There appears to be a discrepancy in this marriage in that Samalā’ulu (generation 25) is said
to be the daughter of Faumuinā of generation 24. While it was not unheard of for older women to marry younger
men in Samoan society, it is possible that this Samalā’ulu could be a granddaughter.
48 Fale’ula comes under the Mālietoa jurisdiction of Tuamāsaga. Saoluafata’s link to the Sā Mālietoa family is also
evident in the titles Loau and Telea, believed to have come to Sāmoa during the Tongan era, although a Tongan
friend tells of two Samoan brothers of the same names who lived in Tonga and never returned from a fishing
expedition.
49 (Nu’ualiu Onosa’i, pers. comm., Sāoluafata, December 2007).
50 Edward Winslow Gifford, ed. *Tongan Myths and Tales* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum, 1924), 19. Curiously, could
Havea Hikuleo be the same Savea Si’uleo (also ruler of Pulotu) in Samoan mythology? Half eel, half human, he
would birth Nāfanua, the war goddess and mover of Samoan politics in the *Vavau*.
paramount. By the turn of the nineteenth century, most of the titles had arrived and been mapped into the village constitution. Table 4 below portrays the layout of the *Nu’u o Ali’i* as of December 2007. Before the argument could be made about power sharing at Sāoluafata, a genealogy of Sāoluafata is critical in order to determine the rise and demise of the *Nu’u o Teine* over the last few decades. In this case, a determination of the divine links of the village follows.

**Table 4. Nu’u o Ali’i o Sāoluafata, Men’s Village**

Active Titles, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sagapolutele</th>
<th>Tagaloa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taufia o Ali’i</strong></td>
<td><strong>Usoali’i</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fālefa o Ali’i/House of Four</td>
<td>Falelua o Ali’i/House of Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa’amaau</td>
<td>Loau &amp; Telea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pīmoe</td>
<td>Mulitalo &amp; Asomua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talatā`ina</td>
<td>Vaivao &amp; Mao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuala</td>
<td>Fu’e &amp; Leumu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fāletolu o Ali’i/House of Three</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilolo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa’autagia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamapolu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matua o Foutanu &amp; Aiga Sā Foutanu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta’amai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sāoluafata: Tuláfale, Orator Titles (Fa’asāoluafataga)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>Paʻúu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleaʻae</td>
<td>Mapu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu’ualiu</td>
<td>Fatumanavao’upolu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seumālo</td>
<td>‘Aigamaua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afesulu</td>
<td>Maposua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleaaesina</td>
<td>Manu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saifiti</td>
<td>Malaulau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Itaifaleupolu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mosogau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51 Not all the titles are explicated here due to space limitations. For example, most of the orator titles are not explained in terms of origin and arrival date at Sāoluafata. The purpose of the display is to juxtapose the two power structures of the *Nu’u o Ali’i*. These titles reflect who was active in village politics; some of the titles in the honorifics in Table 3 are not in Table 4 and vice versa. This discrepancy is unimportant; what is important is how they generally came to Sāoluafata and what it means by fa’asāoluafataga (the ways of Sāoluafata).

52 Orator for Sāgapolutele.

53 Orator for Tagaloa.
Sāgapolutele: Establishing the Sanctity of Teu’ialilo

‘Aumua asserts that Sāgapolutele was Luafata’alae’s father thus establishing a more immediate connection; however, Tu’u’u designates him as the twenty-sixth ruler of Sāmoa, the Tui Ātua who was also known as Matatua, an ancestor of Semalamamaalagī and Luafatā’alae. He married Luafaletele of Saga, a subvillage of Si’umu which lies between the latter and the district of Faleālili.

However, Krämer places Pulutua and Sāgapolutele in prehistory about eight and nine generations from Lu, who was many things to many people but whom Turner claims to have been a son of Tagaloa-a-lagi ejected from the heavens because he wished to be the first born.⁵⁴ Prehistory, says Krämer, implies a legendary source which he does not think would be credible. These ancestors appear to predate the Tui Ātua lineage which began with Pili and his sons, Tua, ‘Ana, and Saga.⁵⁵ However, Tu’u’u lists a Tui Ātua Tuālemoso as tua’a, ancestor, of the family already established as the son of Tuiātua Matatua Sāgapolutele, the twenty-sixth ruler of Sāmoa. This validates the existence of these titles as antecedent of the chieftainship in Saoluafata’s past.

Perhaps a most significant indicator of the supposed sanctity of Sāoluafata is signified by the seventh honorific whereby respect is paid to the elder, Fineitalaga. Krämer infers that Fineitalaga (c. 1390 C.E.) was the son of Fa’autagia and a descendant of Sāgapolutele; his union with Foloolela of Leone in Tutuila and of Manu’a issued forth a son, Ali‘amanaia and daughter, Letutupu. Letutupu married Tuisāmoa (c. 1420 C.E.) of Faleālili and they had two daughters, Gauifaleai and Totogatā circa 1450 C.E..⁵⁶ Ali‘amana married Taeolalopu’a or Teu’ialilo, and

---

⁵⁵ This period is often referred to as the time when Sāmoa was divided permanently: *o Sāmoa ua uma ona tofi*. These divisions have survived all kinds of natural and human challenges, each sustaining its boundaries, village affiliations, and *aga ‘ifamua*, its own tactics or methods of manifesting Samoa’s beliefs and values, customs and traditions.
they had the sons Fa’autagia, Foutanu, and Talata’ina, and a daughter Taiai. Again, the brothers are known in the honorifics as the Taufia a Taiai, “the anchors of their sister Taiai.” Hints of a strong feagaiga are noted here.  

Tuisāmoa and Mālietoa Uituālagi (c. 1390 C.E.) had arranged a marriage between Gauifaleai and Fuaoleto’elau, Mālietoa’s younger son; however, she preferred the older son, La’auli (c. 1420 C.E.). Cunningly, Gauifaleai managed to convince her younger sister to marry Fuaoleto’elau with the concession that if it did not work out, they could share La’auli. This was exactly what happened and from this threesome came the daughters Gato’aitele and Gāsoloiaooloelagi. Like their mothers, they, too, married the same man, Sānālala of Sāfata.

Gato’aitele was apparently barren, but her sister birthed three children: Lalovimamā, Vaeatamasoa, and Lea’togaugaelituitoga. Vaetamasoa was the mother of the Tui Ā’ana Tamaalelagi whose tenth marriage with the half Tongan princess, Vaeitofaga, resulted in the birth of the first Tafa’i of Sāmoa, the lady Salamāsina.

---

57 From Mafutaga a le Au Simanu, (unpublished 2006), 18.
58 It is a well known tale in Sāmoa that he was called La’auli (a step in the dark) because he was the illegitimate son of Mālietoa Uitualagi’s wife, Gatolooiaio. She was with child by another man when she married Mālietoa. La’auli grew up to become a skilled and talented pigeon snarer. From his story would derive some of the popular proverbs for the orators. See Schultz, *Samoa Proverbial Expressions*, 1980. See also Brother Henry, *Tala Fa’asolopito*, 43-46. La’auli and his younger brother Fuaoleto’elau went to Faleālili where the latter spent time wooing the above sisters. Meanwhile, La’auli was in the bushes snaring pigeons. Henry and Krämer create a rendezvous for the sisters and La’auli in the forest. The former made fun of La’auli’s disheveled hair and dirty skin to which he replied, *E valavala a tu manu*, “it is the shagginess of a young banana bunch.” To their comment about his filthy body, *La’auli countered, E lafulafu a tama seugogo*, “it is the dirt (disguise) of the pigeon hunters.” He lived with both sisters. However, when Fuaoleto’elau was teased about losing his beau to his brother, he replied, *O lau o le tolo, lau o le fiso*, a metaphor comparing the brothers to leaves from the same sugarcane plant. See Krämer, *Salamasina*, 1958, 7-8.
59 Tafa’i comes from the word tafa, side, and is applied to the guards providing security to a paramount ruler of Sāmoa. The female titles Gato’aitele and (Vae)Tamasoāli’i were the manifestation of Mālietoa Uitualagi’s māvaega (dying wish) when he named La’auli as his successor. As a gift for the latter’s services, Mālietoa instructed that when La’auli bore a son, cheers should ring across the nation; however, if a daughter, she would become the mother of the country. After the wars of the pāpā, all the titles had been claimed quid pro quo by the war goddess, Nāfanua, who ordered their bestowment on her niece Le Vālasi So’oa’emalelagi. The latter, in turn, gifted them upon her niece, Salamāsina, who became the first tupu tafa’i of Sāmoa. This meant each district from whence each title came was to serve the Tafa’i with loyalty and bounty—hence, the resemblance of a tributary system in Sāmoa. Each paramount title therefore was accompanied by two tafa’i. Details of this reorganization of Samoa’s politics are
Unfortunately, it came to pass during fieldwork that Saoluafata’s contribution to the creation of the Tafa’ifā titles has not been duly noted or known to the Teine. Clearly, the Sāgapolutele legacy by way of Fineitalaga’s great grandchildren were the two female titles, Gato’aitele and Tamasoāli’i; both titles represented the Mālietoa family with the appointment of Fata and Maulolo as tafa’i for both. Saolufata’s ties to the male titles, Tui Ātua and Tui Ā’ana, have already been established.

It was suggested in chapter two that the ‘Āiga Sāgapolutele had already established roots and have fa’ato’a, tamed, the land that was known as Evaloa when Luafatā’alae and her entourage arrived. However, what is not known is whether anyone held the Sāgapolutele title at the time; although if we are to accept ‘Aumua’s claim, then her father had the title. What we may culturally deduce is that if a chief was already there, and if Luafatā’alae came asking for land, it was in everyone’s best interest by Samoan moral standards, to give her land.

Nonetheless, she chose Cape Utusi’a. It is understood by village people today that most of the land between what is today Lufilufi to the east and Solosolo to the west technically belonged to the family Sāgapolutele and that major decisions concerning the use of this land required his input. Evidently, the fa’alupega of Sāoluafata, Fusi, Salelesi, and Eva share a common detail: they all honor the title, Sāgapolutele.60

For four hundred years, the Sāgapolutele family reigned dominion over Sāoluafata and its western sub-villages. With the addition of the Tagaloa title, all lands south of the stream and west of the Utusi’a belonged to the Sā Sāgapolutele family, while those north of it were the domain of the Sā Tagaloa. Such has been the status quo to this day.

---

60 See texts on fa’alupega cited earlier.
It is also during this time that these arrays of high chiefs and their divine leaders needed administrators, hence the emergence of the orator group known as ‘Oe Sāoluafata, You, Sāoluafata.’ Each ali‘i is designated a tulāfale who speaks on his behalf. The most important orator titles to note are the ones for those who speak on behalf of the paramount chiefs; they are Eva for Teu’ialilo and Sāgapolutele, and Pa’u’ū for Tululautū and Tagaloa. In other words, when involved in public events, oratorical protocol is employed and unless paramount or high chiefs wish to speak—which would signal ua to’oto’o ali‘i le aso, “the day is orated by high chiefs”—it is the orators who control the exchanges. The title Eva is undoubtedly the namesake of the land Evaloa. Pa’u’ū has been a difficult one to determine. Lexically, it could mean “fallen.”

Other important orator titles are Faiumu and Afuvai. It is safe to speculate that these titles might have arrived at Sāoluafata around the early 1500s when Salamāsina traveled around the islands during her reign. It is believed that wherever she stayed for a while, she would create titles for villages which served her well. In a conversation with Tilau Sialava’a, widow of the late holder of the Afuvai title, she disclosed the family’s belief that the name was coined by Salamāsina to describe the water seeping through the rocks and collecting in tiny pools behind the residence of the Pīmoe family. There is evidence here of how long this title had been at Sāoluafata.

But what of the Tagaloa title, the other fine mat? From whence did it hail?

Tagaloa: A Divine Quid Pro Quo and the Sanctity of Tululautū

Luafata’alae’s children were direct heirs of the Tagaloa title which originated on the island of Savai‘i. To reiterate, Funefe’ai (c. 1350 C.E.), a descendant of Le Alali (c. 1270 C.E.),

---

61 See Table 2, Honorific 1.
62 (Tilau Sialava’a, pers. comm., Wainuiomata, April 2009). Tilau lived at Sāoluafata in the 1980s and relocated to New Zealand in the mid 1990s.
one of the sons of Mālietoa Gagasavea, was given the title Tagaloa by the God, Tagaloa-a-lagi in exchange for his lovely wife, whom the deity had greatly desired. And so it was that the Tagaloa line originated from this exchange: a wife for a title. Funefe’aí became the first Tagaloa and the earthly progenitor of the title Tagaloa that spread around the archipelago through marriage.63

Tagaloa Funefe’aí’s second wife, Tauānu’ufaiga of Letogo, ‘Upolu, gave him a daughter, Utufa’asili who married Tui Ātua Fepulea’i. Their son, Tui Ātua Tologataua, married Luafatā’alae.64 Krämer notes that after Fatumanavao’upolu was defeated in a war with his older sibling ‘Aumuatāgafa for the title Tui Ātua, Fatumanava, supposedly known as Tagaloa, became the sa’o’aumaga who prepared the kava when the Ātua district convened at Lufilufi.65 If Krämer’s informants are to be believed that Tagaloa Fatumanavao’upolu assumed a lower rank, then it is logical to conclude that power sharing at Sāoluafata did not occur until much later for the reasons laid out below.

The constitution of the village of Sāoluafata locates the Teine as founders and therefore the pule fa’avae, constitutive authority, of the village. In fact, people who are familiar with the origins of Sāoluafata call it the Nu’u o Teine, literally “the village owned by girls/women.” However, did its founding lady, Luafatā’alae, have any inkling that her village would be regarded as a nu’u pa’ia, sacred village? Perhaps not; however, she might have understood, as the wife of a paramount chief, Tui Ātua Tologataua, that her daughters would attract other paramount sons and daughters. As such, not only would they have authority as sisters to control the affairs of their own village or as the wives of paramount chiefs, but their power would be enough to give them legitimacy among their subjects. Essentially, the legitimacy of the Nu’u o

---

63 Funefe’aí’s heirs would meet again c. 1480 C.E. in a marriage which issued forth the son, Selaginatō, Salamasina’s grandfather.
64 For details on Funefe’aí’s pedigree, see Krämer, ibid., 115-16.
65 Ibid., 384.
Teine was guaranteed by their paramountcy, by their royal connections, and by their increasing numbers through the concept of *paolo*, lit. shelter. As reflected in Table 3 above, the new political structure of Sāoluafata is a manifestation of a network of paramount agnatic lineages converging to give the Teine much to be proud of, as well as much to be cautious about. After all, paramountcy through the Tagaloa line connotes *pa’ia*, sanctity, and *mamalu*, dignity; it gives them security.

*Paolo* means “shelter” or “shade.” Lexically, it means shade from the heat and blinding light of the sun; *fa’apaolo* is the verb “to shade.” One’s in-laws, in an extended sense, are one’s *paolo* from violence, sexual harassment, and hunger. Historically, each marriage implied increased security and protection for a family. Each marriage added an arsenal in terms of manpower and bounty to the family. Since, for example, tradition expected paramount wives to return to their villages to birth their children, serial monogamy for the paramount chiefs often forced the wives to return home permanently; sons and daughters could either relocate to the father’s land in adulthood, or remain with the maternal family.

A case in point is that of Luafā’alae whose son and daughter joined her in the relocation. Many of the titles enumerated above were the names of the children of these paramount marriages; some were necessarily titles in their paternal lands. To reiterate, the names Loau and Telea are high chiefs’ titles at Fale’ula, the residence of the Mālietoa. They were the names of Simanu ‘Afoa’s son and grandson respectively, circa late eighteenth century. The title Toilolo was the name of the son of Tau’ili’ili i Papa of Savai’i and Sualupe of Sāoluafata. This was another connection of the *Nu‘u o Teine* to the Salamāsina lineage.66 The

---

66 Tau’ili’ili i Papa of the Salemuli’aga lineage had four usuga (marriages): the first to Taufau, Salamasina’s granddaughter. Her son, Tupuivao, was the reason why Taufau’s direct line lost the Tafā’ifā titles. The third marriage resulted in the son, Vaovasa. The three half siblings were the pride and joy of their father. Tupuivao, however, was exiled to Tutuila after his warring efforts to reclaim the titles which his mother bequeathed to her
initial link to Salamāsina and Mālietoa pedigrees was through Fineitalaga’s granddaughters, Gauifaleai and Totogatā.

Consolidation and centralization of power during the Salamasina Era ostensibly resulted in a restructuring of the political landscape of Sāmoa and the incorporation of a two-tier system of chiefs: aliʻi and tulafale. Prior to that, it was logical that since the people of Sāoluafata were connected to the Tafa’ifā titles, the men left to fight in the wars, leaving the women to fend for themselves—although, they were relatively safe because they were related to all the warring parties. This situation probably lasted well into the early twentieth century as relatives of the Sā Mālietoā and Sā Tupuā were required to support their kin in times of war and peace. At Sāoluafata, leadership would not have been an issue because the women owned the village.

As well, every village needed protection from neighbors’ invasions and famines, thus all the able-bodied men were needed to develop fighting skills and food gathering and preservation models. The reigns of the initial Tafa’ifā, from Salamāsina (c. 1540 C.E.) to Tupua (c. 1720 C.E.) were relatively peaceful ones; thus, people had time to develop peacetime occupations and recreation.67 By the late eighteenth century, the Nu’u o Ali’i had taken shape; although its place in the district of Ātua would be obscured by Teu’ialilo’s reign and her status as a member of the Faleātua, House of Ātua. In other words, whether they organized earlier in the Salamāsina Era or later towards the nineteenth century, they were part of a gendered politics reminiscent of that
around the rest of the archipelago; yet different because of the *pule fa’avae a Teine*, “the constitutive authority of the teine” enjoining them not to violate village *sā*.\(^{68}\)

Eventually, as village population grew and a reordering was needed for socio-political reasons, sisters and brothers shared the *pule*, parallel to each other on a daily basis and converging when necessary. As Table 2 in the previous chapter indicates, male and female titles portray that for every male title, there was a corresponding female title. Each title was assigned a status and rank, in the same manner that those for the rest of the country had been treated. Technically, every family of Sāoluafata aligned behind two chiefs; however, Krämer’s chronology imply that while some of the Teine’s titles might have been initiated by earlier Teu’ialilo and Tululautū holders, many of them appear not to have emerged until the male titles were incorporated. In other words, as affines entered the village, their *Teine* were undoubtedly expected to be part of the *Nu’u o Teine*. This is consistent with the founding principle that every girl born of Saoluafata ancestry was a member of the Teine’s council.

Nonetheless, the titles Suluifale’ese and Tauata’ese, for instance, are aligned with those of Loau and Telea, respectively, in the *Nu’u o Ali’i*. According to Krämer, Suluifale’ese was the name of Tualemoso’s daughter and is currently an honored title in the *fa’alupega* of Vailoa, Āleipata. The titles Tagitagia’au and Amiaitutolu (Amialelei in Table 2) date back to pre-Sāoluafata days. They were the namesakes of the sons of Tualemoso. Tui Ātua Tualemoso is mentioned in chapter two of this study as an ancestor of Luafatā’alae. He is dated by Krämer in legendary times, while Tu’u’u locates him in the Tongan era.

\(^{68}\) See chapter three for a list of these taboos.
As indicated in previous chapters, the socio-political structure of Sāoluafata reflects a triangulation of the four paramount titles who reside at the apex of the hierarchy of chiefly titles, gendered as the Nu’u o Teine and Nu’u o Ali’i. In a normal village, the two titles—Teu’ialilo and Tululautū—would be considered sa’otama’a’ita’i, paramount sister, and ‘augafa’a’apae, peacemaker, for the sisters’ organization called the aualuma. The Nu’u o Teine is not one of these organizations; it is a village council whose counterparts across the archipelago have historically been a male. One of the ways this difference becomes apparent is that when the Nu’u o Teine embarks on a malaga, trip, to another village, it is not the aualuma of the host village which greets them, but the fono a matai, village council. However, they take with them a few male chiefs to speak on their behalf and to protect them. The Teine are not entertained by the host village’s ‘aumaga, the organization of untitled men, because they are not an aualuma. The implication here is that the Teine are not subjected to the ancient tradition of ‘aiavā, when the hosts farewell the guests with gifts on the eve before departure. This was typically known as the time of pōula when untitled men and women farewelled each other with some very special agendas in mind.\(^6^9\)

If the Teine digress from protocol while they are on the road, tension results and their brothers are placed in the awkward position of sanctioning Teine behavior. Early in the first decade of the twenty-first century, a grave matter was brought before the council--one of the Teine was allegedly having an affair with a builder who was doing some construction work for them. An elderly chieftess suggested and led the Teine in an ifoga, public apology, before the man’s family in the neighboring village. Not all the Teine agreed to the plan; those who opposed

did not participate on the grounds that they did not see how it was their role to issue such a
dangerous and public apology.\footnote{Samalā’ulu Mata’itusi, pers. comm., Sāoluafata, December 2007.} There is a ban in village rules against adultery and unwanted
pregnancy, but lacking evidence, an ifoga was out of the question. According to my informants,
it was an impulsive moment, and one which the Nu’u o Ali’i found to be immature and
irresponsible, particularly when the lives and sanctity of the Nu’u o Teine could have been
affected.\footnote{Samalā’ulu Mata’itusi and Seumālol Meripa, pers. comm., Sāoluafata, December 2007.} As it were, the Teine who led the ifoga had a stroke soon after. She was laid to rest in 2010. She had apparently assumed the Teu’ialilo title and felt it within her power to order
such an ordeal. While being an heir gives one the right to use a title in certain contexts, one
could not embark on something as dangerous as an ifoga without the consent of the active holder
of the title.

The Teu’ialilo and Tululautū titles belong to their heirs, thus it was the practice that the
selection of new holders was determined through their consensus. It appears, however, that for
some time across the twentieth century, the bestowal of these titles had been done at the pleasure
of the male chiefs, Sāgapolutele and Tagaloa.\footnote{‘Aumua explains that the selection of the sa’otama’ita’i was traditionally done by the orators of the village who
were charged with the protection and the conjugal affairs of the lady. This is supported by Schultz in Samoa Family Laws, 1953. It appears however that today’s sa’otama’ita’i are largely chosen by the paramount chiefs.} The implication of this change speaks volumes
as to where the power may lie if not now, then in days to come. Moreover, if unchallenged, it
could perpetuate the belief held popularly in the village during fieldwork that the two paramount
chiefs were the ones to decide who the new holders were to be.

The Nu’u o Teine enjoyed on-site leadership for centuries until the last two decades
when the two paramount chieftesses relocated elsewhere. This situation does not bode well for
the Teine, who are in need of strong leadership to guide them through the twenty-first century.

After all, what good are titles without or with absentee holders? Foucault’s response would be
that without individuals as vessels of power, there is no power. Does this mean that the titles Teu’ialilo and Tululautū are meaningless without active holders?73

Aiono dubs the fifth spoke of the socio-metric wheel of village politics as the Saofa’iga a Suafa Matai, namely, the seating or hierarchy of the chiefly titles. Titles are immediately personified in this instance. The implication could only be that holders are not above or as important as their titles. Though vested in holders, their personification implies an escape from, if not a superiority to the discursive nature of their holders. Aiono appears to be saying that the holders are not the ones with power—after all, holders come and go—but their titles remain as cogs in the networks of power. Furthermore, it is the titles which own the land, the foundation of Fa‘asāmoa.74

Titles are the tools of the Fa‘amatai; they wield power to either repress or to mobilize resources for the benefit of the community. Without them, there is no economic structure, no economic development, no Fa‘asāmoa as we know it today.75 Therefore, in order for holders to maintain their titles and hence their power, they must fulfill their obligations as constituted for certain statuses and ranks.76 Heirs have a right to titles, and a right to bestow and remove them from their holders. Does this mean that titles are only as good as the people who bestow or assume them? After all, a person could be an unproductive holder, but could still reap the privileges attached to the rank and status of his/her title, unless the family decides to remove it.77

The strength or the extent of such title-based power depends on the title’s position on the hierarchy, regardless of economic wealth. Thus, as long as an individual has possession of a

---

74 Le Tagaloa, Faasinomaga, 1997, 30-54.
75 Ibid.
77 Freeman, The Social Structure of a Samoan Village Community, 1948, Peter Hempenstall, ed. (Canberra: Target Oceania, 2006).
title, he is still part of a distribution list and will receive his title’s share of village resources.\textsuperscript{78}

Usually, as long as titles have holders, issues of power are almost non-existent; unless one of two things occurs: the holder is inactive in village affairs, or his/her title has been removed. Upon analysis, the two chieftesses, the holders of the Teu’ialilo and Tululautū titles are both absent from the village and have been so for sometime. The former has not visited for a number of years; the latter visits periodically. By contrast, when a former holder of the Tagaloa title violated a court order for him to move house and live at Sāoluafata, the other heirs took him to court and requested that the title be removed from him.\textsuperscript{79} The difference in treatment should certainly provoke a discussion among heirs; yet, none of the \textit{Teine} informants felt that it was their place to even think such a thing. In fact, when the current holder of the Sāgapolutele title, the counterpart of Teu’ialilo, took issue with the fact that the current holder has been inactive for some time, there was a general sense of shock among the teine.\textsuperscript{80} Was Sāgapolutele in line with normal protocol for sanctioning holders, or was he violating something deeper than that? What is worth mentioning here is the fact that since its inception, all four of Sāoluafata’s paramount titles have never been split. A move as such would be consistent with the frenzy of heirs to be titled albeit not unusual for paramount titles elsewhere to incur the same fate.

In the latter half of the twentieth century, party politics at the national level was introduced and with it an excessive splitting of chiefly titles.\textsuperscript{81} However, title splitting did not just originate with the party politics of the recent decades. At Sāoluafata, title splitting was common at the \textit{Nu’u o Teine} and, to this day, there are multiple holders of certain titles in that

\textsuperscript{78} Freeman, \textit{ibid.}
\textsuperscript{79} (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Sāoluafata, December 2007).
\textsuperscript{80} \textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{81} Asofou So’o has treated this issue extensively in \textit{Democracy and Custom}, 2008, 93-129.
hierarchy.\textsuperscript{82} Such was the case in many other villages of Sāmoa, but it was not until there was a need to win in parliamentary elections that title splitting became excessive hence the resultant vote for universal suffrage in 1990.\textsuperscript{83} Prior to this major transformation in Samoa’s politics, it was the norm that only those with matai, chiefly, titles could vote and run in parliamentary elections. For the most part, an imbalance in political capital between men and women had been the status quo.

Foucault asserts that power is nothing and has no function without its exercise, without its networks.\textsuperscript{84} In the Samoan context, the titles are the conduits of power that traverse and transcend the individuals who hold them. It is the titles that have power; although without the individual, titles are rendered meaningless. The symbiosis of titles and holders often gets lost in the daily shuffle; however, it could explain why in some villages, the paramountcy of certain titles is diminished if not completely muted even though they may still be part of the network or relations of power. For example, ‘Aumua claims that the historical significance of the title Fa’autagia, recognized for its crucial role as king-maker circa late seventeenth century, has been obfuscated in the cluster of chiefs known as the Taufia (anchor brothers) in the Sāgapolutele faction of the Nu’u o Ali’i.\textsuperscript{85} Established earlier in this dissertation, the holders of the Teu’ialilo and Tululautū titles resided elsewhere. It begs the question that if both lived abroad and had no involvement in the daily operations of the village, then by Foucault’s definition, these individuals had no power. The key to power—and here I would agree with Foucault’s premise—is by being in the location.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{82} The title Leao in the Nu’u o Teine has at least three holders.}\\
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{83} So’o, Democracy and Customs, 2008, 93-129.}\\
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{84} Foucault, Society, 2003, 24.}\\
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{85} (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Honolulu, October 2010). Fa’autagia was the name of the tapuafanua, the first settler of Sāoluafata, but through marriage to Luafatā’alae’s descendant, he was incorporated into the gender politics across history. A Fa’autagia is listed as having married Taeolalo’ua or Teu’ialilo, either the first daughter of Luafatā’alae, or a later descendant.}
where the title is exercised because “[p]ower functions… [and] is exercised through networks, and individuals do not simply circulate in those networks. They are in a position to both submit to and exercise this power. They are never the inert or consenting targets of power, they are always its relays. In other words, power passes through individuals. It is not applied to them.”

Implicitly, power is a relationship of actions between two intersecting forces; thus if there is no interaction, then there is no power.

In today’s Fa’amatai, as long as a chief continues to perform his duties and fulfill his obligations for the village regardless of place of residency, he maintains his pule, albeit largely of the constitutive type. At the foundation village, regardless of how many holders each title has, the holder who delivers the oratory is the one who lives in the village. This is generally true today for many chiefs who reside elsewhere in and beyond Sāmoa. They may remain current by remitting to relatives or directly to the village council, but could orate only when the moa fanua, chicken of the land hence the holder in residence, grants him permission.

The political and economic future of the Nu’u o Teine is obvious: as long as there are heirs to continue the work and keep order for Saoluafata’s people, the circulation of power does not stop. The lower layers of power are there to continue its relay between nodes which, asserts Foucault, “is something that functions only when it is part of a chain. It is never localized, it is never in the hands of some, and it is never appropriated in the way that wealth or a commodity can be appropriated.” In this sense, the answer to Foucault’s question of whether there is political power without economic power is yes; power does not have its raison d’être or justification in the economy; rather, it is enhanced by it. Thus even if/when the persons of the

87 (Le Tagaloa Pita Ala’ilima, pers. comm., Niu Valley, July 2010). ‘Aumua was in agreement with Le Tagaloa on this matter.
Teu’ialilo and Tululautū were not there, it was not they who constituted the relays of their power; it was their titles which were assumed by their representatives, themselves chieftesses with power to manage, distribute, and keep the cogs of the wheel oiled on behalf of the Nu’u o Teine and their families. As often witnessed during an oratorical fa’atau, debate on who wins the oratory, even chiefs with lesser titles may coin those of their paramount leaders in order to justify their eligibility to orate.89

In his study of the social structure of Sā’anapu village in the mid-1940s, Derek Freeman analyzes this notion as follows:

Every chiefly title in Samoa—executive as well as titular—represents a well defined structural position. Any individual chief exercises his rights and attains his authority not by reason of his individual abilities but by virtue of the fact that he temporarily holds a title which has a specific structural significance. Thus if an individual is deposed from chieftainship he loses all his special privileges and all his exalted rank, and becomes merely anuntitled man compelled to obey the edicts of the other chiefs of his community.90

Freeman describes a titular chief who was “expelled from the… fono, and was denied the right of the Mulitalo fa’alupega, honorifics, and kava-cup title, etc.”91 However, although this chief lost all the privileges that came with the title, the title itself remained intact in its position of power in the social structure; therefore, a new holder of this title would enjoy all the privileges that came with it. Essentially, since titles remained and individuals holding them at any given time did not, it is fair to say that in Sāmoa, individuals with titles had political power; those without, the converse. Could this chief have been stripped of his title and still have economic power? The answer would be “yes,” but it would not be possible in his village community if he were also banned from remaining in the village.92

89 (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Kaneohe, 2010).
90 Freeman, Social Structure of a Samoan Village 1948, [2006], 152.
91 Ibid., 153.
92 Ibid.
Another example laid out by Freeman involves a chief who lost his ability to be a fully functioning member of the Sā’anapu council due to old age and partial blindness. He was a leading tulāfale, executive chief or orator, and these conditions notwithstanding his inability to carry out the functions of his office, did not “lessen the rank of the… title… [or] interfere with its position in the social structure” of the village. As long as he held the title, he was still recognized “in kava ceremonies, in the recitation of fa’alupega, and in the distribution of food and property.” The fact of the matter is, he was still in the village as part of the council.93

In the case of Freeman’s first example above, there had ostensibly been cases whereby chiefs were expelled from the village fono, but not from the land; in which case, they could grow taro or run a business, get money, and be economically viable. However, this would not be without difficulty since the council would look for any way to diminish that power, which would be dependent on the commodities he bought and sold on the market. In the second instance, Freeman’s analysis is still true of contemporary Sāmoa in that the politics of titles has never been more pursued, contested, and in some cases very dangerously, especially when family members cannot agree on who should become successors when titles become available after a death or expulsion. In fact, in the 1980s, the Sā Tagaloa family gathered at the Lands and Titles Court at Mulinu’u, to determine the true heirs of the title Tagaloa. Ostensibly, there were more than a dozen factions which claimed rights to it. There was also an effort by some to remove the title from Fugaipaogo, who held the title at the time. The contention was that he was of the faction which held the title for many generations; that it was time for the title to circulate. The Court ruled to uphold the decision; however, Fuga was instructed to live permanently at the village, a condition which he failed to fulfill. Consequently, the heirs took the matter to court and succeeded in removing it from him. The net effect of all this has been the installation of the

---

93 Ibid.
current holder, and the emergence of a more cohesive family. Paradoxically, the holders of the Teine’s paramount titles no longer reside in the village, yet, with the exception of the recent effort to bring back the Teu’ialilo title from its current holder, there has been no mention of a similar action becoming possible for that of the Tululautu. This then begs the question of whether the reason for such an inaction might be due to the fact that the women’s titles as sa’otama’ita’i are not registered at the national levels and therefore have never had political traction in national politics. This matter is examined in chapter seven.

Nonetheless, what the politics of titles means for Sāoluafata is nebulous at best; however, as demonstrated in the next chapter, for Samoa’s Teine, there has always been a correlation between political and economic power. Paramount titles are synonymous with wealth and this is displayed during fa’alavelave economics. This is why even if the paramount chieftesses were away, they had representatives who gave and received on their behalf. However, if the absence continues over time, whatever is received may not reach their chieftesses and their families, but get consumed by representatives at the lower ranks. In this way, relatives or representatives at the lower levels may enjoy the benefits. In the case of Teu’ialilo, she has not had contact with the village for some time; when Šāgapolutele tried to remove her title, she left it up to God to decide.94 As far as she was concerned, the title was her birth right; it was hers to keep. Yet the vacuum created by her absence was reported even by her close kin. Without a formal transfer of power, those in subordinate positions or kin politics could only go so far; beyond that, the immediate kin stand to lose any real agency to stay involved in village politics.

94 I visited with her Afioga in Auckland, New Zealand on April 10, 2009 and asked her about this situation. Her response was that God was the one to judge these things. A few months later, I heard from Samalā’ulu Mata’itusi that Šāgapolutele had traveled to New Zealand for medical purposes. However, this may not be construed as a “curse” in progress; although village thinking may be situated along these lines. I was on my way to a Samoan language conference in Invercargill and was glad for the opportunity to follow up on her Afioga’s status. Since that visit, she has returned to Apia and has been living with nieces at Vaivaseuta. However, she still had not visited the Nu’u at the time of this writing.
Initially, as the founders, Luafatā’alae and her daughter, Taeolalopu’a, might not have known that their descendants would be ensured protection and respect wherever they traveled because of their royal roots. Sure enough, these roots wound themselves around the sanctity and dignity of their royal and divine connections, namely to the Tafa’ifā titles (Tui Ātua, Tui Ā’ana, Gato’aitele, and Tamosoali’i); to Mālietoa and Tui Manu’a; to the god-given title, Tagaloa, from the Sāfunē district of Savai’i; and to Salamasina’s descendents who cross referenced themselves in modern times as belonging to the ‘Āiga Sā Tupuā and ‘Āiga Sā Mālietoā.95

Customarily, adult children were free to move back and forth between their paternal and maternal homes; however, those who decide to reside in their maternal villages could become chiefs as well. Many of Saoluafata’s girls were not primary wives of the royals; thus their sons and daughters usually preferred to stay with their maternal families. Nonetheless, the connections remained royal, an attribute which mothers aspired for their children, particularly for those who marry up. Schlutz provides a detailed account of the protocol for dealing with links of unequal status or rank. He also reveals that the adult sons residing in their mother’s villages and becoming chiefs were addressed as ma’upū, a concept which he claims to have salacious connotations.96 ‘Aumua, on the other hand, claims that ma’upū is a contraction of ma ‘upu, and the words (according to a certain honorific) symbolizing the royal paternity of the heirs.

