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ABSTRACT

This dissertation analyzes the role of the Chilean land tenure system in ongoing conflict, and proposed conflict resolutions, between Rapa Nui and the Chilean state in “Easter Island”. The land tenure system is analyzed in terms of ethnographic data I collected on the island from August 2007 through December 2008, and documents of official Chilean legal history in Rapa Nui. Critical discourse analysis reveals that the Chilean land tenure system is only one aspect of a broader conflict between Rapa Nui and Chile in “Easter Island”. The Chilean land tenure system is part of a complex transnational dispositif and governmentality that constructs and reproduces a limited colonial subject position for Rapa Nui people. Rapa Nui contest the subject position in terms of the discursive practice of an interpretative repertoire incommensurable with Chilean state and transnational discourse marginalizing the place of Rapa Nui in “Easter Island”. While Chile attempts to legalize its cartography of “Easter Island” by enforcing its land tenure system and thereby reproducing the colonial subjectivity of Rapa Nui, Rapa Nui actively destabilize the coherence of Chilean state discourse by culturally remembering their ancestors, imagining a decolonial future for their progeny, and simply being Rapa Nui. Utilizing research from a broad range of disciplines in addition to anthropology—indigenous studies, Pacific Islands studies, philosophy, political science, and sociolinguistics, the dissertation aims to develop a discursive ground by which the moral coherence of Rapa Nui resistance can be respectfully heard. The dissertation concludes with an epilogue that assesses the significance of recent and ongoing re-occupations of lands, buildings, and hotels by Rapa Nui people and Chile’s violent response.
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INTRODUCTION
Chapter 1

Upon arrival to Rapa Nui in August of 2007 I hoped to investigate the significance of Chilean law in “Easter Island” to the indigenous Rapa Nui people in terms of discursive anthropology. Of particular interest was the extent to which Rapa Nui perspectives were in conflict with Chilean laws. Though I hoped to focus on legal conflicts regarding land, I did not know what specific laws I would study. I hoped to emphasize analyses of discursive data within the dissertation, but I did not know what kinds of discourse would be useful or available to study. I assumed I would acquire this knowledge inductively during field experience, and this experience would enable me to better position my research in terms of concerns of critiques of “research” (Smith 2002) within Indigenous Studies. Following approximately eight months of fieldwork, it became apparent that a discursive analysis of Rapa Nui understanding of the Chilean national land tenure policy and laws referred to as El Titulo Dominio by Chilean Officials and Te Parau Henua by Rapa Nui would enable me to study the relationships I had initially hoped to study. The ethnographic experiences I had by then developed with respect to Rapa Nui language, kinship, and politics also suggested how best to study the relationships in terms of discursive data. To learn how Rapa Nui understood Te Parau Henua it appeared imperative to study how Rapa Nui discussed the land policy and laws in terms of the Rapa Nui language and within Rapa Nui extended family conversations, rather than within the courts (Clifford 1988d, Nader 1990), or in terms of court records (Merry 2000) as has been canonical in the ethnography of law.

The dissertation shows that Te Parau Henua is at the heart of conflict between Rapa Nui and Chile; however, while land is at the center of Rapa Nui and Chile conflict, analysis suggests conflict between Rapa Nui and Chile is much more than simply a “land conflict” as recent
reports have claimed (Lee 2010, Shikina 2010). Critical analysis of Te Parau Henua reveals the land tenure policy to be a “conflict discourse” (Arno 2009, 1993, 1985) that structures and manages conflict between Rapa Nui and Chile in a manner that limits both the scope and possible resolution of conflict. In juxtaposition to Rapa Nui assessments of the policy, represented herein in the form of narratives and conversations articulated in the Rapa Nui language, and reflections on various experiences of fieldwork in Rapa Nui, Te Parau Henua emerges as one tactic of a broad form of “governmentality” (Foucault 1991) in Rapa Nui that Chile uses to construct and manipulate Rapa Nui people as things, and transmogrify Rapa Nui “land” (henua/kāiŋa) into Chilean tierra. Chilean governmentality is shown to articulate within a complex transnational “dispositif” or apparatus (Agamben 2009, Deleuze 1989, Dreyfus and Rabinow 1982: 121, Foucault 1978: 12-14, 1980c, 1991: 95, Rabinow 2003: 49-55) of archaeological, state, and tourist discourse. The result is what may be called a “moral geography” (Shapiro 1997: 16) that pre-organizes and limits what is and is not possible within the island now understood by Chilean cartography as “Easter Island” (Isla de Pascua), not Rapa Nui.

“Easter Island”, as a spatial imaginary, one could say, ‘violently empties the island of its indigenous people’ (Winduo 2000: 599). Within the ‘traces of folk narrative space’ (Winduo 2000: 600) persists a stable critique of the violent cartography of “Easter Island”. By examining Rapa Nui kinship discourse, the dissertation hopes to demonstrate how Rapa Nui “unwrite” (Winduo 2000: 608) the dispositif of “Easter Island” in terms of alternative knowledge, memory, and values related to their island world. The dissertation highlights the epistemology and ontology of Rapa Nui kinship discourse against the cartography of “Easter Island” to destabilize

1 Foucault’s notions of governmentality and dispositif are clarified in Chapter 10.
the rationality of “...the dominant mode of intelligibility and open up spaces for new political thinking with empowering implications for new forms of subjectivization...and politically relevant space” (Shapiro n.d.: 53-54). By disrupting the coherence of “Easter Island”, a discursive ground for Rapa Nui people is cleared in which their struggle to re-inscribe their place within their “sacred geography” (Deloria 2003: 121) can be respectfully heard and potentially empowered—a matter of major concern in decolonial Pacific Islands Studies (Wesley-Smith 1995: 125-129). Analysis of Rapa Nui kinship discourse reveals that Rapa Nui dispute the cartography of “Easter Island” by genealogical reasoning—a form of epistemological and ontological reasoning in conflict with Western perspectives noted throughout the Pacific (Jolly 2007: 534). Rapa Nui kinship discourse however, like other Pacific Islander discourse (Jourdan 1995: 134), is not focused only on the past, but is concerned with the future. Rapa Nui people challenge the cartography of “Easter island” not only by dialogically engaging their ancestors, but by addressing their anticipated progeny. When the Chilean land tenure system is placed within the folk narrative space of Rapa Nui kinship discourse, its significance, like “the English method of tattooing in Pohnpei” (Hanlon 2003: 20), washes away. In a sense, “Easter Island” is Magritte’s represented pipe and Rapa Nui kinship discourse akin to Magritte’s sentential negation of the pipe (Foucault 1982).

---

2 The empowerment model of Pacific Islands Studies developed from indigenous theorists of the Pacific Islands like Hau’ofa and Trask against what are termed the laboratory and pragmatic paradigms of Pacific Islands research (Wesley-Smith 1995: 124). The laboratory and pragmatic paradigms of research are Orientalist paradigms (Wesley-Smith 1995: 120) designed by non-Pacific Islanders that serve the colonial and neocolonial interests of outsiders (Wesley-Smith 1995: 124). Research within the pragmatic paradigm is developed to serve the geopolitical interests of the three major metropolitan countries influencing the region: Australia, New Zealand, and the United States (Wesley-Smith 1995: 117). The laboratory paradigm treats the Pacific Ocean as a kind of isolated laboratory in which the Pacific Islands and Pacific Islanders are analyzed as specimens of various types of value to investigations of social and physical science (Wesley-Smith 1995: 121). Empowerment research attempts to decolonize methodology and theory of Pacific Islands Studies by emphasizing indigenous epistemology addressed to Pacific Islander identified socio-cultural problems and interests (Wesley-Smith 1995: 124-125).
While the narrative form of the dissertation includes some common tropes of ethnographic writing, it is designed in part as an “experimental ethnography” (Clifford and Marcus 1986, Marcus and Fisher 1999). The subject matter of the dissertation is experimental perhaps first and foremost, because the subject of analysis is not technically ‘a world, but instances of discourse’ (Clifford 1986: 15). This is evident throughout the dissertation, and begins to be explicit in Chapter 2. Ethnographies typically begin with a general representation of the “site” of fieldwork. While I appropriate this trope, it is my hope that my use is bound up in a kind of “differance” (Derrida 1973) that “decenters and plays” (Derrida 1978) outside of this structure of ethnographic writing. Rather than reproduce the trope, the “place” of the ethnography emerges though the analysis of how different discourses represent the world of “Easter Island”. As Pacific Islands scholars have encouraged (Hereniko 1995), the dissertation is also experimental in the order of its representations. For example, while a more conventional ethnography might analyze indigenous understandings of Chilean law by first outlining official accounts of Chilean law in Rapa Nui, I situate official accounts (elaborated in Chapter 9) in the context of indigenous understandings of Chilean law (represented in Chapters 6, 7, and 8). Similarly, while conventional ethnography might situate Rapa Nui kinship life in terms of its relationship to official Chilean social orders, I situate “Chilean things” (me’e Tire) elaborated in Chapter 5, in the context of Rapa Nui kinship forms of life articulated in Chapter 4.

Though the ethnography is experimental, the ethnography is not intended as an exercise primarily in “writing culture” (Clifford 1986a, Marcus 1980, Marcus and Cushman 1982). Much is to be gained by attending to the rhetorical forms articulating in ethnographic writing; however, the discourse of writing culture is ironically vulnerable to standard Deconstructionist principles of inquiry. The signature move in the discourse of writing culture is to “foreground” (Duranti...
and Goodwin 1997: 3) the rhetorical forms engaged in ethnographic writing while placing other contextual features contributing to the discursive ground of writing culture in the “background” (Duranti and Goodwin 1997: 3). Problematically, the discourse of writing culture has ‘drawn a boundary around language use’ (Wittgenstein 2001: 117). This drawn—not discovered—boundary of ethnographic writing reduces ethnographic writing into an aesthetic form: a metonym. Ethnographic writing is thus examined in an aesthetic context in which ‘language problematically idles’ (Wittgenstein 2001: 44), and in which Deconstructionist philosophy can reveal a ‘violent double play of writing and erasure that allows what it obliterates to be read’ (Derrida 2002: 5).³ While my ethnography of Rapa Nui reflects aesthetic choices and

---

³ The discourse of writing culture appears to stem from ironically Structuralist foundations. Though authors of the discourse reference Post-Structuralists, the author that appears to ground the discourse most is steeped in Structuralist rhetoric: Hayden White (Marcus 1980: 508, Marcus and Cushman 1982: 55-56)—an author explicitly critical of Post-Structuralists (White 1979). While Post-Structuralists distinguished history from literary forms (De Man 1983: 163), White tended to structurally reduce history to literary forms (White 1973). Problematically, the discourse of writing culture is heavily premised upon an interpretation of the Structuralist linguist Jakobson by White (Marcus and Cushman 1982: 56) that proposes a rhetorical analysis of the poetics of a historical text precedes any other analysis. The premise not only reveals the Structuralist as opposed to Post-Structuralist foundations of the discourse of writing culture, the premise ironically is a misreading of Jakobson. Contra White, Marcus, and Cushman, Jakobson (1960) actually did not privilege the aesthetic dimension of language usage among the six functional components he adumbrated. Jakobson argued that which of the six major functions of language were primary in any particular use of language varied by context and speaker/writer goal (Hanks 1996: 102). Jakobson and the Prague school are not associated with an aestheticization of language use, but only a critique of exclusively referential accounts of meaning given the non-referential functions of language—of which aesthetics is only one (Hanks 1996: 105). Curiously, while the discourse of writing culture is associated with post-structuralism and a postmodern turn in anthropology, authors working within the discourse of writing culture tended to stabilize the significance of ethnographic writing as primarily rhetorical structure and draw analogies between ostensibly disparate discursive practices like writing fiction or travelogues and writing ethnography, while Post-Structuralists were more typically known to destabilize the structural significance of any form of writing (Culler 1982: 25, Norris 2002: 18-32, Sturrock 1986: 137, Young 1981: 18), and stressed epistemological (Foucault 1994: xxii) and political (Foucault 1991) differences between genres of discursive practices. Perhaps this is why one of the founders of poststructuralism did not want to be associated with postmodernism (De Man 2006: 119-120), and another—Foucault—claimed ignorance regarding the meaning of postmodernism in a late interview (Raulet 1983: 204-205).

The most disconcerting features placed in the background are the colonial as well as imperial (Young 2001: 26-27) contexts in which ethnographic research and writing occurs and too often has been found to support. Major authors of the discourse of writing culture tended to marginalize the significance of post-colonial critiques of anthropology developed around Said’s discourse of Orientalism (Clifford 1988c, Marcus and Fisher 1999: 2); a sensibility previously in the foreground within the critical turn of anthropology (Asad 1973, Hymes 1974b, Willis 1974, and Wolf 1974). Rather than attending to questions of power and the serious political economic issues of the cold war (Vincent 1991), the discourse of writing culture catalogued rhetorical forms of anthropological texts (Marcus and Cushman 1982) and entangled ethnographers in a philosophical conundrum of “realism” which philosophers had long ago shown to be a pseudo-problem of philosophy—a bottle philosophical flies had been led out of and should now know how to avoid (Wittgenstein 2004: 413f, Carnap 1996, 2003). Ironically, authors of the discourse of
conventions, the ethnography cannot be coherently reduced to aesthetics of writing. The ethnography is articulated in response to a complex, reflexive, empirical field experience (Rabinow 2007) situated in local, regional, and global fields of power relations; not simply the conversations, “protoconversations” (Shapiro 1992: 10), and genre constraints of a discourse, as is true, for example, in a discipline such as academic philosophy (Rorty 2007).

One conversation I partially resist is that focused around the notion of “writing against culture” (Abu-Lughod 1991, 1993). For Abu-Lughod, anthropology has problematically represented “others” in “essentializing” and “hierarchical” inferior terms of “cultural difference” (Abu-Lughod 1993: 12-13). Instead of writing about cultural differences she prefers to relate “tactically humanist” (Abu Lughod 1993: 28-29) “stories of a few individuals” (Abu Lughod 1993: 29-31). Ironically, while Abu-Lughod criticizes essentialism in ethnographic representations, she represents ethnographic interpretation of cultural difference in essentialist terms that betray an impoverished understanding of the history of anthropological theory and discourse. Abu-Lughod would perhaps only be correct to associate hermeneutic anthropology—

writing culture write against ethnographic authority in terms of an unexplained poetic authority. Their attempt to structurally stabilize the rhetorical significance of ethnographic writing is post-structurally unstable: “…the grammatical decoding of a text leaves a residue of indetermination that has to be, but cannot be, resolved by grammatical means, however, extensively conceived” (De Man 2006:15). Aesthetics, particularly in ethnographic writing, should not be isolated and foregrounded in a way that backgrounds the wider field of power-knowledge in which it operates; for “the aesthetic calculus is always submerged in the social logic” (Baudrillard 1981: 48) of particular social interests and power (Baudrillard 1981: 38).

The unit and goal of analysis in anthropological research clearly has not always been representing the “essential” traits of “ethnographic others”. What is the unit and goal of analysis has varied tremendously depending upon the nation-state of the anthropologist, and the particular era of research in that nation-state. The founder of American Anthropology, Franz Boas, for one, was not primarily interested in representing “essential” traits of “ethnographic others”, but variation in “cultures”. This is clear in his analysis of art styles of cultures; among other things, he argued that art styles varied within a culture (Boas 1955: 180), and that they resulted from complex historically contingent processes (Boas 1955: 1) of cultures interacting with other cultures (Boas 1955: 121). Boas studied cultural differences not to argue that different cultures or “ethnographic others” were inferior to Western cultures or peoples, but to challenge cultural evolutionism (the dominant theory of the status quo that was used to denigrate non-Western cultures and peoples) in terms of a relativistic theory of culture history that stressed “negative instances” against evolutionary generalizations (Fox 1991: 101). Early Boasians like Mead and Benedict, but not Radin and Kroeber (Fox 1991: 101-103) were perhaps primarily interested in ethnographic others, but Mead and Benedict did not write about ethnographic others to demean them. They wrote about cultural differences to critique the naturalness and universality of Western culture (Marcus and Fisher 1999: 130). Perhaps, given the more explicit
a relatively recent approach to ethnography—with a concern for primarily representing “ethnographic others”. Yet hermeneutic anthropologists do not necessarily consider “ethnographic others” as inferior. While the discourse of writing against culture has helped to further expose some of the problems of essentialism in ethnographic writing, and offered some insights into alternative ways of ethnographic writing, it stabilizes a problematic sense of cultural differences and promotes a bourgeois alternative to writing culture deconstructed by her own writing. For post-colonial indigenous theorists like Stella of Bougainville, to say representing

colonial nature of British anthropology, it is fair to characterize it as concerned with marking non-Western peoples as culturally inferior others. Yet, British anthropologists, to the chagrin of their colonial benefactors, often showed that colonized peoples of the British Empire had rationally and functionally integrated social systems (Marcus and Fisher 1999: 129). Unfortunately, anthropology has not always radically challenged the “savage slot” its work inherited from deeper foundations of Western culture (Trouillot 1991: 18), yet twentieth century anthropologists were usually involved in the liberal reform of Western racism (Marcus and Fisher 1999: 20). I also believe Boas did radically challenge the “savage slot” and invented a theoretical concept—cultures—far more powerful than Abu-Lughod’s individualist tactical humanism for continuing to disrupt and challenge the racist history and ongoing racism of Western culture.