From 1350 to 1998 C.E., each generation of Teu’ialilo and Tululautū exercised pule through the observance of rules either stated or implied, because it was their right and responsibility to do so. These rules were known as sā. However, one wonders whether the men of Sāoluafata, ever felt emasculated by the fact that their village was controlled by their sisters.

95 For a comprehensive webbing of Samoa’s titles, see Simanu, Fāiā Faʻatūmua, 2011.
96 Schultz, Samoan Family Law, 1958; see also Vaai, Samoa Faamatai, 1999, 53.
Did not the men in other villages make fun of them? In short, we know from current village politics that the men do have a voice in Saoluafata’s politics. Yet, if ridicule from other villages was not moving them toward consolidation, then something else was; logically, if not sensibly, this would be the arrival of the *moa folau* (sailing chickens) of a very different nature.

There is no record of the eighteenth century that reveals a direct encounter between *Teine* Sāoluafata and the first *papālagi* to sight Sāmoa. In fact, there are no records of any interaction between the *Teine* and these sailing chickens until well into the mid-nineteenth century, although church history locates at least two English missionaries earlier in the century.97 If, at this point, the power sharing had already occurred between the *Teine* and their brothers, then it is possible that the tenets of the *feagaiga* inadvertently—perhaps at first—became a powerful tool with which the latter could exercise much control in managing the cross-cultural encounters with the Europeans. The men had to have known or heard about the way the *papālagi* treated the women. From “first contact” literature, Lapérouse perceived the women of Aasu in Tutuila as “mistresses of their own favors.”98 Moreover, surely Saoluafata’s paramounts were wearing “beads” which the *papālagi* noticed being worn by the girls of Massacre Bay. Sāoluafata appears to have had a healthy connection to the Tongans where, I suspect, the beads could have come from prior to the “discovery” of the Samoan group in 1722. The point to be made here is this: as *feagaiga*, the brothers had to make sure their sisters were safe; especially at this time from a force about which they knew very little. However, once Saoluafata Bay became a harbor for German ships, it was incumbent upon the brothers to protect their women from the sailors. Yet, this begs the question of whether Saoluafata’s *Teine*, chiefs in their own right with *pule* to do whatever they wished,

---

97 Names of these missionaries and dates of residency at Sāoluafata are made explicit in chapter six which is concerned with the evolution of the spiritual and social power of the *Teine*.

allowed their brothers to control their conjugal affairs. An incident accounted for in chapter five certainly begs such a curiosity.

It is the contention of this study that as chiefs themselves, Saoluafata’s *Teine* probably had more say in whom they chose as partners; that they were not enjoined to observe virginity rites. As will be elaborated upon in chapter six, the *mana* and *mamalu* of Saoluafata’s *Teine* have been compromised, but this decline might not have been caused by early encounters with *papālagi* men. I support the implications of earlier studies that Christianity and the transfer of certain roles of the Samoan *Teine* to the church had more effect on the power of the *feagaiga*. In the late nineteenth century, when the Germans were allowed to anchor their ships at Sāoluafata Bay, the village people saw them as an economic enterprise. Saoluafata’s land could substantially replenish food supplies to both visitors and villages experiencing famines. German families like the Von Reiches are known to have leased large tracts of land at Sōlaua for cattle ranching. Sōlaua is a sub-village of Sāoluafata.

Marriages in old Sāmoa were more of an economic and political nature than romantic.99 Hence, it follows that any conjugal relations between the *Teine* of Sāoluafata and *papālagi* men benefitted their families. The role of the *Teine* in the economic development of their village, if not their nation, is the focus of the next chapter.

---

CHAPTER 5:
O LE INA’ILAU A TAMA’ITA’I: ECONOMIC POWER

Introduction: *Ina’ilau* and *Fa’alavelave* Economics

Foucault’s discourse on an analysis of power focuses on the relays of its functions rather than on a body identified as the sovereign. His analysis clarifies in historical terms why the *Teine* of Sāoluafata, have managed to maintain their political power, absorb incoming forces and challenges, and adjust to it where necessary over the course of many centuries. The historical manifestation of this *pule* has been in their socio-political structure—the *Nu’u o Teine*—which has survived various waves of political and economic intrigues since its inception circa mid-fourteenth century:¹ from the civil wars and subsequent political reorganization of Sāmoa during the Salamāsina and Tupua eras in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, respectively, to the redirection of resources to the church through a shift in *feagaiga* politics of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries;² from the shelling of the village by American and German boats³ to the perpetual migration for education and wage work that continues to this day. Considering these events, numerous generations of *Teine* have done an amazing job keeping their socio-political structure functional. The ancient structure that has survived is more than a mere vestige of a distant past. It has survived a world that may have appeared to be ending when a United States naval expedition, led by Lieutenant Charles Wilkes, “arrogantly … demonstrate[d] strength

---
¹ See chapter 2 for a conceptual discussion and other information on the *ina’ilau a tama’ita’i*. In the case of Sāoluafata, the *ina’ilau* for the women is their council, the *Nu’u o Teine*, which was founded by a woman and has survived over at least six centuries with women in power.
and power to the Samoans and ended up by exacting disproportionate retribution including
burning the villages of Saluafta, Fusi, Sālelesi, and Satupaitea."\(^4\)

Imagine how the entire Evaloa plain must have lit up on that 24\(^{th}\) day of February
1841 when the Peacock, guided by Captain Hudson of Lieutenant Charles Wilkes’
expedition, pivoted its guns ashore and bombarded the villages\(^5\) as retribution for the murder
of Giddeon Smith, a sailor on the whaling boat William Penn, a year earlier. Eyewitness
accounts reveal that “the town of Saluafta, which consisted of about seventy-five houses,
was reduced to ashes. The towns of Fusi and Salelesi, of some fifty more, shared the same
fate.”\(^6\) Ostensibly, Sāgapolutele, the paramount chief of Sāoluafata had refused to deliver
Tagi, a “petty chief” whom the villages and relatives around the islands chose to protect,
albeit fully understanding the consequences that such resistance would incur.

There is no record of how many people of Sāoluafata and its sub-villages might have
been killed, or how long it might have taken to rehabilitate those fields; nonetheless, such an
episode is illustrative of the recurring patterns of violence that characterized cross-cultural
encounters with the West in the nineteenth century and a substantial portion of the twentieth.
Sagapolutele’s refusal to follow the terms of an agreement previously signed with Wilkes
and the Apia municipal government, and his posturing to resist any threat upon his people
are testimony that local people were in command of their own destiny, rather than victims of
the fatal impact theories espoused by early twentieth century scholars.\(^7\) There is no textual
evidence indicating how the physical damage might have affected the Nu’u o Teine;

\(^4\) John C. Williams, in Richards, Samoa’s Forgotten Whaling Heritage, 1992, 16, 121-23.
\(^5\) See also Anne Cleaver and E. Stann, ed. Voyage to the Southern Ocean: The Letters of Lieutenant William
Reynolds from the U.S. Exploring Expedition, 1838-42 (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1988), 244; Wallace
Patrick Strauss, Americans in Polynesia, 1783-1842 (East Lansing: MSU Press, 1963), 141; and Tavita, Samoa
Entry, 2006, 65.
\(^6\) Richards, Samoa’s Forgotten Whaling Heritage, 1992, 121-23. Italics are the author’s.
\(^7\) Alan Moorehead, Fatal Impact: An Account of the Invasion of the South Pacific, 1767-1840 (London:
nevertheless, one could wager a guess that the village people did what any community would have done after a disaster. No doubt each group in the village responded appropriately to the reconstruction. As the weavers and thatchers of the village, the Teine would have immediately set to replanting flax and sugarcane bushes, while their male counterparts set to building new *fale*, houses, and to provide food. In other words, Saoluafata’s established village government and Samoa’s kinship traditions provided much leverage against the burning.

Keesing’s claim that Sāmoa had sustained its traditions in spite of a century of contact would lead one to conclude that Saoluafata’s links to all the paramount families of Sāmoa, would have made the recovery from the burning an overnight success.8 There is every reason to believe that emergency assistance from around the islands was unsolicited, given kin expectations at times of *fa’alavelave*, obligatory events, since such was and still is the nature of Samoa’s kinship or what I call *fa’alavelave* economics.

Upon analysis, the burning is reason to ponder the wisdom or the lack thereof to share power with the men. On the one hand, the decision by the Teine to share power with their brothers prior to contact might have appeared prescient when the *papālagi* sailed in; eventually, Saoluafata’s men became the links between the locals and the outsiders. They were supposed to be, for all intents and purposes, the Teine’s protection. Unfortunately, the *papālagi* retaliation for the murder of a sailor unmasks the glaring reality of how the local men appear to have violated the tenets of the brother-sister *feagaiga*. John C. Williams (in Richards) notes that the murderer, Tagi, had traded his younger sister for exotic *pālagi* goods. It also reveals how ideology can often obfuscate a more nuanced and complex reality of life on the ground where the Teine appeared to have been both agents and victims

---

of their own making. Under the *pule fa’amanualu*, protective power, of the men, the question is whether this made the *Teine* more vulnerable even under the terms of the contract between the brothers and the *papālagi* in 1877, which allowed the Germans to use Saoluafata Bay as a harbor. Details on the terms of this contract are scanty; nonetheless, the violence to both humans and their environments ought to have changed the physical and socio-cultural landscapes of the bay area, not to mention the stress and fear among the people. ‘Aumua has no knowledge of the burning having happened, but I posit that the annual thanksgiving service that the *Nu’u o Teine* helps to facilitate might have originated at this time, approximately eleven years after John Williams introduced Christianity.

However, she believes that the service originated when Saoluafata was spared the famine which imposed hunger across most of the archipelago. Tavita locates this famine in 1854 soon after a destructive hurricane which, according to him, destroyed eight ships.  

I have discussed in chapters two and three the genesis of the *Teine’s* power and evolving jurisdiction-- *Nu’u o Teine*, and the choice to share power with their brothers. In this chapter, I claim that the *Teine*, having pretty much ceded their security to the men, turned inward and organized an economic system which sustained the village, and accommodated the high volume of kin obligations to paramount families around the archipelago. This chapter, therefore, examines the evolution of the Teine’s economic power and roles in kinship economics since the *Vavau* and, in the subsequent juxtaposition of both traditional and modern economic systems in the last two centuries; it illustrates where and how they have either helped or hindered family and village solvency within or against national and international geopolitics.

---

Samoans understand both political and economic power as *pule* and *tamāo’āiga*, respectively. When a family has wealth, it has strength, and vice versa. Wealth, however, is not to be viewed in light of capitalist notions of wealth or, in other words, as an accumulation of capital for individual profit. Instead, it is pertinent to emphasize that Samoans are more concerned with group rather than individual benefits. Wealth, therefore, circulates and manifests itself through the *fa’alavelave*, kinship obligatory system, which ideologically demands kin participation regardless of how close or distant the relationship is between at least two relatives. In other words, although the material manifestation of such participation is expected, its size and scope are determined by how close or distant one’s *fāiā*, connection, is from the relatives needing fiscal and moral support. This is Samoa’s kinship economics in which its *Teine* have been a critical component wherever they reside and regardless of whom they marry. Kinship or *fa’alavelave* economics demands a distribution rather than an accumulation of wealth.10 It is pertinent to point out that just as people travel back and forth within and between home and abroad for economic and social obligations, so too circulates Samoan wealth—feathers, scents, and all.11


11 Murray Chapman, “Pacific Island Movement,” 1991: 263-92. For an extensive analysis of how Samoans sustain their kinship connections abroad, see Craig Robert Janes, *Migration, Social Change, and Health: A Samoan Community in Urban California*, (Stanford: Stanford University, 1990), 96-108. Here, Janes translates *fa’alavelave* as “life-crisis.” While it is understandable to view Samoa’s socio-economic obligations as such, Janes avoids being mired in generalizations by pointing out that Samoans find a way to negotiate the expensive nature of *fa’alavelave* in order to sustain kinship connections, regardless of their socio-economic statuses; although, those with better resources are not as dependent on family and can contribute more. Conversely, those with poorer resources find the *fa’alavelave* system more stressful, even though they may still consider it a valuable insurance when there is a death or marriage in the family. For a view of how the New Zealand Samoans have dealt with “migrant kinship,” see Macpherson and Macpherson, “Kinship and Transnationalism.”, 2009. For a discourse on how people of Sātelologa negotiate the tensions between relatives in and out of Sāmoa, see Sa’iliemanu Lilomaia-Doktor, “Samoan Transnationalism: Cultivating ‘Home’ and ‘Reach,’” in the same URL. Basically, says Lilomaia-Doktor, the essentialism into which the discourse on transnationalism has cornered the migrant experience does not fly in the face of the unique approaches used by various home or migrant groups in their native or host communities. People’s local
A mirror for the nation, Saoluafata’s story emphasizes certain key elements for political and economic success, and perhaps other factors which have been found wanting: first, the endurance of the power of titles as vessels of constitutive, exploitative, distributive, and protective authority—of political legitimacy. Second, while economic power may enhance the status a chief has, it cannot be the key ingredient. Given the fact that titles transcend bodies even in the absence of the latter, they often find relays in those that were left behind, even those without formal investiture. In other words, even if Teu’ialilo and Tululautū were not there at the time of fieldwork, their representatives were expected to keep the village functioning on their behalf. In Sāmoa, the lower ranks, as heirs of the higher ranks, freely used the titles of their paramounts. Marx and Foucault would label this level of development as “power from below.” The next section deals with the truth-effects of a system that is at once both a help and hindrance in kinship economics.

Fa’alavelave as Women’s Economics: Hindered or Hallowed?

Fa’alavelave economics is the umbrella under which the ‘āiga potopoto, extended family, comes together with whatever food, cash, or prestigious items for exchange—tōga, fine mats, and siapo, tapa cloth—to assist relatives in their moments of crisis. Here, a crisis can be a wedding, funeral, title investiture, or house dedication. In church terms, it is the presentation of a son or a daughter (as the pastor’s wife) to a congregation that has selected them as their liaison with God. A fa’alavelave requires a sharing of family wealth and labor and the exchange of prestigious and utility goods in confirmation of kin relations, good will, beliefs, values, and praxis on dealing with their borderlands have more to do with the expectations of both groups on each other.


and ongoing support between intermarrying families. The term itself is problematic—as a verb it means “to hinder,” or “to obstruct;” as a noun it is “a hindrance” or “an impediment.” When something is lavelave, it is tangled. In a sense, a faʻalavelave is a tangle since the scale to which Samoans have procured reciprocity has gotten extremely excessive, particularly in communities abroad.

Samoan wealth is circular; this is certainly true of ‘ietoga, fine mats. The ‘ietoga constitute what Marcel Mauss (in Annette B. Weiner) calls “inalienable wealth.” Inalienable, according to Weiner, comes from the French term immeuble, which characterized medieval feudal codes for “landed estate, fixed, real property.” At a faʻalavelave, ‘ietoga begets ‘ietoga; although I would agree with Weiner that this arrangement does not mean a fine mat of equal proportion and beauty is returned. Shore expands that in a complementary relationship—between brother and sister, for example—fine mats are not reciprocated with other fine mats; however, they are a quid pro quo in a symmetrical opposition—between like-status chiefs, for example. Anything less in this instance is cause for unease and ill feelings between the exchanging parties.

While I would hesitate to call ‘ietoga fixed property, what makes them lasting and “fixed,” according to Weiner, is the fact that its possession is always constant. Fine mats are seen in the public domain during faʻalavelave which means they are constantly in motion since there is frequently a funeral, wedding, title investiture, a building dedication, to name a few. Shore notes that fine mats have no value without an exchange or circulation. Twenty years ago, if not earlier, this would have been a bizarre view; however while then, a fine mat stored within a bank of mats accrued value as it aged and that once it was displayed, its

---

14 For a discussion on complementary and symmetrical exchanges in Faʻasāmoa, and a comparison of the social and economic values of fine mats and cash, see Shore, Sala’ilua, 1982, 203-08.
15 Pratt, Samoan Dictionary, 1862, 103
beauty and symbolism made it all the more valuable.\textsuperscript{16} Today, key fine mats during a presentation are returned, evidence that their use is more a confirmation of Samoanness rather than a strengthening of kin connection. However, this must not be construed as the standard across the globe; nonetheless, it was certainly the case when I had my title investiture in 2007 that the fine mat was no longer a requirement for the initiation into the village council. Other villages still require them. Future research will need to address the efficacy of these shifts in socio-economic practices.

Weiner paraphrases Mauss’ explanation of the ‘ietoga and ‘oloa as “two kinds of objects … used in exchange.”

Fine mats (‘ie toga) presented by a woman’s kin to her husband’s kin at marriage are also exchanged at births and deaths. Another kind of wealth (‘oloa), consisting of expendables such as food and traditionally produced and Western manufactured goods are given by the man’s relatives to his wife’s relatives at marriage. Mauss, in noting these sets of exchanges, labeled fine mats and ‘oloa, respectively as “feminine” and “masculine” property. Mauss argued that fine mats, given in marriage by the woman’s side, were ‘more closely bound up with the land, the clan, the family and the person’ than the other property called ‘oloa… [F]inemats were more valued and were held in higher esteem than things called ‘oloa and that the former things were associated with women and the regeneration of some fundamental aspect of kinship identity.\textsuperscript{17}

Philosophically, fa’alavelave demonstrates the sociality of material wealth in Fa’asāmoa where objects and souls are collectively owned by the community; thus any accumulation of goods is temporary and not for individual but group consumption.\textsuperscript{18} Exchanges are not so much regarded as an expending of one’s earnings, but as a confirmation that everyone at some point in time will need assistance; hence, the importance of giving on someone else’s behalf. Essentially, one does not go to the bank for money for a

\textsuperscript{16} Shore, Sala’ila, 1982, 204.
\textsuperscript{18} Simanu, O Si Manu a Ali’i, 2002, 469-470.
coffin; instead, one waits for the extended family to help buy it. However, fa’alavelave economics becomes a “hindrance” when those with pule fa’asoasoa, distributive authority, operate in excess of what their relatives can afford or take the best of the mea e totoe, things that are left over, for their immediate families. When this happens, relatives bypass the family chief and give directly to the person in need.

Thus defined, a fa’alavelave is an exchange of wealth and resources at times of need. This exchange is usually between two families whose children have come together in marriage and is a confirmation of the promise that they have made to protect each other from danger and in times of trouble. The two sides call each other paolo, shelter, and it is incumbent upon each side to secure the safety of everyone connected to each family. This would have been critical in the pre-colonial days when Sāmoa was riddled with civil war and devils on the prowl.19 Identifiably, it is the Teine who are the essence of such exchanges, since they bring to the groom’s family fine mats and tapa, the objects of exchange. Mauss provides this historical confirmation of the critical role that the women play as producers and distributors of wealth. In essence, it is the women who are the conduits of economic power. During a fa’alavelave, it is the daughters and sisters of a family who are tasked with sorting, parading, and then giving of the fruits of their labor.

The key ingredients of Fa’asāmoa are Fa’amatai, fa’alavelave and fine mats. Fa’asāmoa is about matai who are hierarchically ordered in the fono a matai, chiefs’ council. In there, the fa’alavelave traditions are managed by the pule fa’asoasoa and pule fa’aaooga, distributive and exploitative authority respectively, of the orators. Women who

---

19 See Williams, Missionary Enterprise, 1837, 327. He was Tamafaiga Lei’ataua of Manono who was feared by families because of his cannibalistic ways and cruelty to women. He was killed by the people of Ā’ana. His death was avenged by Malietoa Vainu’upo who embraced the new religion and spread it across Sāmoa.
are not chiefs of the council are sisters or feagaiga whose tautua, service, provides chiefs with valuable items of negotiations and exchange.

Samoa’s Teine are a critical element of fa’alavelave economics since they are the “mint” for the production and distribution of the items of exchange—the ‘ietoga, fine mats, siapo, tapa cloth, suau’u, palm oil, lega, turmeric, masoā, sleeping mats, baby mats, daily mats, and costumes for entertainment. Invented in the Vavau, these things constituted the industry of Samoa’s women. At Sāoluafata, the Nu’u o Teine manufactured such goods, acting as the economic base and structure of the village.

This chapter explains and interprets the historical basis of the mālosi, or economic power of the Nu’u o Teine. It is an interrogation of how an ancient victory over thatching a roof—ina’ilau—has relevance to today’s very different economic system. More importantly, it reveals how the idea and practice was subjected to a confusion over roles and implementation, particularly since Sāmoa became an independent nation and struggled to redefine political and economic legitimacy, retool its Fa’asāmoa, and understand the hegemony of Church materialism. Yet, it is easy to lose perspective in paradox, and to ignore the benefits of history; thus this chapter is also a recognition of some such benefits, that is, women’s inventions and creations, few and far between though they may be. Here, I weave and celebrate the Samoan woman’s contribution to the economic well-being of her family and village, and her ability to produce, procure, and trade—if not control—family prestige. Using the story of Saoluafata’s Teine, I weave the fine strips of their intrinsic and extrinsic contributions to the economic development of family, village, and nation from the Vavau to the present in order to reveal a mat that has survived the various textures of their environments over time. It is an aging mat, vulnerable to the aneaanea, biting of the white
ants, of other production lines, but “hanging” by a strip of laulau or laufala, flax, for future generations. These things have survived and adapted alongside the white laces of the church and the plastic tālā of government wages, which are so much sturdier and easier to obtain. Evidently, the ancient legacy has lasted to this day; it is all the more reason to hope that it will propagate well into the future.

As I have argued above, ancient models have survived many challenges across time, not the least of which have been those similar to those enumerated above. Given this resilience, why not revive them and develop for them an infrastructure that supports the efficacy of local assets—land as productive work spaces and women and youth as a productive work forces. For a culture that has sustained its political power through a “unitary system of dispersed authority,” and the mālosi of their organizations—ʻaumaga, organization of untitled men, and aualuma, organization of sisters, for example—it is amazing that a similar approach cannot be implemented. The siphoning of the labor force from the village to core government and business enterprises in town, and migration and the promise of wealth abroad have been anything but efficacious. It has left villages underdeveloped and populations roaming into below poverty statistics.

---

20 Economic reports continue to cite the underdevelopment of rural areas in Sāmoa and the inequities in economic policies; yet, the Samoan government does not seem able to develop an infrastructure that is sustainable to both the environment and culture of Sāmoa. See Fa’amoetauloa Dr. Wood Salele, “Economic Update,” in Samoa National Human Development Report 2006: Sustainable Livelihoods in a Changing Samoa, ed. Asofou So’o (Apia: National University of Sāmoa, 2006), 113-36. Also Sefuiva Reupena Muagututi’a, “The Human Development Indices,” ibid., 47-68.


22 Very few wage jobs are available in the public sector; remittances on the other hand, make up twenty percent of GDP. See Salele in footnote 20 above.

23 Salele, ibid. Based on Samoa’s Human Development Report, it appears that the people of Sāmoa have remained underdeveloped for a variety of reasons, one of which is the fact that there is still no systemic promotion of rural industry such as fine-mat production in Savai’i. See Arlene Griffen, Lalanga Pasifika: Weaving the Pacific: Stories of Empowerment from the South Pacific (Suva: The Institute of Pacific Studies, USP, 2006), for the stories of fine-mat production in rural Savai’i. Blaming the Third World nations for their economic underdevelopment underscores the volatility of small economies such as Sāmoa; however, it is still unconscionable that the status quo has remained. One may conclude that Sāmoa can no longer afford to blame...
Reviving the Echoes of Cape Utusi’a: Clearing, Planting, Processing in the Vavau

In the Vavau, villages teemed with able-bodied men and women who made things and exchanged them when needed and who invented tools and processes as the need arose, without waiting for miracles. In Sāoluafata, women fished at Cape Utusi’a and planted flax, mulberry, and coconut palm. There was a season for planting and fishing, and a season for weaving. There were fine mats to prepare for the next fa’alavelave, and oil for the next dance. In the fifteenth century, word has it that Fineitalaga’s granddaughters Gauifaleai and Totogatā had both married La’auli, Malietoa Uitualagi’s son. Toward the end of that century, the great granddaughters of Sāoluafata, Gato’aitele and Gasoloaiolelagi bore children who would shape the modern politics of the archipelago. These births required volumes of fine mats, tapa cloth, oil, and starch, to name a few of the items that the Teine were responsible for producing.24

Toward the middle of the sixteenth century Sālamasina was crowned the Tafa’ifā, sovereign with the four titles—Tui Ātua, Tui Ā’ana, Gato’aitele, and [Vae]Tamosoāli’i. The heirs of Faiumu and Afuvai needed to weave fast and to travel to Ā’ana to help with the wedding plans. In the family Sā Ta’amai, Tofoipupū was marrying Mālietoa Toatuilaepa, and Muagututī’a, the third Tafa’ifā, was demanding the hand of Toa’s daughter, whom ‘Aumua believes was none other than the daughter of Fa’autagia. In the late 1700s, Tafa’ifā Galumalemana married Teu’ialilo Luafaletele, Sagapolutele’s daughter, and they had

---

24 These connections are featured in chapters three and four.
Tualamasalā. He was one of the aloali‘i, paramount sons, of Galumalemana. They managed the ‘aumaga, but not the Nu‘u o Teine. Clearly, these were fa‘alavelave of intense magnitude, and the Teine were constantly kept busy and apprised of who was marrying whom. Such paramount marriages required huge quantities of the products enumerated earlier.

Perhaps, then, it is worth it to reminisce about the labor and productivity of the Teine in the Vavau, and to celebrate those of the present. This chapter takes a moment to laud the sources and vessels of the ina ‘ilau a tama ‘ita‘i, the women’s work ethics, and to acknowledge as well Saoluafata’s Teine who blazed the trails in the transitions from the fields to the office, and began the lāgaga, weaving, of a different sort, where many of them have thrived as educators, medical professionals, professors, and church wives of the twentieth century. Though many have not been actively involved in the management of the Nu‘u o Teine in the recent past, their remittances over the years must have surely given the homebound sisters a moment of exaltation—a pride in the success of their tapua‘iga.25

For the Teine who may be feeling a marginalization by their brother chiefs and their wives in the Nu‘u o Ali‘i, perhaps this is a reminder for them that they can reclaim credibility by recognizing areas for self-improvement, such as in leadership selection, better economic choices in their backyards, and reasonable approaches to fa‘alavelave economics in order to avoid the excessive materialism that is counterintuitive to sustainable development.26

---

25 Tapua‘iga is the process whereby Samoans pray for the success of their representatives participating in all kinds of activities—whether they are individuals or groups. For an insightful discussion on tapua‘iga, see Tcherkézoff, “Culture, Nation, Society” 2008, 245-302.

26 A growing discourse exists in the Pacific about the role of island women in sustainable development, thus spouting the importance of traditional approaches where women had been the gatekeepers of traditional economics. See Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, “Women's NGOs,” 2000, 97-112.
I posit that the *Teine* may have lost political legitimacy due to a lack of leadership and the ambiguity of their role in family and village economics.\(^\text{27}\) Therefore, if, in their traditional role as *fai’oa*, producers of wealth, the contemporary women cannot produce either fine mats or cash, then what is left for them? Can they still sustain a degree of authority as the *Nu’u o Teine*?

**Theoretical and Historical Intersections:**
*Vavau, First Contact, Church, and Colonial Administrations*

Theoretically speaking, any society may be understood through the ways it organizes its production of wealth or material goods. To do so, according to Marx and Engels, would require an examination of its “forces of production”—land, raw materials, technology, skills, and knowledge,” and the recognition that “social relations of production—who controls the forces of production and how”—constitute the “economic base of a society . . . particularly its political and legal superstructure.”\(^\text{28}\) Marx and Engels’ premise manifested itself in the context of nineteenth century Europe and their condemnation of the evils of capitalism, the bourgeoisie class which produced it, and their effects on race, and class.\(^\text{29}\) They claim that underdevelopment in rural and Third World nations should be blamed on the capitalists from Europe. For this chapter, their basic argument helps to frame a discussion on the shape of the economic power of the *Teine* and what it may have looked like across the various eras of its development in village and national politics. Specifically, if, according to a Marxist interpretation, economic power is the ability to create wealth through production and trade, then in what way have the *Teine* engaged in the production and distribution of family and

---

\(^{27}\) (Eseta Nuualiu Sape, pers. comm., Sāoluafata, December 2007).


\(^{29}\) *Ibid.*
village *tamāo ‘āiga*, wealth, particularly when capitalism and Christianity arrived in Sāmoa? How were their modes of production and social relations affected?

Capitalism by way of colonialism and Christianity did affect modes and forces of production in Sāmoa. Its effects on the role of women in production and the efficacy of their industry in family and community relations have also been evident at Sāoluafata. Prior to westernization, village life was organized in groups reflecting a division of labor, with males and females separated into four formal groups: *fono a matai*, chiefs’ council, *aualuma*, sisters’ organization, ‘*aumaga*, untitled men, and *faletua ma tausi*, chiefs’ wives. Aiono calls these concentric circles, *saofa’iga*. The youth and children also had their own circle. Although they were not formally organized, they were, nonetheless, a very critical component of the labor force. Aiono’s recognition of a circle for the children and youth foreshadows the fact that as heirs to titles and lands, they, too, have every right to determine how they are used, and can appeal in court should they sense a misrepresentation of such rights by others. Whether any such appeals have occurred since the rights of heirs were constitutionalized is not yet known; nevertheless, it does not mean that there have been none. This may be a topic for future research.

Historically, labor and production operated under sanctions imposed by the chiefs, and those with distributive authority supervised the work across a spectrum of expectations. There were days when groups met, especially when a village was preparing for a special occasion. On a daily basis, however, each family gathered at the chief’s house either in the early morning or in the evening after dinner to discuss the agenda of the day. In

---

30 Le Tagaloa, *Fa’asinomaga*, 1997, 12
times of war, gaps in the labor force were quickly filled by those left behind, mainly women and children. Wives tended to the production of food, while sisters tended their bushes; the weaving could not stop because there was always something requiring fine mats and tapa cloth. However, during the postcolonial period, a massive relocation of labor out of the village left a long lasting effect on traditional modes of production and distribution of wealth.33

The question of whether economic power was possible without political power can be traced through the journey of three discourses of Faʻasāmoa and how they shaped and in turn were reshaped by their agents—the women of Sāoluafata. These discourses are: feagaiga, inaʻilau a tamaʻitaʻi, and faʻalavelave. These ideologies interdependently regulated the socio-economic development and political agendas of the Samoan people for centuries.

From the deep past through the colonial period, the Teine of Sāoluafata, for instance, were able to sustain their political power because of what was popularly known as feagaiga ideology, which dictated the kinds of power relations between them and their brothers and the faʻalavelave ideology inherent in them.34 The manifestation of these economic relations was evident in the gendering of labor along certain principles, and the working psychology of the inaʻilau a tamaʻitaʻi, the ancient model of industriousness, skill, and work ethics.35 Sisters were bound by feagaiga politics in terms of the manufacturing of items of kinship exchanges such as the ‘ietoga, fine mats, siapo, tapa cloth, suauʻu, coconut oil, lega,

---

34 Penelope Schoeffel, “Women’s Associations in the Rural Economy of the South Pacific: Case Studies from Western Samoa and East New Britain Province, Papua New Guinea,” (Noumea: South Pacific Commission Report, 1983), 7-10. This report traces in amazing detail the changes in Samoan women’s industry from the Vavau to the twentieth century, from goods-based production to one of service in the colonial and postcolonial periods.
35 Fairbair-Dunlop, Tamaʻitaʻi Samoa, 1998. See also Simanu, O Simanu a Aliʻi. 2002.
turmeric, and *masoa*, starch, to name a few. As well, sisters produced costumes for their brothers for ceremonial purposes. All the while, they were expected to uphold a high degree of *mamalu*, dignity and social power, by observing the virginity code—the focus of the next chapter.

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, colonial and Christian constructs dramatically influenced *feagaiga* politics and economics; Sāoluafata was not exempt from the sweeping changes implemented by them as the village was thrown into merchant, colonial, and mission enterprises. The use of Saoluafata Bay as anchor for German ships in the late nineteenth century, for example, affected economic development and its population demographics. Capitalist projects of the pre- and colonial eras of the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries added Chinese, German, and British elements to the gene pool. The Chinese coolies were brought to Sāmoa to work on the coconut plantations because the Samoans did not see the need to do so since they had their own lands to care for—besides, who would want to work from eight o’clock in the morning to four in the afternoon? The Germans had been in the vicinity of Sāoluafata for a while and some of them were buried there.

Prior to the Berlin Treaty of 1899, Germany, Great Britain, and the United States had been heavily involved in bending the Samoan will toward adopting Western political,

---

38 The current holder of the Tagaloa title is Donald Kerslake; his father also held the title. They are of British ancestry. The current holder of the Tululautū title is part Chinese. A student at the University of Hawaii School of Medicine is Tui Lauilefue, whose great grandmother married a Chinese of the plantation years. *(Fa’amatuāinu Filemoni Lauilefue, pers. comm., Honolulu, June 2007).* For insights into the mixed-race populations of the colonial period, see Meleisea, *Modern Samoa*, 155-182. For a history of political protest over economic policies and their outcomes in colonial Samoa, see Hempenstall and Rutherford, *Protest and Dissent*, 1984, 18-43.
economic, and social systems.\textsuperscript{40} The consequences of their decisions led to numerous epidemics and induced famines, as well as a traumatic reduction in population. The Spanish flu of 1918 killed at least 8,000 or one-fifth of the population of Western Samoa.\textsuperscript{41} No record exists detailing who lost relatives in this tragedy, but ‘Aumua claims that Aunt Sipi’s eyes might have been affected by the flu virus since she was born in 1918 when the virus-laden \textit{HMS Tulane} sailed into Apia harbor. \textit{Sisipi} or \textit{sesepe} are slang terms for cross-eyed. Nonetheless, fear of subsequent pestilences required appropriate mechanisms to keep diseases at bay; hence, the initiation of the \textit{komiti tumamā}, hygiene or health committees, by an American female doctor in the 1930s.\textsuperscript{42}

The war years of the 1940s witnessed a major shift in the kind of work available to Samoan women as well. According to ‘Aumua, during World War II, the arrival of American marines and road construction lured many of the male teachers and nurses away from the classroom and medical facilities for better pay, thus paving the way for women to become teachers and nurses.\textsuperscript{43} Today, these professions are still overstaffed by women.\textsuperscript{44} As the world moved towards decolonization in the postwar years, Samoa’s move toward independence demanded a skilled labor force that required training overseas, especially to assume leadership roles. A few of Luafata’alae’s descendants were a part of this scheme.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{40} Wendt, “Guardians and Wards,” 1965, 21-24.
\textsuperscript{42} Schoeffel, “Women’s Association in a Rural Economy 1983, 2.
\textsuperscript{43} Simanu-Klutz, “‘Aumua Mata’itusi Simanu: Lifestory of a Samoan Educator and Orator in Diaspora,” 2001, 78.
\textsuperscript{44} (Papali’i John, pers. comm., Public Service Commission, Apia, January 2008).
\textsuperscript{45} Simanu-Klutz, “‘Aumua Mata’itusi Simanu,” see notes #133 and 134 for details on the New Zealand scholarship scheme that took Samoans of middle school age for a complete immersion in New Zealand culture. ‘Aiono Fanaafi Le Tagaloa and Albert Wendt were part of this program.
Teine as Fai’oa: Feagaiga Economics

In an illuminating introduction to the construction of Samoan identity, Aiono grounds the feagaiga both in the sanctity of the “cult of virginity,” and in the practical reality of her nafa, roles and responsibilities.46 She establishes the moral foundation of a feagaiga as teinemuli, virgin, who demands the protection of her brothers as the i’oimata, corner of his eye.47 She is his political, economic, and spiritual support. She is also the

![Figure 8. ‘Ietoga, Fine Mat of Old Samoa](image)

fai’oa, producer of wealth, ositaulaga, priestess, pae ma le auli, peacemaker, taulâsea, healer, faiā’oga, teacher (of family lore), taupou, she who sits on the side post, and tausala,

---

47 In the same sense as someone who is the “apple of [someone’s] eye.”
she who is offered as sacrifice or payment to save her family from being annihilated because of an alleged sin.\textsuperscript{48}

As fai’oa, the feagaiga were charged with the production of Samoa’s objects of exchange—fine mat, tapa cloth, coconut oil, starch, and turmeric, and so forth. In the past, production began with individual cultivation of flax and mulberry bushes for fine mats and tapa respectively, and culminated in group manufacturing at the fale lalaga, weaving house. The production of oil, starch, and turmeric were outdoor activities, but they required more labor and space. However, the production of turmeric was restricted to particular villages and perhaps the reason why it has not been able to survive. Women of my generation did not use turmeric.