The hermeneutic tradition in anthropology has been grounded in Ricouer’s concern with “the comprehension of the self by the detour of the comprehension of the other” (Rabinow 2007: 5). However, the tradition does not necessarily consider “ethnographic others” as inferior. For one of its champions, “There is no “primitive.” There are only other men, living other lives” (Rabinow 2007: 151). Chauvinist, perhaps, but hermeneutic anthropology like that of Rabinow is relativist, not racist.

While many have embraced Abu-Lughod’s position as radical one wonders if they have thoroughly read her proposed alternative. Abu-Lughod encourages one to fundamentally and completely abandon culture based analyses and replace it with analysis of “…people going through life wondering what they should do, making mistakes, being opinionated, facilitating, trying to make themselves look good, enduring tragic personal loses, enjoying others, and finding moments of laughter” (Abu Lughod 1993: 27). Though she does make a few points about the broader regional and global political economic issues articulating among Awlad ‘Ali Bedouin of Egypt—for example she discusses how Bedouin men are injured by WWII ordinance (Abu-Lughod 1993: 63-65)—her attention to the broader world circumscribing Awlad ‘Ali Bedouin amounts mostly to the statement that it is so circumscribed (Abu-Lughod 1993: 8). Though she claims to be critical (Abu-Lughod 1993), at the time of her writing rural Egyptians were involved in contexts that generated radical Islam and a host of other conflicts within and outside of Egypt (Toth 2005) that she significantly ignores. Ironically too, while she claims to be against writing about cultural generalizations, she often writes about general practices among Awlad ‘Ali Bedouin simply without using the word ‘culture’ in her representation. She discusses, for example, normal male roles during birth (Abu Lughod 1993: 122), common wedding rituals (Abu Lughod 1993: 170), and deflowering customs (Abu Lughod 1993: 198). Moreover, despite her opposition to the culture concept, Awlad ‘Ali Bedouin given voice in her ethnography do discuss Awlad ‘Ali Bedouin culture and they note that their culture is contested by the Egyptian status quo (Abu-Lughod 1993: 227-233). In theory she “writes against culture”, but in practice culture appears regularly in her text. In light of those who give voiced concern with their culture’s perpetuation maybe she should have listened more to culture among Awlad ‘Ali Bedouin and its broader significance in the serious events occurring in Egypt at the time. It would be interesting to know more about the implications that not speaking of Awlad ‘Ali Bedouin culture has and had for Awlad ‘Ali Bedouin as a politically economically oppressed, vulnerable, indigenous group of Egypt. Abu-Lughod also refers to herself as a “halfie” in her studies of Awlad ‘Ali Bedouin, as if her religious identity as a Muslim woman makes her “half” Awlad ‘Ali Bedouin—a very unique Islamic culture. Abu-Lughod, an admittedly upper-class woman (Abu Lughod 1993: xiii-xiv), descended from an elite Palestinian leader (Abu Lughod 1993: 40), and
cultural differences is essentially problematic is to beg the question; the critical question is what is being done in a text when one writes about cultural differences. Post-colonial theorists like Stella seek to ‘re-inscribe and empower cultural differences that colonial discourses initially ascribed as part of their domination’ (Stella 2007: 17). If I were simply to discuss universal features of Rapa Nui in terms of individualist stories of tactical humanism it would seem I would discuss features to further legitimate Rapa Nui assimilation into Chile. Contrary to Abu-Lughod, and I believe consistent with Boas’s founding deeper humanizing anti-colonial anthropological spirit, writing about cultural difference appears to be an important strategy for challenging power-knowledge in colonial and neo-colonial contexts: “…difference in postcolonial discourse becomes one of the major bases for the empowerment, and re-inscription of an indigenous political agenda” (Stella 2007: 164). Abu-Lughod’s analysis of cultural differences, like her understanding of the history of anthropological theory and discourse, is jejune and potentially colonial, particularly in indigenous places. It tends towards a bemoaned subjectivist reading of the discourse of writing culture (Rabinow 2007: xix), rather than deeper engagement with the socio-cultural action of discourse (Edwards 1997), and fieldwork in local, regional, and global worlds.

Like the “anthropology of the contemporary” (Rabinow 2007: ix-xxiv), I hope to incorporate the insights gained from the discourses of writing culture and writing against culture while not saturating my ethnography in terms of their excessive reductions. Generally, each of

married to an Englishman (Abu-Lughod 1993: xiv), perhaps does have a lot of halves within her. However, it seems a bit odd to insinuate these halves entitle her to consideration as half Awlad ‘Ali Bedouin. 

7 Alternatively, for some analysts of the Pacific, post-colonial theory fails to address the ongoing neo-colonial or settler colonial processes in the region and should thus be addressed by different theoretical frameworks and questions (Franklin and Lyons 2004, Hereniko 1999: 148-149, Smith 2002: 24) than post-colonial theory. This makes sense given that the genealogy of post-colonial theory traces to contexts and issues in India (Krishna 2009: 64-66) that bear little resemblance to the issues faced by Hawaiians, Māori, Tahitians (Mā‘ohi), and Rapa Nui. If power-knowledge circulates differently in these spaces—as a spatial theory of power-knowledge would suggest (Foucault 1980d: 70-71, Shapiro 1992: 4-5), then perhaps post-colonial theory needs to be supplemented or replaced by more locally sensitive theory and method in such contexts.
the chapters of the body of the dissertation is headed by a phrase that I learned either during fieldwork, or came to understand upon subsequent analysis of the process in the following years, that constituted a kind of “dialogic breakthrough” (Attinasi and Friedrich 1995) in my research. Reflection upon these phrases led me to re-conceptualize my understanding of Rapa Nui and re-organize my investigation in a fundamental way. The chapters in a sense tell the stories of how I learned these phrases, and how this learning process “reflexively” (Rabinow 2007: 38-39) shaped the empirical development of fieldwork, and the writing of this ethnographic dissertation. While Chapter 1 is the official beginning of the dissertation, it is Chapter 2 that constitutes the ‘intentional and methodological beginning’ (Said 1985: 17) of the text. The style and content of the chapter begins the “unwriting” (Winduo 2000) of “Easter Island” and the process of listening to Rapa Nui. Learning how to respectfully listen to how Rapa Nui use the question ‘I hē koe? ’ to place themselves, Chileans, and outsiders on the island constituted perhaps my first dialogical breakthrough. Rather than locate the subject matter of this dissertation in absolute terms, Chapter 2 introduces competing discourses used to “place” the geographical and historical context of Rapa Nui in light of how Rapa Nui use the question ‘I hē koe? ’. The competing discourses are introduced partly to adumbrate the “contested” (Clifford 1986a: 18) place of Rapa Nui, but more importantly, to “defer reference” (Chow 2006: 11) by ‘decentering dominant historiographic representations of the Pacific’ (Hanlon 2003: 30) that could marginalize Rapa Nui senses of their island place and history. I begin with the Rapa Nui question ‘I hē koe? ’ to destabilize the significance and ethics of placing Rapa Nui in terms of ‘Cook tours of Western cartography’ (Jolly 2007: 532) via their methodological juxtaposition to “indigenous epistemological practices” (Gegeo 1998: 290, 2001: 493-494, Gegeo and Gegeo 2001, Meyer 2001) of placing Rapa Nui. At the level of writing, this practically involves the application of an ‘hermeneutics of
suspicion which makes what has been central in the discourse marginal, and makes central what has been marginalized’ (Bal 2000: 2). To disrupt the hierarchy of Western knowledge embedded throughout writings about the Pacific Islands (Teaiwa 2006: 71-74), the standard details of archaeological and written histories of Rapa Nui are demoted to the textual margins, that is, to the chapter footnotes; Rapa Nui discursive practices and discourse are thus given central textual space.

A fundamental dimension of Rapa Nui discursive practice of place, I argue in Chapter 3, is use of the Rapa Nui language. After critically rejecting recent linguistic anthropological analyses of Rapa Nui language (Makihara 1999, 2004, and 2007) in terms of both their empirical adequacy and theoretical assumptions, Chapter 3 introduces my field experience learning and interpreting the various genres of Rapa Nui language in use on the island, and their relationships to other languages circulating in Rapa Nui. Like many Western analyses of Native American languages, Makihara’s recent analysis of Rapa Nui language problematically ‘dismembers a native tongue and ties it to her belt’ (Alexie 1993: 152). Makihara, applying the “invention of tradition” discourse long problematized in Pacific Islands Studies (Firth 2003: 141, Hanlon 2003: 29, Hereniko 1999: 148-149, Jolly 1992: 63-64, Teaiwa 2003: 72-74, Trask 1991), frames Rapa Nui language use as merely political ideology invented to address Chilean officials (Makihara 2004: 536), and normalizes what she calls “syncretic” forms of language on the island that combine Spanish and Rapa Nui. Given the colonial power structure, Rapa Nui language use appears not so much as an “ideology”, but as “subjugated knowledge” (Foucault 1980a: 82-85) and “counter-memory” (Foucault 1977: 160).8 Makihara’s celebration of “syncretic Rapa Nui”,
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8 While the notion of “ideology” may be ultimately antequated (Hall 1992), to engage its initial critical value within Marx’s philosophy, it seems best defined as discourse of social groups with power and control over social institutions, modes of production, and resources (Reisigl and Wodak 2009: 88). From such a perspective, it is
within such a power-knowledge structure, is, on a more thorough political analysis, a celebration of a language of assimilation that further subjugates Rapa Nui people and their forms of knowledge within colonial Chile. Rather than “disciplining” (Foucault 1980a: 107, 1995: 167) variegated Rapa Nui language use into a normative form of value to a colonial state, and tactically placing it within a taxonomy that marginalizes the strongest speakers of the language in terms of coding schemes of an outsider’s “professional vision” (Goodwin 1994), I introduce the significance of Rapa Nui language by highlighting features of the language stressed by master speakers and the contexts in which they used it. While the chapter focuses on the use of Rapa Nui language primarily on the island of Rapa Nui, I also ‘follow the discourse and its speakers’ (Marcus 1995: 91) to the island of Maupiti in “French” Polynesia to gain a more complex understanding of the relationships of Rapa Nui language to the broader Polynesian identity of Rapa Nui people. The chapter emphasizes that Rapa Nui is a historically documented tradition on the island (Chavez 1996, Du Feu 1996, Englert 1978, Fuentes 1960, Gomez-Macker 1982, Langdon and Tyron 1983, Pate Tuki 1986, Pauly and Huke Atan 2008, Rapahango and Liller 2003, Weber 1988, Weber and Weber 1999), and that while threatened by ongoing problems of globalization in Rapa Nui and the Pacific Islands region (Lockwood 2004), Rapa Nui language has a much broader and complex use than Makihara proposed—a point buttressed by the extensive examples of Rapa Nui language usage peppered throughout the dissertation.

Chapter 3 is fundamental to the dissertation goal of providing textual space for Rapa Nui voices. By ‘proceeding by analysis of use, rather than code’ (Hymes 1974: 79), the goal is to clear a ground in which Rapa Nui not only can speak, but their voices can be seen as important voices to carefully listen to and hear, rather than dismissed or trivialized as “invented ideology”.

misleading to analyze Rapa Nui discourse as ideological because Rapa Nui, as a colonized people lacking sovereignty in their homeland, do not have control and power over their social institutions, mode of production, and resources.
While ethnographers should continue to develop methodology and theory to “learn how to ask” (Briggs 1986), perhaps more importantly, anthropologists need to concentrate further on how to respectfully listen—an early concern of anthropology (Boas 1998: 183), and an increasing interest of Pacific Islands Studies concerned with decolonizing theory and methodology (Wesley-Smith 2004: 83). This is particularly important in contexts of ongoing colonialism like Rapa Nui. Clearly, I ultimately analyze Rapa Nui talk about the Chilean land tenure system and general discursive practice within Western theory; however, I emphasize listening because like indigenous scholars (Burkhardt 2004, Deloria 2006, Hereniko 1999, Howe 2008, Momaday 1979, Meyer 2001, Silva 2010, Stella 2007, Teuton 2008, Thamen 2003, Wendt 1983) I think it is important to recognize theory as something within the discursive practices of indigenous peoples. To be consistent with the hope to ‘shift indigenous theory at the periphery of Pacific Islands Studies to its more coherent decolonial center’ (Thamen 2003: 13), the structure and content of the dissertation highlights Rapa Nui epistemology and ontology articulated in Rapa Nui kinship discourse. Learning to understand the use of Rapa Nui language by listening to its use by master speakers, and valuing this use as a source of theory for articulating the dissertation, constituted a major dialogical breakthrough in my research.

Chapters 4 and 5 introduce features of Rapa Nui kinship life in contrast to Chilean forms of life on the island. I introduce features of Rapa Nui kinship in Chapter 4 by reflexively situating my understanding of it in the context of adoption into a particular kin group and association with a few others. The chapter begins by reflecting on a dialogical breakthrough I had regarding the question ‘ ‘A ai koe?’ while interrogated by a Chilean judge. Reflection on the discursive practice of posing and answering this question begins to reveal how Rapa Nui kinship “places” Rapa Nui epistemology and ontology in daily life. I demonstrate, by examining various
Rapa Nui narratives, how kinship forms the discursive ground by which aspects of Rapa Nui reality are figured and assessed in daily life as well as special occasions. Analysis, in other words, begins to adumbrate some of the basic features of the “interpretative repertoire” (Gilbert and Mulkay 1984, Wetherell and Potter 1988, 1992, Wetherell 1998, Wooffitt 2005: 66) and politics of the discursive practice of Rapa Nui kinship. Rapa Nui kinship, in a sense, constitutes a “regime of truth” (Foucault 1980b: 131) for Rapa Nui. To respectfully “listen” to Rapa Nui conversations about the Chilean land tenure system it is critical to understand this interpretative repertoire grounding their truth and meaning. A central component of the Rapa Nui interpretative repertoire is a binary opposition between “Chilean things” (me’e Tire) and “Rapa Nui things” (me’e Rapa Nui). Chapter 5 tells the story of how I came to learn this fundamental distinction in Rapa Nui epistemology, and analyzes how the distinction articulates in three different circumstances: a performance of the annual “Day of the language” (Te Mahana o te Re’o) celebration, a conflict over a development project, and the inauguration of new Chilean officials. In the colonial world of Rapa Nui, the distinction between me’e Rapa and me’e Tire emerges as a critical discursive tool Rapa Nui employ to contest Chilean state power in Rapa Nui and assert an alternative vision of their future, past, and present. Had I not learned the distinction, I suspect the entire structure of my investigations in Rapa Nui and my interpretation of them would have been fundamentally different.

Chapter 6 introduces further details about the Chilean land tenure system, and reviews the methodological and theoretical decisions that led to ethnographic investigation of the system in terms of particular official documents and Rapa Nui interviews and conversations. The chapter reviews how and why I collected and analyzed the data of Chapter 7, 8, and 9, and some of the key social interactions that led me to collect and analyze the data in this manner. It illuminates
some of the rationale for deciding to analyze the Chilean land tenure system primarily in terms of the “hidden transcripts” (Scott 1990: 119-127) of Rapa Nui kinship conversations, rather than the “official public transcripts” (Scott 1990: 111) of the Chilean state. Reflection and analysis upon some hidden transcripts of Rapa Nui women in Chapter 6 begins to illustrate important dimensions of an interpretative repertoire articulating in Rapa Nui discourse about the Chilean land tenure system. The chapter concludes with an overview of how and why methodological and theoretical features of Conversation Analysis (CA) are incorporated into a broader discursive analysis of the nuanced meaning of Rapa Nui kinship conversations in Chapter 7 and 8. While problems of the standard approach of CA to context are noted in Chapter 6, I argue that the CA approach to contextual analysis is a valuable method for understanding talk-in-interaction in a place of ongoing colonization like Rapa Nui. CA discourages interpreting and decoding talk in terms of theory, and emphasizes analyzing talk in terms emphasized by the interlocutors themselves (Schegloff 1997b: 174, 1998: 414). Principles of CA are thus applied in order to listen to the conversational meaning of the Chilean land tenure system among Rapa Nui people, and thereby accomplish the aforementioned methodological and theoretical goal of providing textual space for Rapa Nui voices and perspectives to be heard rather than further subjugated.

Analysis of the conversations of Chapters 7 and 8 focuses on the way Rapa Nui kin assess the land tenure policy in similar and different terms. Three conversations are analyzed in each chapter. Two conversational features are of particular interest in my analyses of Chapters 7 and 8: conversational assessments (Goodwin and Goodwin 1997, Heritage and Raymond 2005, Pomerantz 1984, and Sacks 2000), and formulations (Bilmes 2009a, 2009b, Carlin 2010, Edwards 1991, Hester and Eglin 1997, Sacks 2000, Schegloff 1971). The first conversation analyzed in Chapter 1 reveals a general theme of Rapa Nui talk-in-interaction about the policy;
namely, that Rapa Nui tend to assess it as a “bad thing” (me’e rakerake), and a policy they hope to remove. The second conversation formulates the policy in stronger negative terms; namely, as “something unjust” (me’e ta’e tano). The interlocutors consider the policy as part of a broader Chilean strategy to entrench Chilean power upon the island. The third conversation of Chapter 7 is considerably longer than the first two, and less easy to summarize. Broadly however, the two brothers engaged in conversation reject the coherence of talking about the policy at all. In a sense, they refuse to dignify questions about the policy—for the policy is considered part of a long history of Chilean “errors” or “falsifications” (me’e hape) in Rapa Nui. Interestingly, the three conversations are similar not only because they assess the policy in negative terms, but because they consider the policy unsustainable for Rapa Nui progeny.

While Chapter 7 highlights what could be called the addressive features (Bakhtin 2002b: 95) of Rapa Nui kinship talk about the Chilean land tenure system, analysis of the conversations of Chapter 8 explores what could be called the dialogical features (Bakhtin 2002b: 95) of Rapa Nui kinship talk about the policy. While the nuances of the conversations differ, the three conversations all assess the significance of the Chilean land tenure system in terms of a discursive ground that stresses the cultural memory of Rapa Nui ancestors, rather than issues of official Chilean discourse. The first two conversations analyzed in Chapter 8 emphasize the importance of cultural memory of the founding chief of Rapa Nui—Hotu Matu’a—in assessing the meaning of land and identity in Rapa Nui. Rapa Nui King Atamu Tekena is a topic of interest in the third conversation of the chapter. Chief Hotu Matu’a and King Atamu Tekena emerge in these conversations as critical foci of Rapa Nui counter-memory and subjugated knowledge. By genealogically remembering the way Chief Hotu Matu’a is thought to have divided the island among Rapa Nui “tribal groups” (mata), and recalling how King Atamu Tekena explicitly
resisted the idea Rapa Nui consent to annexation included alienation of island land to Chile, Rapa Nui kinship discourse articulates important indigenous epistemology undermining the intelligibility and validity of the Chilean land tenure system marginalizing the place of Rapa Nui in their homeland.

Chapter 9 reviews two official legal histories of Chilean law in Rapa Nui written in Spanish: Vegara’s seminal legal history *La Isla de Pascua: Dominación y Dominio*, and Rochona-Ramirez’s more recent account in *La Propiedad de la Tierra en Isla de Pascua*. A review of Vegara’s text reveals initial Chilean interest in Rapa Nui as part of a broad imperial strategy of making Chile an economic and military ‘lord of the Pacific’ (Vegara 1939: 82-83). Relatedly, Vegara demonstrates that Chilean registration of title to the lands of Rapa Nui was a tactic to resolve legal conflict between Chile and the Easter Island Exploitation Company; Rapa Nui people were not even consulted or considered. Contrary to Vegara, Rochona-Ramirez’s analysis is intended to legitimize Rapa Nui, not Chilean, rights to land on the island. She is critical of Chilean land claims in Rapa Nui, as well as the history of Chilean treatment of Rapa Nui. While comparatively progressive, critical discourse analysis reveals Rochona-Ramirez to ultimately share a colonial discursive stance with Vegara; a stance that severely limits the possible forms of conflict resolution available between Rapa Nui and Chile. \(^9\) Rochona-Ramirez and Vegara imagine conflict resolution in Rapa Nui as determined by the discourse genres of Chilean law and national policy.

Chapter 10 examines in greater detail the extent to which aspects of the Rapa Nui interpretative repertoire are incommensurable with Chilean representations of conflict between
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\(^9\) Each of the documents was translated by me initially. Pali Reemelin, a native Spanish speaker from Argentina and her husband Spencer Reemelin, a lecturer in Spanish at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa helped me revise my translation of Vegara. Dominique Mansilla, a lecturer in Spanish at the University of Hawa‘i at Mānoa, assisted revisions of Rochona-Ramirez’s text.
Rapa Nui and Chile and its potential forms of resolution. The chapter illuminates that, contrary to mass media representations of the conflict today, land is only one aspect of the conflict. For those Rapa Nui struggling to determine governance in Rapa Nui, the conflict is partly about land, but more importantly about political power and authority in Rapa Nui. Chile’s main proposal for resolving conflict with Rapa Nui retains the much detested land tenure system, but assures Rapa Nui “a space of participation” within governmental decisions about Rapa Nui. While on some level this proposal does suggest liberal reform for Rapa Nui, analysis reveals a colonial form of governmentality articulating within the proposed liberal reform that reproduces “Easter Island” and the marginal place of Rapa Nui within it. Proposed conflict resolution in terms of increased participation for Rapa Nui would not appear to decolonize Rapa Nui, but legalize a colonial subject position for Rapa Nui within “Easter Island”. Further analysis of Rapa Nui discourse and additional reflection on Rapa Nui data throughout the dissertation reveals that Rapa Nui fundamentally reject this subject position in their daily discursive practices.

The dissertation concludes with an epilogue, Chapter 11, which assesses the significance of recent and ongoing resistance of Rapa Nui, and Chile’s violent response. While recognizing the potential indeterminacy of the meaning of the events in light of Derrida’s philosophy of context (Derrida 1982), I adumbrate some of the possible meaning by juxtaposing a Rapa Nui perspective to that of the Chilean Interior Minister in the context of a review of global political economic history in Rapa Nui. The dissertation concludes noting expanding international concern for Rapa Nui struggles, and hope for a decolonial Rapa Nui future.
I HĒ KOE?
Chapter 2


Papiano Ika Tuki, Spring 2008

Derechos de los Victimas

1. Ser Atendida.
2. Recibir Un Trato Digno
3. Denunciar al delito
4. Ser Informada
5. Solicitar Protección
6. Obtener Reparación
7. Ser Escuchada
8. Interponer Querella
9. Participar en el Proceso
10. Reclamar

Chilean Government, Haŋa Roa Courthouse, 2008

I think they should make it a golf course.
United States tourist, November 2008.

In just a few centuries, the people of Easter Island wiped out their forest, drove their plants and animals to extinction, and saw their complex society spiral into chaos and cannibalism. Are we about to follow their lead? Among the most riveting mysteries of human history are those posed by vanished civilizations. Everyone who has seen the abandoned buildings of the Khmer, the Maya, or the Anasazi is immediately moved to ask the same question. Why did the societies that erected those structures disappear? Their vanishing touches us as the disappearance of other animals, event the dinosaurs, never can. No matter how exotic those lost civilizations seem, their framers were human like us. Who is to say we won’t succumb to the same fate? Perhaps someday New York’s skyscrapers will stand derelict and overgrown with vegetation, like the temples at Angkor Wat and Tikal. Among all such vanished civilizations, that of the former Polynesian society on Easter Island remains unsurpassed in mystery and isolation. The mystery stems especially from the island’s gigantic stone statues and its impoverished landscape, but it is enhanced by our associations with the specific people involved: Polynesians represent for us the ultimate in exotic romance, the background for many a child’s and an adult’s, vision of paradise. My own interest in Easter Island was kindled over 30 years ago when I read Thor Heyerdahl’s fabulous accounts of his Kon-Tiki voyage. But my interest has been revived recently by a much more exciting account, one not of heroic voyages but of painstaking research and analysis. My friend David Steadman, a paleontologist, has been working with a number of other researchers who are carrying out the first systematic excavations on Easter intended to identify the animals and plants that once lived there. Their work is contributing to a new interpretation of the island’s history that makes it a tale not only of wonder but of warning as well. Easter Island, with an area of only 64 square miles, is the world’s most isolated scrap of habitable land. It lies in the Pacific Ocean more than 2,000 miles west of the nearest continent (South America), 1,400 miles from even the nearest habitable island (Pitcairn). Its subtropical location and latitude at 27 degrees south is approximately as far below the equator as Houston is north of it—help give it a rather mild climate, where its volcanic origins make soil fertile. In theory, this combination of blessings should have made Easter a miniature paradise, remote from problems that beset the rest of the world. The island derives its name from its “discovery” by the Dutch explorer Jacob Roggeveen, on Easter (April 5) in 1722.

Jared Diamond
The question ‘‘I hē koe?’’ (‘‘Where are you?’’) was one of the first questions that my Rapa Nui language teachers stressed I needed to constantly pose and answer on the island. Learning this discursive practice, reflexively, grounded the direction of my investigations in Rapa Nui. My Rapa Nui teachers not only highlighted the question as the one to first ask myself—and answer—wherever I was in Rapa Nui; it was also a question I noticed my Rapa Nui teachers often asked and answered themselves as they engaged in places of Rapa Nui. Answering the question was considered a key to identifying and understanding Rapa Nui, as well as Chilean, places on the island. It was stressed that one could not understand the island, its culture, language, places, people, and politics without knowledge of the place names of wherever one was coming, going, or residing in, and the important history, people, cultural features, resources, and stories associated with each place. In other words, the discursive practice of answering this question was seen as critical to locating and positioning oneself within Rapa Nui. During my initial experiences on the island, however, I often found myself unable to answer the question. As I posed the question to myself, I felt myself similar to the French philosopher Sartre’s fictional character Antoine Roquentin whom suffered nausea at attempting to identify the essential meaning of a tree (Sartre 1964). My confusion stemmed though, not from a modern existential crisis, but from the apparent postmodern condition of Rapa Nui. The island was traversed by many kinds of people but principally four sorts: archaeologists, Chileans, international tourists, and Rapa Nui. Daily mediated interaction among these groups in the context of deterritorialized flows of capital, knowledge, people, and technology seemed to destabilize the meaning of anything in Rapa Nui—fragment it from the vantage of “cosmopolitan ethnography” (Appadurai 1991: 197). To answer the question seemed to require applying an anachronistic key of modernist logic—that there is a single correct answer to any question
(Harvey 1990: 27-28)—to an unlocked postmodern Rapa Nui world. What was a sacred and
storied place on the island to Rapa Nui, alternatively was imagined as a rich archaeological site
to an archaeologist; a nice context for a photo to a tourist; and a convenient location for a new
military base to the Chilean government. Moreover, while Rapa Nui might be found discussing a
location in Rapa Nui as a sacred place among fellow Rapa Nui, in another situation—as a tour
operator for example—they also might discuss the location as having been an important
archaeological site or a great place for photography.

While their boundaries blur in actual discursive practices and social interactions, over
time, I came to note that the Rapa Nui with whom I lived, implicitly and explicitly distinguished
the discourses\(^\text{10}\) of these four types of people on the island. Each of these discourses answers the
Rapa Nui question differently. Rather than immediately locating the context of this
dissertation—that is, answering the question “Where are you?” for the reader, herein I introduce
Rapa Nui in a way to index my initial confusion. The four epigraphs which introduce this chapter
“place” Rapa Nui differently. Analysis of the four epigraphs of the chapter introduces alternative
ways the various things, people, histories, and events associated with the island are ascribed
meaning, and the different ways the island of Rapa Nui itself can be located. Analysis of the
epigraphs also adumbrates some of the distinguishing features of the four discourses. Herein I

\(^{10}\) The term ‘discourse’ has been used to mention variable propositions in critical theory, the philosophy of language,
linguistics, and linguistic anthropology. A stable meaning of the term in part is problematic as analysis of so-called
little ‘d’ discourse analysis as developed in linguistics has deviated from the so-called big ‘D’ Discourse analysis
inspired by the philosophy of Foucault and others; however, they need not be considered incompatible (Arno: 1993:
xi-xii). At a basic level, I use the term ‘discourse’ to mention what Gee (2005) considers big ‘D’ Discourse as
opposed to little ‘d’ discourse. Little ‘d’ discourse analysis is of language use in situ that ‘enacts specific identities
and activities’ (Gee 2005: 7). Big ‘D’ discourse includes little ‘d’ discourse as well as the objects, institutions,
technologies, practices, values, beliefs, etc. that constitute a form of life such as being a physicist or being a Greek-
Australian (Gee 2005: 7). I find the use of big ‘D’ Discourse to be a bit awkward, and will distinguish it from little
‘d’ discourse when necessary in the dissertation. I use the term ‘discourse’ primarily to mention big ‘D’ Discourse,
rather than language use in situ which I will refer to as talk or writing. I am proposing that these discourses are
roughly distinguishable in terms of the fuzzy logic of practice (Bourdieu 1977: 123), rather than precisely
distinguishable in Cartesian terms.
begin to differentiate the discourses in light of my experiences on the island in terms of the broad concerns of the ethnography of communication (Hymes 1974: 24); for example, the contexts of their expression, who uses them, how they are coded, and principle themes. I further contrast the discourses more technically according to the linguistic philosophies of Bakhtin, Foucault, and Wittgenstein; philosophies that ground many of the fundamental forms of contemporary discourse analytic studies (Wetherell, Taylor, and Yates 2009).\footnote{While these philosophers overlap on many issues, and perhaps with respect to the issues I am emphasizing herein, I emphasize one philosopher rather than another on these particular points because I think that philosopher addressed the issue comparatively better than the other for the purposes of my study.} Two concepts of Bakhtin are critical: addressivity and dialogism (Bakhtin 2002b: 95). In consideration of Bakhtin, each discourse is roughly distinct because the principal interlocutors of the discourse dialogically engage different past speakers and discursive resources, and address alternative future speakers. The discourses contrast in light of Foucault because they are ultimately managed by alternative “regimes of truth” (Foucault 1980: 131). In terms of Wittgenstein’s philosophy (2001) the discourses contrast given that they are engaged in alternative “forms of life”; perhaps the most important contribution of his philosophy to contemporary linguistics (Levinson 1979: 365).