Production was time consuming and women were often confined to their homes to weave and beat cloth; their brothers were more at will to venture afar in their farming and fishing expeditions. The long processes were labor intensive and engaged women of all ages at various production points; even the young girls were useful in fetching drinking water and banana leaves for those who smoked.\textsuperscript{49} These industries were true of the women’s activities until modernization, first introduced by the colonial governments and then by the development discourse of the recent decades. There is not enough room in this study to detail the production of each item listed; nonetheless, the emphasis here is the fact

\textsuperscript{48} Le Tagaloa, \textit{Fa’asinomga}, 1997, 19. Le Tagaloa cautions against the misuse of the terms \textit{taupou}, \textit{tausala}, and \textit{‘augafa apace}. \textit{Taupou} refers to a person of paramount status who sat at the middle post at the side of a guest/meeting house. A village virgin has the right to sit at such designation. \textit{Tausala}, on the other hand, refers to a taupou who is used by a family or village to stop an invading force from burning down the village by offering herself as punishment. In Samoan cosmology, when Lu, Tagaloaālagi’s son, discovered who had stolen his chickens, he chased them up through the ten heavens until at the eighth, Tagaloaālagi ordered \textit{Lu} to stop and to take his daughter Lagituavalu as wife, an appeasement of the sin committed by his (Tagaloa’s) kin. \textit{Tau} also means cost; \textit{sala} is sin.

\textsuperscript{49} (‘Aumua and Samalā’ulu Mata’itusi, pers. comm., Saoluafata, December 2007). I also participated in the production of fine mats and other materials as a young girl until I was twelve when I moved to Apia for high school.
that while the brothers were charged with taking care of the basic sustenance of families, the sisters’ roles were by no means secondary in value or any lighter than those performed by the men—at least not until the fine mat and other traditional items were relegated to secondary importance by a cash economy.  

Shore documents a male perspective in noting that women’s work was “light;” to the contrary, it was back-breaking, boring, and time consuming. The weaving houses, nonetheless, offered a relief from the mundane pace of village life. They were also sites of contestations and entertainment. Gossip, sometimes lewd dancing, and the eruption of tempers resulted in a certain degree of physical contact. These were stereotypically regarded as normal means by which women endured the lulling effects of weaving, the back-breaking beating of the tapa stick, the long waits for their men to return from fishing trips, or *malaga*, which always required a number of brothers and husbands to travel.

Yet, since the colonial period, the roles of sisters have shifted as new ideas and systems took precedence over old ones and to a large extent forced a specialization of skills, and a resulting mass migration away from the land. These included the draining effects of formal education and wages in lieu of subsistence labor and production; eventually in the postmodern era, new generations of women would have to redefine their work spaces and ethics to meet the excessive demands of a modernizing nation.

---

52 (‘Tilau Sialava’a, pers. comm., Napier, December, 2010; Fu’a Seumanutafa, Facebook comm., Rotorua and Honolulu, January and February 2011). From personal experience, young girls were forbidden from getting close to the weaving houses lest they saw behaviors that young virgins were not supposed to see. Of course, much of the lewd behavior was displayed by old widows. I remember also how the elder ladies were quite comfortable going around topless in their fale, even in mixed company. The church had already been around for a century and a half.
Notwithstanding, the fine mat has remained a critical item of exchange in *fa’alavelave* economics like funerals and weddings. However, it has also become an expensive commodity to produce, or procure, and it has lost much of its grace and value since fast travel has required fast production. Today, the fine mat is made of the same flax that is used to make sleeping mats. The strips are wider and more coarse. The *lau’ie*, the original ingredient, unfortunately, is rare and very difficult to process.\(^{55}\)

Nonetheless, the resilience of the fine mat and tapa cloth as cultural symbols warrants a celebration in this study. Just as the *pālagi* had and continues to value gold, the dollar, and treasury bonds, so too has Sāmoa continued to produce its fine mats, tapa, and to a lesser extent, oil and necklaces. The turmeric has been replaced by Oil of Olay, Oscar de la Renta, and Chanel, or their cheaper versions, and starch has now taken the form of imported tapioca.

The *feagaiga* and the *ina’ilau a tama’ita’i* have become the “industrial” model that Samoa’s women have used to keep families and village organizations current. In the next section, the origin of the term *ina’ilau* is provided. Meanwhile, Pratt defines the *ina’ilau* as a “row of thatch.”\(^{56}\) ‘Aumua explains that when thatching the outside of the dome of a Samoan house, a row of thatch is made first from the base and then moves up towards the top, or *taualuga*. Though typically men’s work, the successful thatching of a legendary dome in the *Vavau* was a breaking point for the proverbial “glass ceiling” for Samoa’s women, thus marking the origin of the adage that women always achieved their goals.

---

55 For stories on fine mat production as a cash crop, see Griffen, *Lalanga Pasifika*, 2006.
The phrase, *ina'ilau a tama'ita'i*, is a symbolic expression of the Samoan woman’s economic power at all levels of society. In all realms of consciousness—whether personal or professional, traditional or modern, political, economic, or religious—the *ina'ilau a tama'ita'i* has become the ideology by which Samoa’s women perform their labor, sustain solidarity, and validate themselves as *suli* and *feagaiga* in equal footing with their menfolk. To this day, when Samoan communities plan and execute projects of all sorts, women are the key to executing them to their logical conclusion. It is common knowledge among Samoans that the (traditional) wealth of the Samoan nation is still largely dependent on the labor and industry of its women.

Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop speaks about the *ina'ilau a tama'ita'i*, as a model of *tautua*, service, and *mamalu*, respect, in her introduction of the story-tellers in her landmark publication, *Tama'ita'i Samoa: Their Stories (Samoan Women)*. Here, she claims that whether sister, high chief’s wife, orator’s wife, or untitled man’s wife, Samoan women have been guided by the spirit of the sisters in the *Vavau* who demonstrated a thing or two about work ethic and environmental knowledge.⁵⁷ According to Fairbairn-Dunlop there was a chief named Tautunu from the village of Faleālupo, Savai’i who was having a *faletetele*, guest house, built. He sought the help of the *aualuma*, organization of the daughters, and *‘aumaga*, of the untitled sons of the village, to thatch the roof. He hoped the men and

---

women would take just a day to do the job; unfortunately, by sunset, only one half of the roof was covered and that was the side thatched by the aualuma. The chief was apparently so upset with the men that he cursed the house and turned it to stone. Figure 9 above is a current view of the spot at Faleālupo where the thatching competition purportedly took place.

‘Aumua on the other hand, locates the phrase in the courtship traditions of Sāmoa—the tōfale’auga. In Samoan mythology, a well known name in the affairs of the heart was Tinilau. Tinilau was a mānaia, paramount son, of Sāvavau, Savai’i who went on a tōfale’auga, courting trip, to Faleālupo, a village at the western end of Savai’i. Sināleana lived there as the ‘augafā’apaе, paramount sister, with her chaperones and entourage of
daughters and sisters of the village. As soon as Tinilau arrived with food and gifts, they engaged in pōula, night of teasing and joking. Tinilau knew that Sināleana was a difficult prize to win and was therefore determined to spend all night if he had to until her ladyship concurred. The pōula was lasting longer than expected and Sināleana did not care for all the attention her suitor and his companions were showering on her. She posed the final challenge: the paramount chief’s faletele needed thatching and what better way to please him than to have his roof thatched in a day. For this purpose, the two groups would compete the next day to see who would fully roof or thatch their half of the house before sunset. The crowd concurred and the village immediately went silent.

When Tinilau and his boys emerged from their sleep, the sun was high and the girls were halfway up the roof; a few hours later, the sun sank beneath the waves, thus making it impossible to lay another row of thatch. The girls, of course, had au, completed, their ina’ilau, their rows of thatch. Thus shamed, Tinilau and his men beat a rapid retreat out of Faleālupo, leaving Sināleana and her girls to celebrate their victory and knowledge that at Faleālupo, the sun, though slow to rise in the morning, sank abruptly in the evening.58

As imperfect as these traditional models may have been, they continue as valid blueprints of women’s work, particularly in weaving and making tapa. For the Nu’u o Teine, their ina’ilau is their council, founded by their fearless ancestors, Luafatā’alae and

---

58 Simanu, O Si Manu a Ali’i, 2002. The thatching competition above is remembered by the statement, E au le ina’ilau a tama’ita’i. Samoans, like academics, also believe in the power of evidence, or lagi soifua, particularly when it comes to their politics and economics. These are popularly known as vavau. A vavau is regarded as possessing supernatural power partly because of its pre-historical existence. At Faleālupo, there is a cave with an entrance that looks like a fale, half of which is covered. See figure 9 above for a view of the entrance to the cave. According to ‘Aumua, there is a stone platform in the cave that the people of Faleālupo say was a seat for the Mālietoa when he visited. While visitors may enter and look around, they were prohibited from sitting on this armchair-looking rock in it. ‘Aumua also claims that when she visited in the 1950s, she sat on a huge rock resembling an armchair and her guides were horrified that she might be fasia, possessed, by the spirit of Mālietoa. Though this did not happen, she still felt that she was just lucky to have escaped such a fate.
Taeolalopu’a. It is a tremendous source of power for them. For them, there need be no other explanation for its survival than to assume that the ancestors ought to have been blessed with the skills to make things and to govern production and distribution. They ought to have had the political will, the economic sense, and the personal charisma to develop wealth and distribute them; in return, their sustenance and protection from their feagaiga, their brothers, was guaranteed.

The fa’alavelave were manageable, because the currency for the exchanges was made by their own hands and distributed by themselves; they understood the value of each mat or the relevant amount of oil and starches to produce. As paramount daughters themselves, they knew their eligibility to become paramount wives was very high; thus the need to produce more currency for future exchanges. Paramount wives often returned home to have their children—some stayed even longer—providing Sāoluafata with capable leaders and executors at any point in time—some were autocrats, others much calmer and probably more effective. Under such leadership, the Nu’u o Teine was maopopo, cohesive, and their industry unquestioned; but then the moa folau sailed into Saoluafata Bay.

Such was the pulse of the village communities before and even in the early years of modernization. At Sāoluafata, the Teine planted, harvested, and manufactured these goods under the authoritarian control of Tululautu’s or Teu’ialilo’s tulāfale, orators. Their products were tangible and countable. And even with the advent of outside forces, the transition from the fields to a different work place was gradual—that is, until commerce and travel to and out of town was popularized by the labor movements of the latter half of the twentieth century. Samoa’s most valuable resources—its people—were required to staff the meat packing houses of New Zealand. Mass migration in the 1950s and 1960s uprooted
many families—first the father, then the mother, and then the children. In the 1970s, education abroad attracted nieces and nephews as well, a trend that has continued to this day.\(^{59}\)

In the absence of real data on *Teine* migration, one cannot know how development affected the constitution and execution of their affairs; however, one can deduce from within the wider context of Samoa’s women that the cash economy created a sense that working in an office was much better than working in the fields.\(^{60}\) World system economics was luring the Samoan *Teine* into a different type of “wealth” production; *fa’alavelave* ideologies adjusted as well. Consequently, families saw formal education and wage employment as a more efficient way of accommodating their obligations to kin and, more critically, to the church.

*Fa’alavelave* economics underwent a fascinating and excessively expensive evolution with the advent of capitalism and colonialism. By the postcolonial era, *fa’alavelave* economics had gotten out of hand—fine mats devolved into rough, sleeping-mat quality, money was replacing them even faster, and with the revival of the weave bigger and whiter mats have appeared, some selling for at least one thousand dollars. For at least three decades between the 1970s and 1990s, fine mats circulated strongly between Sāmoa and overseas communities. What infiltrated and made their distribution expensive was the commodification of small mats called *lalaga*, which were rolled into bundles of ten and

---

\(^{59}\) Perhaps there has been no better way in capturing this experience than in the novels and plays of the renowned Wendt, a son of Sāoluafata. The dislocation of people, their sense of cultural loss, and fortunately with time, the ability to redefine identities, are best portrayed in *Sons for the Return Home* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1973), and *The Songmaker’s Chair*, 2004.

relayed in conveyor-belt fashion during gift exchanges. The culture of the bundles created much stress for those that delivered them much to the chagrin of the airlines and airport personnel. Recently, however, and to most people’s delight, the Samoan government banned the use of these small fine mat bundles during fa’alavelave and urged a return to an exchange of the chiefly mats, which were fewer and easier to manage. New Zealand and Australian communities have followed suit; Hawai‘i and American Samoa have yet to totally purge these. By and large, Samoa’s fa’alavelave system has made many people gasp as funeral, wedding, and title expenses have skyrocketed while revenues have underperformed.\(^{61}\)

Saoluafata’s Nu’u o Teine was not exempt from the labor movement from rural to urban areas. Their ina’ilau had been their village council, the foundation of their pule, which set them apart from sisters in other villages. Other Teine are also feagaiga in their own right, but they are answerable to a village council that has historically been male. This gives them a status on par with Nāfanua and Salamāsina in terms of political influence. However, while Luafata’aale’s and Taeolalopu’a’s pule was confined to the Evaloa plains, there is no doubt that their descendants from the Mālietoa (1400 C.E.) era to those of Salamāsina (1500 C.E.) and Sā Tupuā (1600 C.E.) have shaped Saoluafata’s political framework both as a powerful mechanism of control and as a nu’u pa’ia, sacred village, protected by their divine genealogies and guarded possessively by the Fa’amatai.\(^{62}\)

---

\(^{61}\) When Sāmoa introduced this change at the beginning of new millennium, I gave away the numerous bundles in our home storage.

A word of caution, however, needs to be laid out. Notions of sacredness and divinity did not preclude the Teine of Sāoluafata or Samoa’s feagaiga from planting bushes of flax, rows of mulberry trees, or patches of sugarcane for thatch. However, it is during formal occasions that their sanctity and divinity are obvious— that is, through the place they occupy in the meeting house: the paramount and lesser chieftesses reside at the posts on the side while the orators line the front and back. Their titles and status commanded an artistry in and for their production; on a daily basis and in their tapa wraparounds and perhaps a few necklaces for a cheerful disposition, the Teine of Sāoluafata got dirty and tired. The bushes were not too tall so they did not need ladders to harvest or heavy machinery to sow the seeds or push saplings into the soil. The bushes were situated within walking distance of their residences so they could carry their harvests on their backs without much straining. And since Sāoluafata was a coastal village, the sea was within walking distance, making it easier when it was time to bleach the flax strips for the fine mats.63

Peak hours for outdoor phases of production were early morning before the dew evaporated, and in the coolness of the evening breeze when the sun was at a twenty degree angle in the west. This was their work according to the journey of the passing sun, the slight variations of the tropical seasons, and the support of their brothers, wives, and daughters. Since Saoluafata’s Teine were genealogically paramount, there was much needed to produce; paramount weddings were common, paramount births numerous, and naturally, paramount deaths, which required so much more currency with which to please the paramount gods.

63 ‘Aumua confirms the hustle and bustle of village communities before migration left many villages empty and sleepy. (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Kaneohe, February 2011).
Blueprints of the *Ina’ilau* in the *Vavau*

*Siapo*, Tapa/Bark Cloth

The prototypes of the *Teine*’s industry came from various islands of the archipelago. First, the *siapo*, tapa cloth, was invented by Sinā’a’ele of Ā’ele, an inland village south of Apia.\(^64\) Besides its practical utility as clothing and covers for sleeping, the *siapo* was also a part of a repertoire of costumes known as the *maniti a tamāli’i*.\(^65\) It came in various sizes depending on its use; it was tough to process and took longer to create the final product. During initial contact with European explorers, the Samoan chiefs and chieftesses were observed to be wearing a certain kind of cloth. This could be no other cloth than *siapo*. By the end of the eighteenth century, a preference for European cloth was evident as Samoans discovered that this new cloth was not vulnerable to water.\(^66\) *Siapo* easily disintegrated in the rain, hence the observation that red cloth was a preferred item of exchange with the strangers, not nails or other iron products. When the missionaries came, one of their first priorities was to rid Sāmoa of its nakedness. At the dawn of the twentieth century, the use of *siapo* had been limited to ceremonial status. In the middle of the same decade, *siapo* had also become a popular tourist souvenir—thus its emergence as a wall hanging.\(^67\)

Another adaptation of a more practical sort emerged in the late 1960s and has become commonplace today. It appears that public and private employees have come to

---

\(^{64}\) Simanu, *O Si Manu a Ali’i*, 2002, 326-38. Much of my description of the processing of the tapa cloth is detailed by ‘Aumua in this publication. Numerous sources are to be found online, but they do not have the details or the historical references. See also the text by Sean Mallon, *Samoan Art and Artists: O Measina a Samoa* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002), 64-73.

\(^{65}\) Simanu, *O Si Manu a Ali’i*, 2002, 303-40


\(^{67}\) Spearheading this adaptation was Mrs. Mary Pritchard of American Samoa who transferred her designs onto smaller tapa cloth ranging in size from as small as a square foot to more than three feet. See Mallon, *Samoan Art and Artists*, 2002, 64-73.
favor ‘elei prints as uniform in both Samoas. It is therefore a rare scene in Apia to see a Samoan worker in a skirt and top; the woman’s postcolonial body is clothed in ‘elei printed puletasi while the men wear plain ‘ie faitaga, pocket lavalava, and printed shirts.

Figure 10. ‘Elei Printing

‘Ietoga, Fine Mat

The ‘ietoga culture has also experienced a transformation, one which has strengthened its exchange if not commodification—albeit at the expense of a fine weave. Invented in Tula, Tutuila, by Maofa circa the twelfth century, the fine mat appeared not to have gained its prominence as the most valuable item of exchange and beauty in Fa’asāmoa until it became the mat of refuge for Tauoloāsi’i and her relatives, who were enslaved by Tui Tonga circa 1200 C.E. Threatened with death, Tauoloāsi’i unfurled her fine mat and softened the king’s heart with a graceful apology. Tui Tonga pardoned and then sent them back to Sāmoa. This is believed to have been the origin of the tradition of ifoga, public

---

68 ‘Elei is screen printing, which in the traditional way requires an ‘upeti, carved motifs; today, stencils are used.
apology, of Sāmoa. 69 This is also believed to be the origin of the naming of the fine mats for the paramount chiefs. This mat received its two names of Pulouoleola, hat of life, and Tasi’aeafe, one in a thousand. 70 At Sāoluafata, the mat for Teu’ialilo and Sāgapolutele is called Falavasa, ocean mat, while that of Tululautū and Tagaloa is Aneanea Punapuna, long standing or growing in quantities. 71

Nowhere else in Sāmoa are its chiefs honored as fine mats. At Sāoluafata, the honorific for the paramount chiefs and chieftesses is Ie e lua, the two fine mats. Its origin is not clear; however, it is possible that Saoluafata’s connections to all the paramount families aptly make them “mats.” Generally, it was customary that as soon as a son or daughter was born, a mother began weaving. A fine mat could easily take twenty years to make. If it were a son, a mat was made for his title investiture; for a girl, an i’e tū, wedding mat, also known as i’e āvaga, elopement mat, which was presented to her to keep for her first daughter. 72

Other Items of Exchange: Suau’u, Oil, Masoā/Ufi, Starch, and Lega, Turmeric

Additional evidence of the ina’ilau included the production of coconut oil and turmeric for medicinal and cosmetic purposes, respectively, leis, and dance costumes such as the tuiga, chiefly ceremonial headdress. The coconut oil was once a huge annual production activity in the lives of Samoa’s women, but, while still used today, it is now produced in factories mainly for export and hotels. The lega, or turmeric, has unfortunately been eliminated from Samoan customs. In the past, only the women of paramount families of

69 Simanu, O Si Manu a Ali’i, 2002, 311.
70 Ibid.
71 Pratt, Samoan Dictionary, 1862, 118. According to Pratt, aaneana refers to something of “long standing” as applied to the mālō, government or victory. It also means a large quantity, too much to be attended to and is thus vulnerable to being eaten by white ants. Anea means “to be eaten by white ants.”
72 For a list of what the fine mat is symbolic for, see Simanu, O Si Manu a Ali’i, 2002, 314.
specific districts produced lega, which was made from the roots of a creeper known as ‘ano that was considered temperamental and disappeared at times, perhaps due to deforestation.

The first turmeric and oil production was done by Talai of Si’uamoa. She introduced the mixing of coconut oil and turmeric as a lotion for dancers and men on a courtship trip.73

Other Ina’ilau from the Vavau

Other inventions or “firsts” by women of the Vavau included kava, the coconut tree, the milamila, and the ‘ula. The first kava is believed by some to have been planted by Mulivaioalele of Vaimauga, while the first coconut tree was put in the ground by Sinālaloataata of Laloata, Vaimauga. Matuna of A’ea i Sisifo, Savai’i plaited the first milamila, upper body covering of coconut leaves, which Nāfanua wore during the war with A’ea i Sasa’e.75 Known in modern Sāmoa as the tiputa, this type of garment was later made of tapa cloth, and even later out of de-ribbed umbrella canvas for daily use. Finally, the first ‘ula, flower garland or lei, was made of sigano and the sweet smelling fala, ripening pandanus fruit. It was made by the rat-looking Metotagivale who lived in a cave and used it to lure the handsome Alo as husband. She succeeded and would only release Alo when he agreed to build her a house of garland and posted with the wood of the toa tree.76

Textile manufacturing in Europe did not sprout until the eighteenth century, although its pre-industrial times, the putting out system had been around for a long time. This latter

---

73 See Simanu, “O le ‘Ina’ilau a Tama’ita’i i le Saofaiga a Gagana” (paper, FAGASĀ conference, Palmerston North, New Zealand, 2002.)
74 Vaimauga is a sub-district of the Tuamāsaga district on ‘Upolu. The town of Apia is situated here.
75 Matuna and her husband of the same name were instructed by Nāfanua to fight the enemy on the other side of the road and that they were not to cross over under any circumstances. They failed to follow orders, thus they were killed by Nafanua’s magic weapons. See Simanu, O Si Manu a Ali’i, 2002, 303-40.
76 /casuarina/. See Krämer, The Samoa Islands: Material Culture Vol. 2, trans. Theodore Verhaaren, (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1995), 248. The famous Samoan proverb from this relationship is, O le fale na i Amoa, e lau i ‘ula ‘ae pou i toa, which means “there is a house in the village of Amoa (Savai’i) which is thatched with leis and propped up by trunks of the toa tree.” It is applied today to embrace a successful and peaceful gathering of Samoan chiefs and other dignitary. For a full text in Samoan of these ina’ilau a tama’ita’i, see Simanu, 2002, 303-40.
type of industry was comparable to the manufacturing of the prestigious items of Sāmoa, such as the fine mat, which had already taken root by contact. Today, however, not many women are weaving and it seems that much of the weaving is being done by a few women’s committees. Acknowledging the women’s accomplishments in the Vava’u is done each time they are presented in gift-giving oratory; unfortunately, not much has been said about women’s accomplishments of the colonial and postcolonial periods.

Contemporary Ina’ilau: Teine as Professionals

This section sets up a contrast to the previous section in terms of the discussion around the labor and production mechanisms of family and village industry. Snippets of information from a few Teine would lead one to conclude that the land was no longer perceived as a viable space for “making wealth,” particularly as the cash economy meant obtaining desired goods and services instantaneously. Moreover, this new economy meant that many of them left for good, only to return to the village periodically during fa’alavelave.

A notable Teine who has been numerously cited in this study is the Afioga a le La’au na Fausia, Aiono Dr. Fanaafi Le Tagaloa, [nee Maiai], of the Sā Tagaloa family. Afioga Aiono was sent to New Zealand as one of the young Samoans who participated in the New Zealand scholarship program when she was only thirteen years old. She graduated from Great Britain’s London University as the first Samoan to obtain a doctoral degree in philosophy. In Sāmoa, she translated some of the English classics like The Black Tulip,

78 During the colonial period, many of Saoluafata’s teine obtained opportunities in education, health, politics, and the church. The scholarship scheme, for example, took many other teenagers to learn pālagi ways of running a government. Many of them were successful and returned to participate in the transition when Sāmoa became independent in 1962.
King Solomon's Mines, and Treasure Island. She is well published in various journals and books about women’s issues in the Pacific. Aiono was the first Samoan and woman to become the director of education.79 In the 1960s, she initiated a cultural revolution during which Samoans began to revalue their language and culture and to rethink the way language was being taught. In the final decade of the twentieth century, she laid the foundations for what has now become the National University of Sāmoa (NUS). When her contract ended with the university, she and her husband, Le Tagaloa Pita Ala’ilima, founded the university known as Le Amosā o Savavau, which is conducted in the vernacular and has been awarding bachelors and master’s degrees for a couple of decades now. Aiono’s passion for maintaining Samoan culture and language and her vision of a citizenry of competent thinkers in the native language has taken root. The university embraces learners who would not otherwise have had access to other world thinkers like Plato, Aristotle, and Descartes had they not learned about them in their own language.80

Aiono’s “thatching” has definitely benefited many other daughters and sons of Sāmoa. Her own daughters have been high achievers, and are faculty and administrators at the university. She was one of the first women to win parliamentary elections in the 1980s from her district. Unfortunately, women in parliament and politics are still few in numbers, although there has been a significant increase in recent years.81

Another “thatcher” has been ‘Aumua Mata’itusi Simanu of both Sā Tagaloa and Sā Sāgapolutele families. ‘Aumua became the first woman principal in Sāmoa in the 1950s when the country was still under New Zealand colonial rule. Just before Independence, Dr.

---

79 The second woman was installed recently and she is Galumalemana Nu’ufou Petaia.
81 When asked about this slow rise of women in government offices, Afioga Fiame Naomi Matā’aña revealed that women were largely guided by a pragmatism as mothers and wives.
Lambie, then director of education, appointed her to the post of school inspector; however, protest from the male staff delayed such a move until 1969 when Aiono became director of education. She confirmed ‘Aumua in that post, who became the first woman school inspector of Western Samoa. ‘Aumua was a member of the *Nu‘u o Teine* in the mid-twentieth century and has since been passionate about keeping the village relevant. Her publications, *The Samoan Wordbook, O Si Manu a Ali‘i* and *‘O Fāiā Fa‘atatūmua* are already proving to be critical texts of Samoan history, culture, and language. At ninety years of age at the time of this writing, ‘Aumua has blazed the trail for Samoa’s women of the colonial and postcolonial periods in education, and especially for the students of Sāmoa, whose cultural classrooms are now the universities. Her entrance into chieftainship in the 1970s at around age fifty received mixed feelings from her male counterparts; however, she has been one more example of the power of Saoluafata’s *Teine* as chiefs under the *pule fa‘amalumalu*, protective authority, of the ‘Āiga Sā Malietoa and ‘Āiga Sā Tūpuā.\(^82\)

Other trail blazers in the modern sense include the late Afioga Telea Luafata who died in her 80s in the mid-2000s in Wellington, New Zealand. She was the first of Saoluafata’s *Teine* to obtain a title in the men’s council due to the absence of male heirs in her family. A nurse by profession, she was perhaps one of the first *Teine* to migrate to a foreign country. Telea Luafata was one of the first of two *Teine* from the village to become nurses—the other was Amilagi Pale’a. Worthy of note is Telea’s niece, Dr. Tamasa’ilau Suali’i-Sauni, who received her doctorate from Auckland University and where she had a stint with the Pacific Islands Center. Tamas’a’ilau was a researcher with the University of

\(^82\) I have established these connections in the previous chapter.
Otago and co-edited a volume of texts by Tui Ātua Tupua Tamasese, Samoa’s Head of State, and other Samoan scholars.  

Following in Telea’s footsteps in the nursing profession in the 1970s were Elisa Auina Pruett, a surgical nurse at Moto’otua hospital who now works in a similar venue in Washington D.C., and her late sister Fa’animo who gave up her profession to marry a pastor. Currently at the University of Hawai‘i’s John Burns Medical School, a descendant of Luafatā’alae is becoming the first teine to be a medical doctor. She is Tui Lauilefue, daughter of Fa’amatuainu Filemoni of Sāoluafata and Ana of Pago Pago, American Samoa. Saoluafata’s Teine have even scaled the heights of church pews as church wives. My own grandmother Tilau was a church wife, as were many of my cousins. Tilau blended her skills as ‘augafa’apae, peacemaker, and faletua, pastor’s wife, to shape her own future as well as those of other village daughters’ in the manufacture of prestigious goods and in the management of efficient households. Much later in the twentieth century, the late Fa’animo Auina Pisa Tiatia became the Secretary of the Congregational women’s national council—no small feat in itself. Lili’a Fuataga, Fu’a Tevaga, and O’omi Saifoloi were also prominent in the administration of the same council. Some of these Teine have also been missionaries in Papua New Guinea. From the flax and mulberry bushes, to executive positions in health, church, and education, Luafata’alae’s descendants have done well in their respective spaces and times, and have produced outstanding sons and daughters as well.

84 (Elisa Auina Pruett, pers. comm., Honolulu, October 2008).
85 (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Kaneohe, Spring 2001).
86 Notably, Susuga Tagaloa Sale Donald Kerslake is the current president of the Lands and Titles Court in Mulina‘u. His father, Tagaloa Siaosi, was also a judge there. A lawyer by profession and a former parliamentarian, Tagaloa has worked diligently to move village projects forward, but most importantly he made a move towards strengthening the situation of the Nu’u o Teine. His two daughters, paramount
Many Teine migrated out of the village in the latter part of the twentieth century and continue to do so even at a very young age. In a Facebook discussion with my most recent informant, Fu’a Seumanutafa, who lives in Rotorua, New Zealand, established that many young Teine left Sāoluafata for New Zealand schools at around the same time. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the New Zealand government opened up opportunities for middle school age students to pursue high school and university education there. She was one of these young people who left.  

Fu’a joined the Nu’u o Teine when she was only five years old, donning the chieftess title of Tili’a of the Sa Mulitalo family. Her father was Mulitalo Ropi, whose title belongs in the Usoali’i, brotherhood of chiefs, of the Sā Tagaloa family. When she was of high school age, she left for New Zealand where she has since become a head teacher or principal in pursuit of a master’s degree in early childhood education. Amazingly, Fu’a could remember numerous names of her generation who left at a young age for education and have ended up staying in New Zealand. She also remembered with fondness her experience in the Nu’u o Teine, especially of how strong and dignified village governance was. She stressed the equal rights afforded both the Nu’u o Teine and Nu’u o Ali’i in the operation of village life. When a member left, a sister or daughter resumed the same title. Thus, when Fu’a left, her sister joined.

Ironically, Fu’a’s sister later left the council due to what she felt was an unfair exercise of the rules concerning pregnancies. Technically, one of the sā of the Nu’u o Teine themselves, have joined the council. There is hope that the Nu’u o Teine may once again regain the strong leadership that brought them forth to this day.

87 Liki-Chan, “Rootedness in Aiga,” 2007, 20-21. Liki-Chan’s study on the women of Samoan and Solomon Island ancestry supports notions of women rooted in culture regardless of their economic and political intentions. Fu’a’s story is reminiscent of Liki-Chan’s girls’ nostalgia for a time when social relations mattered more than the struggle to survive and sustain some level of dignity during the relocation and dislocation of modernization.

88 (Fu’a Seumanutafa, pers. comm., Napier, December 2010).
sanctioned pregnancies out of wedlock. In this case, another Teine under the same condition
was allowed to return to the Nu’u o Teine without paying any fines. To make matters worse,
the culprit was impregnated by a village boy, an infraction that is also sā, or forbidden.
Needless to say, Fu’a’s family is once again represented on the council.

At the time of Fu’a’s membership, the Nu’u o Teine was building the first primary
school building at Sāoluafata. It was a project of pride, joy and bonding, especially on a
fundraising malaga, formal trip, to other villages or overseas communities. It was fun
particularly when she was sandwiched between Aunt Sipi and other elder ladies in the
group. Here, she listened to old tales and enjoyed the elders’ humor on the one hand, and
feared their plain speaking when instructing the younger generations on manners and
productivity on the other. Yet, when asked about a facsimile of the Nu’u o Teine in
Aotearoa, she was at first overwhelmed by the thought because of the geographic distances
separating the Teine; however, a recent communication indicated a growing interest in an
overseas council. It is my hope that this happens, since Sāoluafata could benefit from what
many other villages in Sāmoa have established with their overseas relatives duplicating
village governance abroad. Hawai’i has several of its own in La’ie, although they are of a
different affiliation.89

Teine Sāoluafata

Perhaps the most important Teine to celebrate are those that have remained in the
village. Their endurance of political, economic, and social challenges deserves an accolade.
Table 1 in chapter three lists the Teine who were active in the Nu’u o Teine in December
2007. Collectively, they have sustained the Nu’u o Teine, notwithstanding its

89 In the late 1980s in Hawai’i, members of the said villages participated in island-wide Samoan events. It was
here that I learned that while these chiefs continued to use their titles in their council, they were no longer
affiliated with their foundation villages.
marginalization by some of the brothers. During fieldwork, ‘Aumua and I expressed a need to meet with the Teine as a group. On December 31, 2007, we hosted a New Year’s Eve luncheon and we gave and helped them complete a questionnaire. Many of these women appeared not to have pursued higher education, and many had spent many years living in their husbands’ villages. Some of them since fieldwork have migrated to New Zealand. In the village, most, if not all, of them had indicated a dependence on remittances from relatives to accommodate fa’alavelave and church obligations. On a daily basis, they tended their households and met periodically to discuss the Bingo schedule and how to expend their proceeds. They performed their duties without the tangible leadership of the chieftesses. *Matou te iloa le mea e fai,* “we know what to do,” was their brief response to many of my queries.