**Archaeological Discourse**

During my stay in Rapa Nui, many archaeologists regularly visited the island for brief or extended investigations. In addition to the ongoing archeological investigations conducted by the Chilean state under the leadership of Claudio Cristino, I encountered a number of extended investigations by British, French, German, and United States teams. Every few months it seemed one team would leave and another would arrive. Archaeological discourse can be encountered wherever archaeologists are located, or among tourists acquainted with the literature; moreover, it can be read in much of the tourist and academic discourse circulating on the island and
circumscribing the significance of the island outside of Rapa Nui. Talk in terms of the discourse is pronounced most at the archeological museum of Father Sebastian Englert and the adjacent William Mulloy library; archaeologists regularly hold presentations and public talks there. As the museum and library closes each day for lunch, archaeological and other types of researchers can often be found discussing their latest research plans and desires outside the buildings amongst one another. I first experienced archaeological discourse on Rapa Nui in 2004 as a student of Terry Hunt’s month-long University of Hawai’i archaeological field school in Rapa Nui; not as an ethnographer of contemporary Rapa Nui. The epigraph from Jared Diamond above is a selection from an article by Diamond that was the first assigned reading in the field school. Having no additional knowledge of the archaeology of Rapa Nui prior to the field school to assess Diamond, nor experience with Hunt, I falsely assumed Hunt was introducing the archaeological research paradigm our field studies would extend. The theses of the article have been further elaborated in one of Diamond’s highly read books: *Collapse* (Diamond 2004). Diamond’s account of “Easter Island” prehistory relies upon archaeological research of others, and questions Diamond has continued to explore in Rapa Nui (Diamond and Rolett 2004). While much of the scientific merits and premises of this research continue to be strongly contested by Hunt and others (Hunt and Lipo 2009, Rainbird 2002) as well as continue to be defended (Flenley and Bahn 2007), the archaeological themes stressed and popularized by Diamond have dominated archaeological research on Rapa Nui for the last two decades. It has marginalized the prior diffusionist research hypotheses of Thor Heyerdahl and his associates who argued that the technology requisite for building the world-renown monumental architecture of Rapa Nui—the *moai*—was diffused from South America. The themes of Diamond’s “Easter Island” story have also been dramatized in the Kevin Costner film *Rapa Nui* and are often expressed in various
archaeological representations of “Easter Island” that regularly circulate on U.S. television channels such as National Geographic and The History Channel. While there were exceptions, usually when I encountered archaeologists in Rapa Nui or people conversant with archeological discourse of Rapa Nui, our dialogue would invariably pivot around the salience of Diamond’s story. Irrespective of the aforementioned critiques by Hunt and others, it is the prototypical archaeological perspective on Rapa Nui and the predominant theme of discourse about Rapa Nui outside of the island.

Rapa Nui may discuss aspects of the discourse as tour guides or in cultural resource management positions, but generally, I did not find the themes of archaeological discourse to be of central concern in daily Rapa Nui conversation. Rapa Nui, as will be demonstrated throughout the dissertation, generally engage with the world of the “ancestors” (tupuna) with one another in the context of their own discourse. While a few Rapa Nui have developed knowledge of archaeological research discourse as professional archeologists themselves, and more working knowledge of aspects of the discourse as tour guides and cultural resource managers, Rapa Nui have not authored many archaeological texts on Rapa Nui. Archaeology is principally a foreigner’s discourse; coded in a foreign language few Rapa Nui have historically learned to speak or write: English. In part, few Rapa Nui have professionally contributed to the discourse because it has been organized by “external and internal qualifying rules” (Foucault 1971) that have tended to exclude Rapa Nui from explicitly contributing to the truth of the discourse. The discourse is managed by the international scientific academy in institutions external to Rapa Nui that few Rapa Nui have been able to access. While Sergio Rapu Haoa, a Rapa Nui archaeologist, has and does participate in the discourse, given professional credentials in archaeology achieved in the United States, and likely more Rapa Nui will contribute in the future, Chilean
underdevelopment of Rapa Nui (Rochona-Ramirez 1992) has not historically provided significant resources for Rapa Nui to acquire the academic credentials necessary to qualify for ritual participation in the discourse. Internal rules of truth have also limited the role of Rapa Nui contributions to the discourse. Rapa Nui speak; but only as informants (Teaiwa 1995: 61). Typically, Rapa Nui informant knowledge is classified as useful, yet ultimately limited and biased—something the archaeologist must reorganize to extricate the real truth (Van Tilberg 1994: 37). Moreover, Rapa Nui at the time of my research still had limited roles in formally deciding what kind of archaeological research could occur on the island; permits for archaeological research were ultimately managed by Chilean bureaucrats in Valparaíso, not Rapa Nui. Though Rapa Nui maintain it is only Rapa Nui who truly own and should have a right to manage moai and other Rapa Nui cultural heritage (Trachtman 2001), in practice it is the Chilean government who acts as owners.

As analysis of place formulation would suggest (Schegloff 1971: 129), Diamond’s location of Rapa Nui reflects his own occidental position, cultural membership categories, and topics of analysis. Whatever its scientific merits, Diamond’s “Easter Island” story expresses many of the broad themes of a discourse genre known as Pacific Orientalism (Thamen 2003: 4-6, Wesley-Smith 1995). Like Said suggests for the Orient (Said 1994: 5), Diamond’s answer to the Rapa Nui question, though apparently geographical, is more critically discernable as imaginative. Diamond identifies the island not by one of its Polynesian names, nor in terms of the hallowed indigenous voyaging story of Hotu Matu’a and Ava Rei Pua from the ancestral Polynesian world of Hiva, but in terms of a rarefied Dutch adventure story that led to Jacob Roggeveen naming the
island “Easter Island” in 1722.\textsuperscript{12} Diamond’s “Easter Island” is situated not in proximity to the nearest Polynesian islands inhabited by Rapa Nui—Ma’angaeva and Tahiti: islands with over a century of diasporic Rapa Nui communities—but by the British territory Pitcairn and South America.\textsuperscript{13} Diamond locates “Easter Island” as an isolated scrap of land in a remote region of the Pacific Ocean equidistant to the equator as Houston Texas, rather than as a place in Polynesia among the sea of Oceanic Islands (Hau’ofa 2008: 31). Like the apparent science of Orientalists whose analyses emphasize fascinating tales of Sphinx and genii (Said 1995: 63), Diamond’s...

\textsuperscript{12} Roggeveen, though often represented as merely an explorer, was actually the Dutch captain of three ships seeking to exploit the resources of the undiscovered continent Terra Australias Incognita on behalf of the Dutch West India Trading Company (Ezyaguirre 2006: 10), and the United Provinces—one of the main centers of the world political economy at this time (Braudel 1992: 79, Wallerstein 1974: 212). Captain Roggeveen, in an ethnocentric style normative for European merchant capitalists of his era, logged the name of Rapa Nui in Eurocentric terms; the island was commemorated by the date of his arrival on Easter Sunday 1722. He named the island Paaasch Eyland; Easter Island in Dutch. After being peacefully greeted by a naked Rapa Nui who swam to one of the ships offshore, the Dutch proceeded to land. Upon landing however, the Dutch became fearful as the welcoming Rapa Nui tried to touch their clothing and metal weapons. Consequently, they fired approximately sixty rounds at the unarmed Rapa Nui who came to meet them at shore with goods to exchange; twelve Rapa Nui are known to have been murdered (McCall 1994: 32). After a brief survey of the island and some exchanges of Rapa Nui provisions for beads, cloth, mirrors, and scissors, the Dutch left to continue their search for Terra Australias Incognita. As Roggeveen and his crew sailed in regions claimed to be exclusive to the competing Dutch East India Company, they were accused of criminal trespass (Fisher 2005: 45). Their cargo and ships were confiscated by the Dutch East India Company in route back to the United Provinces, and Roggeveen and his crew were later captured as prisoners of the company (Fisher 2005: 53). After extensive litigation, the Dutch East India Company compensated the Dutch West India Company for the two ships and outstanding wages to the crew (Fisher 2005: 53). The name ‘Easter Island’ or ‘Passch Eyland’ is thus embedded in a kind of “violent cartography” (Shapiro 1997); it is linked to capitalist expansion, and like any story of capital, it “… comes dripping from head to toe, from every pore, with blood and dirt” (Marx 1990: 926).

\textsuperscript{13} The development of Rapa Nui diaspora is embedded in more bloody capitalist expansion into Rapa Nui. Between 1722 and 1871, Rapa Nui became a provisioning station for many whalers and other Western navigators; it also became part of the Peruvian slave trade in the Pacific between 1862 and 1863. At least 57% of the Rapa Nui population died as a result of the slave trade (Maude 1981: 170). Of the 34 %, or 1407 of 4000 Rapa Nui that were estimated to have been enslaved (Maude 1981: 20), only 15 are known to have survived and returned to Rapa Nui following the illegalization of the trade (Maude 1981: 176). The 15 who returned carried small pox back from Peru that infected and ultimately killed an estimated additional 1000 Rapa Nui (Maude 1981: 176).

In 1871, 350 of the 525 estimated total surviving Rapa Nui people on the island were forced to migrate to French Polynesia: 200 were shipped to Tahiti; 150 were sent to Magareva (Porteous 1981: 120). The process was coordinated by French Polynesians: the missionary Roussel based in Magareva whose 1866 mission followed the first French Polynesian Catholic mission to Rapa Nui by Eyraud in 1864 (Altman 2004); and the Pape’ete based capitalist entrepreneurs Dutrou-Bornier and Brander who had began to develop a sheep ranch on Rapa Nui in 1868 (Porteous 1981: 123). Competition between Roussel and the sheep ranchers resulted in warfare on Rapa Nui; the Rapa Nui who supported the ranchers engaged in armed conflict and arson with the Rapa Nui affiliated with the mission (Makihara 1999: 59). Ultimately, the conflict was resolved as Roussel and his supporters went to Magareva, while some of the main leaders of the ranching supporters were sent to Tahiti to work plantations held by Brander near Pape’ete. By 1877 the Rapa Nui population had been reduced to an all time low of 110 people (McCall 1994: 64). However, the sheep ranch of Dutrou-Bornier and Brander had begun to flourish.
story is also expressed in dramaturgical terms. “Easter Island” is portrayed as ‘a mysterious lost civilization’ once populated by ecologically ignoble and irrational cannibals who spiraled into chaos because they carved too many *moai*. “Easter Island” is an archaeological site compared to Angkor Wat and Tikal: it is formulated as a lost, rather than living civilization. The story does not dialogically engage with conversations Diamond had with Rapa Nui about the island—assuming he had any. Contemporary Rapa Nui people are never even mentioned by Diamond in this passage nor the entire article. Actually worse: he appears to mention Rapa Nui people only as “the former Polynesian society of Easter Island.” Rapa Nui, to Diamond, are thus not even a vanishing people: they are a “vanished” people. Like the schematic textual attitude of Orientalists (Said 1995, 85-93), Diamond’s text is dialogical only with prior Western researchers of “Easter Island”. He frames his story as stimulated by boyhood cultural memories of the adventure researcher Thor Heyerdahl, and his contemporary paleontologist friend—David Steadman. Diamond’s “Easter Island” narrative chronicles only island history which articulates with a concern of the West. Diamond, in typical ethnocentric occidental fashion, places Rapa Nui in the savage slot as he fantasizes ways to reform the imagined Western project (Trouillot 1991: 32). Rapa Nui is simply of allegorical interest to Diamond: he uses “Easter Island” culture history to question U.S. and global ecological policy and propose alternatives. The narrative engages not with current or historical island struggles of Rapa Nui people, but those of environmentalists concerned with global ecological collapse. “Easter Island” hence becomes like dirt to an archaeologist, an artifact of a complex professional vision (Goodwin 1994). Perhaps then, such discourse does not so much place Rapa Nui as much as it constitutes it as a sign of differance (Derrida 1973) disseminated within the field of archaeological research projects.
Hunt’s field school quickly disabused me of the scientific veracity of Diamond’s narrative and introduced me to an alternative archaeological research paradigm of Rapa Nui; one sensitive to the historical struggles of Rapa Nui as a contemporary people; and one engaged in developing programs designed to provide Rapa Nui knowledge and training that will give them more opportunities to become professional archaeologists.14 Perhaps over time, this work will result in an alternative archaeological research paradigm on Rapa Nui that does not simply place Rapa Nui in a savage prehistoric slot for reforming the Western project. Since returning to the United States, however, Diamond’s story incessantly haunts me. The most common questions I

---

14 Hunt and his associates have included many Rapa Nui as field assistants, and also have relied upon the Rapa Nui archaeologist Sergio Rapa Haoa as a principle advisor throughout a decade of field research on Rapa Nui conducted in summer field schools from 2000-2010. Their research publications represent Rapa Nui people as a living, not “vanished” people on the island (for example, Hunt and Lipo 2009: 40-41). Research has been complemented by assisting conservation projects organized by the municipality and various government organizations on Rapa Nui. Contrary to earlier research on the island, Hunt and his associates have not found archaeological evidence to support many of the most famous theses of Diamond and those working within this paradigm of research. Aligning their work with recent reformulations of Polynesian settlement of the Pacific (Anderson and Sinoto 2002), Hunt and associates propose a shorter chronology for settlement and cultural elaboration on the Rapa Nui. Citing their own excavation data at Anakena, as well as various other ecological analyses of the Polynesian rat, they propose settlement of Rapa Nui at approximately 1200 CE (Hunt and Lipo 2009: 29). A peak population is estimated at 1350 CE of approximately 3,000 to 5,000 assuming an initial settlement of approximately of 40-50 Rapa Nui (Hunt and Lipo 2009: 37). Like Diamond, Hunt and his associates find evidence of deforestation and ecological destruction from 1250-1650 CE (Hunt and Lipo 2009: 28). However, they have not found archaeological evidence that suggests that the ecological devastation of this period is principally an effect of Rapa Nui forest clearance for carving and moving the famous moai statues (Hunt and Lipo 2009: 42). While they recognize Rapa Nui forest burning for settlements as a contributing factor in ecological destruction, they do not see evidence of reckless burning (Hunt and Lipo 2009: 36). Among a set of factors including geographical isolation and biotic scarcity (Hunt and Lipo 2009: 23-24), Polynesian rats, not Rapa Nui cultural practices, are highlighted in their archaeological explanation of ecological devastation in Rapa Nui. The Polynesian rat, they point out, has been comparatively known to destroy forests in Polynesia independently of Polynesian settlements; notably in ‘Ewa, O’ahu (Hunt and Lipo 2009: 30-32). The rats have been documented to eat the seedlings of indigenous palm trees in Polynesian islands; thus obstructing forest regeneration (Hunt and Lipo 2009: 32). Rat gnawed seeds of the once dense forest of palms in Rapa Nui suggest that the potentially 17 million rats that could have populated the island from a single mating pair accompanying the Rapa Nui settlers in 1200 CE in just three years (Hunt and Lipo 2009: 34), are the main culprits of destruction of the ecology of Rapa Nui. Importantly, they note that there is however, no evidence that the ecological devastation, resulted in a social crisis for Rapa Nui. They emphasize that the first European to arrive to Rapa Nui, the aforementioned Roggeveen, found the island productive and a potential human paradise (Hunt and Lipo 2009: 26). Social collapse is only demonstrated following interaction with Westerners that led to genocide on the island. For Hunt and Lipo ironically, “…the victims of cultural and physical extermination have been turned into the perpetrators of their own demise” (39). Contrary to Diamond, they do not believe that the archaeological record suggests self-induced “ecocide”; rather, after a decade of field research, Hunt and his associates maintain, “the real story here is one of human ingenuity and success that lasted more than 500 years on one of the world’s most remote human outposts” (Hunt and Lipo 2009: 4).
encounter when mentioning that I have lived a year and a half in Rapa Nui are archaeological, and often focused on Diamond. People often note that they have read *Collapse* (Diamond 2004), and ask me how my research clarified the processes of ecological collapse of “Easter Island” he proposed. When I respond that I don’t study the archaeology of “Easter Island”, but contemporary issues of the indigenous Rapa Nui people, I typically encounter the follow-up dumbfounded question ‘There are native people there?’ Archaeological prehistoric “placement” of Rapa Nui remains powerful indeed in Western mediated imagination.

**Tourist Discourse**

Though some tourists may know the indigenous name of the island, generally tourists come to a place they think of as “Easter Island” or “Isle de Paque” or “Isla de Pascua,” etc. International tourist discourse is mostly expressed in Spanish, French, German, English, or Japanese. While tourists are likely to learn about Rapa Nui from some Rapa Nui tour guides, their ideas about Rapa Nui are principally dialogical with tour guide books with such titles as *Chile and Easter Island* addressed to tourists or archaeologists. The discourse of the guide books is focused upon the archaeological sites of Rapa Nui; where to stay, eat, and shop; and a review of some of the cultural shows and tours of the island. A small section of these books typically provides some background information about the current population of the island; a synopsis of its history since Roggeveen’s christening of the island; and the archaeological stories of its prehistory. The truth of the discourse, though sometimes contested by Rapa Nui guides and more often simply ignored, is managed and published primarily by international travel agencies and foreign presses, not by Rapa Nui. While I have noted occasional quotes in these guide books from Rapa Nui officials or leaders, it appears their references are principally other travel agents and texts about “Easter Island” the lost civilization. Though the content of international tourist
discourse links with archaeological research discourse, it does not articulate much with Chilean or Rapa Nui discourse. Tourists do not generally come to Rapa Nui to engage with either contemporary Chilean or Rapa Nui culture; they come to see the spectacles of the lost civilization of “Easter Island”. During my occasional discussions with tourists, I was often asked to elaborate my understanding of prehistoric “Easter Island”, but rarely what was currently happening on the island with Rapa Nui people. And international tourists generally were never interested in Chile. Chilean discourse was of interest only to the extent it facilitated their tour.

The quote from the U.S. tourist above (epigraph #3), was uttered in a conversation between two American tourists at a café in the main town of Rapa Nui, Hanga Roa. In proposing that ‘they should make it a golf course’ the reference of “it” was the island itself: the speaker thought the entire island would make a good golf course. She expressed excitement at the prospect of large scale hotels scattered about the course and celebrity tournaments, and beamed at the thought of moai as obstacles. She relished an imagined future of resorts abutting the coast like in Hawai’i where she could take in a few holes after a spa and pedicure. In contrast, on another day at the café, I overheard another pair of American tourists who commented on how fantastic it was that the Chilean government was able to preserve the island as a state park with minimal impact by hotel development. They enjoyed the ruggedness of “Easter Island”, the family-run inns, and small-scale tourism. They hoped that this policy would persist and preserve “Easter Island” as it is… a kind of ‘open-air museum’ and ‘wild place’. Although somewhat antithetical to one another, both perspectives exhibit a common feature: complete disregard of the possibility that the island had a purpose and significance besides tourism. Though no doubt both pairs of tourists had encountered local Rapa Nui by this point along their tour, neither explicitly considered that maybe Rapa Nui would prefer to develop the island in alternative terms
or objected to those currently operating. Neither entertained the possibility that the principle significance and purpose of the island was that it was the home of Rapa Nui people concerned with raising their grandchildren and future grandchildren on it, and having their “bones” (ivi) buried within the land among their ancestors. While undoubtedly not all tourists are as insensitive as these two pairs of tourists and some are even less (while I was living on the island a tourist was convicted of cutting off an ear of one of the moai), I think in general their comments highlight a basic feature of international tourist discourse. “Easter Island”, within this discourse, is reproduced as something for tourists to consume. Tourists formulate all things “Easter Island” within a matrix of consumer desires. As tourists discussed the island they typically assessed it by considering ways their consumption of it could improve: more elaborate hotels, more entertainment, better rental cars, more beaches, and its potential for golf. Tourists place “Easter Island” in a new kind of historical theme park (Handler and Gable 1997); a prehistoric amusement park of moai rides.

International tourist discourse predominates across the central town of the island—Hanga Roa, the primary tourist sites on the island—Oroño, Rano Raraku, Ahu Tahai, Ahu Toŋariki, and Anakena beach, the primary tourist educational center for the island—the Sebastian Englert museum and William Mulloy research library, and of course at the airport. From the vantage of tourists having coffee at a café on the main street of Hanga Roa, Rapa Nui does indeed appear as somewhat of a thing to consume. The main street is lined on each side principally with souvenir shops, tour agencies, and restaurants catering to tourists. Billboards advertise Rapa Nui cultural dance shows exhibiting Rapa Nui dancers in provocative traditional dress. Rental cars line the street curbs awaiting customers. The most Rapa Nui-centered building on main street—the local fish and produce farmer’s market named ‘Feria’—doubles as an artisanal market that sells
souvenirs. Tourists, enthralled with the handsome, hand-crafted shell jewelry, hand-carved wood and stone sculptures modeling the world famous *moai*, and intricately crafted woodwork modeling ancient Rapa Nui war clubs and chiefly staffs, hardly take notice of Rapa Nui purchasing their local food and conversing in Rapa Nui within the same building. Also typically ignored by the tourists making a bee-line to the souvenirs is the local café also nestled within the Feria where Rapa Nui gather for small talk and conversations in predominately Rapa Nui language. Beyond the Feria, on the main street, the multifarious languages of the tourists compete with Chilean Spanish across the sidewalks and within the stores, restaurants, and tour agencies as primarily Chilean cab drivers dominate the street. Rapa Nui language and the Rapa Nui people, if seen or heard at all by the tourists, fade into their background as they anxiously shop for a simulacrum of prehistoric “Easter Island” culture.

**Chilean Discourse**

The sample of legal rules above (epigraph #2) posted inside the courthouse of Rapa Nui is illustrative of one genre of official Chilean discourse in Rapa Nui. Such discourse, coded in Spanish, represents Rapa Nui not as ‘a lost civilization’ to excavate or tour, but simply as Chile. At an official level, this sense of Rapa Nui is grounded ultimately in terms of the Chilean annexation of Rapa Nui in 1888, yet more particularly, in terms of a more recent law organizing the island: Ley 16441. The law established Rapa Nui as part of the civil district of Valparaiso, Chile; prior to Ley 16441, the island was administered as a military territory according to Naval rules established by Ley 3220 (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 43). The passage of this law in 1966, under Chilean President Eduardo Frei Montalva, ended a complex era of imperial domination and transnational corporate exploitation of Rapa Nui that began shortly after Chilean annexation
of Rapa Nui in 1888.\textsuperscript{15} According to Ley 16441, Rapa Nui is to be locally administered by a governor appointed by the Chilean president as opposed to one appointed by the military as had been the case, a locally elected mayor, and a six member municipal council. There is also another genre of official Chilean discourse however; it is founded upon another law: Ley 19253,

\textsuperscript{15} The meaning of annexation to both Chile and Rapa Nui remains a hotly contested issue that will be explored throughout the dissertation, particularly chapters 7, 8, 9, and 10. It is clear however, that between 1888 and the establishment of Ley 16441 in 1966, Rapa Nui political power varied in relationship to the different forms of governance imposed upon the island. Annexation involved a two-party agreement between Rapa Nui “King” (\textit{Ariki Nui}) Atamu Tekena and the Chilean ‘Agent of Colonization, but not Governor’ Policarpo Toro (McCall 1997: 114). At annexation there is significant evidence of a kind of sharing of power. First, Chilean histories note that state officials honored the King Atamu Tekena’s demand that Chile hoist its flag below the Rapa Nui flag (Bienvenido 1920: 140-142) and “…there was no attempt to tell Atamu Tekena that he was no longer king… Indeed, the Spanish version of the documents makes it clear that the chiefs signing keep their titles and benefits” (McCall 1997: 114). Second, both Rapa Nui oral history (McCall 1997, 114) and Chilean historical accounts (Bienvenido 1920: 142, Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 30) note that at the time of annexation King Atamu Tekena explicitly communicated to the Chilean agent of colonization that annexation did not involve sale or transfer of the land of Rapa Nui to Chile.

The role of Rapa Nui in governance changed as Chile leased the island to sheep ranching companies following a failed colonial settlement effort. Rapa Nui lost the kingship as well as any significant role in governance on the island as Chile leased the island to Enrique Merlet who purchased the sheep ranch from the heirs of the Dutrou-Bornier and Brander estate. Following Chilean annexation, the Brander and Dutrou-Bornier sheep ranch on Rapa Nui, formed in the missionary era of the 1860s, and registered as a legal association in the French registry of Pape’ete in 1871 (Rochona-Ramirez 1993: 23), became embroiled in a complex international legal conflict between the heirs of the estate, the French and Chilean governments, the Catholic Missions of France and Chile, Enrique Merlet, and the Rapa Nui people. Bishop Jaussen of Tahiti, acting on the behalf of Rapa Nui (Vegara 1939: 42), and upon his own disrespect of the land claims of the estate (Fisher 2005: 116), appealed the Pape’ete court decision to transfer the estate to John Brander Jr. following the death Brander and Rapa Nui murder of Dutrou-Bornier. The case was sent to the court of Bordeos, France, but ultimately, the Bordeos court rejected the appeal in 1893 and upheld the Papae’ete decision (Vegara 1939: 42). John Brander Jr. sold the estate to Policarpo Toro, “agent of Chilean colonization,” upon Chilean annexation of Rapa Nui; however, Policarpo Toro failed to make payment and the contract was voided (Vegara 1939: 42). Subsequently, this estate was purchased from John Brander Jr. by Enrique Merlet in 1895 (Rochona-Ramirez 1993: 32). Upon default of a loan to purchase the estate given to Merlet by the Williamson Balfour Company (Fisher 2005: 157), the Williamson Balfour Company decided to purchase the estate from Merlet. In 1903, Enrique and his brother Pablo sold their remaining interests in the estate to the Williamson Balfour Company (Rochona-Ramirez 1993: 32).

The Williamson Balfour Company, initially started by Scotsmen in Liverpool, England in 1851, was a vast transnational company with offices spanning the United States, Chile, and Great Britain; it had business interests from South America, North America, West Africa, to the Philippines principally focused on international wool and nitrate (Fisher 2005: 157). Retaining Enrique Merlet as a manager, the Williamson Balfour Company created the subsidiary company, la Compañía Explotadora de la Isla de Pascua or “Easter Island Exploitation Company,” to incorporate Rapa Nui into its global wool enterprise. Though Merlet and the Compañía thought they in effect owned the entirety of the island, the Chilean government ultimately denied their land claims on the basis of international and national law and registered the island as Chilean state fiscal property in 1933 (Vegara 1939: 37-61). The Compañía nevertheless remained powerful from 1903-1953 as the Chilean government leased the island to the Compañía with limited restrictions on its power. When the Compañía was not given a new lease in 1953, the island and Rapa Nui people was subject strictly to rule by the Chilean Navy. While the Chilean military did ostensibly rule the island since annexation, between 1888 and 1953 this was only \textit{de jure}; rule \textit{de facto} was by the sheep ranch managers (Porteous 1984: 169). It is only in 1966, that Rapa Nui again asserted some degree of formal political power on the island.
the “Indigenous Law” (Ley Indígena). This law, passed in 1994 under Chilean President Eduardo Frei Ruiz-Tagle—the second president following the end of Chilean dictatorship by Pinochet (1973-1990), legally established Rapa Nui people as one of the six federally recognized indigenous peoples of Chile. It also added an additional administrative organization to Rapa Nui: the “Easter Island Development Commission” (Comisión de Desarrolló de la Isla de Pascua: CODEIPA). Both official discourses place Rapa Nui within Chile in terms of the Spanish name ‘Isla de Pascua’; however, each locates Rapa Nui differently: Ley 16441 locates Rapa Nui within a district of Chile; Ley 19253 locates Rapa Nui within the indigenous spaces of Chile.

To distinguish the two herein, I will refer to the discourse associated with Ley 19253 as Pascuense discourse and that coordinated by Ley 16441 as Valparaiso discourse. Pascuense discourse formulates Rapa Nui as a kind of special bicultural Polynesian place; a space of an ethnic group with special rights compared to other Chileans. Valparaiso discourse formulates Rapa Nui as simply another Chilean place, a space to be administered just like any other Chilean district. While the two discourses interact throughout the island, some places seemed more organized by one than the other. Though the offices of the governor and mayor and various social institutions like the public school were established by Ley 16441, much of the daily life I observed in those places was what I would call Pascuense. This was manifest in language usage, daily practices, and architecture. The bicultural Pascuense discourse of such places contrasts with such places as that of the court house and the office of land titles, as well as the offices and conduct of the Chilean military and police stationed in Rapa Nui. Those institutions were not only silent on Rapa Nui as a Polynesian place; they often seemed to operate antagonistically to Rapa Nui as a special indigenous place. Official Chilean discourse in Rapa Nui was thus
unstable, ambiguous; depending on the context, it shifted between two broadly distinct genres of discourse: Valparaiso and Pascuense.

At the office of the governor, a memorial statue of the Rapa Nui King Riro, as well as a large Rei Miro sculpture, symbolically mark the place as at least partially a Rapa Nui place. A lone Chilean flag erected in front of the office of the governor also established the office as a Chilean place. Importantly, the Rapa Nui flag that accompanies the Chilean flag at the mayor’s office, and that Rapa Nui insisted on erecting above the Chilean flag at the date of annexation, was conspicuously absent from the governor’s place. King Riro, the last king of Rapa Nui, is a man of great historical significance to Rapa Nui. His official memorial thus represents Rapa Nui in historical, rather than simply prehistoric terms. The placement of the memorial is reminiscent of the memorial to the Tahitian leader Pouvāna’a ‘O’opa in front of one of the government buildings in Pape’ete, Tahiti. King Riro, like Pouvāna’a, was an important leader of indigenous resistance; however, this memorial does not provide a narrative to elaborate this fact. The memorial to Pouvāna’a expresses considerable detail missing in that of King Riro.16

16 Here is the text of the memorial to Pouvāna’a with diacritical marks added and translation under the guidance of University of Hawai’i Professor of Tahitian Jack Ward:

Fānauhia i Fare Huahine i te 10 nō Me 1895. ‘Ua mate ‘oia i Pape’ete Tahiti i te 10 nō Tenuare 1977. Taure’are’a (20 matahiti) ‘ua ti’a mai ‘oia i roto i te nu’u fa’ehau nō pātīfita ‘o te pāruru iā Farani i te tama’i rahi mātāmua. ‘Anatau matahiti 1949-1958, ‘ua riro ‘oia ‘ei tēpūē nō Pōrēnetia Farānī. ‘Anotau matahiti 1958-1968 i muri a’e i te uira’a mana’o nō Tetepa 1958, ‘ua ha’amau ‘o Farānī iāna (63-73 tōna matahiti) i te ‘āuri i te hau metua. ‘Anotau matahiti 1971-1977 ‘ua riro mai ‘oia ‘ei tenatorie nō te fenua nei ‘o ‘oia tei mau ‘ei ‘upo’o tumu nō te R.D.P.T., te pupu ‘o tei tutāva iā noa’a mai te fa’aoterera’a hau manahune nō te arata’i i te mau nūna’a nō Tahiti. ‘A huti noa ai ‘oia i te aho, ‘ua ‘pāto’i noa ‘oia i te fēia ai’ora ‘e te fēia fa’ātīfī aihu’arā’au: ‘ua ‘aro noa ‘oia iā hōro’ahia mai te mau tōro’a ra’atere i te fēia ihotupu; ‘iā ha’amahia te mau ture e tano nō te ohipa turu uta’a; ‘iā fa’aho’ihia te futara’a tāpū fenua mā’ohi I te hui mau iho . E ‘iā’au here ‘e te ferurira’a ti’amā ‘e te fa’atura tōna; ‘oia i ta’a maita’i ai te fifi o te nuna’a mā’ohi ‘iā fa’ātu atu i te mau fa’ahuru’ēra’a onono o te peu papa’ā nō tōna ahomaoro ma te tapineva ‘ore ‘iā nahonaho te orara’a o tōna huira’atira, i ha’amauhia ai ‘oia i te ‘āuri i te ātea ‘e atu i tōna ‘āi’a. 10 matahiti te fa’aoromaira’a te ruau, ‘o tei ti’aturi i te atua tei turu iāna nō te amo i taua mau hōpoi’a ato’a ra i rotopū i te nuna’a nei. ‘Ua hi’a te ‘aito e fanu re’a iho ‘āva’e hou te papa-ture ai i mana mai ai i te 12 nō Tiuari 1977. Tāpa’o e ‘ua pū te a’ea’e o tōna mau mana’o. ‘Inaha ‘ua fā mai te tau iho-fa’aoterera’a o te fenua nei. ‘Ua tārava ‘oia i te ta’oto nui ‘e vehihia i te repo nō Tahiti, te fenua i muriherehia e āna ma te pūpū atu iāna iho.