Yet, the Teine tuned up a nostalgic tone about aso ia, those days, when the older girls had control of the *Nu’u o Teine.* These predecessors were smart, knowledgeable, and courageous. The girls that were Tululautū ostensibly ruled with an iron hand. 90 Perhaps the longest serving chieftess was *Teu’ialilo Malavai,* who was ordained the augafa’apae or sa’otama ‘ita ‘i when she was twelve years old. She talked about her mother and aunties teaching her food and speaking etiquette and how she could not understand why she was not allowed to eat too much in public, especially when the food looked so good. The village taupou, she related with a chuckle, needed to be graceful and not eat like a pig. It was not tamāli’i, chiefly. She was not allowed to say much, but to listen and rule. Tamāli’i people should not say much for fear of revealing too much of what was in their mind; listening

---

90 (Fu’a Seumanutafa, Facebook comm., February 2011).
meant better decisions. Of course at her young age, her mother and aunts made all the decisions.91

More than sixty years ago, as she was starting out as the village chief, Afioga Teu’ialilo Malavai, did not learn to weave fine mats or to beat tapa; she learned reading, writing, and ‘rithmetic in preparation for a white collar job, which was easier, cleaner, and brought in money. And so it was, she joined the workforce at the Customs Department where she met her late husband, Fa’afetai Leausa. Her mother was outraged and felt that her daughter was marrying down. Teu’ialilo Malavai said that she loved him and that was the end of it. ‘Aumua claims to have been Teu’ialilo’s bridesmaid when her Afioga, in defiance of the wishes of her Mother and council, married the man of her choosing.92 As far as economic power was concerned, she worked at a time when obtaining a white collar job was considered much easier than tending to flax bushes or beating tapa cloth. Monetary pay was a novelty for village women. At the time of fieldwork, very few members of the *Nuu o Teine* were earning wages, and if they did, such wages would have very limited purchasing power.93

*Toe Tepatasi, Reflections*

Oral traditions reveal that three centuries prior to the Sālamasina era, the Tongans had had much influence on Samoan politics and economics through warfare and marriage. Even prior to that, the triangle of Fiji, Tonga and Sāmoa in western Polynesia had engineered their own world system—a site of exchange often highlighted by war and

---

91 (Teu’ialilo Malavai Leausa, pers. comm., Vaivase Uta, July 2007).
92 “Mistress of [her] own favors” is a phrase from “first contact” literature, in Tcherkézoff, *First Contacts*, 2004, 34.
93 A case in point is that of Soonaalofa Pule’ava, a *taule’ale’a*, untitled teine in the *Nu’u o Teine*. When I arrived, I learned that she had quit working in Yasaki factory since what little money she earned was expended on bus fare and lunch.
superstition. For example, tales of a kingdom in the eastern islands of Manu’a speak of Tongans, Fijians, Rarotongans and Samoans paying tribute to the Tui Manu’a; in Samoan mythology, Fijians loom large (tattooing was ostensibly sent from Fiji), and the hegemony of some of Fijian gods is still ritualized in certain villages of Sāmoa.\(^{94}\) Tongan kings, on the other hand, sought connubial partners in Samoa’s women and established a genealogy that influenced paramount families. Essentially, trading among the three peoples had been a common practice.\(^{95}\)

At about the same time, transformations were happening in the far distance as medieval Europe and church repression gave way to the Science Revolution, Age of Enlightenment and Discovery, and eventually, the Industrial Revolution and Colonialism.\(^{96}\) Pacific and European “world systems” were moving toward an encounter; the former braved the vast ocean in sophisticated vessels of their time, and the latter broke away from the contours of their own continent in search of the far flung spices of Southeast Asia. On the way there and back, they “discovered” the far-flung islands of the Pacific, and triggered a series of transformations that have been fascinating, if not problematic.\(^{97}\)

In her seminal essay on social change in the Pacific, Schoeffel discusses how the Pacific moved from a slow incorporation of the colonial period to rapid changes in the post-independence era. Since independence, she argues, the Islanders have needed to assimilate quickly into a world economic order despite having had very little preparation for it during the colonial experience. Consequently, islanders have failed to “catch up” to their former

---


\(^{95}\) For mythical references to Tongan, Fijian, and Samoan cultural and economic trade, see Julia Walwork, ed. *Samoa Ne’i Galo* Volume 5 (Apia: Ministry of Youth, Sports, and Culture Affairs, 1998).


colonial powers, and instead have developed a dependence on foreign aid. This, says Schoeffel, pitched the islanders into “uncertain times” of paradox and irony and a preference for pālagi materialism. Moreover, this period of transition pushed Pacific islanders into the confusion of urbanization, emigration, and churchism. In great detail, Schoeffel accounts for the move by Polynesians and Micronesians to the church as the center of great rewards like cash and food, as well as huge church buildings to which are attached mansion-like living spaces for the ministers, or faife’au.98

According to Schoeffel, perhaps the biggest decline in traditional industry has been in the office of the ‘augafa’apae. The installation of faife’au as feagaiga in villages has resulted in a reduction of the ‘augafa’apae’s political and economic power. It has also led to the removal of traditional school houses where girls were prepared for adult life as they matured. As a result, the ‘augafa’apae could no longer perform prayers, were robbed of young girls to teach, and her chaperones were now required to take care of church grounds and to count dishes, spoons and cups for the pastor, his family and his guests. The young girls were instead sent by their parents to live and learn from the church, which was considered a more secure place for virgins than the fale o le aualuma, house of the sisters’ organization. In place of learning to make tapa and to weave fine mats, the girls were now taught to crochet, knit, and mend tears in their clothes. They also learned scripture and eventually graduated to public education established by colonial administrations in the first half of the twentieth century. This has now been replaced by the fale komiti, committee house, where wives, sisters, and daughters have blurred their roles and statuses.99

---

99 Schoeffel, Ibid.
Fortunately for the girls, public education was accessible to them; although the curriculum did not include local knowledge or methodologies. It was foreign, difficult, and devoid of context. As a result, while the promise had been western education for a better life, most of the students failed the exams and were forced to return to live off the land. Some of them, fortunately, found sponsors in New Zealand for further education and employment. Unfortunately, for those who could not, they found traditional tasks cumbersome if not overwhelming; they had not learned the skills that their mothers and grandmothers had learned as producers and guardians of family and village resources; they were now forced to seek wages in a changing landscape where the demand for jobs was rapidly increasing and overtaxing the supply end. The promise of capitalism and eternal life in heaven were elusive as fa’alavelave and church economics crippled family resources and broke the dreams of youth who were now lounging around town trying to catch a movie or a “two,” or get money from working relatives, who themselves were barely earning enough wages to buy a week’s supply of food.100

The implications of Schoeffel’s text are numerous; ultimately, the cargoism of the lotu, church, in Sāmoa is genuinely accepted by most members as the manuia mai le Atua, blessings from God. The indigenization of the church, says Schoeffel, concretized the Samoan belief in the divine power of the matai, which has ironically been reduced by the church in migrant communities and, to some degree, in Sāoluafata at the time of my fieldwork.101 In the postcolonial transition period, the church in Sāoluafata appears to have exerted much influence in village politics and economics, particularly for activities such as the chiefly tapua ‘iga, prayers, at times of games and war, and in malaga, group travel, for

100 Ibid.
101 Ibid.
weddings, funerals, and title investitures. These have become less a function of the matai, and more that of the pastor and deacons. The church, in my view, has become the biggest fa’alavelave for the Samoans.  

Ideally, fa’alavelave is or should not be about the capitalist pursuit of profits and the accumulation of wealth, nor should it lead to the dependence on others. Rather, it is and should be about interdependence. The obligation to help has been genetically determined: E sosolo i le toto, “it runs in the blood.” Samoan ethos dictates that once a fāiā, connection, is determined, the sense of obligation is injected and regardless of geography, once word of an event is heard, one must travel.

Circular movement in postcolonial Sāmoa has been taken up once again as in the ancestral days, although in extremely different modes of travel. Faster travel to and from a fa’alavelave has made these events much more expensive. However, it is not just in monetary terms that excess is defined; with ease of travel and relaxed customs and immigration policies, so too have the fine mats, tapa, and food in like fashion. In the latter half of the twentieth century, a culture of boxes and trash-bag bundles characterized much of the travel to and from Honolulu and other urban centers. The ticket lines were long and airports eventually had to ban sea cucumbers and sea-urchins from leaving the islands as their corrosive power destroyed the planes’ metal linings. With same day travel becoming more commonplace and with kin labor proliferating, Sāolua fata relatives can be at two places in the same day and return to work a week later. Mobility for fa’alavelave and variations in cultural practices and props were never so rampant.

By the dawn of the twenty-first century, Fa’asāmoa and the fa’alavelave system had become idiosyncratic for each country or region in which Samoans were located—although

102 Ibid.
to date, the excesses have not yet been diminished. The prefix *fa’a* has become a root word and to it has been added the various countries or cities in which Samoans reside; for example, there is the Fa’aniusila (New Zealand Way), Fa’a’ausetalia (Australian Way), and Fa’ahawai’i, (Hawai’ian Way).\(^{103}\) Along with the idiosyncrasies of culture has come the frustration borne by overseas-born Samoans who have experienced differing opinions from their Samoa-born parents in terms of how much to give to a *fa’alavelave*.\(^{104}\) Overseas-born Samoans in New Zealand, for example, have insisted on a new identity that blends both Samoan and New Zealand cultures. Once clarified, however, overseas-born Samoans have become willing providers at *fa’alavelave*, managing to avoid excesses even in more traditional church settings where, by the end of the twentieth century, *fa’alavelave* had become elaborate affairs.\(^{105}\)

When Aunt Sipi passed away in 1998, her relatives from all over the world returned to Sāoluafata for her funeral. The *Nu’u o Teine*, led by Teu’ialilo Malavai and Tululautū Fuea, was also in attendance. They brought tōga, fine mats, and siapo, and stayed overnight to guard her body. They even carried her coffin to the church and then to the grave. Eye witnesses had never seen anything like it before—that is, *Teine* carrying a coffin—but such was the culture of the *Teine*. They made their own decisions, they provided their own labor, and when called upon, they performed their duties as mandated.

The family reciprocated overwhelmingly; there was no *quid pro quo* or a sense thereof—just relatives feeling the mana of Sipi’s contributions to the *Nuu o Teine*. I was told that rows of canned goods and fine mats touched the ceiling of Aunt Sipi’s house. The

\(^{105}\) Anae, *ibid.*, See also Va’a, *ibid.*, 2001.
day was *mamalu*, dignified, and nothing was too expensive for Aunt Sipi’s children and relatives. Yet, when it was just Aunt Sipi’s children gathering to finally mourn their mother, they discovered that this *fa’alavelave* had accrued more expenses than revenue.¹⁰⁶

Accommodating *fa’alavelave* in the past motivated Samoans to nurture their gardens, raise a lot of pigs, and prepare canoes for instant fishing. The women wove the fine mats and beat siapo; there were ‘*ula*, necklaces, to be made on the spot, and, if the event was a funeral or wedding, flowers to be picked for bouquets. *A fa’alavelave* could happen at any time and one needed to prepare to travel immediately. Before the roads reached Sāoluafata, the *Teine* either traveled by foot or by canoe. *Fa’alavelave* could be on the other side of the island and might not be known until much later; no matter, kinship demanded making that trip as soon as circumstances allowed. Today, wages are the key source of the material accommodation of *fa’alavelave*. At Sāoluafata, very few *Teine* worked at the time of research; those of pension age received a small sum of money from the government. Although, one of the younger *Teine* in the Nu’u once worked at the Yasaki factory in Apia. Eventually, she decided to stop working there because she would spend much of her wages on bus fare and lunch, leaving hardly any money for a single day’s family meal.

Prior to the *Fa’apapālagi* era, the chiefs and chieftesses of Sāoluafata had control of the forces and relations of production, growing produce and raising pigs for both individual and group consumption. Under their jurisdiction, social values were developed and manifested in such things as honoring paramount chiefs with the crop of the first harvest, and later, earnings from wage work. The chiefs, in turn, redistributed them across the

¹⁰⁶ (*‘Aumua, pers. comm., Honolulu, 1998, reconfirmed February 2011*). Having given up his passport as guarantee for the inventory of food from the wholesale store in town, one of Sipi’s sons, who resides in New Zealand, spent an extra week in Sāmoa waiting for funds from his children to pay for the outstanding balance. In economic terms, the *fa’alavelave* had gone bankrupt.
breadth of the family or allocated them for various *fa’alavelave*. Many of the non-perishable items travelled from one *fa’alavelave* to another, particularly the ‘ietoga and siapo, the products of the women’s labor as fai’oa, makers of wealth. In this way, families could cut costs wherever necessary.\(^{107}\)

In a traditional village, the gendering of the socio-political structure reflected a gendering of labor. \(^{108}\) Thus, when villagers referred to the organization of untitled men as the *mālosi* of the village, it meant that the men, ranging in age from late teens to the forties, were the physical strength of the village. They did the heavy lifting such as planting, deep-sea fishing, building houses, traditional baking or food preparation, and clearing forests in a subsistence economy.\(^{109}\)

However, when the women were given the same attribute, the fruits of their labor were considered currency for exchanges within and beyond the village. In other words, the fruits of their labor were not for immediate consumption. The Teine’s *tōga*, fine mats, and *siapo*, were articles of wealth.

In the past, when a Teu’ialilo or Tululautū was betrothed to a paramount chief, the mats came out in voluminous numbers in exchange for the groom’s *‘oloa*, items for the exchange, comprising domestic goods like farming and fishing implements, food items, and others. Today for the convenience of travel and time, these local tools have been replaced by cash, and production lines and work in the new work spaces have blurred gender lines.

---

\(^{107}\) (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Sāoluafata, December 2007).

\(^{108}\) Asofou So’o contrasts this with non-traditional villages such as those developed around churches and are common in the Apia area of ‘Upolu. For example, the village of To’omatagi, a suburb of Apia, is a government subdivision for people from outside Apia who had found employment in town but not relatives with whom to stay. The land is fee simple or freehold, yet, people had organized into congregations and forged church communities. Asofou So’o uses the term “foundation” to refer to a traditional village. This means that all the families in the village are related to the founder of the village and included in village *fa’alupega*, honorifics or constitution. See So’o, *Democracy and Customs*, 2008, 154.

Moreover, the products of women’s labor were not immediately needed and they took a while to process, but when completed, they produced valuable articles of exchange that reflected a woman’s grace, talents, and beauty. Their fine weave, made silky and golden brown by age, coconut oil and turmeric, evoke an emotional and spiritual balance to the physical labor that could only be praised by a simple saying during their public unfurling, Sā ō fa’alālelei, “in your giving, beauty is made.”

Historically, the advent of the Christian mission in the early 1800s affected the body politics of the Teine of Sāoluafata at the same level as their fellow Teine elsewhere in Sāmoa. First, attire changed from skirts of leaves and bare breasts to complete coverage of cotton materials. The puletasi was a colonial invention—a simple top overlapping a wrap around cloth covering the lower body. Its production required colonial tools, which to a large extent, removed women from their flax and mulberry bushes to occupations that brought in money with which to buy the materials. What was once the labor of their own fingers had become a waiting game for wages or, in the worst case possible, someone else’s wages. It is not a myth that today most of the Teine of Sāoluafata have someone else sew their clothes for them.

In sum, the industry of women, their ina ‘ilau, has undergone major transformation. Where once labor and products were immediate and tangible; today, labor is expended and the “products” are ambiguous. The Teine of Sāoluafata are mainly engaged in service type activity aligned with church ideology; their mālosi, economic strength, is ambiguous when it comes to personal and family wealth. At the time of fieldwork, people of all ages carried change in search of the next Bingo game. In the final analysis, the answer to Foucault’s

---

question of whether political power is possible without economic power is pursued where Saoluafata’s *Teine* are concerned.
CHAPTER 6:

MANA AND MAMALU: WOMEN’S SPIRITUAL AND SOCIAL POWERS

Introduction: Framing the Sanctity of the Nu’u Pa’ia

When considering the manifestations and results of a woman’s influence in Samoan society, one is struck by how substantive those contributions have been in the maintenance of certain principles of Fa’asāmoa. One can also marvel at the resilience of her spirit notwithstanding the diminishing impact of western religion, colonialism, and migration on her position as the feagaiga of a brother who still holds her as the i’oimata, apple, of his eye and suli of a father who still sees the goodness in her. To these male relatives, a girl will always be Teine. In this chapter, I wish to emphasize the moral significance of referring to the sisters and daughters as Teine instead of the standard term “woman.” Using the latter is problematic since it connotes fafine, the Teine who is no longer a virgin, a very toxic and derogatory branding of an unmarried one. Virginity, and the baggage that surrounds it, structure this narrative. In chapters three, four, and five, I discussed the Teine’s political and economic powers, their derivation, history, and current status, and, in particular, how they pertain to the Teine of Sāoluafata. In this discussion, the political history of Sāoluafata urges one to pause and ponder how notions of mana, spiritual power, and mamalu, dignity or social power, might have played out in a village where the Teine were not under the authority of the Nu’u o Ali’i, but were and are still, themselves, chiefs. In this sense, nowhere else in Sāmoa can anyone lu’i, challenge, the conventional wisdom or ideology controlling the discourse on virginity than the members of the Nu’u o Teine whose status as chiefs might have spared them the pains of fa’amasei’au, or public defloration. For all intents and purposes, it is imperative to argue that Saoluafata’s Teine were not subjected to such a practice because they were chiefs who did not need their virginity for
political and economic gains. Their titles connoted mana and mamalu; they were sufficient for this purpose.

Generally in Sāmoa, the Teine needed to understand their rights as suli and the roles and behaviors expected of feagaiga. Knowing and performing such things helped them to transcend the culture of tau musumusu, scandalous whispering, in Samoa’s body politics.¹ These rights were enhanced and strengthened by their mana ma le mamalu, spiritual and social powers, attributes afforded to gods and virgins.

More than anything else in the realm of the Teine Sāmoa, perhaps the most problematic aspect of sustaining such power had to do with the politicization of her virginity. For her, the politics of the hymen situated her on dangerous grounds, both physically and psychologically, regardless of rank and status—and regardless of whether she was the elected sa’otama’ita’i or ‘augafa’apae to whom all good things were given and for whom a paramount suitor was to be sought, or whether she was a mere teenager just beginning her journey into womanhood.

Historically, Teine Sāmoa were bound by the “cult[ure] of virginity” in which they suffered the brothers’ scrutiny and rage against suitors who failed to follow courtship protocol. More than anything else, a Teine’s mamalu had to be guarded at all times; hence the allocation of her residency at the front and center of the village.²

Until recently, Samoa’s Teine had deferred their right as suli to family titles to their men folk in return for moral and economic support. As feagaiga, they understood their roles in sustaining the public image and reputation of their families and villages through their work as fai’oa, producers of wealth, taulasea, healers, ositaulaga, priestesses, pae ma le auli, peacemakers, and tausala, sacrifice, in times of conflict. For almost two centuries, however,

¹ For an enlightening discussion on the differences between the whispers of tu ‘u musumusu and tau musumusu, see Tui Ātua, “Whispers and Vanities,” 2009, 2.
these roles had been jumbled and re-manifested, with some losses or eliminations in the process. Today, the feagaiga’s *mana* and *mamalu* have been challenged by the blurring of gender roles through education and to a certain extent, the church.

In his hermeneutics on Samoan indigenous religion, Tui Ātua illustrates a discourse on peace and harmony with three very critical aspects of Samoan culture within which I wish to discuss notions of *mana* and *mamalu* and how the *Teine* of Sāoluafata dealt with them. In the recent release of a collection of essays titled *Su’esu’e Manogi: In Search of Fragrance*, Tui Ātua illuminates a trio of fundamental systems that illustrates Samoa’s search for peace and harmony.³ They are “*tapu* (taboo), *feagaiga* (sacred covenants), and *tuā’oi* (boundaries).” In my view, the confluence of *tapu*, *feagaiga*, and *tua’oi* in the Samoan consciousness has made it possible for people to sustain *aga’ifanua*, customs and traditions, against the backdrop of their *aganu’u* or *Fa’asāmoa*. Yet peace implies conflict and Samoa’s past is riddled with all sorts of conflicts, both intra- and interpersonal, intra- and international, and intra- and intercultural. The *Teine Sāmoa* have been both agents and victims of such a past.

At the beginning of this study, I noted the conflicted and violent nature with which the *Nu’u o Teine* of Sāoluafata was founded. It had not been too long before the end of the Tongan occupation, circa 1169 C.E. or 1250 C.E., and the emergence of a new paramount lineage, the ‘Āiga Sa Mālietoā.⁴ However, in this post-Tongan reconstruction period, the archipelago was riddled with succession wars, one of which was fought between the half brothers Fatumanavao’upolu and ‘Aumuatāgafa.⁵ The results did not bode well for the former’s mother

---
³ See Tui Ātua, in *Su’esu’e Manogi*, 2009, 104.
⁴ Talaife’i’i surrendered from a rock offshore the western coast of ‘Upolu by saying, *Ua mālie toa, ua mālie tau,* “brave heroes, brave fight, I leave but will return in peace, not in war.” In a class of artifices known as *mavaega*, the farewell speech is often used by orators at the end of their oratory, to wish peace upon the audience when they depart. This is a well known saying, but for a detailed list of these *māvaega* plus more, see Eric Schultz, *Samoan Proverbial Expressions*, trans. Brother Fred Henry, (Wellington: The Polynesian Society, 1953).
and sister, Luafatā’alae and Taeolalopu’a, who relocated to Evaloa and founded the Nu’u o Teine, and a constitution of ō or tapu, taboos, some of which appeared to be directed against the half brother.6

In the previous chapters, I have also tried to trace the origins and evolution of the political and economic power of the Teine of Sāoluafata against local and global phenomena—human and natural—from the Vavau through Fa’apapālagi and since Independence in the second half of the twentieth century. I have problematized the status quo of the Teine’s relations with other socio-political groups in the village and pondered their political legitimacy, economic pragmatism, sanctity, and perpetuity amid the tensions created by modern governance and the international push for civil and human rights, as well as by the implosive attitudes of other groups in the village.

This chapter completes the triangulation of meaning behind Saoluafata’s Teine having pule, political power, mālosi, economic power, and mana and mamalu, spiritual and social power, in a society that has been transformed by historical events—some of which were beyond their control—and by the convenience of pragmatism. Concepts of mana and mamalu are defined and then conflated or blurred in light of their mechanisms and manifestations, and also explored in terms of whether they have any bearing on the girls’ political and economic powers. Questions arise as to whether it is possible to have political and economic power without spiritual and social power, or vice versa; whether it is possible to have sanctity in the absence of political and/or economic power; or whether, when people refer to Sāoluafata as the Nu’u Pa’ia, sacred village, there is any relevance for a group of Teine struggling to sustain some degree of political legitimacy in a field rife with competing interests from the brothers and their wives.

---

6 One of the initial taboos was that Tui Ātua was not allowed to set foot on the grounds of Sāoluafata; further when he died, Teu’ialilo was the one to beat the lali, wooden drum, to announce his death. Taboos that exist today include a ban against unwanted pregnancy and sexual relations with the village boys.
A major issue under scrutiny here is the role of the church in the apparent de-legitimization of the pule a Teine, authority of the Teine. From an historical perspective, one can safely assume that the progressive church and government initiatives of almost two hundred years affected Teine politics, including those at Sāoluafata. Penelope Schoeffel has talked extensively about the shift in body politics in Sāmoa since the installation of the pastor as a new feagaiga. Tracing the shift from indigenous religious understandings to those of Christianity, and investigating how this might have affected village behavior toward or against the pule a Teine, is essential in an interpretation of the status of Teine in religion and the psychological effects of not being central to the decision-making in church affairs.\(^7\)

By focusing on the Nu’u o Teine to illustrate the power of the Samoan Teine, this discourse has now arrived at the intersection between the sacred and the secular, and an examination of what was god-given and what was gendered in the body politics of the time. This chapter takes a look at how the Teine procured, sustained, or demolished the boundaries of their mana and mamalu; it also examines their self esteem and relationships with their “Other,” and in harmony with the cosmos.\(^8\) It attempts to explain how a particular Teine of Sāoluafata acquired mana and mamalu in her roles as feagaiga and suli, particularly when she had to deal with a daily life of weaving, raising children, and most importantly, with being Samoan and being woman.

\(^7\) As established in the previous chapter, the endowment of the pastor as the village feagaiga impacted the position of the ‘augafa ‘apae, the village feagaiga. This move coincided with the colonial imposition of health committees in villages which required the participation of adult females under the supervision of the national organization of women (NOW) in the 1970s and currently the Ministry of Women, Community, and Social Development (MWCSD). These modern directives have tended to blur sacred and secular spaces between the sisters and wives. For more interpretations, see Penelope Schoeffel, “The Samoan Concept of Feagaiga and Its Transformation,” 1995, 85-106. See also Serge Tcherkézoff, “Culture, Nation, Society,” 2008, 245-302.

\(^8\) In the traditional sense, virginity was what affected the Samoan woman’s ability to move ahead with her plans relative to those of her family. None of the literature on the sex practices of the Samoan girls includes a discussion of the interplay between altruism and self-esteem or the girl’s understanding of the power she could gain by keeping her virginity intact.
The term *pa‘ia* connotes *mana* and *mamalu*. In the Biblical sense, God is *pa‘ia*, sacred, and *mamalu*, dignified; because of such, he has *mana*, and therefore, *pule*, power. At the chiefs’ level, it refers to the sanctity of the titles as manifestations of ancestral relatives and their heroic, if not brutal, acts. Within or against all this are the questions: what was the culture of virginity like for the *Nu‘u o Teine*, a *Nu‘u Pa‘ia*, sacred village, and how did that contribute to the acquisition/weakening of their *mana* and *mamalu*? To what extent might they have felt subjected to the custom of *fa‘amasei‘au*, public defloration? Did their position as chiefs exempt them from such customs? These are the queries of this chapter. Moreover, it is pertinent to see if being *Teine* and chief at the same time created a paradox for them, or whether this combination was no different than being a man and chief.

I posit here that the *Teine* did not need *tulafale* to negotiate their marriages on their behalf. Their status as paramount *suli*, heirs, and divine *feagaiga*, sisters, allowed them to be “mistresses of their own favors,” although this should not be construed in the same light suggested by Lapérouse in “first contact” literature.9

Sourcing this discussion has been limited by the scarcity of archival records, particularly about Sāoluafata; however, secondary sources, ethnographic studies, fieldwork, and personal experience provide sufficient information on the precepts of the spiritual and social power of Saoluafata’s *Teine* albeit their counterparts elsewhere in the country. Krämer’s seminal text, *The Samoa Islands*, provides raw data for a genealogy of kinship connections that suggests a reason why the *Nu‘u o Teine* has been regarded as sacred.10 Much of this information is unknown to many of the people of Sāoluafata both at home and abroad, but now much of it has been mapped out in chapters three and four. Additionally, “first contact” and colonialists’ observations as well

---

as missionary accounts provide insights into cultural manifestations of *mana* and *mamalu* and how they impacted their local contacts. Of some value are the studies of Samoan behavior and mentalities by Bradd Shore and Jeannette Mageo. Their interpretations of the psychology of the Samoan mind are useful for a theoretical and historical framing of *Teine* politics and consciousness.

Shore’s seminal text, *Sala’ilua*, contextualizes Samoan conceptions of power and behavior in a murder story on Savai’i, and reveals in great detail the dualities of a person’s constitution in the hegemony of group ideology. Shore suggests that at an abstract level, Samoa’s worldview models suggest a constant push and pull between “the dignity of the eternal forms and the necessary power of the mutable events” that characterize the struggle between the urges of the personal self and the sanctions of the group. The complexity of such worldviews is further illustrated in Mageo’s study on the “self models and sexual agency” in which she historicizes the body of a Samoan *Teine* as a “site of struggle and for the transformation of culture.” However, in spite of the imposition of outside models, she concludes that “Samoan self-power relations are neither reducible to Western imposition nor to indigenous persistence [and this] underscores the fluid and hybrid relationship of power to the self.” In the context of Saoluafata’s *Nu’u o Teine*, I suspect that if “the pivot between power and the self is agency,” as Mageo suggests, then the *Teine*, by all implications of their political, economic, and sacred connections, had control of their social if not sexual relations.11

The debate over the Mead-Freeman controversy has a bearing on this discussion, although it continues to perpetuate the imperialistic nature of western academics. I agree with James Clifford in that all this back and forth about the sexual practices of the Samoans has

---

focused more on western approaches and theories instead of making the effort to solicit the
views of the people themselves. Paul Shankman’s discussion, repeated a few times since the
nineties, has focused too much on disputing sources and representations; nonetheless, his
periodization of the evolution of the virginity culture of Sāmoa in a recent publication is
helpful. Works by Krämer, Mead, Keesing, Gunson, Grattan, Freeman, and Schoeffel and
Daws, also provide historical and anthropological substance. Finally, the wisdom of Tui Ātua
and Aiono lends much credibility to what I am trying to do in this chapter. Su‘esu‘e Manogi
offers a framework in which the transformations or devolvement of the women’s spiritual and
social powers are explored. Aiono highlights the historical roles of the feagaiga as priestess,
peacemaker, anchor, and sacrifice; her namesake and daughter, Fanaafi Aiono-Le Tagaloa,
illustrates how the priestess of old facilitated tapua ‘i, worship, for her family and village.
Penelope Schoeffel’s historical discussion on the transfer of roles from the sa‘otama ‘ita ‘i or
augafa ‘apae to the pastor continues its currency in this chapter. Finally, ‘Aumua continues as a
primary source given her living experience as a Teine who was an active member in the past; she
is what Shore calls a cultural artifact, a vehicle through which relations and information pass.
Her input on extramarital relationships in the village helps explain seemingly incestuous
relations at Sāoluafata.

---

The struggle for political legitimacy, sparked by the church’s impact on the institution of *feagaiga*, has yet to be addressed. I hope this writing becomes a catalyst for that discussion as well as the Teine’s decision to utilize their rights as *suli* to reclaim a position of power denied them by male-dominated churches. Curiously, if Teine can become chiefs in *Fa’asāmoa*, why has it taken the church so long, particularly the London Missionary Society (LMS)’s protégé, the Ekalesia Fa’apotopotoga Kerisiano o Sāmoa (EFKS), to approve Teine as *faife’au*, pastors?15

*Mana and Mamalu: Spiritual and Social Powers, A Conceptual Frame*

Historically, the chiefs and women in pre-Christian Sāmoa were believed to have mana, spiritual power, since they were descended from ancient gods.16 Paramount chieftesses as *feagaiga* and priestesses in the villages also had mana because of their role as spiritual links to ancestral spirits.17 Chiefs were said to have had *ilāmutu*, female gods, who guarded and advised the brothers on daily affairs of the village; by definition, the sisters were the chiefs’ *ilāmutu*.18

Tui Ātua speaks of “four key harmonies that hold the balance for Samoans[:] harmony with the cosmos; harmony with the environment; harmony with one’s fellow men; and harmony with one’s self.” The harmony that is most relevant to this study is that between brother and sister. Here Tui Ātua offers a much needed explanation that captures the essence of the *feagaiga*, sacred covenants, between brothers and sisters:

The relationship between brother and sister underscores the ideal of male and female relationships. Indigenous Samoan society promoted the virtue of women as special and different but complementary to that of men. The *feagaiga* was founded on the principle that women have the gift of producing and nurturing life. As child-bearers women were seen as

---

15 Earlier this decade, a motion was filed during the annual conference of CCCS for the church to permit women to become pastors. According to ‘Aumua, who was one of the representatives from the Hawai’i district, the most vocal against the motion were women themselves, particularly those in leadership positions. Efforts are still being made to change the policy. (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Kaneohe, May 2000).
18 Ibid.
sharing divinity with the gods. By virtue of their links with the gods, namely their family gods, sisters were known as ilamutu. Ilamutu is the Samoan term for family gods. Feagaiga and the family gods are ilamutu because they share divine intercessory powers. Hence, when the role of the feagaiga as peacemaker is rejected or spurned, the curse of the feagaiga, known as mala o le ilamutu, may be imposed.19

In Samoa’s realm of the supernatural, there were two types of spirits: those of non-human origins were the atua, while those of human origins were the aitu.20 These beings were worshipped more as a family affair than communal; the medium in communion with them was either the ali‘i, high chief, or taupou, virgin. In the mid-eighteenth century, Pratt defined mana as the “supernatural power.”21 Unfortunately, he did not offer much beyond that, except that the term might also be used as a verb. He explained mamalu as “overshadowing” and “influential.”22 In my view, denoting mamalu as “overshadowing” gives it a threatening ring unless the term had a different application in the nineteenth century from the contemporary meaning of “dignity.”23

Kathleen Hancock equates mana with influence and illustrates by showcasing the lives of three of the Pacific’s most prominent politicians, all of whom she calls “men of mana:” Sir Ratu Kamisese Mara of Fiji, Afioga Va’ai Kolone of Sāmoa, and Robert Rex of Niue.24 Hancock writes that Afioga Va’ai Kolone had mana because he possessed a critical element in his political make-up that some of his contemporaries did not have; that is, he was an “honest” man.25 He was well-regarded in Sāmoa for his efforts to instill in Samoan politics a sense of dignity, honesty, and love of all people rather than just one’s own relatives and friends. Through Va’ai’s

19 Ibid.
21 Pratt, 1862, 204.
22 Ibid.
23 Or, unless Pratt was talking about the fa’amalumalu—which means to use one’s position of power to provide protection for constituents or subjects in the form of political and moral support.
24 Kathleen Hancock, “Afioga Va’ai Kolone,” in Men of Mana (Wellington: The Steele Roberts Ltd., 2003), 90.
25 Ibid.
story, Hancock reveals what undignified behavior looked like as Samoa’s political landscape became a conflation of self-interest, self-aggrandisement, corruption, and nepotism. Va’ai fought hard to erase these attributes which had consequential effects, including a public servants’ strike in the early 1980s, from which the country took long to recover.26

While there is not much literature on mamalu, there appears to have been more written on mana over the years in various places across Oceania. There is no standard definition of mana in the literature, although there are areas of complementarity. Pacific anthropologists and ethnologists such as R.H. Codrington, an English missionary in Melanesia in the late nineteenth century, deemed mana as a force to contend with. For the Melanesians, Codrington claimed, mana is a capricious force for people and objects; everyone wanted it even though it was accessible only to men of talent and chiefs, not commoners and women. Melanesian religion was thus by and large about the “pursuit of mana.”27

Edward Clodd in 1920 believed mana to be a “universal religious phenomenon,… a natural forerunner of personified deities.”28 About twenty years later, William Howells saw mana as a

sort of essence of nature,… not a spirit,…[which] has no will or purpose of its own[;] a Polynesian conception… [that] is not scientific, but completely logical, indestructible,… dissipated by improper practices.29

Howells reasoned that mana was god-given, although he felt that the gods did not have it “any more than any other being or substance.” He believed mana to be “independent of

---

26 Ibid. ‘Aumua lived as an integral part of Va’ai’s household when she worked as principal at Vaisala, Savai’i. She attests to these attributes and remembers with fondness the kindness and generosity of the Va’ai family, not only towards her, but to all members of the household and labor force. See Simanu-Klutz, ‘Aumua Mata’itusi Simanu, 2001, 126-37.


them” and fluid; it flowed from heaven to earth, from a “positive to negative pole,” and from “chiefs as direct descendants of the gods… [ who] kept… and conducted it to whatever function needed it: ceremony, war, or agriculture.” Therefore, chiefs were not privileged with mana; rather, their “function… [was] to serve as reservoir and transmitter of it.” This is consistent with Foucault’s notion that power is nothing without individuals through which it could pass or function.30

The New Zealand Ministry of Justice defines mana as something derived from the kawai tipuna, first ancestors, that “needed to be maintained at the highest degree.”31 Individuals evidently obtained mana through the performance of their deeds and used it as a compass for “one’s achievements and successes in life.”32 These notions are consistent with Alissa Strong’s articulation of the Maori people’s legal system in that

\[\text{mana is important in that those displaying high levels of it are respected for being viewed favorably by the kawai tipuna or revered ancestors.\ldots In the sense that good actions, ones consistent with Maori values and customs produced or increased both individual and group mana,\ldots[it] is somewhat of a karmic concept.}\]33

However, Strong departs from the ministry’s position by explicitly defining mana as a “life force, prestige, power, influence, and authority,\ldots that can be both inherited or earned during life,\ldots or can be lost temporarily or permanently through contamination.”34

During and since fieldwork, when asked for an explanation of the terms mana and mamalu, fellow Samoans have offered elaborate articulations of mamalu, but not of mana. As I

32 Ibid.
33 Alissa Strong, “The Maori People and Their Legal System,” http://www.daviddfriedman.com/Academic/Course_Pages/legal_systems_very_different_06/final_papers_06/Maori/Maori.html.
34 Ibid.
had expected, they immediately pointed to the familiar—the Judeo-Christian God—as having *mana*. The term was and is still reserved for the Christian God, a relocation instigated by the mass conversion of the nineteenth century which, in the process, reduced Samoa’s indigenous *atua*, gods, to the status of *aitu*, ancestor ghosts, to be feared as *tevolo*, devils.\(^{35}\) *Mana* was immediately situated in the holy trinity, connoting the power of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. It was inviolable, uncontested, and out-of-bounds; a premise that is in line with Bradd Shore’s observations made in the 1980s that the term *mana* was seldom used in reference to the power of men. Here, Shore problematizes the “virtual disappearance of an explicit Samoan distinction between *mana* (sacred power),… and *pule*, a more secular authority to act.” He argues that although the term *pule* appears to have masked such a distinction, there is still a hint of *mana* in terms of *ali’i* having *pule* and “orators as *fai pule*, the activators of power.” In this sense, Shore suggests that there were really “two states of power, a potential and a kinetic aspect,” which he situates in the instrumental or activating role that *tulōfale* and *tamatane* played in relation to or for their *feagaiga*—*ali’i* and *tamafafine*, respectively.\(^{36}\) In this sense, says Shore, the sisters or *tamafafine* maintained *mana* through the *fa’aaloalo*, respect, of their brothers, or *tamatane*.

It is more than twenty years since Shore laid out his views on these distinctions and acknowledged the confusing nature of the relations between *mana* and *pule*. Whether prescient or not, his point foreshadows another “virtual disappearance,” which is the complementarity of roles and deference between *tamatane* and *tamafafine*. Such disappearance is realized through

\(^{35}\) John Williams, the LMS missionary who introduced the Samoans to Christianity, was alerted by Faueā, the Samoan he had picked up in Tonga on his way to Sāmoa, that the tevolo was dead. This was a reference to Tamafaigā, whose reign in the early nineteenth century was one of terror. He was quartered by his enemies a few months before Williams arrived in Savai’i. See Williams, *Missionary Enterprises*, 1837, 285.

\(^{36}\) Shore supports this notion in *Sala ’ilua*, 1982, 248.
the hegemonies of modern governance, global economics, church ideology, succession to titles, and *feagaiga* institutions.  

Thus *mana* in Sāmoa is rarely applied to an earthly being, regardless of status or rank. However, when/if used at all, its adjectival form, *mamana*, indicates the emotional connection to elders and leaders who have demonstrated through the language they use a history of kindness, generosity, fairness, and humility—evidence that they have the interests of their people at heart.

*Mamalu*, I would argue, is the fine print for Samoa’s *tu fa’atamāli’i*, chiefly traditions—a public posture manifested in a dignified pose, stance, walk, attire, and most significant of all, choice of words and grammar. *Mamalu* is about the body as a site of struggle, particularly for the sister and the *ali’i* whose posture and gestures must reflect *aga fa’atamāli’i*, chiefly behavior. Essentially, in public, a leader held his/her head upright, crossed hands at the wrists in front just below the navel if standing, or on the lap if seated. She or he ate very little, spoke only at the appropriate times and in the appropriate registers, and listened to all points of view especially during a village meeting. Whether at home or in public, the designated space for the *ali’i* and *sa’otama’ita’i* was sacred and could not be *la’asia*, crossed, or *solia*, violated, by those of lesser status and rank.

Thus the saying, *e lē tauilo tama a tamāli’i*, “the children of the chiefs do not need to be acknowledged,” marked a tension between opposing sides often observed at public functions when purported leaders or their representatives flaunted their statuses and ranks. Such behavior was instantly regarded as one of the *tufanua*, people of the bush, or commoner. Essentially, body language and verbal registers were sufficient markers of one’s (chiefly) identity. Thus *mamalu* manifested itself in dignified behavior, both verbal and nonverbal. For Samoans, it was when one was *mamalu* that one had *mana*; the converse is also true.

---

37 Shore, *ibid.*, 248.
Traditionally, it was not enough for an individual to have *pule* to do or be something, unless the individual through which that *pule* functioned reflected society’s expectations of him/her physically and linguistically. Based on my own experience of what Samoans expect of their leaders at all levels of society, one was expected to speak with *mana* and to act with *mamalu*; however, Samoans were more comfortable with the notion of *mamalu* when referring to leaders who upheld the dignity of family titles and the wisdom expected of elders. Thus, one might be *suli* to certain titles, but one may never be selected if one did not demonstrate a potential to occupy the office of the title with dignity, humility, fairness, and justice. In order for *suli* to uphold their *mamalu*, they were to be mindful of the statuses of their titles since these are what dictated behavior in both public and private places. Aiono instructs us that the core of Samoa’s *Fa’amaatai* was not the holder of titles but rather the *Saofa’iga a Suafa Matai*, seating of titles—in essence, it was the titles that necessitated and/or demanded certain behavior.38

It is in the upholding of the *mamalu* of *matai* titles that a gendering of behavior and roles in Samoan society was executed. In terms of Samoa’s *Teine*, their position as *feagaiga* in their families and villages demanded behavior that was *mamalu*; for this purpose, a girl’s sexuality and relationships with male relatives came under close scrutiny. In an email conversation with a relative about the expectations of a girl’s dignity today, he confirmed what many of my women friends as well as students have shared, that

> when... talking about *tausi le mamalu o le Teine* [preserve the dignity of the girl],... [m]y interpretation... is girls doing the honourable thing: a) not sleeping around, and remaining a virgin till the day she marries. b) [b]e able to show the proper protocol when in the company of men. ‘Aua le kākō ma iloa upu e fai i le va ma tuagane poo tama o isi aiga, [Don’t draw attention to herself, and respect the va, space, with brothers and males of other families. c) [s]peak in the proper manner (italics mine).39

---

39 (Tupa’i Mau Simanu, email.comm., Sāmoa, March 25, 2010). My translations are in brackets.
Ali’i, high or paramount chiefs (who were mostly men), also had similar expectations placed on them; thus one could safely say that to gain mamalu, ali’i and Teine modeled upstanding behavior that every other member of society was expected to emulate. Mamalu behavior was evident in one’s observance of Vāfealoa’i, respect system. Vāfealoa’i is what Samoans call their respect or deference system. Regardless of rank, the expectations of the interlocutors during interaction was that the elements of the Vā, space/time, were observed in order to ensure peace and cohesion in village society. In terms of gender and generational relations, the Vā was pa’ia, sacred; certain taboos were imposed on how males and females dealt with each other and likewise between the young and the old. Much of this is true of contemporary Sāmoa although as more and more people become middle class, there is a tendency to relax some of these principles particularly at home.

There are different types of Vā in Fa’asāmoa, but the one that is relevant to this study is Vātapuia, sacred space. As demonstrated in the next section, the institution of feagaiga is only as good as its observance of Vātapuia in both private and public places.

Manifestations of Mana and Mamalu: The Politics of Space, Food, Clothing

For six hundred years, or so it seems, the girls of Sāoluafata have been subjected to the rigid rules or taboos of each generation. As stated in chapter two, many of the original taboos have been replaced according to the needs of the time, but the one taboo that was still evident during fieldwork was the ban on intra-village conjugal relations. In other words, the precepts of feagaiga, or sacred pact, between brothers and sisters still determined how men and women interacted with each other in both public and private spaces. However, even the principles of feagaiga as a tool of power relations between men and women have undergone certain changes over time. In the village, many intra-marriages have created tension between the violators and
those that married outside, but this has not been unique to Sāoluafata. Freeman reports similarly for the girls of Sa’anapu—a village in the southern part of the district of Tuamāsaga, ‘Upolu— although the reasons may be different. For Sāoluafata, there has been the attitude by some girls that to marry within meant keeping the paramount lines pure; in the case of the Sa’anapu, marrying the boys of the village meant not having to travel far from one’s home; for girls from families of a lower rank, it was a chance to marry up. ⁴⁰

It bears to be reminded that the idea of feagaiga was not just about brothers and sisters in a nuclear family, but tamatane and tamafafine in the larger context of the extended family. Historically, all male relatives—brother, cousins, uncles—observed the Vātapiua in their treatment of female relatives. Likewise, female relatives regarded all males as their brothers; hence, the importance of keeping the space sacred by employing certain behavior. In practice, the manifestations of feagaiga were overt in both private and public spaces before capitalism moved Sāmoa from a reliance on subsistence agriculture to the monetary system in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and before the pastor was promoted as the new village feagaiga, “sister.” Nonetheless, from as early as puberty, males and females moved through gendered spheres in terms of living and sleeping arrangements, meals, attire, and labor. At Sāoluafata, the Teine’s space was sacred to the male relatives and the only males allowed were the husbands. The same has remained true to this day. Explanations as to why this was the case were ambiguous at best. None of the informants could attach any historical value to it in terms of its origin; however, one could surmise that given the genealogical links and the taboo against mata’ifale, incest, it was understandable why the Teine’s space was kept free of any hint of her male relatives.

Typically, people in a household were distributed among a cluster of *fale*, open traditional houses, with the young children and girls living with their parents while teenage, single males lived in separate quarters. Teenage girls slept close to their mothers. The proxemics in this case were closely observed since incest was considered a shameful violation of the *Vātapuia* with the opposite sex. Generally, a brother did not walk in close proximity to his sister, and avoided eye contact at all costs. Incestual acts in the *Vavau* often serve as reminders of the shameful and damaging effects of incest in the present. These are illustrated later in this chapter.

Food preparation and consumption were another area gendered by the *feagaiga*. Sisters ate before their brothers—a practice that is less realized today in westernized households where a dining table and a preference for western-style seating is preferred. However, historically, generational and gender hierarchies were applied in the presence of guests, or when the table could not accommodate an extended family gathering. In other words, adults, children, and unmarried girls ate before the untitled men, their wives, and teenage sons. During fieldwork, the two male chiefs of Sa Nu’ualiu group received their food after ‘Aumua and I had been served; Samalā’ulu Mata’itusi, also received her portions before the brothers were served theirs, unless she was the one preparing the meal.

Daily attire, like sleeping arrangements, was also dictated by the principles of *feagaiga*: girls did not wear their brothers’ clothes, except for the youngsters of both sexes who freely donned shorts and t-shirts as daily wear. The *Teine* of Sāoluafata were restricted to a dress

---


42 See Simanu, *O Sī Manu a Ali’i*, 2002, 121-82 for the concepts and manifestations of *Vāfealoa’i*, respect system, as illustrated through Samoa’s food customs or, for example, its *taligāmālā*, hosting.

code that discouraged the wearing of pants through the village. In the late 1960s, a practice had emerged—not just as Sāoluafata, but across Sāmoa—that when walking through the village or while serving chiefs, Teine wrapped lavalava over the pants and then took them off in the privacy of their homes. As in the Vavau, the lower region of a Teine’s body was to be concealed. Thus, when seated on the floor, thighs were not to be visible, and any indication of a public display prompted reactions—some of which were quite embarrassing. Signs of sa’epū, displaying the hole, was shameful to all witnesses.44

Cross dressing for boys was discouraged, although the fa’afafine, transvestites, did so openly in their homes until the village council and the church ruled against it.45 Fa’afāfine literally means “to make woman” or “in the mannerisms of a woman;” fa’afātama means the opposite, “to make man” or “in the mannerisms of a man.” Historically, while fa’afāfine were numerous and openly gay, the fa’afātama were few in numbers and subdued.46 Nevertheless, the fa’afāfine were occasionally subject to a sā, ban, of this nature, which has often prompted a rural-urban migration to town, where “freedom” connotes lawlessness.47

In public, where kinship connections were not immediately understood by everyone, relatives in mixed company, including in-laws, needed to indicate blood relations so that the non-related others could mind their manners. Tensions in public gatherings—for example, at a meeting—could arise when a clown cracked a salacious joke to the embarrassment and

---

44 (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Honolulu, March 2011).
45 Mageo comments on the cross dressing of people on White Sunday that was reflective of the non-gendered dress code of the pre-Christian era in Sāmoa, i.e. prior to 1830. See Self Model and Sexual Agency, 1998, 141-74.
46 There is no generic term equivalent to “gay” in Sāmoa. Unless a single male is openly effeminate, or acknowledges being gay, there is no way of knowing his sexual orientation.
47 In the 1970s, when I was living in Apia, the fa’afafine cross-dressed freely in public, particularly in the night clubs often beguiling tourists and new residents. For a fascinating discussion of Samoa’s fa’afafine, see Douglass Drozdow-St. Christian, Elusive Fragments: Making Power, Propriety, and Health in Samoa (Durham: Carolina Academic Press, 2002), 27-36. For the legal status of fa’afafine in the Samoan Constitution, see Sue Farran and Alexander Su’a, “Discriminating on the Grounds of Status: Criminal Law and Fa’afafine and Fakaleiti in the South Pacific,” Journal of South Pacific Law, 9:1 (2005), http://www.pacllii.org/journals/fjspl/vol09no1/5.shtml.
discomfort of people who were related. For instance, when I was in the Teachers’ Cultural Group in the mid-1970s, there were a few of my male relatives in the group. Since one of the leaders of the group was a cousin, he made sure that joking never crossed the line from humor to profanity. ‘Aumua also commented on her time as a teacher, describing the many times when traveling on a malaga, that she was embarrassed by the vulgar gestures of the group fa’aluma, clown, especially during a performance. Eventually, these clowns were instructed to keep their joking clean and above the waist.

A malaga is a trip taken by an organization for a variety of purposes: a groom’s extended family traveling to a wedding, or a village traveling on a fundraising concert tour. If the latter, then the group historically walked from village to village, carrying with them their own food or perhaps fine mats and other gift items for the hosts. Each malaga included a clown who ensured that the performances were lively and humorous—an exploitation of Samoa’s love of a good time and generosity. Usually male, the clown must maintain a certain degree of decorum and must ensure that his humor did not overreach the boundaries of aga fa’atamali’i, chiefly behavior, in mixed company.48

Virginity as Manifestation of Mamalu, Dignity

The concept of mamalu has not been fully explored in the discourse on virginity rites of Sāmoa. Existing research has been ambiguous about what “dignity” looks like in real terms, and the debate about the sexual practices of Samoa’s Teine appears to be mired in the Mead-Freeman

controversy of the mid-twentieth century. Technically, a Teine who has lost her virginity has lost her mamalu. Historically, the hymen was a site of struggle for the Teine Sāmoa. Guarded with lives and status, its politicization cannot be underestimated since the mamalu of the feagaiga and her family depended on it. Her credibility and the reputation of the family depended on it. In political and economic terms, losing it meant denying the extended family and/or village of an effective paolo, alliance in marriage; it left a Teine with limited options and the likelihood of gafatā i tua, marrying a man of lesser status.

There is an assumption in the secondary sources that the virginity rites were always a part of Fa’asāmoa until Christianity, yet tala o le vavau, tales of the Vavau, and tala fa’afāgogo, fables, point to siblings and other categories of relatives engaging in sexual relations before marriage, even with their own nieces and nephews. The intriguing manner in which La’auli and the sisters Gauifaleai and Totogatā became a triangulated affair points to the liberal manner in which the Teine appear to have been active agents in their sexual practices in the fifteenth century. It appears that it was quite acceptable for Gauifaleai to defy her father’s wish to marry Fuaoleto’elau, Malietoa Uitualagi’s younger son, and instead opt to cohabitate with her sister and his older brother, La’auli. In the sixteenth century, Salamasina’s clandestine affair with Alapepe, a man of lower rank, appeared not to have worried her too much; according to Krämer, she understood the consequences quite well. In fact, Krämer appears to have taken liberal artistic license to create a love story that suspiciously reads like a Harlequin Romance. In Salamasina, the “queen” has the upper hand in her affair with Alapepe, the son of an orator. Krämer tells of Alapepe’s fatal exile in Tonga and the queen’s sadness over it. In this story, the

50 Schultze, Samoan Family Law, 1953, 11.
51 Krämer, Salamasina, [1924] 1958, 1-9, also Brother Henry, Tala Fa’asolopito o Samoa, 1958, 43-46
intrigue of sneaking sex was counterintuitive and risky, even for paramount or high born sisters and daughters who wittingly engaged in premarital sex. Yet, incest stories date even farther back into the distant past, as is obvious in existing vava'u, evidence, of the past.

A Teine who is mamalu, dignified and respected, must be a virgin, a taupou; if she is a widow of a paramount chief, she must remain single. Aiono explains that

the word taupou corresponds to the person who should reside at the side post of the chief’s meeting house. Why? It is said that a teinemuli, virgin, is important in Fa’asamoan. She is the girl who, having passed the age of fifteen, has not had a husband or who has not had sexual relations with a man; it means she is a taupou. She is therefore suitable to sit at the side post because she is a true virgin.

Unfortunately, Aiono’s use of the term tuateine in the same text is confusing. The term tua could be interpreted as to depend on someone in times of need. O le Teine e tua iai . . ., the girl to whom one may depend when one is in need, Thus this definition makes sense in this context. The teinemuli in old Sāmoa was the village girl, or virgin, whose hymen was guarded by the brothers until marriage. In the common vernacular, a virgin is a teine mo’i, real girl, or tama mo’i, real boy; the latter term, however, is used more in a joking manner instead of in the seriousness afforded its counterpart. To ask a boy if he were a tama mo’i is to tease him into a nervous disposition; it is meant as a challenge to his sexuality and/or sexual prowess.

Generally speaking, girls were subjected to one set of rules and boys to another, illustrating a “double standard” that Mageo references in her theory of Samoan “self models and sexual agency.”

---

52 Krämer, Salamasina, 82-87.
54 The prefix “tua” is problematic since it means “after” or “behind of;” however, it could also mean either “before”—thus before becoming a woman—or “after” being a girl. Nevertheless, tuateine lexically means “behind girl,” and tuafafine, “behind woman,” or simply translated, the sister
55 (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Kaneohe, March 2011; also UHM Samoan female students, pers. comm., January 2011).
By no means a fixed status, virginity connotes a historical process in the life of a girl. As feagaiga, she was all at once taupou, the virgin who resided at a side post, ositaulaga, priestess, fai’oa, producer of wealth, faiā’oga, teacher, taulāsea, healer, tausala, sacrifice, and pae ma le ʻauli, peacemaker. Upon marriage, she remained feagaiga and the social status of taupou remained unchanged. Loss of virginity through legal marriage did not mean loss of mamalu; in fact, marriage enhanced it.

In a focus group of Samoan females at the University of Hawai‘i, Mānoa, the girls were asked about their perceptions of virginity and sexual practices of Teine Sāmoa. What appeared not to have changed over the years has been a reluctance to openly debate sexual issues, even among a same-sex, twenty-first century group of women. Answers were mixed and noncommittal, especially about premarital sex; although there were hints from some that parents still expected their daughters to remain virgins before marriage. Such a lack of openness about sex is supported by what Tina Tauasosi claims in her dissertation as the discomfort of unmarried girls when discussing sexual matters in contrast to their married counterparts who openly did otherwise. Nevertheless, there was a general agreement among the UH students that dating was now commonplace; whereas it was frowned upon in the past of my youth.

The literature on Samoan sexual practices suggests that by the early twentieth century, virginity rites and the sexual, political, or economic value of virginity had essentially disappeared. What the literature does not explain, however, is that beneath the surface, mothers’ and husbands’ attitudes about daughters and wives entering the marriage bed as teinemuli or Teine mo’i have persisted. The motivations of the two groups are necessarily different: the

59 UHM Samoan female students, focus group, January 2011.
mothers’ expectations might have more to do with the prevention of abuse by men, who take much pride in their wives being virgins on the wedding night. The men’s expectations presuppose a power over their mates, a pride stemming from the notion that their *Teine* kept their *mamalu*.\(^61\) This attribute manifests in how the wives are treated by their mothers- and sisters-in-law.

Historically, it was never a myth that virginity had much to do with how a wife was treated in her husband’s village. This is evident in the amount of material *alofoa*, love, that was showered upon her if she were a virgin. It was also never a myth that many *misa*, fights, between couples ended when a husband publicly accused his wife of being a *pa’umutu*, whore, on his wedding night or throughout the life of the marriage. *Faleaitu*, comedic skits, often employed spousal relationships as public satire; they often portrayed a husband threatening to reveal the hymeneal status of his wife, a threat detrimental to her survival especially if she were staying with his family.\(^62\) Tauasosi’s study on wife abuse in Sāmoa reveals an intensifying problem of disobedience and jealousy as key reasons why men abuse their partners. While she does not specify virginity or the lack thereof as a variable, it could be an implicit factor contributing to the jealous rage of some of her informants’ husbands, who were often suspicious that their wives were engaged in adulterous affairs with other men. A follow up phone conversation with Tauasosi confirmed that a lack of virginity was mentioned as a cause of wife abuse in a focus-group she had facilitated during research on the island of Savai’i in the late 1990s. Under the research umbrella known as the *Mapusaga o Aiga (MOA)*, the focus group was solicited for information on abuse in their villages. They discovered that one of the reasons for

---

61 Shore implies this in his exposition on the brother-sister *feagaiga*. The shy and demur brother in front of his sister belies the violent rages directed at their wives. See *Sala ilua*, 1982, 233-36.

women being physically and verbally abused was their loss of virginity to a former husband or, worse, before marriage. Ostensibly, the elderly women commented on how husbands constantly used it to exert control.⁶³

Yet at Sāoluafata, while the incest taboo has been in place for some time, and while the Teine informants related the importance of a ban on alcohol and excursions to night clubs for the younger Teine, there was no indication beyond these sanctions that the Teine have internalized virginity as a moral compass. In other words, incest and inbreeding are historical outcomes or manifestations of a real lack of enforcement that appears to be an issue for the Nu’u o Teine.⁶⁴

Virginity: Private and Personal

Much of the discourse on virginity has focused on that of the so called “high born” girl; yet, there was a reason why every Samoan girl, regardless of family status and rank, was also coddled, cocooned, and/or cussed at when there was ever a hint of sexual interest in her walk, talk, or laughter. In this sense, I disagree with the notion that virginity was only valued by the high born. For a place like Sāoluafata, where one could claim links to the “high born,” the question is, who is not high born? The term is therefore problematic given Samoa’s complex kinship network. It is another example of the tyranny of empirical pursuits and the effort to sort life into tidy little boxes. Real life is not so tidy.

Virginity was not only important to the village feagaiga; it was critical for every Teine’s self esteem and family reputation regardless of family status and rank in the village. Samoan men liked their Teine to be virgins on their wedding nights. The onus was therefore on her to safeguard it since it was the cornerstone of a decent marriage. Thus, mothers and brothers saw to

---

⁶³ (Tina Tauasosi, pers. comm., Waipahu, March 2011).
⁶⁴ Part of the problem with the Nu’u o Teine, as related to me by Seumālō Meripa and Samalā’ulu Mata’itusi, was that many of the chiefs have deliberately kept their daughters away from the Nu’u o Teine, thus the womanpower needed to police and sanction violators was not readily available.
it that their daughters and sisters attracted the best suitors; girls understood well the difference between remaining a Teine and becoming a fafine before marriage—the implications on spousal relationships were all too clear. It also meant a lot to the groom and his mother and sisters that the new wife led a sheltered life in order to avoid what Tui Ātua calls the whispers of tau musumusu, an aspect of culture which was scandalous and damaging.

Marriage for Samoans was and still is not just between two individuals, but between two families. One’s in-laws are one’s paolo, shelter or safety net; after formal exchanges at the wedding, new alliances are forged, and hence, security. Samoa’s connubial culture was not just for private consumption, it was also very public. Once in the public domain, virginity, took on a whole different meaning; it was no longer confined to the scrutiny of the household or family, it was now an item of exchange for the community.

**Virginity: Public and Impersonal**

The discourse on the feagaiga and her virginity has been largely limited to anthropological narratives; however, Sāmoa has been the target of ridiculous claims due to the erroneous assumptions and lack of historical context made by Margaret Mead during her brief stay while researching the sexual habits of teenage girls in Manu’a in the 1920s, and by Freeman’s efforts to replace her claim on Sāmoa as “paradise” with a darker view of Sāmoa as stressful and violent. The controversy caused by Mead and Freeman over the sexual practices of Samoa’s teenage girls sent the academy into a spin for almost thirty years, either defending or refuting Mead’s findings on the sexual practices of teenage girls on Manu’a or Freeman’s findings on girls in Sa’anapu. However, some, like Sharon Tiffany, have tried to stay neutral by exposing the flaws on both sides. In her critique of Mead’s and Freeman’s scholarship, Sharon W. Tiffany asserts that
despite their significant differences in tone and emphasis, both narratives assumed a static, one-dimensional social geography that resisted an understanding of complexities and paradoxes that comprised a human reality. Essentialist portrayals of Islander women’s bodies and lives disallowed a careful examination of the dynamics of gender, rank, and ethnicity. Such portrayals also ignored the ways in which women’s bodies are appropriated for consumption in a globalizing political economy as the exoticized and eroticized “Other.”

Tiffany continues that Mead’s portrayal of the sexual practices of Manu’a’s teenage girls was very much compromised by the commercial interests of her publishers, as is evident by the pictures on the outside covers of the various editions of *Coming of Age in Samoa*. Furthermore, writing in a style that was accessible to lay readers added to the book’s popularity, but very much at the expense of the culture she objectified. Says Tiffany,

> The commercial success of *Coming of Age in Samoa*, combined with Mead’s busy schedule of public-speaking engagements and interviews to promote her research and published work, secured her public status and simultaneously made her academic stature problematic in the eyes of male colleagues. Unlike many women anthropologists of her time, Margaret Mead avoided the erasure of women’s writing from the canon of ethnographic literature. Derek Freeman, as the self-described “heretic,” undertook a self-imposed quest to remove Mead and her “spellbinding text” from the canon. Freeman’s narrative of sexual politics in Sāmoa, accompanied by its subtext of biological determinism, sought to restore the legitimacy of men’s power and women’s subordination. According to Freeman’s version of the story, Sāmoa could not be a “paradise” of free love because male-dominated institutions and the privileging of male-defined ideologies of sex and gender relations constrained the lives of girls and women.

Paul Shankman employs a different tack and takes it upon himself to discredit Freeman once and for all by tracing the evolution of female sexuality since first contact. Informative, the essay makes numerous claims which, while they do not exempt Margaret Mead totally, show numerous ironies in Freeman’s assumptions, which were supposedly derived from a very flawed use of existing sources. Shankman accuses Freeman of being quite selective with what he used

---

65 Tiffany, “Imagining the South Seas”, 2004, 159.
66 Ibid., 164.
to substantiate his claims, even to the point where he failed to use his own data from previous
research that would probably have given him a more balanced view of Samoa’s sexual practices.
Instead, says Shankman, while Freeman was bent on displaying virginity as a fixed ideology
Shankman demonstrated that shunned public defloration and even cheated by “counterfeiting”
hymeneal blood with chicken, pig, or cow blood.67

Missionaries obviously regarded public defloration as cultish and quickly put a stop to it;
nonetheless, they sustained virginity as a Christian value and encouraged girls not to engage in
pre-marital sex. Eye witness accounts by explorers, missionaries, and colonial clerks damned it
with disgust; however, families knew—even the “virgin” herself—that virginity could be a tool
of power.68

The language of sexual discourse also changed with the missionaries: instead of
fa’amasei’au, there was fa’aipoipoga, church wedding, which Pratt notes as the Rarotongan
word for marriage. While totally non-existent by early twentieth century, the spirit of
fa’amasei’au had lingered at least in a mother’s hopes that her daughters remained true to
themselves until marriage, even if the daughter’s choice was that of an āvagaga, or elopement.69

Like the forbidden fruit in the Garden of Eden, a girl’s virginity was as secure as the
methods used for its protection. It was the reason why she, who had been selected to play the

67 A fa’amasei’au, public defloration, was the final act in the marriage ensemble of the village taupou. It involved
the piercing of the bride’s hymen by the groom or his representative during the ceremony. If there was blood, the
taupou was confirmed a virgin and was afforded great respect; she was mamalu and her family’s reputation was
intact. See Paul Shankman, “The History of Samoan Sexual Conduct and the Mead-Freeman Controversy,”
68 Shankman and Boyer, The Trashing of Margaret Mead, 2009, 183.
69 ‘Aumua relates a story about her oldest sister Pea, who married a pastor. Long before the wedding, Pea was
found absent from the house one evening and Tilau, her mother, found out that a group of young men and women of
Satalo had gone somewhere for the day but did not return until late at night. Tilau was absolutely livid and vowed to
disown her daughter for going off like that when she was already betrothed to be married. She was worried that her
daughter may no longer be a virgin. However, on the day after the wedding, Tilau cried tears of joy when she found
blood on the wedding sheets when her daughter went to sea for an early swim. Tilau was obviously spared the
“whispers of taumusumusu,” which would have been the affair of the day had no blood been discovered that
morning. (‘Aumua, pers. comm., March 2011).
role of village feagaiga or taupou was coddled, fattened, and heavily chaperoned; she resided in the fale tele, big house (or the high chief’s guest house), at the rim of the village malae under the scrutiny of the elder ladies of the village who chaperoned her within and outside this space. At the edge of the village green (some were sandy), in the openness of the house, she entertained the faletautū, suitor and his wooing entourage. Even at a latter date, as a widow or divorcee, her space in the fale tele was assured—not as the village virgin, but perhaps the family priestess. All this is now history in Sāmoa due to a changing material culture, religious practices, and village politics. Wealth, which was the responsibility of the village taupou, was now readily available through other means.

Shankman claims that historically, rigid rules controlling sexual practices had been relaxed by the turn of the century; however—and I quite agree with Mead here—the missionaries failed to provide sanctions that were as effective in breathing fear into the young virgins as public defloration had done. For the most part, Samoa’s rigid sex taboos had totally vanished by the early twentieth century. Traditions of poula, night entertainment or “joking nights” between men and women during a malaga, were eventually halted; premarital sex and elopement were frowned upon. While these changes did not completely annihilate the organization of the aualuma, they weakened the organization to the point where, today, the survival of the sisters’ group across Sāmoa has been greatly compromised. As the new feagaiga for the village, the

---

70 It has been a Samoan tradition for the expectant mother to return to her natal village to give birth; paramount wives were not exempt from this practice. It was not uncommon, however, for a paramount wife not to return to her husband since in her absence a new wife would have been installed. This was common practice instituted to the extreme by orators guided by greed for the wealth a new wife fetched for them. This understanding is cited ubiquitously by Samoanists.


72 Schoeffel observed this as having happened during fieldwork in the 1970s. See *Daughters of Sina*, 1979.
pastor has completely undermined the *feagaiga* with the village virgin, making it more fashionable for her to become the wife of a pastor than becoming the pastor herself. \(^{73}\)

While Christian missionaries in the late-nineteenth century transformed the hymeneal power of the *Teine* as *feagaiga*—whose public virtues were emulated by every girl in her home—and reinforced the ban on premarital sex and elopement, American marines in the mid-twentieth centuries became another force that also redefined sex and transformed Samoan sexual practices. \(^{74}\) The views on sexual practices between these two forces could not be farther apart. While the missionaries successfully outlawed *poula* nights, nakedness, and public defloration, the marines were, according to Stanner, promoting sex for money. Stanner points out that liaisons between *Teine Sāmoa* and American soldiers had become quite common; in fact, the gates to the airport were considered “‘gates of sin’” and local men were being arrested for pushing girls into prostitution. \(^{75}\) At the same time that the missionaries were successfully branding virginity rites as pagan practices, the marines were helping the *Teine Sāmoa* to break free of the bonds of defloration and Bible chastity. \(^{76}\) Shamefully, in the case of Sāoluafata, the case of a brother selling the favors of his young sister to an American sailor in 1840 resulted in the destruction of village property and perhaps the death of some people the following year. Obviously, the transforming landscapes of the nineteenth century had an impact on Saoluafata’s women. \(^{77}\)

---


\(^{74}\) Stanner in Shankman and Boyer, *The Trashing of Margaret Mead*, 2009, 186.

\(^{75}\) Ibid.

\(^{76}\) Ibid.

The paradoxical nature of *papālagi* agents in Sāmoa would play itself out throughout the twentieth century as the church covered Samoan nakedness from neck to toe and *pālagi* tourists touted bikinis and basked in the sun along Samoa’s beaches, particularly on a Sunday.

Analytically, it is within the space between the church and the marines that some women became agents of their own favors, while others became objects of exchange between Samoan males and their *pālagi* counterparts—beachcombers, whalers, traders, among others. The former may have been girls shunned by their brothers and families after engaging in premarital affairs; while the latter, if eyewitness accounts are to be believed, perhaps had no choice but to suffer the shame of being exploited by their own brothers.\(^7\)

In the case of Saoluafata’s *Teine*, the space for them would be that between the church and the German sailors with whom they could have found exotic partners. I would argue here that the paramount chieftesses of Sāoluafata were a different kind of *‘augafa’apae* or *taupou* for one main reason: the holders of *Teu’ialilo* and *Tululautū* did not answer to anyone in the village, after all they were the sovereign power of the village. As such, they did not have to seek suitors; rather, suitors found them. They were not at the mercy of male orators since they were not under the jurisdiction of a men’s council. It is therefore my belief that Saoluafata’s *Teine* might have been spared the anxieties of public defloration of the pre-Christian era; and thus I argue that virginity could not have been a huge factor for public consumption, although the girls understood the politics of virginity on family welfare and personal relations with their husbands.\(^8\)

---

\(^7\) Tagi, the murderer of Gideon Smith in 1840, gave the latter a young virgin for a couple of axes and a jacket. See John Chawner Williams, United States Consul, “The Murder of Gideon Smith at Saluafata in July 1840 and the Burning of Saluafata, Fusi, and Salelesi in February 1841,” in Richards, *Samoa’s Forgotten Whaling Heritage*, 1992, 116-121.

\(^8\) This would make more sense for out-marrying *Teine* residing in their affinal villages.
On a daily basis, though, the chieftesses performed all other duties of sisters, priestesses, and leaders as did their counterparts in the other villages. Village girls in subordinate positions were expected to emulate their leaders and to earn their mamalu by developing a disposition that was consistent with the tenets of vafealoa’i, feagaiga, ositaulaga, taupou, tausala, and ‘augafa’apae. As the augafa’apae, Teu’ialilo and Tululautū kept the peace in the village; like their counterparts in other villages, they were also the ositaulaga, priestesses, the links between family and the deities. Their altars were the fireplaces called the magālafu, fire pits, in the pebble floor of the faletele next to the central posts.

In her book Tapua’i: Samoan Worship, Fanaafi Aiono-Le Tagaloa (hereafter addressed as Aiono-Le Tagaloa) claims that when the missionaries arrived Samoan traditional worship occurred twice a day—in the morning around five o’clock and evening when the fires were lit. Evidently, during tapua iga, worship, the priestesses dusted off the ashes in the fireplace, blew on the embers and dropped a few tinder to create bursts of flames. This type of worship, says ’Ai’ono-Le Tagaloa, was known as the fanaafi o fa’amalama, fire vortices.

Aiono-Le Tagaloa records that “fire votives” or sacrifices to the gods were delivered through the flames. There were four of them.

1. O le Fanaafi o Faamalama mo lau Afio, le Atua
   Ia apelepelea i matou i lou agalelei
   This is a fire votive for you our God
   May you wrap us, cloak us in your goodness and kindness.

---

80 ’Ai’ono-Le Tagaloa notes that in the absence of a chief to pray to the gods, the ‘augafa’apae filled in.
81 Le Tagaloa, Fā’asinomaga, 1997, 16.
83 Newell in Aiono-Le Tagaloa, ibid. Aiono-Le Tagaloa confirms what I remember when as a child: that the magālafu, fireplace, was never cold. Between the prayer sessions, the embers were again slightly covered with the ashes. In my young days at Satalo, I remember the elders with their magālafu in their little fale o’o, cottages; but they were not used in the manner intended. Rather, they were more for lighting their tobacco or for warmth during the cool season in the southern hemisphere between June and October.
84 A votive is a fulfilling vow offered in fulfillment of an oath or vow, a symbol of a wish or desire; from Encarta Dictionary: English (North America).
85 Italics are mine.
Again the fire flamed.

2. *O le Fanaafi o Faamalama mo lau Afio, le Atua*
   *Ua se atua ma lau afio lo matou agamasesei.*
   This is a fire votive to you our God
   Our erring, wrongful, defiant ways are blatant before you.