Pouvāna’a was born in Fare, Huahine May 10, 1895. He died in Pape’ete, Tahiti January 10, 1977. As a young man (twenty years old) he joined the Pacific Army which protected France in World War I. In the period of 1949-
memorial to Pouvā’a ‘O’opa summarizes his biography and significance in both Tahitian and French, the plaque for King Riro simply notes, in Spanish, the man as the last king recognized by the Chilean Navy (La Armada de Chile en Reconocimiento al Ultimo Rey Rapa Nui Simeon Riro Kainga. Hanga Roa, 06 de Mayo del 2006). The memorial to King Riro is constituted in terms of the “national memory” (White 2004: 293-294) of the Chilean military, not Rapa Nui people. The memorial thus ironically remembers, while officially forgetting (Trouillot 1995: 48), the actual importance of King Riro to Rapa Nui people.17

17 King Riro was the second and last Rapa Nui King of Rapa Nui; he was assassinated during the Merlet era of sheep ranching in Rapa Nui. King Riro was murdered in 1898 in route to protest conditions of Rapa Nui to the Chilean President (McCall 1992: 2). The first “King” of Rapa Nui was the Frenchman Dutrou-Bournier who implemented Scottish sheep ranching in Rapa Nui beginning 1867 along with his partner the Scotsman John Brander of Pape’ete, French Polynesia. In 1875, this former French artillery officer in the Crimean war (Fisher 2005: 100), appointed himself “King” of Rapa Nui and his newly acquired Rapa Nui wife Koreto Queen (she was one of three of his wives—he also had a wife in Tahiti as well as France), and his two Rapa Nui daughters princesses as he attempted to turn Rapa Nui into his own kingdom (McCall 1997: 112). Dutrou-Bornier, who the Rapa Nui called not “King” but “buttons” (Pitopito) because he wore fancy coats with big buttons (Fisher 2005: 102), was killed by Rapa Nui in 1876 after years of abusive and violent treatment of Rapa Nui (Fisher 2005: 120). In addition to acquiring much of his land claims with a rifle in hand (Fisher 2005: 106), “Buttons” often took young pubescent Rapa Nui girls at his random pleasure (Fisher 2005: 120), and regularly burned the houses and crops of Rapa Nui around Hanga Roa (Fisher 2005: 112). In 1883, Atamu Tekena was appointed King of Rapa Nui by the French Catholic mission in part established and lead by Father Roussel by the request of Rapa Nui to replace the “Pagan” leadership of Dutrou-Bournier (McCall 1997: 114). King Riro was elected King by fellow Rapa Nui (McCall 1997: 115) after King Atamu Tekena died from natural causes in 1892 (McCall 1997: 115).

The assassination of King Riro followed the implementation of a new political order by Enrique Merlet who had “purchased” the Brander and Dutrou-Bournier sheep ranch. Upon arrival to the island with armed guards, Merlet took down the Rapa Nui flag accompanying the Chilean flag; had Rapa Nui build a wall around the town of Hanga Roa; imprisoned Rapa Nui within the walls; and refused to acknowledge any political authority of King Riro upon the island (McCall 1997: 116). He informed Rapa Nui that they could not trespass beyond the walls of Hanga Roa as that was his ranch, and that all cattle and sheep belonged to him. Rapa Nui began to strike against the new order, and King Riro immediately arranged with the Chilean Maritime Sub-delegate and company manager Alberto Sanchez
At the offices of the governor and mayor, many aspects of Pascuense discourse are manifest. Administrators and staff within both offices included Rapa Nui and Chileans. Importantly, both heads of these offices—the governor and mayor—at the time were Rapa Nui; a contemporary norm achieved through Rapa Nui resistance to the Chilean government. Talk within these offices shifted at times between Rapa Nui and Spanish. The mayor produced a weekly radio talk in which he sometimes spoke exclusively in Rapa Nui, and sometimes in a way that shifted between Rapa Nui and Spanish. While Rapa Nui could be heard spoken among Rapa Nui within the offices, most talk was conducted in Spanish.

Literature provided by the offices

Manterola, the only significant Chilean government official on the island, to provide him passage to Valparaiso where he would challenge Merlet’s new order before the Chilean President (McCall 1997: 116). Citing Manterola’s journals, McCall relates that upon arrival to Valparaiso, King Riro was met by a man named Jeffries who worked under Merlet. He proceeded to get King Riro drunk at various establishments in Valparaiso until he fell ill and died in a hospital (McCall 1997: 116). This account broadly accords with Rapa Nui oral tradition that asserts King Riro was poisoned by Merlet (McCall 1997: 116), as well as Merlet’s own claim that King Riro simply drank himself to death accidentally (McCall 1995: 2).

Alfonso Rapu Haoa, oldest brother of Sergio Rapu Haoa—the Rapa Nui archaeologists noted above, was the first elected indigenous Rapa Nui mayor in 1964. Alfonso, one of the early cohorts of Rapa Nui to receive a formal education in Chile, had become a school teacher on the island. As Rapa Nui informally elected him to take the place of the current mayor appointed by the Chilean Government, the Chilean official Guillermo Rojas summoned the marines to subdue a Rapa Nui revolt. Upon landing and marching into Rapa Nui to take Alfonso, the marines were confronted by hundreds of Rapa Nui women who refused to hand him over and hid him (McCall 1997: 118). Perhaps because a Canadian medical team (METEI) was coincidently present on the island, and drawing media attention to the events, ultimately, Chilean President Frei supported a formal reelection. Alfonso Rapu Haoa was ultimately elected mayor, and President Frei passed “Easter Island Law” (Ley 16,441) that ended military rule on the island, and granted Rapa Nui citizenship in the Valparaiso district of Chile (McCall 1997: 118). Though it created a municipality that could be administered at least in part by Rapa Nui people, it was accompanied by the first large scale settlement of the island by Chileans who arrived to help administer the island according to the law. In the 1950s the number of non-Rapa Nui on the island—most of these being Chilean—is estimated at 50; a small minority within a Rapa Nui population of approximately 900 (Makihara 1999: 69). In 1968, following the institutionalization of Ley 16441, the number of Chileans, most of them members of the new “civil administration” skyrocketed to 538 (Cristino 1984) while the Rapa Nui number increased only to 1158 (Makihara 1999: 69). While this is seen as the beginning of Rapa Nui modern democratization of the island (Makihara 1999: 96-97), it is alternatively seen as the beginning of “Chileanization” of the island (McCall 1997: 118). More technically, this historical event can be said to have transformed Rapa Nui from an economic and military exploitation colony into a settlement colony (Young 2001:17).

The types of language spoken could be described more complexly as involving various types of Rapa Nui and Spanish language. Makihara (1999, 2004, and 2007) distinguishes three types of Rapa Nui language (“Old Rapanui”, “Purist Rapanui”, and “Syncretic” or “Modern Rapanui”), and four varieties of Spanish in Rapa Nui (two forms of “Rapanui Spanish”, “Chilean Spanish”, and “Castilian Spanish”). All seven types of language are represented as having blurred boundaries, yet distinguishable along a continuum that consists of “Old Rapanui” at one end and Castilian Spanish on the other end (Makihara 1999: 165-167). “Old Rapanui” is considered the language of Rapa Nui ancestors prior to interaction with Europeans during the Western imperial era (Makihara 1999: 169). “Pure Rapanui” is reportedly a contemporary form of Rapa Nui language that consciously avoids mixing
was also predominately expressed in Spanish; however, Rapa Nui was included in some of the documents produced. The publication of a newsletter by local officials of the Chilean government named ‘Rapa Nui’ consisted of a few pages of articles about problems on the island each month and was distributed at the governor’s office and other institutions scattered around Hanga Roa. The name ‘Isla de Pascua’ was printed small and below the name of the publication entitled “Rapa Nui” and Rapa Nui language translations were provided of some article titles, though the articles themselves were written in Spanish.

Yet many of the places organized explicitly by the Chilean government did not make any effort to represent the place in bicultural Pascuense terms. In these places the discursive practice of the government simply organized the island as a Chilean place. Valparaiso discourse in Rapa Nui is expressed most explicitly around government institutions around Hanga Roa and Mataveri—the site of the airport and the location of the Chilean military and police. Like the Chilean police and military whose uniforms and vehicles identify themselves not in terms of Rapa Nui or even Isla de Pascua, but simply as representatives of Chile (Carabineros de Chile, and Armada de Chile respectively), the discourse of the courthouse in Rapa Nui was unequivocally Chilean. I was informed that a Rapa Nui judge was available to judge the court proceedings; however, after six months of regular observation of court cases and proceedings, I

of Chilean Spanish with Rapa Nui language (Makihara 1999: 304). “Syncretic” or “Modern Rapanui” is characterized as mixing Rapa Nui with English, Tahitian, and Spanish (Makihara 1999: 175). She distinguishes two varieties of “Rapanui Spanish”: one spoken by Rapa Nui whose first language is Rapa Nui (R1S2); and one spoken by Rapa Nui whose first language is Spanish but who have some competence in Rapa Nui (R2S1). According to her, R2S1 “Rapanui Spanish” has some lexical borrowing but does not have phonological or grammatical features transferred from Rapa Nui. R1S2 “Rapanui Spanish” shows structural interference in levels of phonology, morphology, and syntax but very few instances of lexical transfer from Rapa Nui (Makihara 1999: 182-183). One feature she highlights as a particular salient feature of R1S2 is the use of third person present tense verbs in a variety of contexts where standard Chilean Spanish forms would conjugate different verb tenses and person forms (Makihara 1999: 185-186). While Makihara generally takes pains to distinguish the use of these types of Rapa Nui and Spanish language on the island, I have not concerned myself with these distinctions too much in my dissertation. I elaborate some of the reasons I avoid Makihara’s typological analysis in more detail in the next chapter.
never observed a case in which he presided. The judge was Chilean as were the two attorneys who counseled plaintiffs and defendants. The majority of users of the courtroom during this period were Rapa Nui. Though Law 19253 stipulates that Rapa Nui have a legal right to a translator and to speak strictly in Rapa Nui, I never heard the judge or council ask Rapa Nui in court if they would like to exercise this right or would like a concept or issue clarified in terms of Rapa Nui. While Rapa Nui referred to the building as *te hare ture* ("house of debate/argument"), the building did not include the Rapa Nui phrase outside as a name of the building. Unlike the courthouse in Pape’ete, Tahiti which is denoted first in Tahitian terms and second in smaller French terms, and places Tahitian beside French in most signs orienting visitors to and within the institution, Rapa Nui language was conspicuously absent from the building. One might expect the interior of the courtroom to have some Rapa Nui carvings or sculpture given their presence at the offices of the governor and mayor and the school; however, there was no sign of anything Rapa Nui within the courtroom. There was a Chilean flag and a set of anonymous wooden pews and tables. Presumably, the courthouse in Rapa Nui is like any other courthouse in a small Chilean community. At the seat of justice in Rapa Nui, Rapa Nui appear as defendants, but Rapa Nui culture, language, and people are conspicuously absent from the processes of adjudication.

Similarly, the “Office of National Goods” (Oficina Bienes Nacionales) that administers the individual land titles known as the ‘titulo dominio’ by the office and ‘*te parau henua*’ by Rapa Nui also lacked a bicultural sensibility. Like the courthouse, the building architecture lacked Rapa Nui aesthetics and was not identified in terms of the Rapa Nui language. Inside no sense of Rapa Nui culture could be found. A poster-size photo of the current Chilean President Bachelet lined the walls, not *moai* or murals of Rapa Nui aesthetic forms. Though a Rapa Nui man staffed the waiting room, the three lead administrators were all Chilean. As in the case of
the judge and attorneys, none of these officials could speak Rapa Nui. As I received requested information from the office about the land titles and the history of the policy, I also asked if they had any literature available that was expressed in Rapa Nui. The administrators assured me that this information was currently being developed, and gave me a copy of the rough draft of the document being prepared in Rapa Nui. The office of land registration, like the courthouse, a place of social and political power, lacked an explicitly empowered Rapa Nui seat. Valparaíso discourse was also expressed in the general social landscape of the island. In the “country side” (kampō) of Rapa Nui outside of Hānja Roa, the sense of Rapa Nui as a Chilean place is manifest in a profound absence. Few Rapa Nui have been legally permitted to live in the kampō since first missionaries and capitalists, and ultimately the Chilean government, settled, incarcerated, and administered Rapa Nui in Hānja Roa in the late nineteenth century to stabilize wool production for the global political economy. The entire island is circumscribed by ancestral territories (kāiŋa) punctuated by the world famous moai sculptures of Rapa Nui that signify Rapa Nui cultural heritage, but a heritage now organized primarily to serve tourist, archaeological research, and Chilean interests. Hence, to read the kampō as strictly Rapa Nui would produce and conceal a “De Manian allegorical reading” (Jameson 1991: 245) that betrays over a hundred years of organization not determined by Rapa Nui. Official Chilean discourse, despite some Pascuense articulations, often fails to locate its institutions and landscape within a Rapa Nui place.

Rapa Nui Discourse

Some sense of how Rapa Nui discourse poses and answers the question ‘I he koe?’ can begin to be illuminated by attending to the fourth epigraph. The quote is a fragment of a longer discussion at one of the places I visited near the town. It is an explicit example of Rapa Nui answering this fundamental Rapa Nui question. The text can be roughly translated as follows:
Pure Nahe is the name of this place. We have traversed to Pure Nahe to compassionately greet the great man of the place: Papiano Ika Tuki. He is eighty years old. Fifty-eight people resided here and died here. These elders speak here to this day. He has been here—to this day—fifty-eight years; imprisoned here by the Chilean government. This is the home of the lepers. Women and men were imprisoned here. They were not sick. They were injected with medicine [that contained leprosy]. Why? To exterminate the people. To this day, Papiano is the last one alive. They have built a school for the children to cover the evil history here; the evil of the Chilean government to this great man of Rapa Nui.

The conversation consisted of Papiano’s reflections on Pure Nahe and some narration of the meeting articulated by another elder who helped facilitate the conversation. No Chileans were present during our conversation. Papiano spoke to me in his home in Pure Nahe: a home now next to the remains of the leprosy colony in part developed by the Chilean government; it is the only home remaining among the relics. As the conversation developed, the elder would sometimes restate Papiano’s words to me. Papiano’s jaw, as well as his entire body had been ravaged by Hansen’s disease; he lacked fingered hands, could not walk unassisted, and speaking was painful for him. While I conversed directly with Papiano, his words were sometimes restated to make them clearer to me (because of a partially collapsed jaw his voice resounds in a tone that is difficult to hear precisely) and save him the pain of having to repeat his words as I wrote them down.

Like much of Rapa Nui discourse, the discussion was articulated in Rapa Nui language among elder Rapa Nui within a Rapa Nui home. While it can be coded in the various languages spoken among Rapa Nui such as Spanish, German, French and English, I noted the discourse most commonly coded in Rapa Nui. Rapa Nui may address the discourse to Chileans, and

---

20 The Chilean government did not build it, but only sponsored the development of the colony as a condition of leasing the island to the Easter Island Exploitation Company (McCall 1995: 2).
aspects of the discourse are communicated to tourists and researchers; however, Rapa Nui discourse, as I experienced it, was principally a discourse mature and elder Rapa Nui used to communicate amongst one another and tried to teach to children as they engaged with their daily forms of life. Generally, it was thus expressed anywhere adult Rapa Nui gathered among other Rapa Nui; for example, residential areas, the main harbor—Hanga Piko, the farmer’s market—the Feria, Rapa Nui organized town meetings, gatherings of Parliamentó Rapa Nui (a political organization in Rapa Nui that promotes Rapa Nui political independence from Chile), outside the Catholic church after Sunday mass as well as inside at key song and recitation points, monthly umu celebrations,21 annual Rapa Nui cultural festivals (Mahana o te Re’o, Tāpati Rapa Nui, and Tangi te Ako), and in gatherings and adventures of Rapa Nui in the “country” (kampō). In terms of mass media, it is expressed sometimes on local television and radio productions, songs and dances of local Rapa Nui music and dance groups circulated in DVD and CD sold on the island, and a few publications about Rapa Nui culture, history, and language written in Rapa Nui language. It was, however, predominately a discourse I experienced orally among kin within residential areas organized around extended families (hua’ai); a subject to be more specifically analyzed in chapters 3 and 4.