Again the fire flamed.

3. *O le Fanaafi o Faamalama mo lau Afio, le Atua*
   *Ia taitaiese i nuu le aina atua folau e latou te aumaia ma mala.*
   This is a fire votive to you our God
   Direct those ‘gods’ of the seas – seafarers, to uninhabited lands for
   they bear sickness and curses.

[Again the fire flamed].

4. *O le Fanaafi o Faamalama mo lau Afio, le Atua*
   *Ia aafu i matou i le ie lautele o lou alofa . . .*
   This is the fire votive to you our God
   Cover us, hide us in the broad mantle of your love.86

One could imagine Teu’ialilo and Tululautū, before Christianity, managing the daily
worship above—twice a day, a practice that I had once believed was brought by the missionaries,
but obviously had its roots in pre-Christianity.87 Other kinds of worship listed in ‘Ai’ono-Le
Tagaloa include the *alofisā*, sacred kava ceremony, *‘anapogi*, fasting in silence, and the *umutī*,
fishing worship.88 The *Teine* have continued to engage in *‘ava* ceremonies when hosting *malaga*
at the village or when they travelled. As mentioned before, when important guests arrive, it is
the *Nu’u o Teine* that welcomes them first, and then the *Nu’u o Ali’i*.

Another important role for the *‘augafa’apae*, for example, was that of the *tausala*, the girl
as village payment for war crimes. While this practice does not exist any more, it is important to

---

86 Aiono-Le Tagaloa’s source here was J. F. Newell’s diaries, which her mother, ‘Ai’ono, discovered in the London
Archives. In there, Newell lists the above votives, a tremendous window into how Samoan’s worshipped in pre-
Christianity.
note how the tradition began in the days of Samoa’s cultural genesis. Here, I expand on an earlier account in chapter two to explain the significance of the Teine in ancient sanctions. Recall that the God Tagaloaalagi’s family was in danger of being run to the ground by Lu, whose chickens had been stolen by male members of Tagaloaalagi’s family. In order to appease Lu, Tagaloa-a-lagi gave him his daughter, Amoā, as payment. Amoā laid across Lu’s path to stop him from advancing any further to the tenth heaven, where Tagaloa resided; hence, the proverb, ua fa’alava a Amoā, “it laid across like Amoā.” So practiced, this act of throwing herself in harm’s way to save someone else from an assault or from a worse fate is still remembered if not carried out in the contemporary cultural consciousness of Samoans. For example, earlier this decade, ‘Aumua intervened when a church leader was on the verge of assaulting another with a chair; to her, it was her duty as a Samoan Teine to promote peace and harmony.89

Teine Sāoluafata: “Mistresses of their Own Favors”

Given the status of the Teine at Sāoluafata, it is logical to think that they did not depend on the body politics necessary for the girls of other villages to obtain and sustain their mana and mamalu. It is conceivable that where Saoluafata’s girls were concerned, the principles of feagaiga could not have applied to the chieftesses to such a severe extent as was expected of feagaiga elsewhere. I argue that the sanctity of the girls was made possible by the historic founding of their village and multiple genealogical links to paramount titles of Sāmoa, which made their physical space inviolable and certain mental boundaries impenetrable; thus potential suitors needed to be on par politically, economically, and socially with the Teine’s high status before they dared penetrate it. The Teine’s models of self and sexual agency derived from such manifestations as chiefs; their participation in family and village fa’alavelave placed them front

and center of decision-making, wealth production, peacemaking, and conjugal choices. To a certain extent, this is still evident today in most families, if not most villages.

I posit that the Nu’u o Teine operated and continues to perceive itself as a political entity in its own right. Because of their linkages to many of the paramount families of Sāmoa, which gave them the power to pick and choose their husbands, the girls could not have been subject to public defloration and other practices surrounding the culture of virginity; although, they may still have believed that in virginity there was power and with it they could exercise an altruism expected of sisters and daughters.90 Similarly, the Teine’s link to paramountcy could have been motivation for in-village partnerships with “brothers,” although incest was and is still sanctioned by the Nu’u o Teine.91

Incest and Incest Taboos: Violations of Mamalu

In the Vavau, numerous tales of intra-family and intra-village unions have been recorded. The union between Saveasi’uleo, the god of the underworld Pulotu, and his brother’s daughter, Tilafaigā, circa 1240 C.E., is ubiquitously known. Saveasi’uleo, the half eel, half man, designed it this way when he could not outwit and eat his brother, Ulufanuasese’e. He thus threatened his brother that they would feiloa’i i i'u o gafa, “meet again at their genealogical ends.” The war goddess Nāfanua was the result of that incestuous affair, when Saveasi’uleo married Tilafaiga, his brother’s daughter.92

Circa 1390, Aliamanaia and his sister Gatoloai engaged in sexual intercourse. Aliamanaia disappeared for fear that his father, Tunāvaetele, would kill him once he heard about

90 (Tupa’i Mau Simanu, email comm., March 29, 2010).
91 Many of the Teine during fieldwork joked about intra-liaisons between village men and women. Some believed that incestuous relations kept royal blood pure, a notion not shared by everyone in the village. It is, however, typical for young people not to know about the blood ties among themselves; hence, a connection could only be determined when a couple requires the help of the extended families. (Tilau Sialava’a, pers. comm., Wainuiomata, April 2009).
92 For the entire legend, see Walwork, ed., Samoa Ne’i Galo, 1994.
the situation. Gatoloai told her father, who immediately offered her to Malietoa Uituālagi, who lustily accepted. In a few months, La’auli (“a step in the dark”) was born. He succeeded his father to the Mālietoa title and took as wives the sisters Gauifaleai and Totogatā, descendants of Sāoluafata.93

An infamous saying in Samoan, ‘Oute fa’atulou mata’utia, “in prostrate fashion, I beg your pardon for the horrendous act,” is another reference to incest in Sāmoa. Circa 1510 C.E., So’oa’emalelagi and Tui Ātua Māta’utia were first cousins who were forced into a marriage by Leifi and Tautolo, the guards of the Tui Ātua title. Later, the orators urged So’oa’emalelagi to marry another cousin, Tamaalelagi, Salamasina’s father. So’oa’e was still married to Māta’utia; however, having failed to persuade the cousins to concur, Leifi and Tautolo murdered him while

Elsewhere in the Pacific, Hawaii’s royal families were known for their incestuous practices, which were later outlawed by the Christian church. Perhaps the most well known case was that between Kaumuaali’i or Kamehameha III, and his sister Na’ena’ena who defied the church and lived together for some time.94 In the Trobriands, Malinowski reports on the incest tolerance for chiefs; while incest between siblings was simultaneously regarded with horror.95 Archibald claims that during the medieval ages, incest and therefore incest taboos were prevalent in places like Europe and Africa.96

Some have argued that the aversion to incest in most cultures might have resulted in the formation of incest taboos. Bernard Williams concludes that the “contents of the aversion and those of the taboo” were not the same: the aversion is about “sexual relations with people with

93 Brother Henry, Tala Fa’asolopito o Famoa, 1958, 43-45.
whom one is reared,” while “the taboo is about marriage between those who are classified as close relatives.” 97 Westmarck argues that incest taboo was a “moral concept… based on moral emotions…. [T]hey are essentially generalizations of tendencies in certain phenomena to call forth indignation or approval.” Moreover, he says, what makes disapproval of incest moral is the fact that the “disapproval is general and does not appear to serve any selfish interest. In sum, it is moral because it is generally approved disapproval.”98

Wolf and Durham, however, describe the agents of incest as those who were reared and/or lived in the same household. In twentieth century discourse on incest and incest taboos, there is apparently no evidence that incest was inherently human. Rodham Needham concludes that the incest taboo is “a mistaken sociological concept and not a universal.” There can hence be no general theory of incest99 One could examine Saoluafata’s ban against incest against this discourse.

First, Teine Sāoluafata presently have an incest taboo which outlaws sexual relations with the village boys. Village boys are seen as brothers and in Sāmoa sisters and brothers do not live together in the same space. However, it could be historically proven that over the years, it appears that many Teine have violated it. During fieldwork, at least five Teine Sāoluafata were married to village brothers.100 My own family has had a few intra-village marriages from the early-twentieth century. My maternal grandparents came from both the ancestral villages of Sāoluafata and Sapunaoa, a village on the southern coast of ‘Upolu. Towards the end of the century, a cousin married the boy next door, and when he was killed in an alcohol related incident, the widow married his father. It was the practical thing to do in order for her and her

---

97 Bernard Williams in Wolf and Durham, ed. Inbreeding, 16.
98 Ibid.
100 From my survey conducted in December 2007.
children to gain New Zealand citizenship for a better future for her children. Since then, the second husband passed away and she and her children are living comfortably in New Zealand.

Second, there is no evidence that the taboo existed at the village’s founding by Luafatā’alae; and third, contemporarily, some Teine have knowingly violated the taboo for fia tagata, arrogant, reasons. Those that have violated the taboo have been people residing at the opposite ends of the village. This connotes a distance which some of my informants felt had sufficiently transcended the moral boundaries of incest; yet the taboo is clear: Teine are proscribed from marriage with the boys of the village. Vai, an informant during fieldwork similarly characterized a friend’s attitude when she had an affair with one of the paramount chiefs: “She wanted a direct link to the title for her children’s future.” Another informant, Afu, commented that the Nu’u o Teine had expelled this same woman from the Nu’u, only to reinstate her after some time without consequence. Ostensibly, the violator was not punished as Afu’s sister had been when she became pregnant, albeit not by a village boy.

Presently, Teine who engage in relationships with village boys are suspended; however, they may return after a divorce or death. There is no clear time frame on how long a single Teine is suspended; although, another Teine I conversed with remembered how her own mother still had a voice in the running of the Nu’u o Teine, if not through injecting gossip about the “law-abiding” members, then through her own daughters whom she instructed on how the Nu’u’s affairs should be conducted. It appears that the same is true of these Teine-cum-wives today. While not members of the Nu’u o Teine any more, they still exert an influence, albeit a negative
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101 (Finau, pers. comm., Wellington, December 2010).
102 (Vai, pers, comm., Wellington, April 2009, and Afu, Facebook comm., February 2011). Vai and Afu are pseudonyms since these informants did not want to be cited. I respect their request.
one; they have been, for example, very vocal about keeping the Teine out of the komiti a tama’ita’i, women’s committee.103

I have argued in the introduction to this chapter that the mamalu of Sāoluafata’s Teine could not have depended on the culture of virginity alone, but on their paramount connections. I say this since the reasons why some people have referred to the village as the nu’u pa’ia, sacred village are embedded in Saoluafata’s fa’alupega, honorifics.104 Tupa’i Mau pointed out in an email response to my questions that the girls of lower status might have used something like virginity as a political tool to gain status for themselves. I would argue the contrary—that the girls of Sāoluafata were of high status and did not need to prove their suitability as wives. Therefore, virginity could be considered a bonus for Teine Sāoluafata, although more of a private rather than public nature; what endowed them with mana and mamalu were the genealogical links carved for them by ancestors since the inception of their village some six hundred years ago.

Sāoluafata was founded by the ladies Luafata’alae and Taeolalopu’a of the fifteenth and sixteenth generations of the Tui Ātua lineage. The question is, was Luafata’alae subjected to public defloration in the fourteenth century? No one will ever know the answer. What will also never be known is when such a tradition began. It is possible that the virginity cult might not have existed until the more formal political reorganization of Sāmoa as a single entity under the Tafa’ifā, the four-titled monarch initially manifested in the person of Salamāsina, the favorite

103 (Eseta Nu’ualiu, pers. comm., Sāoluafata, December 2007). The women’s committee is a government initiated body in the village which combines sisters and wives in government-driven projects, e.g. health and hygiene inspections.
104 Pa’ia is an adjective meaning mamalu, dignified, and mamana, powerful. All three are also used as nouns in this study.
niece of So’oa’emalelagi Le Valasi, a descendant of Nāfanua and the two major families of Sāmoa, ‘Āiga Sa Tupuā and ‘Āiga Sa Malietoā.105

The Teine Saoluafata are direct suli of the titles Tui Ātua, Tui Ā’anaTupua, Mālietoa, Sagapolutele, and Tagaloa. Through the centuries, other links were added as evident in the symbolic acknowledgment of who’s who in the village fa’alupega listed in the preface and historicized in chapter four. There is no record on when village, district, and national honorifics became the custom in Sāmoa; however, a case could be made that as lands and chiefly titles—the two markers of a Samoan’s identity—were created, bestowed, and/or contested, villages organized as nu’u māvae, foundation villages, where members shared a common ancestry whose name was thus ordained as the paramount title.106

It is popularly believed that the classical council that is known today as the fono, village council, might have had its origins in Tagaloalagi’s Fale’ula, “the red meeting house.” The late paramount chief Fa’ivae Galea’i of Leone, American Samoa, related how the Fale’ula o Aitu ma Tagata was a place where ancestral spirits came down in the wee hours of the morning to initiate the new chiefs of Manu’a.107 The practice subsequently spread throughout Sāmoa such that when the papālagi burst through the horizon, the Fa’amatai was well established.

With the advent of the Christian mission in 1830, a parallel might have been drawn in that Tagaloa-a-lagi and Jehovah were both supreme beings with their hierarchies of mortal beings executing their will on earth.108 That is, the Christian hierarchy was another type of

106 Ibid., 11.
107 Honorable Senator and Afioga Fa’ivae Galea’i of Leone shared this oral tradition during the 2000 Language Conference sponsored by the American Samoan Humanities Council. The title Galea’i can be traced to the beginning of Manu’a politics as first king and father of the first Tuimanu’a. See Krämer, The Samoa Islands, ibid., 526, for this pedigree. Also Tu’u’u, Rulers of the Samon, 2001, 23.
108 Aiono-Le Tagaloa, Tapua’i, 2003, 58; see also Lalomilo Kamu, The Samoan Culture and The Christian Gospel, 1996 on the evolution of the Christian faith in Sāmoa and his notion that the Samoans are worshipping the vehicle of the Gospel—that is, the Church, instead of the Gospel.
chiefly system with Jehovah substituting Tagaloa-a-lagi and creating a class of local pastors as orators. These pastors eventually undermined the institution of the ‘augafa’apae, whose mana and mamalu derived from herself as priestess and feagaiga.\textsuperscript{109}

The Lotu, Churchism, at Sāoluafata

![Church at Sapapāli’i](image)

\textit{Figure 11. Church at Sapapāli’i, the village where John Williams dropped anchor during his first voyage to Sāmoa in August 1830.}

There is evidence that Sāoluafata was one of the first villages of Sāmoa to embrace the new lotu. According to K. T. Faleto’ese, Sāoluafata got its first pālagi missionary in 1844, fourteen years after the arrival of John Williams and the London Missionary Society (LMS) in 1830.\textsuperscript{110} He was Misi Pukana (Reverend E. Buchan), arriving in Sāmoa in 1838, the year before John Williams was killed at Erromanga. Buchan was initially posted at Faleālili, but relocated to


\textsuperscript{110} Faleto’ese, \textit{Tala Fa’asolopito o le Ekalesia}, 1959, 66.
Sāoluafata where he worked until his return to England in 1849. It is highly likely that he was at Saoluafata during the 1841 burning.

The second missionary at Sāoluafata was Misi Uatisone (Reverend W. I. Watson) who arrived in Sāmoa in 1866, but left four years later owing to ill health. It is possible that the village law banning other churches from being established in Sāoluafata was laid out at this time. As far as their involvement with Teine, there is no record of whether the Teine were consulted or if they received instruction from them.

Chief Sāgapolutele was the authority at Sāoluafata at this point; it is possible that the missionaries might have dealt only with the chiefs. It is therefore logical to deduce that the missionaries at Sāoluafata might not have dealt much, if at all, with the chiefesses of the Nu’u o Teine, or had time to learn about, or perhaps chose to ignore, village foundations and traditions. Insights garnered from Williams’ narrative reveal that the missionary wives were largely tucked away in the confines of household work and childrearing. Mary Williams, John Williams’ wife, for instance, rarely accompanied her husband on his far-flung missions, and was pregnant each time her husband was due to leave for another voyage. Once they were established at Raiatea, Tahiti, she was left behind frequently while Williams spread the Gospel. It would not be until 1939 that she accompanied her husband when they relocated to Fasito’otai, ‘Upolu, from where her husband launched the fatal trip to the Melanesian islands in 1839. Like John Williams, many missionaries were accompanied by their wives; however, there is no record on whether Buchan and Watson had wives while staying at Sāoluafata; however, since most of the

111 Ibid, 69.
113 Williams, Missionary Enterprises, 1837. See also Sione Latukefu, “Pacific Islander Missionaries,” in The Covenant Makers: Islander Missionaries in the Pacific,” ed. Doug Munro and Andrew Thomley (Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, USP, 1996); Oka Fauolo, O le Vavega o le Alofa: O le Tala Fa’asolopito a le Ekalesia Faapotopotoga i Samoa (Malua: Malua Printing Press, 2005), 67.
missionaries brought their wives, it is safe to assume that these men did as well. Missionary wives were instrumental in the domestication of Samoa’s *Teine* into seamstresses, needle-workers, cooks, and housewives. The pastor’s school in the village was a place where Samoa’s *Teine*, as members of the LMS church, learned *pālagi* skills. While the *Teine* produced goods for public consumption in pre-Christian society; the church taught the *Teine* how to manage their households and to prepare to become pastors’ wives.114

During these early years, the LMS church was showing signs of tremendous progress; by 1844 the Māluva Theological College was established and Reverend Dr. George Pratt was set to design a text on Samoan grammar and a bilingual dictionary. The Roman Catholic Church sprouted roots at Lealatele, Savai’i a year later, the same time that the native bird, manumea, received its scientific name, *Gnathodon Strigirostris*, and the “k” replaced the “t” as the colloquial Samoan. Pratt was apparently very disheartened by this development and deemed it a “great injury of the language.” Within this period as well, the Old Testament was completed in Samoan and by 1860, the entire Bible had been translated and was offered to the public. Missions to Niue and Tokelau also began during this period: Paulo introduced Christianity to Niue in 1849; in 1861, Tokelau welcomed their first Samoan missionary, and in 1865, Tuvalu did as well. By 1871, the LMS church had set up a mission in Papua New Guinea.115

The Methodist mission reopened after almost two decades of absence. In 1864, the Methodists began pastoral training for the local people at Satupa’itea, Savai’i, and four years later the Piula Theological College was opened. Piula is in Lufulufi, the village immediately east of Sāoluafata.

---

114 Papauta and Atauloma girls’ schools became popular places where pastors sought their wives.
All the while, three civil wars erupted: the War of the Taumua Fa at Vaimoso and Tufulele in 1848, the naval war between Ā’ana-Ātua and Salāfai-Manono in 1851, and the war of Tuā’oi i le Tai in 1859 between the two main families of Sāmoa—Sā Mālietoā and Sā Tupuā. Mālietoa Mōlī succeeded Mālietoa Taimalelagi, but died a year later; his son Mālietoa Laupepa succeeded him. Undoubtedly, since Sāoluafata was related to both families, its men probably fought as well although Krämer notes that Saoluafata allied itself with Sā Mālietoā. In 1868, discussions between various districts over the formation of a central government with headquarters at Mulinu’u took place; Laupepa’s claim against Talavou’s over the Mālietoa title was supported by Tuamāsaga.116

On the economic front, in 1855, JC Godeffroy und Sohn began trading through August Unshelm, the same year a United States agent was appointed in Apia. Two years later, it had opened an office in Apia, but by 1870, it was bought by the German firm, Deutsche Handels und Plantagen Gesellschaft, or DHPG—the same year the Tama a ’Āiga, Tuimaleali’ifano To’ōa Sualauvī, died. Cotton had ostensibly become Samoa’s leading domestic export by 1866, but a year later, a hurricane struck Sāmoa.117

Against this nineteenth century political and economic scenario, Christianity cemented its foothold in Sāmoa. Nonetheless, the question that remains unanswered is why Sāoluafata received missionaries and not the village next door. It appears that in subsequent years, the Church placed missionaries in villages known as the nu ’u o tamāli’i, villages of the paramount chiefs.118 Sāoluafata certainly fitted this bill. One can only surmise that Saoluafata’s connection to the Sa Mālietoā family placed them in a favorable position to receive their own missionaries.

---

116 Ibid.
117 Twenty three years later, as Great Britain, Germany, and the United States convened in Apia in March 1889 to determine the partitioning of Samoa, another severe hurricane sank six warships belonging to Germany and the USA, thus delaying the political decision.
118 Faleto’eese, Tala Faasolopito, 1959.
This connection is well documented in chapter four of this study, but it is worth mentioning again how the links to the Mālietoa and Tupua families became established. The *Nu’u o Teine* was and is still linked to the Sā Tupuā family through its *aloali’i* titles, Tualamasalā and ‘Afoafouvale, and the Fa’autagia family. Krämer, for some reason, does not make this connection obvious.\(^{119}\)

In the *Vavau*, circa 1720 through 1870, the sharing of power with their brothers was not coincidental with the advent of Capitalism and Christianity, but the latter course logically enhanced it. Having sighted the *papālagi* where the sky met the ocean a century earlier, the *Teine* ought to have known that these were forces beyond their control. Word of eighteenth century sightings and trading would have reached Sāoluafata; thus the *Teine* knew that a very different phenomenon was about to happen. Men of a different sort were coming and their brothers readily acquiesced to be their liaisons. Thus the 1877 contract with the Germans was signed by men—the terms of which affected Sāoluafata in various ways. It gave the Germans the right to anchor their ships at Saoluafata Bay.\(^{120}\)

The allocation of missionaries to Sāoluafata had to have been decided by the men, although there is no reason to believe that the power of the Teu’ialilo and Tululautu was any less because of the new development. Given the fact that the *Nu’u o Teine* has an existence to speak of, the *Teine* probably operated a coherent authoritarian force which hovered over their brothers and sons as a reminder of who the power behind the public persona of the village really was.

---

\(^{119}\) *Ibid.*, 317, 646. As iterated in chapter three, the links may be traced back to the marriage of Fineitalaga, ostensibly of the Sāgapolutele family, circa fifteenth century, to Letutupu, a daughter of Tuisāmoa of Falealili’s. Such a union resulted in the birth of Gauifaleai and Totogata, who both married Mālietoa Uitualagi’s son, La‘auli. They each had a daughter Gato’aitele and Gasoloaiaoolelagi, respectively. Gasoloaiaoolelagi gave birth to three children who were of noted significance in the teine’s genealogies. They were: Vaetamasoali’i, who became Salamasina’s paternal grandmother; Lalovimāmā, Tui Ātua Mata’utia’s father; and Le’atogaugaaletuitoga, So’oa’emalelagi’s mother. Much later, circa 1660, another descendant of Luafatā’alae, Tofopipupu, married Mālietoa Toatuila’epa. She was a daughter of Ta’amai of Sāoluafata.

However, I suggest that the hegemony if not hubris of the colonial administrations and the church eventually empowered Saoluafata’s men, while weakening the Teine’s voice in different ways. Today, matters concerning these institutions are controlled by the Nu’u o Ali’i; the Nu’u o Teine, as mentioned throughout this study, now plays a supportive role, albeit a very weakened one in both government and church initiatives.121

Evidence across Sāmoa of the church encroaching on village order was its weakening of the aualuma in the village.122 Consequently, young girls were encouraged to move in with the pastor and his family where they would be trained to cook and sew. There was also the belief that they would be safe from moetolo, night prowlers, in search of mischief.123 Moreover, living in church quarters could result in a marriage with a student pastor who occasionally spent the weekend with the veterans in their parishes. These brief interludes in the villages made church families the matchmakers between village girls and potential pastors who, according to church policy, could not graduate from theological college without a wife. On a darker side, pastors have not been above the fray of sexual molestations, as evident in cases across the twentieth century where pastors have āvaga, eloped, with village girls or have flown into jealous rages when their faletua, wives, so much as speak to a male member of the church.124 Away from the watchful eye of their brothers, the pastor’s house is not necessarily the safest place for a young virgin to be.

Nevertheless, the traditional faletautū, courtship house/protocol, of the paramount sons has become the Christian pulpit. In retrospect, it is perhaps the reason why many of these sons

121 (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Saoluafata, December 2007)
124 I grew up in the church, thus church news was common knowledge; moreover, the pastor who eloped with the village girl was a cousin’s husband.
chose to *tautua*, serve, their chiefs—not through the donning of the *pe’a*, male tattoo, but through the church. For the *feagaiga*, the shift from the *auluma* as classroom to the *Papauta* Girls’ School established in 1892, removed her from the village for an education in Christianity and preparation to serve as a pastors’ wife.

Perhaps on a more pragmatic side, although with somewhat depressing implications, Kenape Tepa Faleto’ese, Samoa’s renowned church historian, notes that many of Samoa’s daughters developed *mafaufau* and *amio*, intellect and behavior, and became a strong pool of potential wives from which many graduating pastors found partners for God’s work.125 *Papauta* Girls’ Schools was the result of a decision by the pālagi Elders in London in 1888 to provide a Christian education for the girls. In 1890, two English female missionaries, Misi Sulesa (Miss W.F.L.V. Schultze), and Misi Mua (Miss E. Moore), laid the foundations for the school, which officially opened on August 29, 1892, with a dedication by the Australian Governor’s wife, the Countess of Jersey. The school opened with 17 girls; a year later, 54 had enrolled, and in 1894, about 72 had registered. Ostensibly, Robert Louis Stevenson, who lived half a mile south of *Papauta*, assisted Misi Uitime (Reverend Whitmee) in the construction of the school. *Papauta* girls were evidently the first nurses at the Moto’otua Hospital; training on effective motherhood also began here. Girls from the Ellis and Tokelauan islands were also accepted at *Papauta*.126

In September 1900, five months after the United States hoisted its flag claiming Tutuila as territory, a similar school was established in American Samoa by Misi Mua (Miss Moore) and Misi Fereni (Miss A.E. French). Situated at Atauloma, Tutuila, it began with 65 girls, eleven of whom were from Manu’a. This number had risen to 89 when the school was officially dedicated on February 20, 1901. It was at Atauloma that the first Samoan nurses for American Samoa

---

125 Faleto’ese, *Tala Faasolopito*, 1959, 41-44.
126 Ibid., 41-44.
were trained. From this pool also came the first Samoan nurses to travel to Papua New Guinea.127

Conclusively, the position and role of Samoa’s *Teine as feagaiga* were redefined by the church. While there are no known records indicating the number of Saoluafata’s *Teine* who might have been schooled at Papauta, I am sure that there were many of them that were attracted to the new ideas and new roles. This different kind of work appeared cleaner, not back-breaking, and did not involve much struggle with the elements. There were many other *Teine* who did not pursue careers as church wives, but some of them ended up in those shoes due to their status as teachers and nurses. Teachers and nurses were attractive to many student pastors. Two of Saoluafata’s *Teine* in recent times went on the mission to Papua New Guinea. They were ‘O’omi Tuiloma Urika Saifoloi (1964-1971) and the late Fa’animo Auina Isaia Tiatia (1971-1977).128 Mrs. Saifoloi was attending the Teachers Training College at Mālifā when she married Saifoloi; Mrs. Tiatia was a staff nurse at Moto’otua Hospital. As mentioned in chapter five, others like Fua Tevaga and Lili’a Tafua also became prominent leaders in the church women’s affairs in the first decade of the twenty-first century.

_Toe Tepatasi, Reflections_

Since the advent of the evangelical mission from England, the church has taken Sāmoa and Sāoluafata through some amazing social, economic, and spiritual transformations—not only in the processing of its *tapua’iga*, worship, but also in the appropriation and moralization of *Teine*’s bodies. The discourse on the transformative nature of the _lotu_ sufficiently details the missionization of the Pacific. What is useful here is the interplay between the *Teine* of Sāoluafata and what I view as the usurpation of their spiritual and social powers by the church on

---

127 Ibid.
128 Fau’olo, _O le Vavega o le Alofa Lavea’i_, 2005, 603-06.
the one hand, and by the government on the other. I wish to end this chapter with the premise that the hubris of church and government on the traditional body politics of the *Nu’u o Teine* has resulted in a marginalization of the *Teine*; both agencies have touted the desire to democratize and develop rural villages in order to face the challenges of the twenty-first century. Yet, in the process, they have violated the sanctity of the space of *feagaiga* to the extent that Samoa’s *Teine* and those of Sāoluafata have had to scramble through a Western education to reclaim their voice and their position in the body politics at the village and national levels.

The attempt to explain the concepts and sources of the *Teine*’s *mana* and *mamalu* confirms the significant contributions of Samoa’s women to the maintenance of values and principles, if not their traditional manifestations over the centuries. What is clear however is the resilience of a certain spirit that, in spite of the hegemony of the Christian faith, social engineering by colonial administrators, and postcolonial discourse, has enabled the pulse of *Teine Sāmoa* to beat steadily as the *Teine* re-define the role of virginity in keeping peace and harmony at home and across the nation. During these trying times, the Teine’s institution—*Nu’u o Teine*, or *ausaluma* elsewhere—has suffered structural damage in that leadership has been missing and resources remain underdeveloped. However, in spite of such and the fact that certain taboos continue to be violated, their spirit, fortunately, has remained resilient. The *Teine* have kept their feet grounded and their heads high. There remain the lessons of the past such that when their men folk took off to war in all corners of Sāmoa, they, the *Teine*, were the ones who tended the fires of worship, tilled the fields, harvested the oceans for sustenance, and kept order in the village. Through it all, they have sustained a degree of *mana* and *mamalu*, of spiritual and social powers. With such, they have remained the “mistresses of their own favors.”
CHAPTER 7:  
‘A MALU I FALE, ‘E MALU FO’I I FAFO’  
CHECKING THE PETALS OF THE SU’IFEFILOI  
ANALYSES AND REFLECTIONS

The passing on of knowledge, especially tapu knowledge, between one generation and the next is usually done within the confines of the family… and… little can be done about the loss that arises because custodians [of such knowledge] are not sharing their knowledge before they pass away… [However], we need to tread carefully when engaging in tapu knowledge. The guiding issue in [its] reassessment has to be about how we ensure that this knowledge continues through to the next generation in a manner and form that preserves its integrity.

Tui Atua¹

Introduction: Final Petals of the Su’ifefilo

The purpose, goals, and objectives of this study have been to historicize the changes and continuities in gender and power relations in Samoan society using Saoluafata’s Nu’u o Teine to illustrate Teine as both agents and subjects of change and as vehicles of ancestral models that evolved as new paradigms were delivered by the various “tides of history.” It is ubiquitously known that the Teine of the Vavau were active political agents as sulī, heirs, of their parents and feagaiga, sacred sisters, of their brothers. Oral traditions and ethnohistory reveal Teine as warriors and politicians, producers and consumers of wealth, and keepers of peace and harmony—from Taemā and Tilafaigaē, to Nāfanua, So’oa’emalelagi, and Salamāsina.

Luafatā’alae, while not a national force as were the other Teine, reinvented herself as the founder and progenitor of generations of descendants and royal lineages of Sāmoa who have managed to sustain certain foundational principles of their constitution. Evidently, these teine’s actions and reactions to environmental and political pressures of various time-spaces resulted in a fascinating making and remaking of the networks of power in both traditional and contemporary society, and in imagined communities of Teine abroad and in cyberspace.

¹ Tui Ātua, in Su’esu’e Manogi, 2009, 118.
However, colonial and church administrations of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries consistently relegated *Teine* into subpar positions, while at the same time wowed them with the mantra of, *E au pea le ina 'ilau a tama’ita’i*, “the ladies’ thatching will continue to reach the roof;” thus leading them to believe in their *mālosi*, strength, to complete capital improvement projects, host dignitary, and stage celebrations. After almost fifty years of decolonization from Western colonialism—when *Teine* were also agents of social engineering and simultaneously excluded from the politics of nation building during the move towards independence—it seems that the *Teine* are reasserting themselves in bigger numbers into the front and center stage of village and national politics, although not so much the church. After years of *tautua*, service, to their fathers, husbands, and brothers in the name of *lotonu’u*, patriotism, and Jesus Christ, *Teine* appear finally to be mapping themselves into politics. Yet, statistical facts below and the reality on the ground tell a contradictory if not paradoxical story. Today, approximately 20% of Samoa’s *matai*, chiefs, are *Teine*, but only four of them have been from Sāoluafata where *Teine* and men have separate councils—*Nu’u o Teine* and *Nu’u o Ali’i*. These four *Teine* obtained their titles from the *Nu’u o Ali’i*. Therefore, none of the titles from the *Nu’u o Teine* are registered. I discuss this in detail later in this chapter.

On March 4, 2011, nine of 162 contestants in Samoa’s parliamentary elections were *Teine*, but only two were successful. Prior to the elections, four *Teine* held seats in parliament with three of them in cabinet posts. Five days after the elections, Sāmoa joined the international

---

2 I discuss in my master’s thesis the replacement of male teachers by women during and after WWII since the men left the classroom for better money being offer by the American marines in road construction. ‘Aumua’s lifestory reveals the effects of decolonization on Fa’asāmoa particularly as New Zealand engineered education and health programs, and locked them in as female responsibility; hence the establishment of the *komiti tumamā* which was later renamed as the *komiti a tama’ita’i*. See Simanu-Klutz, *Lifestory*, 2001, 77-79; also Penelope Schoeffel, “Women’s Associations, 1983, 2.

community in a celebration of the “International Day for Women.” The irony can hardly be lost on anybody.

Between 2001 and 2009, more and more girls held top management jobs in government and private offices—an increase from 22.2% to 53.9% respectively; from 17% to 29.4% as chief executive officers and general managers for government and corporations. In religion the number of Teine as deacons in village congregations has also increased.

Regardless of these latter statistics, it is a fact that no Teine has become prime minister, head of state, or pastor. However, while it is possible for a Teine to obtain either of the first two jobs, it is unlikely that a Teine will become a pastor at any time soon. This is particularly true for the largest denomination in Sāmoa. To illustrate, the Ekalesia Fa’apotopotoga Kerisiano i Sāmoa (EFKS) has yet to approve Teine as pastors, although many of them have become deacons in village congregations. At my church in Waimanalo, Hawai‘i, more than 50% of the deacons are Teine. It is only fair to conclude that in these so-called democratically-based institutions, the Teine’s ina’ilau, “thatching,” has stalled just beneath the taualuga, roof, of the house. On the surface, it appears that village and national governments have enjoyed symbiotic relations in terms of sustaining village peace and security, providing education for everyone, and ensuring health and hygiene at both village and national levels. Government social and political programs are monitored by the pulenu‘u, government liaison (Nu‘u o Ali‘i), and sui tama‘ita‘i, Teine representative (Komiti a Tama‘ita‘i); church programs are monitored by the Mafutaga a Tinā, fellowship of the mothers.4 The pervasiveness of gender bias in the politics and economics of both government and church unfortunately demonstrates a lack of will and self-determination on the Teine’s part, a situation that has been historically promoted by these very

4 Mafutaga a Tinā denotes mothers as members. In Sāolufata, traditional politics does not recognize the role of teine as mothers in public; in fact, the teine would be uncomfortable being called “mothers” in public.
institutions purporting to promote democratic principles. In the case of Säoluafata, the Teine’s ina’ilau—their council—gives them more power than their counterparts in other villages; however, the underutilization of that power to effect needed change and to ensure sustainability has made them vulnerable to the hubris of their brothers and to the hegemony of national and international policies and organizations whose agendas run counter to their politics and culture.

In this sense, the political power of the Nu’u o Teine relative to that of the Nu’u o Ali’i is no different from that of other Teine.