Importantly, the narrative record of my visit with Papiano begins by implicitly answering the question ‘I he koe?’ The conversation began with the narrator’s explicit naming of the place; it proceeds with a discussion of the particular person associated with the place and the important story there. I was brought to Pure Nahe for the same reason many other Rapa Nui visit

---

21 Rapa Nui, in conjunction typically with the Catholic Church, hold at least one community feast every month. These feasts are likely Catholic transformations of ancestral Rapa Nui koro celebrations (McCall 1973: 33). Different extended families (hua’ai) host and prepare the feasts which usually honor, in part, saints. Sometimes the saints are incorporated into Rapa Nui cultural values; e.g. there is a feast that honors the saints Peter and Paul which also is a celebration of the bounty of the sea and the fishermen who harvest it. The food is normally prepared in an underground oven (umu). The attendance varies, but it sometimes approaches the entire community.
*Pure Nahe* and other places of Rapa Nui; namely, to learn the story of that place. Papiano was considered the important elder to speak to in order to learn about *Pure Nahe*: it was his place. In contrast to archaeological and tourist discourse, Rapa Nui discourse is not focused upon prehistoric sites of “Easter Island”. While stories of ancestral places are important to Rapa Nui, stories of historic places are of equal, and in some cases, more importance. During my tenure in Rapa Nui, I heard various stories about *Pure Nahe*; the origins of Hansen’s disease in Rapa Nui; and treatment of Rapa Nui at *Pure Nahe*. While not all Rapa Nui agreed, many elder Rapa Nui felt, like Papiano, that *Pure Nahe* was part of some broader genocidal plan of Chile. The goal was to remove Rapa Nui from the island to produce more profit for the Easter Island Exploitation Company, and improve Chilean opportunities to utilize the island as a military outpost. This makes more sense given the small amount of Rapa Nui alive during the early part of the twentieth century and the general sentiment among Western settlers that indigenous peoples would simply become extinct.\(^\text{22}\) Though stories of *Pure Nahe* sometimes conflicted, they shared an indignant “structure of feeling” (Williams 1977: 132) that Rapa Nui had been abused there, and sometimes infected once admitted to *Pure Nahe*. In asserting that Rapa Nui victims of Hansen’s disease were imprisoned at *Pure Nahe*, Papiano is speaking literally. *Pure Nahe* was a hellish place. One could observe buildings with barred windows where Papiano and the elder indicated Rapa Nui were actually kept behind bars. They also pointed out the steel chair to which Rapa Nui had been bound as teeth, fingers and toes, and limbs were removed that had become ravished by Hansen’s disease. As I photographed the buildings and chair I had little trouble

---

\(^{22}\)After the low of Rapa Nui population aforementioned in 1877 of 110, the following is the reported demographic history of population increase to 1992: at 1886 there are 167 total people—157 Rapa Nui; at 1900 there are 229 total people—213 Rapa Nui; at 1917 there are 295 total people—266 Rapa Nui; at 1922 there are 311 total people—303 Rapa Nui; at 1936 there are 494 total people—474 Rapa Nui; at 1940 there are 546 total people—528 Rapa Nui; at 1950 there are 753 total people—724 Rapa Nui; at 1960 there are 1155 total people—1030 Rapa Nui; at 1970 there are 1599 total people—1108 Rapa Nui; at 1982 there are 2200 total people—1650 Rapa Nui; and at 1992 there are 2764 total people—1858 Rapa Nui (Makihara 1999: 335).
imagining their screams. Papiano did not scream that day; of course he probably couldn’t scream given that his jaw barely allowed him to speak. But I am sure he screamed when his own appendages were pulled from his body on that chair. The cultural memory of Pure Nahe he related to me that day was in a sense one loud silent scream; a Munchian scream that continues to haunt me long after I have left the island.

It is no wonder why the Chilean government would like to silence cultural memory of this place by building on top of it. The story of Pure Nahe though, is only one of many places Rapa Nui remember horrific treatment and persecution by the Chilean government. Rapa Nui elders, speaking of the town of Haŋa Roa in general, often emphasized that Rapa Nui were all imprisoned and abused within Haŋa Roa for decades without sufficient food and water. One recalled Rapa Nui surviving on seaweed to prevent starvation given that they were often denied access to fish, as well as the meat of animals managed by “la Compañía”. He considered Haŋa Roa to this day a prison, though the fences had been removed since the nineteen sixties and Rapa Nui now democratically participated in Chilean political systems on Rapa Nui and in Chile. He was not alone in his conception; many elders I spoke to remember the fences and continue to consider Haŋa Roa a prison. Another elder, similar to Papiano’s concern with the placement of the new school, was alarmed at the development of the town disco called Toroko. According to him, this place was where many Rapa Nui starved to death while being held at gunpoint during the exploitation of Rapa Nui by the company. It is no doubt cultural memories like these which incite reflections such as that expressed in the following narrative:

Ki he te roa o te Tire ‘i ruŋa o te mātou kaiŋa? Me’e ra’e. Ho’e tautini va’u hanere va’u ahuru ma va’u i toke ai e te Tire i te kuhane o te Rapa Nui tā’atoa. Ko rohirohi ‘ana te taŋata tā’atoa o te hau nei o Pito o Te Henua i te reoreo o te hau nei he Tire. Toke te mana’u; toke te mana o te tupuna ata ki āŋarina. Etahi nō mana’u o te
taure’are’a, o te korohu’a, o te ū’a vi’e peinei e. Ka e’a te Tire mai ruŋa i te rāua motu. Ka hakare te rāua kaiŋa ki te mana’u. Peinei e. Mai te ū’a poki Tire—he toketoke—ki te ū’a vi’e Tire—he toketoke—ki te taŋata Tire—he toketoke. ‘Ina ‘ā katahi me’e tano i va’ai mai e te Tire ki te henua nei. Ka ho’e hanere piti ahuru matahiti ki aŋarina, ina ‘ā he me’e nehenehe ra’e i hakatikea mai e te hau nei he Tire. He tu’u mai, he toke tahi i te henua o te Rapa Nui. Ka e’a koe, tu’u taŋata, tu’u rakerake, tu’u reva. Ka hoki ki tu’u kaiŋa ko Tire.

How long has Chile resided upon our land? That is the first thing. Since 1888 the spirit of all Rapa Nui has been stolen by Chile. All of the people of the government of Pito o Te Henua are exhausted by the lies of this Chilean government. Our mind is stolen. The spiritual power of the ancestors is stolen to this day. There is one thought of the youth, of the men, the elders, and the women. Chile: get out from upon their land! Leave their land and their mind alone. The Chilean children are thieves. The women are thieves. The Chilean men are thieves. Not one righteous thing has been given by Chile to this land. One hundred twenty years to this day, not one beautiful thing has been shown by this Chilean government. They arrived here; they stole all the land of the Rapa Nui. Leave! Your people, your evil, your flag… return to your land: Chile.

Like the earlier narrative, this one was articulated in the context of informal discussion among elder Rapa Nui at a Rapa Nui home. Conversation concerned a recent march of Rapa Nui through the town of Haŋa Roa that concluded with a demonstration and denouncement of Chilean government policies at the governor’s office. This narrative was articulated by one of the elders in response to an informal question of mine in which I asked the group what the march was about. In attending to the narrator’s answer, it is perhaps first noteworthy how the narrative engages with the question ‘I hē koe?’ The narrator identifies the island by the indigenous name ‘Te Pito o te Henua’, rather than ‘Rapa Nui’, or ‘Te Henua o Hotu Matu’a’—two alternative indigenous names commonly used to mention the island. Te Pito o te Henua is located in relation to Chile; however, the narrator distinguishes Rapa Nui from Chile through interesting usage of
locatives and possessive pronouns. In the beginning of the narrative, Te Pito o te Henua is distinguished from Chile: Chile is represented as “upon” (‘ī ruŋa) “our land” (te mātou kaiŋa). Use of the exclusive possessive pronoun ‘te mātou’ in this narrative addressed in part to me, and other Rapa Nui discussing the protest is noteworthy. In Rapa Nui language the exclusive possessive pronoun contrasts with the first person plural inclusive possessive pronoun ‘te tātou’; a distinction not grammatically expressed in English. Use of the exclusive, rather than the inclusive form of the possessive pronoun, disassociates Chile with the land of Rapa Nui as well as me. The other elders who were involved in the discussion were included in the situated meaning of “our” (te mātou); Chileans—children, women, and men—and I are not. The narrative concludes also by distinguishing the land of Rapa Nui from Chile. Te Pito o te Henua is reformulated as “the island of Rapa Nui” (te henua o te Rapa Nui); a place Chilean children, women, and men are asked to leave. Chileans are encouraged to return to a different land: “your land” (tu’u kaiŋa), that is, “Chile” (Tīre).

As with Papiano’s reflections, the narrative is politically engaged with Chilean history in Rapa Nui. The elder expresses intense resentment of perceived Chilean abuse of Rapa Nui; not even women and children are spared scorn and condemnation. Though the representation of the Chilean government does not explicitly attack the government as colonial, it is clear the narrator represents the Chilean government in colonial terms. Officials and common Chileans are formulated as liars and thieves who have stolen their mind, land, and spirit for over a hundred years. The government and people are portrayed as disempowering them, “stealing” (toke) the power (te mana) of their “ancestors” (tupuna) to this day (ki aŋarina). The speaker, like the long standing ethnographer and historian of Rapa Nui Grant McCall (1995), finds the history and contemporary treatment of Rapa Nui by the Chilean government as colonial and fundamentally
derelict. The narrator is adamant that Chile has not provided a single thing positive to Rapa Nui; shockingly, the reproach is consistent with the historical record. Colonialism in Rapa Nui is thus not understood in this narrative as something of the past as a recent linguistic anthropologist has insisted (Makihara 1999, 2004, and 2007), but an experienced contemporary reality to many Rapa Nui. Not all Rapa Nui would agree with the narrator that all Chileans should take their flag and evil, return to Chile, and leave Rapa Nui politically independent. However, few Rapa Nui are satisfied with the status quo. The majority of Rapa Nui seek change and decolonization in one form or another: reform within the current framework, new autonomous political status within Chile, or independence (Di Castri 2003, Fisher 2005: 260-264, Gonshor 2007, Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 80-82).

Chilean colonialism in Rapa Nui is an important theme of Rapa Nui discourse, but it is comparatively silent in the other discourses. While official Chilean discourse sometimes

---

23 Indeed in the period following annexation in 1888 until 1964, as well as beyond, it is difficult to find much salutary in Chilean policy towards Rapa Nui. During the initial exploitation colonial period from 1888 to 1964, their king was executed by the government, their island was registered as a Chilean property without their knowledge, and they were imprisoned in a small section of their own homeland with scarce resources for subsistence, while a multinational corporation exploited the island as a sheep ranch for the global wool market. After the political changes established in 1964 through the resistance of Rapa Nui, certainly the government can be associated with some of the general improvements to the infrastructure and overall living conditions on the island. However, while it appears on the surface today that Chile has supplied significant infrastructural development since 1964, analysis reveals that major aspects of the infrastructure during the contemporary settlement colonial period have been often a result of non-Chilean development and funding. Significant financial and technological contributions of the United States military and NASA created and extended the air strip commercial airlines have appropriated for tourism (Fisher 2005: 219-220). The United States military also helped upgrade the roads and provide trash bins to some of the key archaeological sites (Fisher 2005: 220). And the single generator that long supplied power to the island until recently was brought by the United States Air Force in the 1960s and commandeered by the Chilean government after they were kicked out by President Allende (Fisher 2005: 224). A Canadian team, funded by the World Health Organization, developed the first modern medical facility on the island in 1965; Chile did not develop a hospital on the island until 1975 (Fisher 2005: 214). The Father Sebastian Englert museum was created in 1985 largely as a result of the World Monument Fund (Fisher 2005: 235), and the William Mulloy library next to the museum was created by the World Monument Fund and a donation of the United States based Easter Island Foundation (Fisher 2005: 236). Reconstructed archaeological sites crucial to the tourist industry were completed by funds provided by Japan in the case of Ahu Tongariki (Fisher 2005: 235), and France in the case of Ahu Tahai (Fisher 2005: 207). Ahu Nau Nau and Ahu Ature Huki at Anakena were restored by the Norwegian archaeological team led by Thor Heyerdahl (McLaughlin 2004: 145). And it was Rapa Nui, inspired by United States entrepreneurs that first initiated international tourism from New York, not a state tourism agency, that developed the tourist industry by adding accommodations to their homes and building up commerce to satisfy consumer desires (Fisher 2005: 214-220).
recognizes colonialism in Rapa Nui in the past, it cites Ley 16441 and 19253 as evidence that Rapa Nui is post-colonial. While I encountered tourists and archaeologists who did suspect the island remained colonial, their discourse was preoccupied with Rapa Nui prehistory, not its colonial history and present. Archaeological researchers and tourists are likely to learn some of the perspectives of Rapa Nui discourse on “prehistoric” Rapa Nui, but are less likely to engage with its more historical and political dimensions. One team of archaeologists I spoke with on the island, for example, was only deeply interested in contemporary politics to the extent it obstructed their access to “archaeological sites”. Another team emphasized that Rapa Nui politics should not “stand in the way” of scientific investigation. And while Chileans are sometimes reproached in terms of the discourse by Rapa Nui, it is not a discourse of Chilean talk. Pascuense discourse broadly tries to integrate Rapa Nui perspectives and interests into Chilean institutions, social structures, and practices; however, Rapa Nui discourse often resists and contests many and sometimes all things Chilean. Thus, while Rapa Nui may address the offices of the mayor or governor in terms of Rapa Nui discourse, the discourse is not intrinsic to the daily operation of such institutions. Such institutions and the people who work within them, though managed in part by Rapa Nui, are formulated in the discourse as Chilean things (me’e Tire); a subject of analysis in chapter 5. The truth of Rapa Nui discourse is ultimately managed within Rapa Nui “extended families” (hua’ai); a subject of analysis in chapter 4.

Ko Ku’iku’i ‘Ā?

Rapa Nui—the island, its people, cultural heritage, and discourse—are, in an abstract sense, like the famous postmodern Ghery House of Santa Monica, California: wrapped (Jameson 1991: 109). Rapa Nui is like the original Ghery House; yet, its wrapper is more complex than the relatively uniform industrial wrapper Ghery imposed on the original house in Santa Monica.
Rapa Nui is wrapped in an ungainly Chilean, archaeological, and tourist wrapper. To the outsider cosmopolitan ethnographer, the Rapa Nui house is just one dimension of a deterritorialized global ethnoscapes (Appadurai 1991: 192); indeed, one cannot ever really see the Rapa Nui house in isolation from the outside any more than one can see the original Ghery house. From such a vantage, one is perhaps inclined to ask how hybrid Rapa Nui lives ‘flow within the complex of transnational cultures’ (Appadurai 1991: 209) that wrap the Rapa Nui house; and ask how this flow has enabled Rapa Nui, archaeological, Chilean, and tourists to imagine ‘a wider set of possible lives than they ever did before’ (Appadurai 1991: 197). Centered in the present (Appadurai 1991: 208), and within the narratives of the academy, the cosmopolitan ethnographer does not foreground the structural displacements, domination, inequality, racism, and social horrors that constitute and articulate within such global ethnoscapes (Appadurai 1991: 198), but searches for bourgeois meaning in the ‘fertile ground of deterritorialization in which money, commodities, and persons unendingly chase each other around the world, and group imaginations of the modern world find their fractured and fragmented counterpart’ (Appadurai 1991: 194). Epistemologically centered in the idea that Rapa Nui is a global ethnoscapes, Rapa Nui imagined lives, are just one part of the ethnographic bedrock to consider (Appadurai 1991: 199); to understand Rapa Nui as a deterritorialized transnational world one simply situates their voices within the matrix of other voices imagining the world—one places their voices beside those of archaeology, Chileans, and tourists.