The Teine Samoa’s journey through village, government, and church politics has been paradoxical, particularly as Teine struggle to exercise their rights as suli and to fulfill their obligations as feagaiga, and as they subconsciously negotiate between the “politics of culture” and a “culture of politics.” This tension needs to be better understood, since it appears to have made Teine the victims of government and church programs for which they have also been agents. I would argue that this tension is a consequence of a lack of interplay between “principles of rationality” (the logic behind, or reasons for politics) and the “principles of traditionality” (the “historical-consciousness” of culture)—a “duality” which finds expression in what Rousseau and Herder (in Barnard) call “self-determination and political legitimacy.”

In his analysis of duality first proposed by Rousseau and Herder, Barnard equates self determination with “human mutuality” or “humanity.” Without such, he says, a “political culture” is not legitimate, cannot be universal, and lacks an “ethic” to transcend or blend its “civic character.” Moreover, a political culture could not be imposed from the outside; it has to emerge from within, be “lived,” and be “enjoined by a person’s inner will.” The appeal to both tradition and reason seems apt for even a small community such as the Nu’u o Teine, where

---

these critical elements of an ideal society appear to be missing. In particular, I found missing in their body politics many of the characteristics and elements of what constitutes a free and moral society. I believe that Teine Sāoluafata, given their legacy, must understand what it means to be “free moral agents” with “self-consciousness… [as] member[s] of a collectivity that is at once a historical-cultural growth and a rational-ethical creation.” These freedoms are protected by the national constitution; their manifestations however, need to be within the lived culture of the village.

Thus, there are three things that this study recommends for future research about the power of the Teine Sāmoa—and perhaps also as food for thought for Saoluafata’s Teine as they decide their own future directions. They are: Teine as faipule, girls as politicians (a reclamation of political legitimacy), Teine as fai’oa, girls as producers of wealth (rethinking economic choices), and Teine as faifea ’u, girls as pastors (recontextualizing mamalu or dignity). In order to become or to reclaim their roles and statuses in village politics, it would behoove the Nu’u o Teine to think about turning inward and having conversations among its own members—or to engage in what Anthony Giddens calls “reflexivity,” which is:

> the monitoring of their own day-to-day conduct which all competent members of society necessarily engage in. It is the distinctive property of the human species and would not be possible but for the social character of language.\(^7\)

In addition to the monitoring of actions, Giddens also refers to a

> reflexive self-regulation [which includes not just one’s self, but also] modes of organization whose conditions of reproduction are reflexively monitored…. Reflexive monitoring can refer both to organizational self-monitoring whose feedback loops prompt changes in organizational

---

conduct, and to a monitoring within and beyond the mode of organization which prompts criticism and contest.\(^8\)

While Giddens refers here to “capitalist enterprise and capitalism as a mode of production,” the relevant point for the Nu’u o Teine, in my view, involves the need to think (or unthink) some of the dogma surrounding their operations at home and abroad. Margaret Archer thus adds that reflexivity is the best way for human beings to have internal conversations encompassing activities such as day dreaming, fantasising, reliving past events, rehearsing for future encounters, planning for future eventualities, clarifying where we stand, confirming our understandings of a situation, taking stock of our lives i.e. the conversations we have with ourselves, silently and internally, rather than with external others.\(^9\)

By self, the Nu’u o Teine can be viewed as an individual body, rather than “external others” that includes everyone else. In other words, the Teine need to be leading the charge in a reclamation of their pule in all its manifestations, in their retraining as fai’oa—a status which continues in spite of the fact that many of them are old and lack knowledge of economic alternatives and the skills involved—and, most importantly, in a serious effort to become preachers and thus reclaiming one of their historical roles as feagaiga. Before I reiterate these points, an important story of a Teine Sāoluafata is worth sharing here for the insights into the possibilities that her journey may offer. Aunt Sipi’s story is a window into a past which was shaped by colonial and church rules, as well as by contemporary economics. Her story illustrates families on the move, but most importantly her time at Sāoluafata demonstrates the value of effective leadership and a commitment to serving families and communities. A daughter of a church minister, Aunt Sipi displayed that prayer and a sense of humor, love, and generosity can minimize the pains of a luckless youth and changes that have been beyond her control.

---

\(^8\) Ibid.
Tōfā Nu’ualiu Aniva Sipi Simanu: Natal Beginnings

Aunt Sipi was born on March 14, 1918 at Sātalo, Faleālili, four years after her parents were contracted for pastoral work there. She was named ‘Aniva, which means “the Milky Way.” She was the sixth child in a family of eleven, and one of the five daughters of the Reverend Simanuali’i Fagumoega, F.S. and Tilau Talatalaina, both descendants of Luafāta’alae. Aunt Sipi’s birth year is easy to remember since it was during that year when Sāmoa lost at least 8,500 people (22% of its population) to the Spanish influenza, introduced on November 17, 1918 by the SS Talune, a freight ship owned at the time by the Union Steamship Company of New Zealand. Amazingly, none of Aunt Sipi’s family died from it; although, a slight defect in one of her own eyes—hence the nickname Sipi, a corruption of the word sesepa, or cross-eyed—was suspected to have been caused by the influenza.¹⁰

Aunt Sipi spent 58 of her 80 years at Sātalo as the daughter who stayed behind to take care of her parents and every other relative who decided to make the village their home. Since she started a family early, life for her was totally of a domestic nature. She grew up in an era when pastors focused on teaching reading, writing, and ‘rithmetic in Samoan, the Scripture, and a domestic agenda that focused on instructing the girls to sew button holes, crochet woolen blankets, embroider pillow cases, and hopefully become pastors’ wives.

Thus, with aging parents and several mouths to feed, Sipi had no time to mope. She learned knowledge and skills about living off of the land; she knew when to harvest the reefs for sea cucumbers, seas urchins, octopi, and edible sponges, and when to begin the next weaving season. Not too far from the family quarters were her togālaufala and togalau’ie, flax, bushes,

and *togātolo*, patches of sugarcane. The former was for all kinds of mats, one of which was the ceremonial fine mat; the latter was for the thatch with which to cover the dome-shaped roofs of the *fale*. Aunt Sipi hardly travelled anywhere. Her education stopped at Standard 2 (equivalent of 4th grade), the terminal class in grade school in the 1920s and 1930s.

Elevated by their position as God’s representatives in the villages, pastors in the archipelago farmed and fished during the week in order to feed their families. They did not depend on the village folk for food. Their wives and daughters also engaged in weaving mats, beating tapa, sewing thatch, weeding plantations, fishing in the shallows, and taking care of the children. Thus Aunt Sipi grew up in a household dictated by a mother who was skilled in teine’s crafts and fishing and in *pālagi* sewing and cooking, which she learned from the missionary wives.

**Townbound: From the Abundance of Rural Fields to Hunger at Tufui’opa**

At the beginning of the 1960s in Sāmoa, the Congregational Christian Church of Western Samoa (CCCWS, formerly LMS, and later CCCS) revised its constitution, changed its name to Ekalesia Fa’apotopotoga Kerisiano a Sāmoa (EFKS), and imposed a ruling that altered the length of service for a pastor—from one that ended at death to one with a retirement age of 70. Her father, Simanu, was about 79 years old at the time and had to leave the village as soon as the year was over. At this time, many of the nieces and nephews that Aunt Sipi had helped raise needed lodging in Apia where they were moving for higher education. ‘Aumua found a piece of land for

---

11 Historically, foundation villages adopting the LMS church provided the pastors with land to farm. Aunt Sipi’s parents were offered three inland plots by the chiefs when he was contracted as pastor by Sātalo in the early twentieth century. Aunt Sipi had her flax and sugarcane bushes on this land. For an illuminating analysis of churches and national economy of Sāmoa, see Cluny and La’avasa Macpherson, in *Development on the Edge*, Kennedy Jackson et al., ed. (Auckland: Centre for Development Studies, Auckland University, 2005).

12 The LMS church Samoanized its name to Ekalesia Fa’apotopotoga Kerisiano i Sāmoa, EFKS, in 1961. See Fauolo, *Faapotopotoga Kerisiano i Samoa*, 2008, 748. In 1997, Western Samoa decided to remove the word “Western” from its name, thus returning it to its pre-colonial name.
lease and she moved Aunt Sipi there, where she started a life that was totally foreign to what she was used to.\textsuperscript{13}

She took her sudden urbanization with a grain of salt. A drastic contrast from subsistence living in the village, the market economy of town was a shock to the residents of Tufui’opā. Aunt Sipi and her wards experienced hunger and numerous temptations to catch the next bus or boat home to where food was not a preoccupation. For them, Apia and the \textit{pālagi} lifestyle promised to them through a western education, was just not worth the rumbling guts and the dry mouths during the night. Fortunately, the desire to succeed and to never be hungry again was enough motivation to struggle through the difficulties. Aunt Sipi made them feel safe in her love, even inspiring them to invent comedy as temporary relief. They saw humor in their condition and to this day, every family reunion is like \textit{Comedy Central} as people reminisce about the rough beginnings at Tufui’opā and our beloved Aunt. In 1964, Aunt Sipi’s tenure in town was ending. Simanu let ‘Aumua know that he did not want to stay at his wife’s village.\textsuperscript{14} He was an old man needing peace and quiet, not the daily stopovers by the village chiefs seeking his advice. After much begging by ‘Aumua for her to move to Sāoluafata so that Simanu and Lole could move to Tufui’opā, Aunt Sipi acquiesced. She was in her mid-fifties—no longer a spring chicken and no longer used to the kind of village life into which she was heading.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{13} See Simanu-Klutz, “‘Aumua Mata’itusi Simanu,” 2001, 166-75.
\textsuperscript{14} Aunt Sipi’s biological mother, \textit{Tilau}, passed away before I was born. A church policy stipulated that widowed pastors were to remarry within six months after the passing of their wives; hence, Simanu married Lole Samuelu of the village of Afega. She was a graduate of Papauta Girl’s School, discussed in the previous chapter. (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Kaneohe, January 2011).
\textsuperscript{15} Lole was Simanu’s second wife. The first wife died in 1947; \textit{Simanu} did not take another wife until two years later. It appears that this policy was not as heavily enforced as it is today. Lole was younger than Sipi and a little older than the rest of the siblings. The rest of the \textit{Tufui opa} story appears in the master’s thesis about Aumua’s lifestory. See Simanu-Klutz, “Lifestory,” 2001.
Eastbound: the Rise to Eloquence and Leadership

Aunt Sipi was resigned to the fact that once again she was having to accommodate family needs; it didn’t matter what she thought or wanted. Sāoluafata was another foreign place for her. However, by age 80, after about 30 years as an orator in the Nu’u o Teine, her faith in God and Fa’asāmoa had solidified; her final project was the teine’s council.

When she arrived at Sāoluafata, the family place was a mess. The former residents did not want to take care of her, so her son, Sape, and wife, Eseta, assumed that role. Soon, they adjusted and established themselves as the long-time caretakers of the Nu’ualiu family. To return the family to a legitimate status in the village, the extended family decided on Sape assuming the title Nu’ualiu, a title formerly held by her brother, Fuata’i, who had succeeded Simanu as pastor of Sātalo.16

Aunt Sipi did not become a member of the Nu’u o Teine immediately; instead, she focused on developing her new family. She planted a few bushes of flax behind the living quarters. She returned to her weaving, which she could not do much of while in town. The main house had a tin roof, thus she did not need a big sugarcane patch for roofing material.17 The main house also had a concrete floor so she did not need many floor mats of pandanus leaves; instead she planted flax for the sleeping mats for her family and the church, and more importantly, for the fine mats for family fa’alavelave. Sāoluafata was land-rich and while Aunt Sipi’s son and family farmed, she and her young granddaughter, also named Eseta, fished the promontory of Utusi’a for exactly the same food she was used to fetching at the Sātalo lagoon—

---

16 Reverend Fuata’i Simanu was a graduate of Malua Theological College, but had never practiced until Sātalo asked his father, Simanu, to allow his son to become his successor. Rather, he decided to become a teacher and village chief until his “calling.” It is testimony to the deep emotional and spiritual bonds a pastor and his congregational may have for each other, a reality which was rare at the time. Other villages, such as Nofoali’i on ‘Upolu, has just hired their retired pastor’s son to succeed him. (Vineta Tanielu, pers. comm., Honolulu, June 2011).

17 The traditional fale, house, was covered with thatch made of dry sugarcane leaves. As the corrugated iron and rectangular shaped houses became popular, fewer and fewer sugarcane bushes were planted.
sea, innards of a sea cucumber, *loli*, another variety of sea cucumber, *gau*, sea slug, *tuitui*, sea urchin, *lumane*, sea sponge, and small fish. At first, she hardly knew anybody, but at ‘Aumua’s insistence, she took up membership in the *Nu’u o Teine*. It was there in the shallows of the tidal divide, that she made the acquaintance and gained the trust of fellow *Teine*. I overheard her telling ‘Aumua one day about how inadequate she felt during her early years in the *Nu’u o Teine*; how she was about to experience freedom of speech and the power of *Teine* in a village for someone who grew up in the rigid folds of church dogma.

Sāoluafata was a different village from Satalo, she said; it was managed by *Teine*. She kept her ear to the ground as she observed and memorized village lore and protocol. She learned from charismatic leaders who ruled with an iron hand; who shaped the girls into obedience along the principles of hard work, fearless politics, and sexual restraint; and who frequently employed public humiliation on the cultural deviants. The sā, taboos, were closely observed and violations resulted in heavy fines or ostracization. Upon their passing, Aunt Sipi became the oldest member to whom the younger members were looking for leadership; she rose to the occasion. Having listened to her father and brothers deliver oratory, she found the art come naturally to her. As such, she also had the *pule fa’asoasoa*, distributive authority, and *pule fa’aaogā*, exploitative authority, over council resources. She was in charge of redistributing the wealth of the *Teine* equitably, according to status and rank.18 During *malaga*, Aunt Sipi directed the girls during *‘ava* ceremonies and the exchange of goods.

Sāmoa was changing rapidly in the 1970s and 1980s as it hurtled towards modernity and modern development. Sipi was mindful of the shifts in mentality and the changes in material culture and sociality as more and more *Teine* became educated, married, and relocated. What

---

18 This process of distribution is known in the village as Fa’asāoluafataga, which simply means every family or *teine* was going to receive an equal portion of the wealth. This tradition is also done in the *Nu’u o Ali‘i*. (Nu’ualiu Onosa’i, pers. comm., Sāoluafata, December 2007).
was worse, was that the other Teine were refusing membership since many saw the Nu’u o Teine as an obstruction to their wishes, such as adopting new fashions like wearing pants in the village and going to the night clubs in town. Moreover, New Zealand’s labor recruitment for its meatpacking industry was also siphoning Teine from the village; consequently, Sāoluafata, like everywhere else in the country, was left with the old and the young and with very few able-bodied people to work the fields and the meeting houses. Migration was a growing force; hence, by the time Sipi was an elder in the Nu’u o Teine, the Sāoluafata communities abroad have become fertile grounds for the Nu’u o Teine on a fund raising tour.

The Teine adjusted their working agenda as well: as remittances flowed in from relatives abroad and as new kinds of mats could be bought or gifted, fewer and fewer Teine continued or picked up weaving after leaving school. Thus fewer bushes were being planted and tapa making has pretty much become history as a village industry.

Aunt Sipi was a skilled orator. Although she was initiated as an orator under the title, Nu’ualiu, during big ceremonies, she was the de facto spokeswoman for Teu’ialilo Malavai under the title, Eva. An orator stood to gain much from village functions and fa’alavelave, since each time she orated, she was gifted with fine mats and money. Unfortunately, she did not become a preacher and I doubt that she ever thought it was possible for Teine to become preachers. Being a chief in the Nu’u o Teine and deacon in the church required a lot of money; thus, Aunt Sipi was confident that the nephews and nieces she had pampered and suffered in an

---

19 Many Samoans were enticed by the New Zealand government before and even after Sāmoa became independent in order to provide labor in its freezing works, or meat packing plants. Migration to New Zealand increased in the 1950s as the demand for labor led to more and more islanders leaving the familiar for a very different landscape. See “Samoans,” in Te Ara, http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/samoans/1.

20 Today, an orator could garner at least $20.00 for a speech in a small gathering; but $100.00 if not more, during big occasion. Aunt Sipi also became a church deacon.
earlier lifetime would rise to the occasion and donate on her behalf; they did this until the day after her funeral.

The high point in her life, undoubtedly, was her service to her fellow Teine and church. She talked about the Nu’u o Teine with pride, and loved and traveled miles to keep it current. She learned and delivered the oratory when the occasion required it, and advocated mercy for fellow Teine with fraudulent and misguided behavior. A few years before her death, Aunt Sipi led the Nu’u o Teine on a fundraising trip to New Zealand. It was apparently a very successful trip and they went home with a lot of money; however, a few months later, the treasurer committed suicide on the day she was to give a long-awaited financial report. It appeared that after that incident, the council lost some of its will, if not much of its legitimacy.  

O Manū Ta Te Tete’a Ai; O Manū Foi Ta Te Feiloa’i Ai,
(We Part in Peace, We will also Meet in Peace)22

When Aunt Sipi died, she left an even bigger vacuum that has since been hard to fill. Teu’ialilo’s niece, Tofā Seumālō Meripa, assumed the oratory at the beginning of the new millennium; however, two years after my fieldwork, I heard that she had also moved to New Zealand. Teu’ialilo Malavai, whom Aunt Sipi represented wherever she went in her duty as paramount leader of the Nu’u o Teine, spoke with sadness about Aunt Sipi when I met with her in July 2007. She was in her 70s and had also lost her husband a few years prior to Aunt Sipi’s death; she appeared disoriented. She spoke with sadness about the state of the teine’s affairs in the village. Rest in peace, Aunt Sipi.

21 (Samalā’ulu Mata’itusi, pers. comm., Sāoluafata, December 2007).
22 Mavaega, farewell between brother and sister, Manusāmoa and Pāgōfie before one of the Mālietoa wars. Manusāmoa was the lead warrior in Mālietoa’s army; he killed his counterpart who was his sister’s husband. Having learned of this hero’s identity, Mālietoa sighed, E ua ta fia Falealili fia, “Oh I wish I could be Falealili.”
I have argued throughout this study that the leadership of the *Nu’u o Teine* has been weakened by the absence of the paramount chieftesses Teu’ialilo and Tululautū, who have had to depend on their children for their care. Fa’asāmoa demands that elders are taken care of; hence, their vulnerability to dislocation when the children who can provide the best care migrate to urban areas for work. The current holder of the Teu’ialilo title followed her only child to New Zealand in the mid-2000s; however, due to immigration complications, she had to return to Sāmoa where nieces and nephews who live in the town area of Apia are providing her with care.23 The holder of the Tululautū title, on the other hand, is in her 90s and resides in American Samoa. She returns periodically.24

Historically, where once the elderly died in their natal villages, urban migration as a major outcome of modernization has resulted in their displacement, a situation which finds expression in Albert Wendt’s *The Songmaker’s Chair*, a play depicting the tradition of *fa’aui le ʻula*, passing of the garland/title, to the next holder. It is a depiction of Afioga Peseola Olaga who is dying in Auckland, New Zealand, after years of employment in the meatpacking factories (aka the “freezing works”), and raising a family of four. He presents the title to his older son, Fa’amau, a deputy principal who reluctantly accepts it. Peseola is presumably buried in New Zealand.25

---

23 (Samalā’ulu Mata’itusi, phone. comm., December 2010).
24 Ibid.
25 Writers like Albert Wendt, Epeli Hau’ofa, Konai Thaman, Pio Manoa, and their protégés in the early days of Pacific literature have produced texts which are characteristically angry and frustrated in tone, as they depict cultural loss and displacement during colonialism and the self-aggrandizement of self-serving islanders. See Paul Sharrad, *Albert Wendt and Pacific Literature: Circling the Void* (Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press, 2003), for a comprehensive analysis of Albert Wendt’s work. See Albert Wendt, *The Songmaker’s Chair*, 2004, for generational issues of migration. Epeli Hau’ofa has written commentaries on the effects of modernization on the islanders in *Kisses in the Nederends* and his famous satire *Tales of the Tikongs*. For islanders selling their souls, see Konai Helu Thaman, “My Blood,” in *Higano* (Suva: Mana Publications, 1987), 6-7; Pio Manoa, “Recall,” in *South Pacific Literature: From Myth to Fabulation*, ed. Subramani (Suva: University of the South Pacific, 1992), 17;
This depiction raises a pertinent question for the Teine of Sāoluafata, one which has to do with the efficacy of their titles in village politics. Historically, when title holders are not in their foundation villages, new ones are chosen by their families. The absent ones could return them, retain them, or be stripped of them. Meanwhile, the new holders assume the roles and responsibilities prescribed for such titles. It is a bit more complicated, however, when paramount titles are at issue. When the current holder of the Sāgapolutele title assumed these roles and responsibilities and declared that he had “stripped” Malavai of her title, rumblings of shock and displeasure ostensibly spread through the Nu’u o Teine. Teu’ialilo’s response when I asked her in April 2009 was that only God was the judge of such action. Yet, it is quite legal, under the national constitution, for families to remove the titles from holders who are not residents of the village.26

While everyone knows that titles are for life at the Nu’u o Teine, this seeming disruption in village politics affirms the importance of this study—the purpose of which is to trace a genealogy of the subjugated knowledge of the Nu’u o Teine from its founding to the present, and to employ a hermeneutics of the power relations and mechanisms that affected and were affected by the Teine’s politics. This has been done against a backdrop of national and international human rights initiatives, across a time-space of at least six hundred years. The desperation for this kind of knowledge, which is not in the consciousness of most members of the Teine’s council, was strengthened by a small though no less significant incident which I experienced during the preliminary days of my research trip.

---

26 (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Honolulu, July 2007). The Sa Tagaloa family moved to remove a holder who had disobeyed court orders to move back to Sāoluafata and take care of the family.
The title of this chapter—“A Malu i Fale, E Malu Fo’i i Fafo, means “when one is safe at home, one will also be safe outside.” It was a proverb used by ‘Aumua when she and I visited the Sa’o, paramount chief, of our Sā Tagaloa family. It clarified for me what I was trying to do for a dissertation.

In July 2007, during my first research trip, ‘Aumua and I visited with our paramount chief, Susuga Tagaloa Donald Kerslake, at his town house at Vaiala, a suburb of Apia.27 It was Sunday in Sāmoa. Soon after our arrival, lunch was announced and we extended the conversation to the dining table. As soon as grace was taken care of, I reached out for a helping of palusami, but ‘Aumua immediately ordered me to stop. I noticed then that she was not eating either. Tagaloa helped himself to fish and taro as he lightly protested that since we were family, we should join him. ‘Aumua replied, E le āfāina. O le mea e tatau ona fai. A malu i fale, e malu fo’i i fafo, “It is quite all right. It’s the right thing to do. If one is safe in one’s house, one is also safe outside it.”

Tagaloa continued to eat while ‘Aumua engaged him in family talk. After perhaps ten minutes, he asked the servers for a bowl of water with which to rinse his hands. As soon as he said that, ‘Aumua started eating and I followed suit. I felt confused and somewhat offended that Tagaloa, who was much younger than she and I, was afforded such deferential treatment. But such feelings were soon replaced by a sense of pride that here I was, talking to the paramount chief of our ‘āiga, a privilege not many people could have. Moreover, I was proud to be related to such a brilliant individual whom I had known since he was a young boy at school, but who was now holding the pule and mamalu of the paramount title, Tagaloa. As they talked, I ate and listened; the frustration of an earlier moment was replaced by awe and an eventual appreciation.

---

27 As President of the Lands and Titles Court, he was entitled to government housing at Vaiala, not too far from the wharf at Matāutu. He also has a residence at Sāoluafata which he uses during the weekend or when village affairs require his presence.
that he, like us, believed in and was supportive of the *Nu’u o Teine*. During such an epiphanous moment, ‘Aumua had introduced me to village lore and etiquette—a powerful reminder of my manners as a subordinate infiltrating the realm of chiefs—and a paramount one at that.

The motivation for selecting Sāoluafata as the site for an historical analysis of the power of the *Teine Sāmoa* in village and national governance also satisfied a personal hunger for information about its founders—Luafatā’alae and her daughter, Taeolalopu’a—its *fa’avae*, founding principles, gendered politics, and why it has been called a *nu’u pa’ia*, sacred village. I have sated such curiosity through an extensive mining of Samoa’s ethnohistory, through ongoing personal face-to-face, phone, Facebook, and email conversations with key informants—many of whom are relatives and friends—and through an online survey of a random group of Samoans, including female students, a few colleagues and strangers who were interested enough in my topic. I am deeply indebted to these people. Many of the survey respondents lived in New Zealand and American Samoa. The respondents from American Samoa were members of a congregation affiliated with the EFKS in Apia; most of them were originally from ‘Upolu and Savai’i.28

A sweeping conclusion to be made about this study is that, for the most part, the power of Samoa’s *Teine* and those at Sāoluafata can be reclaimed if not strengthened, and can be beneficial to all if the *Teine* become knowledgeable about village origins, agents of change, and the consequences of such across time. The maxim that knowledge is power can never be a cliché; in a Foucauldian sense, knowledge is freedom and a weapon with which to stem the dangers invoked by misinformation, disinformation, or a lack of information—“conditions of possibility,” as Foucault would say.

---

28 Not to be confused with EFKAS, the Ekalesia Fa’apotopotoga Kerisiano i Amerika Sāmoa. In 1980, the American Samoan Congregationalists split from the mother church headquartered in Apia. See Tavita, *Samoa Entry*, 2006, 79.
Recapping the essence of this study emphasizes the critical need for historical knowledge to inform contemporary decisions. Saoluafata’s *Nu’u o Teine* has been a victim of unknowing; thus I hope this genealogy will provoke a dialectic for the *Teine* as they seek the particularities of individual pasts that I might have left out—not because I have wanted to, but because they were not there. These “silences” need to be uncorked even if that means certain moments of discontent, or even sanctions.

I frame the conclusions of this study by adopting some of the vision of Pacific leaders. They are “peace and harmony, security, and economic prosperity.” These concepts confirm that the human experience is at once both resilient and fragile, that humans are both agents and victims of that experience and of the systems they create or are created for them. The *Teine* of Sāoluafata have been both agents and victims of their experience; the *Nu’u o Teine* appears to be in a moment of political instability that has lasted for at least twenty or so years. According to informants, this instability has been created by a lack of leadership and knowledge of many of the village protocols, especially those between the *Nu’u o Teine* and the *Nu’u o Ali‘i*, their brother’s council and the key source of their discontent.

Yet if history is to teach the *Nu’u o Teine* anything, it is that the space which Luafatā’alae and Taeolalo pu’a had carved for them has been relatively stable in the *longue durée* of at least six hundred years. Except for the bombardment of the village and its neighbors by Wilkes’ expedition in the early-nineteenth century, and perhaps a few blown thatched roofs by past cyclones, the village has managed to ride the “tides of history” without suffering much collateral damage to its socio-political structure. Even the numerous civil wars throughout Samoa’s

---

29 Pacific leaders forged a vision of the future at its 40th anniversary. In there, the leaders envisioned the Pacific as “a region of peace, harmony, security and economic prosperity, so that all of its people can lead free and worthwhile lives,” See “The Leaders’ Vision,” in Pacific Islands Forum: 40th Anniversary Symposium, (Online: Pacific Forum Secretariat) [http://forum.forumsec.org/pages.cfm/about-us/leaders-vision/](http://forum.forumsec.org/pages.cfm/about-us/leaders-vision/)
history and the sharing of the *pule fa‘avae*, constitutive power, *pule fa‘aso‘a*, distributive power, *pule fa‘aaoga*, exploitative power, and *pule fa‘amalumalu*, protective power, with their brothers did not diminish the Teine’s ability to sustain a cohesive polity. Sāoluafata means *sā o*, taboos which are sacred to, Luafată’alae. Originally known as Evaloa, the renamed village was resource-rich. Most of this land belonged to the title Sāgapolutele—a title which dates back to the primordial period of Samoa’s cosmogyny.30

Currently, two councils control village politics. They are the *Nu‘u o Teine* and the *Nu‘u o Ali‘i*. Each council is headed by two paramount titles: Teu‘ialilo and Tululautū for the former, and Sāgapolutele and Tagaloa for the latter. The *Nu‘u o Teine* was the locus of power in the deep Vavau, circa fourteenth to seventeenth centuries. However, for a variety of reasons, the Teine decided to share power with their brothers. It is most likely that this power sharing became reality during the era of the Sā Tupua family, circa 1660 to 1750, when the sons of Tafa‘ifā Tupua Fuiāvailili, king of Sāmoa, married Teu‘ialilo and Tululautū, daughters or sisters of Sāgapolutele and Tagaloa respectively. In line with Samoa’s tradition whereby each paramount chief had a corresponding sister or daughter as ‘*augafa‘apa‘e* or *sa‘otama‘ita‘i*, as the village feagaiga, the paramount titles, Teu‘ialilo and Tululautū, derived from the tears of the daughter, Taeolalopu’a, were incorporated by the male counterparts, Sāgapolutele and Tagaloa as such. Notwithstanding, the Teine’s titles signified paramountcy and the right to *pule*—to exploit and distribute the resources as they saw fit and to control village politics. Unfortunately, this gave these titles the appearance of subordination to their male counterparts. In fact, it had actually led the people to think that the Teine’s titles were of a lesser status. Perhaps this is what

---

promoted the current Sāgapolutele to remove the title, Teu‘ialilo, from Malavai, its current holder.\(^{31}\)

Thus, while this study suggests that the power of the *Teine* has been constant for hundreds of years, informants revealed that the *Nu‘u o Teine*, the protagonist of this study, had been experiencing a decrease in their ability to influence village affairs. Since the passing of Aunt Sipi, there has not been a strong and respectable voice to represent them in their *Vā* with the *Nu‘u o Ali‘i*. It appears, therefore, that the Teine’s political legitimacy has been challenged, particularly by those fellow *Teine* whose membership in the *Nu‘u o Teine* has been revoked due to a violation of the incest and pregnancy taboos.\(^{32}\) It has been reported that these sisters have expressed a need to demolish the Teine’s council; it is possible therefore that the exclusion of the *Teine* from participating in the *komiti a tama‘ita‘i*, women’s committee, created by the national government, is a foreshadowing of the disappearance of the *Nu‘u o Teine*. However, *Teine* informants have been adamant that no one could be so daring as to suggest or even cause such a disappearance.

It would, therefore, be ironic and very frustrating if after more than six hundred years since its inception, circa the mid 1300s, the *Nu‘u o Teine* were to become a thing of the past because of its own *Teine*. In Sāoluafata, it is the sisters themselves who are the catalysts in shaping counterintuitive attitudes against the *Nu‘u o Teine* as a legitimate decision-making body in the village—first, through these Teine’s lack of support and denial of their own daughters from membership in the *Nu‘u o Teine*, and second, because of a limited knowledge of traditional epistemology and ontology—the foundations and protocols of village affiliations. Based on the surveys, the Teine’s knowledge of the foundations of their village was extremely limited: some

\(^{31}\) (Maria Kerslake, pers. comm., Apia, January, 2009).
\(^{32}\) Violations of other taboos incur fines either monetary or in kind.
did not know the founder’s name; others unfortunately did not care to divulge their knowledge. This is understandable given a misguided belief that genealogical knowledge should not be in the public domain.

Foucault had nudged me into an archaeology of subjugated knowledge about one of the many ancestral villages to which I belong. I hope that I have dug up enough fragments of hidden knowledge to whet the Teine’s appetite for a dusting off of the dust of time and a polishing of the petals of their pule with which to improve relationships with the brothers and their wives, and a true re-centering of their pule in village politics. I have unearthed many of these petals and have begun the su’i fefiolo, medley, of genealogical connections and models of production—a garland of history, the contents of their pule. These are possible through their status as suli, heirs, and feagaiga, sacred sisters of their brothers; these are the mechanisms of their power which have been challenged by their own kith and kin, their men folk. As will be discussed later in this chapter, it is possible for the Teine to sustain their socio-political powers in Sâoluafata if there is a willingness to reflect upon what has worked, or not, in their lifetime.

However, perhaps the biggest challenge has come from within the council itself. As discovered during fieldwork, none of the respondents to the questionnaire distributed during the luncheon meeting on December 31, 2007, had any knowledge of Saoluafata’s past. Moreover, there was confusion over the protocol for oratory. Neither of the paramount chieftesses was at this luncheon due to reasons mentioned earlier. It is little wonder then, that the Teine were feeling insecure, unsafe, and downright popole, worried, that their pule had been challenged by their brothers. Feeling malu, safe and protected, has been shaken and along with that, their mamalu, dignity or social power.
This chapter therefore is a reflection on how the demands of being *suli* and *feagaiga* can be re-grounded in real space and time. Informed by a comparative reading by F.M. Barnard of Rousseau and Herder on “self-direction and political legitimacy,” this narrative brings to the ground level in Sāoluafata Barnard’s understanding that “culture and political nationalism” allows for culture to be a “source of political legitimation,” and that culture is “potentially relevant… [and] indispensably necessary.” Legitimation means that “a nation is no longer a group of people owing political allegiance to a common sovereign, but a particularized entity rooted in and bound by its own distinctive traditions and modes of expression[;]… that [t]he historical self-consciousness of a collectivity… is… however, not simply a grown or natural given,… but a product of cultivation.” In this sense, Barnard fuses Rousseau’s and Herder’s ideas of politics and culture resulting in the “transformation of political legitimation… from the ethos of the state-nation to that of the nation-state.”

Sāoluafata is not a “nation” in the sense used by Rousseau, Herder, and Barnard; nonetheless it requires the same line of thinking in order for the *Teine* to begin a rehabilitation of their power. The following discussion, therefore, highlights a few alternatives for such a goal.

**Future Possibilities**

*Teine as Faipule: Reclaiming Political Legitimacy*

When Aunt Sipi died, the *Nu’u o Teine* ostensibly impressed other mourners, especially her family, with a display of its *agaifanua*, its unique traditions. The *Teine* performed the duties that would have been the responsibilities of the untitled men in the rest of the archipelago. For all intents and purposes, the *Nu’u o Teine* had at this time what it took to have political legitimacy. Farbienne Peter, in an entry in the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, launches a

---

comparative explication of philosophies on political legitimacy, using Weber’s thesis as the focal point. According to Peter, Weber defines political legitimacy as “the basis of every system of authority, and correspondingly of every kind of willingness to obey,… a belief… by virtue of which persons exercising authority are lent prestige[.]” Moreover, continues Peter, Weber believed that people had faith in a “political or social order” because of “tradition,” the leaders’ “charisma,” and the “rationality for the rule of law;” that “faith in a particular social order produces social regularities that are more stable than those that result from the pursuit of self-interest, or from habitual rule-following.”34 By virtue of Max Weber’s conception, village people had faith in the *Nu‘u o Teine*, obeyed its rules and practices and afforded prestige and respect to those at the leadership level. For centuries, generations of Luafata’aalae’s descendants accepted the authority of Teu’ialilo and Tululautū and obeyed their commands. They accepted the *Nu‘u o Teine* as their socio-political tradition, had faith in the charisma of their chieftesses, and trusted in the legality of their laws.35 These rules of law were called *sā*, taboos; which over time, have ranged from something as personal as banning a brother from setting foot on the grounds of Sāoluafata (Luafatat’aalae forbade her stepson from stopping at Sāoluafata), to the gendering of space (the brothers were not to set foot in the Teine’s space when they were meeting).36 The question posed by Peter in this entry involves a moral justification of political authority. What is certain at Sāoluafata is that the Teine continue to believe in the legitimacy of their council, even if others do not; it is after all protected by national law in the sense that village councils could maintain the right to impose their rule according to their *fa’avae*, founding principles.37

---

36 See chapter two for a detailed description of the founding of Sāoluafata by Luafatat’aalae and Taeolalopu’a.
37 See “The Village Fono Act 1990, No. 3” in *Pacific Islands Legal Information Institute, An initiative of the University of the South Pacific School of Law to promote access to Pacific law* [http://www.paclii.org/paclii/copyright.html](http://www.paclii.org/paclii/copyright.html)
Chapters three and four focused on the Teine, their political power, and the sources and tools of that power as ingredients of legitimacy. To recap, first, Saoluafata’s Teine are suli of their family titles and lands. By virtue of the founder of their village, they have been chiefs, the political force in the village. This separates them from the Teine in the rest of the Samoan archipelago. Otherwise in Sāmoa, every son or daughter, whether biological or adopted, is heir to titles and lands; although, historically, Teine Sāmoa have deferred their rights to hold titles to their brothers, and have been quite happy in their role as feagaiga, the sisters as sacred covenant. At a lofty level, Teine Sāmoa, or tamafafine, feel empowered by the honor bestowed upon them by their brothers, their tamatane; in return, they have supported their brothers’ political ambitions for centuries with the products of their labor—the ‘ietoga, fine mats, ‘iesina, white cloth, siapo, tapa cloth, and adornments for chiefly ceremonies. These are the items of exchange during fa ‘alavelave. In the past, these items secured political alliances and economic survival; they were symbolically the items of diplomacy between two opposing forces that enhanced political legitimation. Today, the products of this labor have been more or less objectified; cash has become just as important if not more so than fine mats. Since the commodification of tōga, a Teine without weaving skills can easily buy one from the swap meet, or totoma, beg, for them from friends or colleagues.

Teine Sāoluafata, by virtue of birth, have the right to assume chiefly titles including those from the men’s council; however, these Teine’s titles are not accessible to their brothers and sons. Conversely, the national law concerning the rights of suli legitimizes a Teine’s claim to the men’s titles. The Nu ’u o Ali’i has so far bestowed titles on four Teine; however, all of them

38 However, just two of the thirty respondents to an informal online survey concerning teine as chiefs and feagaiga indicated that they did not believe that Samoa’s teine should become chiefs. Both were female and one of them reiterated that she did not need to be a chief to yield power; as sisters, they had more power than their brothers. Otherwise, the rest of the respondents felt that teine can and should be chief; although, being a chief did not guarantee economic survival. The survey was done via email between 2006 and 2008.
reside abroad. As mentioned earlier, the first Teine to assume such a title passed away in 2009. She was Telea Luafata of the ‘Āiga Sa Tagaloa and she was more than 80 years old.

The Nu’u o Teine has legal and cultural legitimacy as the original council, which is justified and confirmed by national and village constitutions, oral traditions—such as names, titles, and honorifics—and daily management of family and village life. Yet the juxtaposition of the men’s council opens up another level of inquiry insofar as political legitimacy is concerned. It is known by virtue of its lasting existence that the Nu’u o Teine has been a major force in village affairs; however, its own existence is denied recognition in the national records, particularly in the Lands and Titles Court where Samoa’s chiefs are registered once traditional investitures have been completed.

Technically, the titles from the Nu’u o Teine are not part of national politics. For example, while my title, Loau (Nu’u o Ali’i), is registered in government records as part of the village council, my host’s title, Samalā’ulu (Nu’u o Teine), is not. Similarly, while the titles Sāgapolutele and Tagaloa are registered (both as Nu’u o Ali’i titles), those of Teu’ialilo and Tululautū (Nu’u o Teine) are not; they are, however, listed as sa’otama’ita’i. Sa’otama’ita’i is a high status in village politics, the honorific afforded the paramount sister or daughter. In that role, she was historically marked for marriage to a paramount chief. Given the paramount links of the Nu’u o Teine, the paramount chiefesses were an attractive prize for interested suitors.

39 (Tagaloa Donald, pers. comm., Mulinu’u, July 2007). According to Tagaloa, Sandra King was bestowed the high chief’s title, Vaivao, the previous year. On January 4, 2008, Seinia Fasi and I received the title, Loau. The title Telea had been held by late Luafata for many years; she recently passed away in New Zealand where she had lived for at least four decades. This brings the number of women in the men’s council down to three. All three of us live abroad. Meanwhile, the teine at Sāoluafata are content to be chiefs in their own Nu’u, a situation which bodes well for the survival of that institution.

40 (Tilau Siälava’a, pers. comm., Napier, December 2, 2010). Tilau is a teine Sāoluafata of the ‘Āiga Sa Nu’ualiu, Sagapolutele’s itūvai, political side. She is also one of Aunt Sipi’s daughters. Tilau did not grow up at Sāoluafata, but prior to her move to New Zealand, she married Tanielu Sialavaa, of the ‘Āiga Sa Afuavai. She lived at Sāoluafata and was a member of the organization of wives. Although she was prohibited from membership in the Nu’u o Teine, she remembers with fondness the strong leadership of the Nu’u o Teine which she, too, confirms, has been sorely lacking.
Thus it was probably in their fathers’ and sons’ interests to help them cultivate their flax, thatch, and mulberry bushes; after all, the Teine fetched, in return, much needed implements for farming and fishing.\footnote{Teine manufactured the tōga to give away in exchange for ‘oloa, the man’s dowry. Weiner speaks to the circulation of tōga through their exchange; Shore posits that tōga were meaningless if they were not exchanged, a premise which I reject; and Mauss sees their inalienability, hence their everlasting value. See Annette B. Weiner, “Inalienable Wealth,” in Material Culture, [2004] 1985.} Hence, the Teine were linked to all the paramount families of Sāmoa, with strong affiliations to the Sa Mālietoa and Sā Tupuā families, the two umbrella families of Sāmoa.

Technically, as long as the Teine remained chiefs in their council, they could not become faipule, makers of power, or national politicians. As an elderly informant told me, \emph{Ua lava tama e o e faipule}, “the boys are enough to go and become politicians.” Here then is the extent of the Teine’s collective thinking.\footnote{(Luafaletele Poto, pers. comm., Sāoluafata, July 2007). She is one of the elders of the Nu‘u o Teine and of the ‘Aiga Sa Faiumu. Poto is a widow and a retired school teacher.} Most of the chieftesses were between the ages of 40 and 60 and those with the most influence were older, between 61-70;\footnote{Data are from an on-site questionnaire distributed in December 2007.} the younger ones were in their thirties. None of the Teine who attended the luncheon meeting were in their twenties. Only one of them had a tertiary education: Afioga Luafaletele Poto was a school teacher and she would have to have attended the teachers training college at Malifa, Apia.

The question is, if the Teine have these “high born” links and if they can access these titles by virtue of the accidents of their births, why the insistence on sustaining the political entity that is the Nu‘u o Teine? What is the use of a political entity which lacks national acknowledgment, and power in the church? What good is a political entity without credibility among the men and the non-member Teine? What went missing in the recipe for success, for strong leadership, and for sustaining the people’s faith in them?

It appears that the pule a Teine of Sāoluafata, its metaphoric fine mat, has been anea, eaten, by the white ants through what I witnessed as a lack of leadership at the very apex of their
ina’iilau; lack of oratorical competence of the tulāfale, orators and managers; and the lack of structural and foundational knowledge of the various ranks and roles—of who was who and where on the hierarchy.\textsuperscript{44}

Essentially a mechanism of power, being suli has not helped Saoluafata’s Teine sustain their political legitimacy. However, they can certainly reclaim it either by reconsidering the criteria for selecting the successors to the paramount titles or by assuming titles in the Nu’u o Ali’i, thus becoming real links between the church, national government, and the village. In this manner, they can participate in national politics as faipule. When I asked Tagaloa about the sacred space of the Teine and its potential violation in mixed company, he was optimistic that men and Teine of Sāoluafata would know how to behave in each other’s company.\textsuperscript{45}

\textit{Teine as Fai’oa, Producers of Wealth: Economic Choices}

A fai’oa is a producer of wealth. Teine Sāmoa as feagaiga were such and their fine mats, tapa cloth, oil, and starch were the fruits of their labor. Some took years to produce, but when they were done, they were beautiful. Their appearance at fa’alavelave was a confirmation of relationships. They were the manifestations of the economic power of the Teine Sāmoa and for the Teine Sāoluafata—a confirmation of the sanctity of their origins.

Chapter five illustrated how the feagaiga as a mechanism of power had been blunted by national initiatives and globalization. Where the industry of the feagaiga was distinct from that of their brothers in the past, modernization has thrown brothers and sisters together to compete

\textsuperscript{44} Every paramount chief in Sāmoa has a fine mat with a given name. At Sāoluafata, Tagaloa’s fine mat is called Aneanea a Punapuna. The verb \textit{anea}, is to eat. Aneanea means “long standing” as in a mālō, or victorious side, or a large quantity. The perfect form of the word is also \textit{anea}, eaten. In the case of fine mats, if they have been pressed for too long, they are vulnerable to the bugs that live and die there, hence the attraction for white ants who thrive between the multiple layers of mats and tapa cloth, piled high on one side of the fale, Samoan house. Fine mats are also vulnerable to a deterioration over time given their soft texture. However, if well kept, they can last for many years. See Pratt, \textit{Samoan Dictionary}, 1862, 118.

\textsuperscript{45} (Tagaloa, pers. comm., Mulinu’u, July 2007).
for the same skills and compensation at the expense of traditional skills necessary for daily sustenance and preparation for *fa'ālavelave*.

Much of Sāmoa still survives on subsistence economics; however, fewer and fewer people have these subsistence skills any more, particularly as education continues to prepare students for a world outside of the village. A rural student pursuing a major in accounting finds no job after training; she either finds work at the Yasaki factory—the biggest manufacturing plant in Sāmoa—or returns to the village where she is most likely absorbed into church activities, like Bingo, and dance practice for other fundraising activities.46

Perhaps a return to the production of fine mats, tapa cloth, oil, and starch, for which the *Teine* ancestors were so skillful and productive, may be unrealistic at this point. Nonetheless, it is important to recognize that these material items played a critical role in the past beyond their political efficacy as arts and crafts of the people. Weaving, for example, was more than labor; it was a labor of love, as the *Teine* imagined the appreciation by others of the beauty of her weave. These arts had social functions; they were the aesthetics of *Fa'asāmoa* made more valuable when presented to someone of paramount status. A culture without its arts and crafts is a culture without a soul. While much of the tapa designs have been commodified by modern artists, it may take a while before they claim a berth as *measina*, jewels, of Sāmoa. Additionally, while the tapa designs have found more practical expressions in the *'elei*, printed designs, of the uniforms of the working population, how can the fine mat be emulated in more practical terms? Could rural development improve if the tooling of the weaving bees were to be modernized in some villages of Sāmoa where the *Teine* with traditional skills have translated them into money-

---

46 In 2010, a niece of mine spent tuition funds which I had sent her to pay for a roundtrip ticket to New Zealand for a church fundraising *malaga*. The purpose of the trip was to find funds for a church bus. During fieldwork, the church van went through the village in the evenings to collect people for the church Bingo.
making enterprises? Can the fine mat manufacturing become an investment so that investors see their mats as long term investments that have sustained the beauty of the ancient weave?

Many of Saoluafata’s Teine over the last fifty or so years left the village for education and employment; their altruism however is manifested during fundraising malaga from the village. Many of them have mapped themselves into the professions. Many have been leaders of church Teine’s affairs; many more have been nurses and teachers. The first doctor of philosophy in Sāmoa was a daughter of Luafatā’alae, the most famous writer from the Pacific—Albert Wendt—is a son of Luafatā’alae, and the current president of the Lands and Titles court is another son of Luafatā’alae. Yet, a life as a professional keeps one away from Sāoluafata. I propose that the sons and daughters abroad could establish satellite groups that could be linked electronically to help families and villages filter for their benefit the incoming initiatives and projects in the guise of helping the village. The culture of dependence instigated by world systems and globalization and perpetuated by NGOs could be returned to the culture of interdependence that Samoans practice, where reciprocity does not become quid pro quo and not organized along the lines of consumerism that remittances have unfortunately perpetuated, but rather one that recognizes in-kind contributions.

Finally, the role of the feagaiga as the mālosi, economic power, of the village needs a redefinition. The absence of a figure of power and a dependence of Teine on outside sources for sustenance and fa’alavelave make it difficult to draw a connection between political and economic power as a duality. Foucault’s question of whether political power was possible without economic power might have to await an answer for another generation. But there is an

---

47 Foucault asks if political power were possible without economic power, that is, whether political power always finds its raison d’être, its justification and reason for being, in the economy. Interestingly, Foucault does not seem to be asking the converse which is whether economic power was possible or sustainable without political power. I would argue that sustainability of political or economic power, particularly where Saoluafata’s teine are concerned,
attitude today that if one is to be vocal in an organization, then one must equate such with an equitable level of donation. In other words, a high chief must set the standard for this sort of relationship. The titles themselves connote political power—the ability to change or force people into doing something necessarily against their will. However, without material manifestations of that power, he is not as amana’ia, credible, as those that do. Therefore, political power appears to gain more legitimacy through economic power, illustrating Foucault’s notion of the “economism” of political power—although I would still argue that one can have political power without profit.

Our paramount chief in the Nu’u o Ali’i is an educated man, although not a rich one; yet, he is powerful as a professional and as a titular head of the village. His power is perpetuated in family or fa’alavelave economics—in which case, he would be considered “rich” or tamāo’aiga because his family has come together to facilitate a fa’alavelave. At the time of this study, this fa’alavelave was the bestowment of chiefly titles upon six people, including me. Each one of us was to contribute the same amount of WST $3,000; fine mats and food had been removed from the list of requirements for such an occasion. The village chiefs accepted the investment of six new chiefs; each one of them received an equitable amount of cash based on rank and status. It was clean and fast and everyone went home pleased that the event was without a fa’alavelave, hitch. Samoa’s fa’alavelave economics could be considered active socialism where wealth was to be distributed among family, not accumulated in a bank.
Chapter six explored the origins and issues in the *mana ma le mamalu*, spiritual and social powers, of Teine Sāoluafata. I have argued that this power stemmed from the Teine themselves as daughters of paramountcy and, more importantly, from their status as chiefs of a legitimate jurisdiction, the *Nu’u o Teine*. Such status traditionally gives them not only legitimacy, but also *mamalu*, dignity. This study joins previous ones in confirming that the term *mana* has been reserved by the Samoans for the Christian God; thus this reflection is mainly concerned with the conceptions and manifestations of *mamalu*. Teine Sāoluafata derive *mamalu*, social power, from their being chiefs of the *Nu’u o Teine* and, in a more private manner, in their virginity. I suggested in chapter six that since these Teine were chiefs, they were probably not subjected to the tradition of *fa’amasei’au*, public defloration, and that they were, in a more positive manner, “mistresses of their own favors.”

Lapérouse characterized Samoa’s Teine in such a manner, although in a very negative way. Against such notions, I could support Tcherkézoff’s appropriations, although I often feel that the chiefs were exploiting their culture to obtain “beads.” I would argue that it was nothing more than vanity and conceit, or perhaps greed on the chiefs’ part, that subjected the least powerful members of their society—the young virgins—to such public defloration. I doubt that the chiefs of Aasu, American Samoa, thought of Lapérouse and his men as chiefs. Reports of a staged public humiliation in the presence of French sailors the day before the massacre might have provoked the aggressive behavior of the brothers, who might not have cared for the way their *feagaiga*, sisters, were being violated. In this manner, the chiefs had been observed out of context.48

Aiono lists the roles of *Teine* as *fai’oa, faia’oga*, teacher, *ositaulaga*, priestess, *taupou*, anchor post or virgin, *tausala*, sacrifice, and *taulāsea*, healer. Perhaps the most problematic effect of Christianity in Sāmoa has been the supplanting of the feagaiga’s role as priestesses. However, it was not just the Samoan girls who lost this status in the world. In the Philippines, for example, female priests were replaced by the Catholic priests. Elsewhere in Southeast Asia, in places where Theravada Buddhism landed, females were eventually relegated a supportive role to the monks; although this in no way diminished their dedication to their faith.  
Essentially, the roles that have been sustained—not necessarily in the traditional manner—have been those as producers of wealth, teacher, and healers. As healers, most nurses are of the modern ilk; traditional healers, however, have mainly been *Teine* using methods that are still sought, particularly when modern medicine cannot explain the causes of certain illnesses. In this sense, the healer is said to possess spiritual powers and the power to exorcise those being possessed by angry *aitu*, family spirits.  
On the other hand, practices that involved a certain degree of spirituality are the ones that have disappeared by and large; although sisters also conduct prayers in the morning and evening and many of them still believe in remaining *taupou*, virgins, until marriage. Aunt Sipi led family prayers morning and night; it is possible that the same is true of the older ladies today. Thus, while being a *fai’oa* and *faipule* have found expressions through modern avenues, the role of *Teine* as *faife’au* has yet to find a formal revival.  
When Christianity arrived, the *Teine’s* role as priestess was removed from her. The village pastor assumed such role and was afforded the title, *fa’afeagaiga*, to be like the sister. Recently, the prefix *fa’a* appears to have become unnecessary; thus symbolically completing the

---

transformation of the pastor as the *feagaiga*, the sacred covenant, with the village, himself the liaison between them and God. This shift perhaps motivated *Teine* to enter the church schools where they learned domestic science and *pālagi* skills of cooking and sewing, as well as reading, writing and arithmetic. Considered “clean work,” it is no wonder that many *Teine* opted to prolong their life as school girls so that they could delay initiation into the *aualuma*, the traditional organization of the sisters. This delay meant the *Teine* were now removed from the fields. As a consequence, negative attitudes began to develop towards the traditional tasks of weaving fine mats and beating tapa cloth, what was now considered dirty and back breaking work. The attraction of cleaner and less strenuous work was perhaps the major contributing factor to the diminution of the Teine’s industry. Nonetheless, I am left wondering often why *Teine Sāmoa* have stopped inventing things in modern times.

In chapter six, I noted also that the number of girls enlisted in church schools more than doubled in the second and third years of opening, evidence of the popularity of imported institutions among the *Teine*. The first *Teine* Sāmoa to attend girls’ schools were the pastors’ daughters who were trained to support the pastors in the villages as wives.\(^{50}\) Fortunately, this generation of *Teine* did not lose their traditional skills, as the gradual pace of change in village industry in the early days of the church still left some relevance for these skills. In some villages, the pastors’ wives taught the girls both traditional and *pālagi* skills.\(^{51}\) Tapa and fine mats were still important items of exchange then, and even God’s servants were part of large kinship networks that demanded fine mats and tapa cloth. However, by the mid- to late-twentieth century, with most girls now ensconced in western education at age five and a half, loss of traditional skills was inevitable. Most girls trended toward higher education and degrees,

\(^{50}\) Faleto’ese, *Tala Faasolopito o le Ekalesia Samoa*, 1959, 41.
\(^{51}\) (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Kaneohe, March 2011).
instigating a shift in places from which pastors could recruit partners. They strayed away from Papauta or Atauloma and headed toward the teachers’ college or nursing facilities—or in today’s case, to colleges and universities—where the Teine outnumbered the boys. Does this mean that many girls of the young generations are not getting the same sewing and cooking skills their mothers and grandmothers received from Papauta? Perhaps.

Finally, the issue of Teine becoming faife’au, pastors, in the EFKS church was proposed in the 1990s. However, it has been church policy that Teine are not allowed to become pastors. In this sense, the church has been lagging behind village and national governments in terms of elevating Teine to the highest ranks. While Teine Sāmoa have become chiefs in their village councils; why can’t they become faife’au? For a religion that purports to promote democratic principles, it does not make sense that Teine have been banned from the pulpit. Nonetheless, Samoa’s Teine have extended their ina’ilau to the church—as deacons and administrators—with a willingness to find funds for the church, and host visiting preachers. In 1993, a motion was fielded by the Hawai‘i delegation to the EFKS annual convention at Mālua proposing that Teine be allowed to attend Mālua Theological College of Sāmoa and become pastors. ‘Aumua was part of the delegation. The result, she said, was disappointing, although not surprising; the reasons behind the denial were interesting if not downright unfounded. According to ‘Aumua, the church felt that Teine pastors would not be immune from issues of a sexual nature, which currently challenge male pastors; that it would be difficult to protect Teine from village politics—according to the opponents, the vātapuia of the feagaiga would be violated. The church wives were the most vocal against the idea; they claimed that Teine would most likely become pregnant while in training. It appears that since twenty years has nearly passed since the proposal, the matter is dead; however, there has been an underlying sense at the Waimanalo

52 (‘Aumua, pers. comm., Kaneohe, March 2011).
EFKS church in Hawai‘i that perhaps it is just a matter of time before Teine can become preachers. I posit that if and when they are given the chance, many Teine Sāmoa of the younger generation would prefer to be pastors instead of pastors’ wives.

**Toe Tepatasi, Reflections**

‘A Malu i Fale, ‘E Malu fo’i i Fafe,

In his lectures on the analysis of power, Foucault argues that in order to see how their mechanisms have been colonized, restructured, and subjugated, power should be examined at the points of least resistance—at the outskirts of its grid or on the lowest rungs of its hierarchy, where those with the least power reside. To do this, he recommends what he calls a “genealogy,” a way of combining the erudite knowledge of the academy with the memories of those at the periphery whose knowledge has been subdued, their oral traditions and folkways discarded. I hope this study has done just that—that it has provided a balanced presentation of scholarly and grassroots knowledge of the past to inform a better future. The Nu‘u o Teine has had a long journey across time and space, a journey disrupted by internal and external forces. It has endured multiple shifts and transformations of environments, cultures, and above all, politics. It has survived to tell its story of generations of charismatic, knowledgeable, and fearless chieftesses whose leadership guaranteed them survival. People had faith in them that they could provide peace and harmony, security, and economic survival. However, as the new millennium threatens more if not worse disruptions, it is my hope that what has been presented will provide a sufficient start for a re-thatching of the Teine’s leaky roof. It is with hope that this su‘ifefilo, unfinished in many ways, is a sufficient start for a fale that will cultivate and keep safe multiple generations of toa, heroines—a Nu‘u o Teine that will be like Alo’s house in Āmoa, ‘e lau i ‘ula

---

'ae pou i toa, “thatched with leis and propped by heroines.” Then and only then can the Teine of Sāoluafata be secure in their pule as chiefs and in their mālosi as makers of wealth, which they will carry with mamalu throughout its Fa’aavau. This knowledge can only give meaning to what ‘Aumua served up for me at Tagaloa’s table in that summer of 2007, ‘Ā malu i fale, e malu fo’i i fafo, “if one feels safe at home, one will also feel safe outside.” Sā o fa’alalelei!

Fa’amatāfiga o Lagi: Clearing the Heavens

‘Oute fa’amālō ma ‘ou fa’afetai i le ‘aufaitau ma le ‘ausu’esu’e. Mālō le tauā’a. Mālō le ‘onosa’i. Fa’afetai i le Komiti mamalu o le lenei a’oa’oga, i lou tou onosa’i. ‘E ui ina lutia so’o i Puava le lenei galuega, ae ua mapu i Fagalele ona o a tou tapua’iga. Mo sā ma faigā o le Nu’u Pa’ia o Sāoluafata, o se fa’alumaga ma se meafo no le lenei mo Afioga Mamalu o le Nu’u Pa’ia, i ‘Le e Lua—Tululautū ma lou Usoali‘i, fa’apea Teu’ialilo ma lo tou Taofia; ae tainane fo’i le tapua’iga a tapa’au fa’asisina, i le o le Mālō, Susuga Tagaloa ma Sāgapolutele; i le susū o le Matua o Fineitalaga fa’pea fo’i Foutanu; Faiumu ma Afuvai, ma upu ia te ‘Oe Sāoluafata. O lenei tusi ‘oute aualofa atu ai i alo ma fanau a Sāoluafata; ‘ae maise Teine fanau o le nu’u pa’ia i so’o se mea o alaala ai. Oute fa’amālūlū atu ai fo’i i le ‘Āiga Sa Simanu pe ‘āfai e manu’a se isi o outou i lenei tusitusiga. Ae talosia o le a tou fa’aopoopo nisi tala mo le manuia o le nu’u ma le ‘aiga i senituri e tele a sau. Afai na iai se upu ua sasi i lau faitau, ia pu’e o manu, ae le o mala lo tatou taeao. Lafo i fogava’atele, ‘ae ola le Teine Sāoluafauta. A tu’uama le fua, ia tatou malu i ’upu o le Falepunaoa, “O manū ta te tete’a ai, o manū fo’i ta te toe feiloa’i ai.” Soifua.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samoan Term</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘āiga potopoto</td>
<td>extended family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ātoa augafa’apae</td>
<td>whole; complete paramount chieftess</td>
<td>fa’alavelave fa’alelotu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aumaga</td>
<td>organization of untitled men in the village</td>
<td>fa’amatai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ava ‘ili’ili ‘Ua togi, pa, tau i le ‘ave</td>
<td>kava pebbles It is thrown, it has hit the stalk</td>
<td>fa’apalemene fa’a’ase’e fa’asinomaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘upu popo</td>
<td>banned knowledge</td>
<td>fa’avae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afiafi afioga</td>
<td>dusk honorific for high chiefesses of Sāoluafata</td>
<td>fa’avavau fa’atosaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agaifamua</td>
<td>customs specific to a village</td>
<td>faife’au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aganu’u</td>
<td>universal customs of Sāmoa</td>
<td>fai’oa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aitu</td>
<td>earthly spirit</td>
<td>faipule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ali’i</td>
<td>chief; male</td>
<td>faite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ali’i o ‘āiga</td>
<td>a family’s first born</td>
<td>feagaiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘A malu i fale, e malu fo’i i fafo</td>
<td>If one is safe in one’s house, one is also safe away from it.</td>
<td>fu’aflu’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ano aoauli</td>
<td>turmeric afternoon</td>
<td>i’a iviivia Ia fua tele le niu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aso o le vavau</td>
<td>days of old</td>
<td>itulā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atua</td>
<td>god</td>
<td>itūvai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atule aualuma</td>
<td>big-eye scad organization of sisters and daughters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāmoan Word</td>
<td>English Translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>læuga o le feiloa’iga ma’a</td>
<td>welcome oratory rock; stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lotu fa’afetai</td>
<td>thanksgiving service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma’i māsina malaefono</td>
<td>monthly period meeting field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malaga malosi</td>
<td>trip strength</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mamalu</td>
<td>dignity; social power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana maota</td>
<td>spiritual power chief’s house (res.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māsina</td>
<td>moon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māsina fālao māsina fou</td>
<td>waning moon new moon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matai mavaega</td>
<td>chief dying wish; farewell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mavaega i le onetai moa fanua</td>
<td>farewell at sea euphemism for a native</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moa folau</td>
<td>euphemism for outsider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu’u māvae</td>
<td>foundation village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu’u pa’ia</td>
<td>sacred village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ositaulaga pō</td>
<td>priest(ess) night</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pu’a pui’āiga pule pule’aga pute sa’otama’ita’i</td>
<td>lantern tree nuclear family power governance belly button lady of the village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sāmoa has already been apportioned share in decision-making medley
heir formal address for a person in authority boy boy of the family; royal title wealth young virgin season, to fight also virgin euphemism for virgin or young girl space canoe, Region, neighborhood season to mix, massage Samoan antiquity; before Western contact evidence from the past wee hours of the morning
GLOSSARY OF TITLES, PEOPLE, AND PLACES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A'ea i Sasa’e</td>
<td>eastern district of Falalupu defeated by Nafanua and her army in the war to rescue her people of A’ea i Sisifo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Aumuatāgafa</td>
<td>Tui Ātua’s son and Luafatā’alae’s stepson; to have gifted the title ‘Aumua wherever he went</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’ea i Sisifo</td>
<td>Nafanua’s district freed from A’ea i Sasa’e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunu’u</td>
<td>island south of Tutuila with ancestral ties to Ātua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afesulu</td>
<td>orator title in both Sagapolutele and Teu’ialilo councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elo</td>
<td>stink—origin in creation myths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Aigamaua</td>
<td>orator in Tagaloa and Tululautū councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>title of the key orator of the Sāgapolutele family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Aimatafagamaleva’a</td>
<td>High chief title in Teu’ialilo’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaloa</td>
<td>the plain settled by Luafatā’alae and her heirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Alae</td>
<td>Luafatā’alae’s ancestor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa’amau</td>
<td>high chief in Sagapolutele’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alao</td>
<td>Saveasi’uleo’s father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa’aasega</td>
<td>son of Leutogitupa’itea and Tui Uea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āleipata</td>
<td>the eastern end of Ātua; hardest hit by the tsunami of 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa’autagia</td>
<td>the first settler of what was known as the Evaloa plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Aliāmanaia</td>
<td>La’auli’s biological father and uncle. His sister married Mālietoa Utualagi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falealili</td>
<td>district in southern ‘Upolu where lived Tuisāmoa, one of the descendants of the Nu’u o Teine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āmaile</td>
<td>a village in Āleipata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falealupu</td>
<td>village at western end of Savai’i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amialalei</td>
<td>title in Tululautū’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falefa o Ali’i</td>
<td>house of four high chiefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoa</td>
<td>village in Savai’i where Alo built Meto’s house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faletolu o Ali’i</td>
<td>house of three high chiefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ā’ana,</td>
<td>political district on the western end of ‘Upolu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fale’ula</td>
<td>resident village of the Mālietoa title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ana</td>
<td>Pili’s son in charge of Ā’ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanene</td>
<td>high chief in Tagaloa’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anoāma’a</td>
<td>political district in northwest ‘Upolu where Sāoluafata is situated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatumanava-’upolu</td>
<td>Luafatā’alae’s son who lost the Tui Ātua title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asomua</td>
<td>high chief in Tagaloa’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faumuinā</td>
<td>Tafa’ifa Fonoti’s father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fineitalaga</td>
<td>progenitor of the female titles Gato’aitele and Tamasoālī’i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foa’imea</td>
<td>High chief title in Teu’ialilo’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foloololā</td>
<td>Married Fineitalaga; ancestor of female pāpā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fonoī</td>
<td>great, great, great grandson of Salamāsina, believed to be the second tafa’ifā; Fuamunā’s son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foutanu</td>
<td>High chief in Sāgapolutele’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuaoleto’elau</td>
<td>Malietoa La’auli’s brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu’e</td>
<td>High chief in Tagaloa’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funefe’ai</td>
<td>First human Tagaloa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusi</td>
<td>a subvillage of Sāoluafata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galumalemana</td>
<td>Tupua’s son who married Teu’ialilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaolooloeloa</td>
<td>orator of Teu’ialilo’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatoloaiao</td>
<td>La’auli’s mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauifaleai</td>
<td>one of the two wives of Malietoa La’auli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gato’aitele</td>
<td>one of the four tafa’ifā titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imoaaallegau</td>
<td>high chief in Teu’ialilo’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itaifaleupolu</td>
<td>orator in Tagaloa’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foi’aitele</td>
<td>Malietoa Uitualagi’s son; married teine from Sāoluafata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagituvalu</td>
<td>Tagaloa’s daughter offered as appeasement to Lū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalogāfuu’a’fa’u</td>
<td>political center of the district of Ātua political center of the district of Ātua located at Lufilufi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laufilitoga</td>
<td>Tui Tonga circa 1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea’togauga-aleuitoga</td>
<td>Le Valasi’s mother high chief title in Tululautū’s council one of Mālietoa Gagasavea’s sons So’oa’emalelagi Le Valasi’s mother guard of the Tui Ātua title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leao</td>
<td>high chief title in Tululautū’s council one of Mālietoa Gagasavea’s sons So’oa’emalelagi Le Valasi’s mother guard of the Tui Ātua title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Alali</td>
<td>So’oa’emalelagi Le Valasi’s mother guard of the Tui Ātua title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le’atogauga’-aleuitoga</td>
<td>So’oa’emalelagi Le Valasi’s mother guard of the Tui Ātua title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leifi</td>
<td>village where the kava was first planted Tuisāmoa’s wife and mother of Gauifaleai and Totogatā a demigod believed to be responsible for the name Sāmoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letogo</td>
<td>village where the kava was first planted Tuisāmoa’s wife and mother of Gauifaleai and Totogatā a demigod believed to be responsible for the name Sāmoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letutupu</td>
<td>Tuisāmoa’s wife and mother of Gauifaleai and Totogatā a demigod believed to be responsible for the name Sāmoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lū</td>
<td>a demigod believed to be responsible for the name Sāmoa ancestor of Luafatā’alae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luafaletele</td>
<td>village at western end of the Evaloa plain and seat of the Tui Ātua headquarter of eastern orator chiefs or Tīmua personal orator of Teu’ialilo title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luatuānu’u</td>
<td>village at western end of the Eevaloa plain and seat of the Tui Ātua headquarter of eastern orator chiefs or Tīmua personal orator of Teu’ialilo title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lufilufi</td>
<td>headquarter of eastern orator chiefs or Tīmua personal orator of Teu’ialilo title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaialaola</td>
<td>headquarter of eastern orator chiefs or Tīmua personal orator of Teu’ialilo title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title/Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaulau</td>
<td>orator in Sāgapolotele’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālietoa</td>
<td>Malietoa Vainu’upo’s father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitisemanu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālietoa</td>
<td>second Mālietoa and ‘Alae’s grandfather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagasavea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālietoa Uituālagi</td>
<td>Mālietoa La’auli’s father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manu’a</td>
<td>eastern islands in Samoan archipelago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manu</td>
<td>Tui Manu’a’s wife and mother of the Gato’aitele and Tamasoali’a titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maposua</td>
<td>orator in Tagaloa’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mao</td>
<td>High chief in Tagaloa’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matua o Foutanu</td>
<td>oigh chief of Sāoluafata; believed not to be part of either council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mototino</td>
<td>orator in Te’u’ialilo’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muāgututi’a</td>
<td>third tafa’ifā of Samoa; Tupua Fuiavailili’s father; also married a teine of Sāoluafata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulīnu’ū</td>
<td>isthmus at Lufilufi and residence of Tui Ātua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulitalo</td>
<td>high chief in Tagaloa’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāfanua</td>
<td>War goddess of Sāmoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nofo a Falelua</td>
<td>dyads of high chiefs in Tagaloa’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu’ualiu</td>
<td>orator in Sāgapolotele’s council; believed to be the evidence of the teine sharing power with the men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sālelesi</td>
<td>Sub-village west of Sāoluafata. Residence of Tui Ātua’s/ Sāgapolutele’s valet family of Muli’aga in Savai’i with ties to Sāoluafata through Toilolo title of paramount chieftess in Manu’a, ‘Upolu, and Pili’s older twin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salemuli’aga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samalā’ulu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sānālala</td>
<td>married Gato’aitele; Vaetamasoa’s grandfather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāolevao</td>
<td>brother of Saveasi’uleo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saveatama</td>
<td>‘Alae’s father; one of Malietoa Gagasavea’s sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefā’ataue-manana III</td>
<td>Tui Ātua Mata’utia’s mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seelimalelelei</td>
<td>the boy who apportioned the fish for Tui Ātua Leutelele’i’ite c. 1240 C.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semalamaalagi</td>
<td>Luafatā’alae’s ancestor; some believed she was the mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seumalo</td>
<td>orator in Teu’ialilo’s council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sināletava’e</td>
<td>mother of Pili’s sons, Tui, Ana, Saga, Tolufale, and Si’umumugagitau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiai</td>
<td>sister of Sagapolutele; protected by taufia or brotherhood of chiefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuamāsaga</strong></td>
<td>jurisdiction of the title Mālietoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tui Ā’ana</strong></td>
<td>paramount title of the Ā’ana district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tui Ātu Fepulea’i</strong></td>
<td>Tui Ātua Tologataua’s father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tui Fiti</strong></td>
<td>king of Fiji in the Vavau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tupa’i</strong></td>
<td>Nafanua’s priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tupuivao</strong></td>
<td>Taufau’s son; reason why his line lost the paramount titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tupua Fuiāvailili</strong></td>
<td>progenitor of Sa Tupua family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tutuila</strong></td>
<td>main island of American Samoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘Upolu</strong></td>
<td>main island of Sāmoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utufa’asili</strong></td>
<td>Tui Ātua Tologataua’s mother; Taeolalopu’a’s grandmother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utusi’a</strong></td>
<td>cape on which Sāoluafata is located</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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