To understand Rapa Nui first and foremost from the vantage of its contemporary global ethnoscapes would purportedly be to resist epistemic grounding in a particular way of life (Appadurai 1991: 200) and see Rapa Nui more realistically. However, the cosmopolitan ethnographer, like the feminist anthropologist (Moreton-Robinson 2000), is positioned and
speaks from a seat of discursive power. Like Diamond’s “Easter Island” story, locating Rapa Nui within a global ethnoscape is just to represent Rapa Nui in terms of another place formulation; one that reflects particular cultural membership categories, topics of analysis, and location in the world (Schegloff 1971), or in terms of post-structural theory, a subject position (Hall 2009: 80). Technically, Appadurai has simply constructed a “master-narrative” (Lyotard 1999) to legitimate the insertion of “cosmopolitan” interests within local spaces. Rather than occupying the so-called philosophical space of “a view from of nowhere” (Nagel 1986), Appadurai has created a subject position that can be placed everywhere. Rapa Nui elders sometimes lament “Ko ku’iku’i ‘ā te pu’oko”; broadly, “the head” (pu’oko) is like “bird chirps” (ku’iku’i), in other words, the person is confused or makes no sense. I heard this expression said of Rapa Nui youth, Rapa Nui officially working within Chilean political and social institutions on the island, and degenerate alcoholic Rapa Nui roaming the streets estranged from their “extended families” (hua’ai). While I never tried to discuss Appadurai’s notion of global ethnoscapes with these elders, I suspect they would find some contextual explanation for “Ko ku’iku’i ‘ā te pu’oko” in Appadurai’s concept. They are people in a sense trying to find meaning in their life by chasing the money, capital, commodities, people, and technology of the deterritorialized transnational world. These Rapa Nui elders did not typically celebrate such people, but derided them as disconnected from Rapa Nui ways of life. Such elders would contest that “Ko ku’iku’i ‘ā te pu’oko” and hence a global ethnoscape story is the most important narrative to tell in Rapa Nui. For them, the more critical story of Rapa Nui, as for many indigenous peoples today (Champagne 2007: 364), is the one focused on Rapa Nui, centered in, and engaged with, their indigenous forms of life. Epistemologically centered in Rapa Nui discourse, Rapa Nui is not first and foremost a global ethnoscape; it is the place of Rapa Nui.
While this chapter has, in a sense, initially followed the precepts of cosmopolitan ethnography and placed Rapa Nui within a global ethnoscape, the majority of this dissertation is not centered upon the relationship of global ethnoscepts and Rapa Nui lives. Having acknowledged this dimension of Rapa Nui, I generally place it in the background and foreground analysis on the more classic unit of ethnographic analysis—albeit informed by contemporary theory and methodology: the native point of view (Malinowski 1984).24 My goal is to represent, as best as I can, how Rapa Nui appears from inside the Rapa Nui house. From this vantage, it is problematic to place Rapa Nui merely beside the wrappers, and analyze the circulation of different voices of the ethnoscape. From inside the Rapa Nui house there is less mere “surreal montage” (Clifford 1988b) as there is tension and conflict between the Rapa Nui house and its foreign wrappers. To background these tensions and conflicts within this contemporary deterritorialized world, as cosmopolitan ethnography encourages (Appadurai 1991: 198), would be to aestheticize the serious problems of the postmodern condition for the majority of the people of the world (Harvey 1990: 337), as well as Rapa Nui. Diamond’s “Easter Island” story, whatever its archaeological failings, poorly wraps the Rapa Nui house. The archaeological tale does not even acknowledge the existence of a contemporary Rapa Nui house; its imagination is fixed not upon the lived space of Rapa Nui people, but grounded in a textual attitude wrapped up in the significance of a lost civilization for reforming the Western project. Tourist discourse is also a poor wrap: like archaeology it does not so much place Rapa Nui as it does imagine it within the constructs of occidental geography. However, the prehistoric significance of “Easter

---

24 I am though less concerned with Malinowski’s more popular definition of the unit of analysis of ethnography as his more technical formulation: the native view as articulated in the context of situated language usage (Malinowski 1935, 1961, 1965). As will be clear as well throughout the dissertation, it would be a mistake to reduce Rapa Nui perspectives to a single view as Malinowski’s framework implies. There are different Rapa Nui perspectives within the community, and this will be addressed in the dissertation. Yet, analysis reveals that in comparison to tourist, archaeology, and Chilean discourse, there are broad themes of Rapa Nui discourse. Malinowski’s linguistic work, as a seminal work in the ethnography of language (Hymes 1974: 75), remains an influence on contemporary discourse studies (Fitch 2009); as such it is incorporated into my own discourse analytic work.
Island” for tourists is articulated more within the consumer desires of Mickey Mouse history (Wallace 1996), than in terms of the research interests of global archaeology. “Easter Island” for the tourist is not so much a research site for evaluating and reforming the Western project as it is a playground of historical entertainment akin to Disneyland’s classic ride *It's a Small World*. Chilean discourse in one way or another simply places Rapa Nui within an “imagined community” (Anderson 1991) of Chile; a community that would like to forget places like *Pure Nahe* and Rapa Nui leaders like King Riro. As will become increasingly clear throughout the dissertation, Rapa Nui not only have trouble imagining themselves as Chilean, but as the narrative herein attests—are often quite hostile to the idea. Whether they hope for an autonomous future for Rapa Nui within Chile, or an independent Rapa Nui, generally Rapa Nui resist the current Chilean wrapper upon their house. As a result of living with Rapa Nui and learning Rapa Nui language and culture from their teachings, the other discourses lost coherence to me; they became like bad television shows I’d watch from time to time for entertainment, but nothing I wanted to live. I overcame my postmodern nausea as I became integrated and positioned within the Rapa Nui community and listened to Rapa Nui place themselves in conversations with one another, particularly among elder guidance. To provide broader contextual significance for the analysis of “Titulo Dominio” (*Te Parau Henua*) that is the principle subject of this dissertation, I relate in chapters 3, 4, and 5 more of the story of how I learned to “place” Rapa Nui from within a Rapa Nui house.
I arrived to Rapa Nui in August 2007 assuming I would speak and study at least two languages: Spanish and Rapa Nui—the two official languages of the island. However, although I hoped to speak some Rapa Nui, I anticipated more of my life would involve use of Spanish given recent academic models of language in Rapa Nui, and perhaps a bit Tahitian as well. Moreover, I expected that the Rapa Nui language I would speak, so-called “Syncretic Rapa Nui” (Makihara 1999, 2004, 2007), would be an amalgamation of all three. Reflections upon my 2004 archaeological investigations in Rapa Nui did not betray anything aberrant in these models. Although I did not spend any time in the residential areas of Rapa Nui where I would learn language usage was different, but stayed in the tourist areas when not at archaeological sites with the field school, I generally did recall that in 2004 I heard mainly a form of Spanish. Occasionally, I recalled Rapa Nui mixed with Spanish, from local people as I traversed the tourist shopping areas, restaurants, and bars of Hanga Roa. I thought I heard relatively unmixed Rapa Nui when I occasionally eavesdropped on the conversations between two Rapa Nui sisters who assisted the archaeological team, but what I recalled was not enough to question the models

25 I arrived to Rapa Nui principally informed by the models of Fisher and Makihara. According to the linguist Fisher, Rapa Nui is a kind of “Pidgin Tahitian” that formed as Rapa Nui were relocated to Tahiti, and founded a diasporic Rapa Nui population in Pomata’i (Fisher 2005: 114), as well as Tahitians that later came to Rapa Nui to work the island sheep ranch (Fisher 2005: 123). For Fisher, this caused a change from “Old Rapa Nui” not directly influenced by Tahitian to “Modern Rapa Nui” a language directly influenced by Tahitian since the late nineteenth century (Fisher 2005: 114), and that became dominant in Rapa Nui in the 1920s onwards (Fisher 2005: 183). The linguistic anthropologist Makihara (1999, 2004, and 2007) asserts three interrelated linguistic changes have occurred on the island. Using the naturalistic metaphor ‘gradual shift’, she argues that there have been three gradual linguistic shifts on the island: (1) from Rapa Nui language to Chilean Spanish (Makihara 1999: 96-97); (2) from relatively unmixed Rapa Nui towards the use of Rapa Nui fundamentally mixed with Chilean Spanish (Makihara 1999: 95-96); and (3), from diglossic bilingualism (Rapa Nui spoken among Rapa Nui and Chilean Spanish spoken between Rapa Nui and Chileans) to complex intra-sentential and intra-conversational bilingualism between Rapa Nui (Makihara 1999: 320). For Makihara, “Modern Rapa Nui” though influenced by Tahitian and English, is more fundamentally influenced by borrowings and integration with Chilean Spanish (1999, 2004, and 2007).
I later read in preparation of fieldwork. With these foreign representations of Rapa Nui in mind, I prepared for field work by studying three languages: Rapa Nui, Spanish, and Tahitian. Since I presumed Fisher was correct and I could figure that I basically knew Rapa Nui if I knew Tahitian, and there were university courses available on Tahitian and Spanish but not Rapa Nui, I focused on Tahitian and Spanish prior to arrival. I arrived to Rapa Nui having completed three years of university coursework in both Tahitian and Spanish. I assumed I could quickly modify my Tahitian into Fisher’s “Pidgin Tahitian” with a little help from Rapa Nui, and just throw in a bit of Spanish to achieve Makihara’s “Syncretic Rapa Nui”. On arrival however, I immediately had a portent experience that suggested something was awry with the prior studies. A friend of mine, an archaeologist and fellow Tahitian student who had stayed in Rapa Nui intermittently for a number of years, met me at the airport. As we discussed various topics the next few days before she left the island, I brought up the question of language in Rapa Nui. I asked her if it more or less seemed like Tahitian mixed with a bit of Spanish. Without hesitation she said, ‘No, I have tried that and no one seems to understand me.’ This was but the first of a series of anomalies that I encountered with these models of the language situation in Rapa Nui. Ultimately, further accumulation of anomalies caused me to shift to seeing language in Rapa Nui in alternative terms; the way my Rapa Nui language teachers instructed me to see it explicitly in our conversations about Rapa Nui language, and implicitly in their discursive practices.

For the first three months I employed one of the former assistants to the archaeological field school, Evelyn Huke, a Rapa Nui woman in her early thirties, to instruct me in Rapa Nui. Evelyn and I studied at her home in the residential area named Te Hoe Manu. This residential area, one I eventually called home (a development to be described in more detail in the next and later chapters) included the majority of the homes of Evelyn’s “extended family” (hua’ai).
Evelyn’s teachings and my experiences in *Te Hoe Manu* immediately suggested further problems with the foreign models of Rapa Nui I had studied. First, the education clarified that Rapa Nui was not understood by Rapa Nui to be Pidgin Tahitian. I began to learn Rapa Nui with Evelyn by presenting Tahitian grammatical structures and vocabulary that she, in conjunction with occasional help from her elders, would transform into Rapa Nui. Our studies revealed overlap between Tahitian and Rapa Nui, but also significant differences. Evelyn and kin, like Polynesian language scholars (Ward 1962), recognized some mutual intelligibility between Rapa Nui and Tahitian—a fact I illustrate in further detail below, but they also saw them as fairly distinct languages given their experiences in French Polynesia as well as experiences with Tahitians and Tahitian language in Rapa Nui. Spouses of Evelyn’s kin who were Tahitian noted that they had to make considerable effort to learn Rapa Nui upon moving to the island. And conversely, kin who moved to “French” Polynesia were adamant that they had to make similar efforts to speak Tahitian. The most common differentiation among Rapa Nui emphasized its phonetic contrast with Tahitian. They summed up the differences by the gist “*topa ke*”; roughly, its [sounds] “fall” (*topa*) “differently” (*ke*). Among other differences, I noted and had most trouble with the difference in Tahitian and Rapa Nui expressions of a concept analogous to the English notion of “having”.

---

26. I presented her the list of Tahitian grammatical structures developed and taught by Professor of Indo-Pacific Languages and Tahitian scholar Jack Ward of the University of Hawai’i. The structures were drawn from the course materials of the first three years of college Tahitian courses I had completed with him at the University of Hawai’i.

27. As has been noted by others (Du Feu 1996: 3, Rapahango and Liller 2003: 4), Rapa Nui has “borrowed” from Tahitian in cultural domains such as greetings, dating, and numbering. I state “borrowed” rather than simply using the word ‘borrow’ without quotes because it is not clear to me that this is the best way to state the relationship between Rapa Nui and Tahitian. As the citations of Fisher in footnote one of this chapter attest, Tahitian has been part of the speech community of Rapa Nui for over a hundred years; moreover, the languages ultimately share close common ancestry as languages of the Easter Polynesian language family (Green 1988).

28. In Rapa Nui, typically to express something similar to the English notion of “having” one uses a verb based structure centered upon the Rapa Nui verb ‘*ai*’. For example, in Rapa Nui one could say “*E ai rō ’ā tō’oku hare*” as analogous to “I have a house”. In the Rapa Nui sentence one has the imperfective aspect marker ‘*e*’ followed by the verb ‘*ai*’, followed by the evaluative particle ‘*rō*’ and the progressive ‘ ’ā ’, the first person possessive pronoun...
Second, my initial experiences in *Te Hoe Manu* were not in accordance with Makihara’s linguistic anthropological analysis of language in Rapa Nui. Though varying slightly over the years, the two main subjects of her work have remained those explicitly identified in her doctoral dissertation: “...the nature of changing bilingual and syncretic ways of speaking, and the place of these communicative practices in the making of modern Rapanui identity and culture” (Makihara 1999: 1). Fundamental to her “ethnopragnatic” (Makihara 2004: 530) analysis of ‘tō ‘oku’ and the noun ‘fare’ that translates “house”. In contrast, in “Tahitian” one predominately uses a possessive structure. For example, the “Tahitian” sentence “E fare tō ‘u” is analogous to the English sentence “I have a house”. In the Tahitian sentence one has the article ‘E’ followed by the noun ‘fare’ and the first person possessive pronoun ‘tō’u’. The cognate Tahitian verb ‘vai’ of the Rapa Nui verb ‘ai’; as far as I know, is not used in a structure similar to the Rapa Nui form. While there are a few other ways this English concept can be somewhat expressed in “Tahitian” and Rapa Nui that are more similar, these two forms—the predominant way this concept is expressed—seemed to diverge fairly radically to me. I came to Rapa Nui with that possessive structure of Tahitian fairly well mastered; I was quite disappointed it simply did not work in Rapa Nui with the requisite phonetic changes adjusted. These subjects are investigated not simply ethnographically, but ethnologically. Initially inspired by Gumperz’s research on code-switching in ethno-linguistic minority groups in the United States (Makihara 1999: 25), Makihara compares Rapa Nui features of bilingualism to bilingualism among other so-called “ethno-linguistic minority groups”: Catalan Spanish, French Canadians, Hungarian Austrians, Gaelic Scottish, Gapuner Papuans, Italian Germans, Nahuatl Mexicans, Puerto Rico New Yorkers, and Romanian Germans (Makihara 1999: 320-322). Though Makihara is aware that Rapa Nui are not a minority group on the island of Rapa Nui at the time of her research (Makihara 1999: 246), she nevertheless finds it important to note that Rapa Nui bilingualism most accords with the features of minority bilingualism among Puerto Rican New Yorkers and Italian Germans, rather than Catalan Spanish (Makihara 1999: 324). Oddly, the homologous cultural groups that would seem to warrant comparison with Rapa Nui most are not mentioned: “Hawaiians” (Kanaka Maoli), Maori of “New Zealand” (Aotearoa), and “Tahitians” (Ta’a tа Mā‘ohi). While she has continued to compare Rapa Nui bilingualism with other ethno-linguistic minority groups like those aforementioned (Makihara 2004: 533), more recently she has shifted to comparison with Rapa Nui with what she neologically calls “contact languages” of the Pacific Islands (Makihara and Schieffelin 2007). Makihara and Schieffelin analyze Pacific Island “contact languages” in part in an attempt to challenge Muhlhauser’s recent studies concerned with language loss in the Pacific resulting from colonialism and missions (Makihara and Schieffelin 2007: 10). Though they do not dispute that colonialism and missions generated language loss in the Pacific, they generally background this issue and prefer to analyze “contact languages” as “...signs of local agency and meaning-making... contexts of dynamism” (Makihara and Schieffelin 2007: 11), and products of “cross-cultural interchange” (Makihara and Schieffelin 2007: 13). “Contact languages” are highlighted as adding “...diversity to local speech communities” (Makihara and Schieffelin 2007: 20). Thus, although Makihara’s most recent work does engage in ethnological comparisons that are more homologous to Rapa Nui, like Marquesan-French speakers, rather than French Canadian and Italian German speakers—bilingualism generated from obviously fundamentally different geopolitical and socio-cultural processes than those affecting Rapa Nui and the Marquesas, she has preferred not to stress language loss and colonial power inequalities, but “local agency and meaning-making” in the euphemistic Pacific Orientalist textual space of “contact”. Such “contact zones” are not scrutinized for forms of political and economic domination, but as spaces which they note some people consider “...desirable and beneficial, leading to economic development and social improvement of opportunity” (Makihara and Schieffelin 2007: 5). While these ideas may have some coherence in understanding the role of Tok Pisin in post colonial Papua New Guinea—the concern of Schieffelin and some of the other authors’ in the anthology—the ideas are problematically applied in places of persistent colonialism like Rapa Nui. In terms of contemporary Pacific Islands Studies, the post-colonial state building issues of Western Pacific nation-states are fundamentally different
Rapa Nui bilingualism is the aforementioned typology she constructs to model language diversity in Rapa Nui. While Makihara does note a continuum between the seven types of language she posits in Rapa Nui (“Old Rapa Nui”, “Purist Rapa Nui”, “Syncretic Rapa Nui”, “Rapa Nui Spanish (R1S2),” “Rapa Nui Spanish (R2S1)”, “Chilean Spanish”, “Castilian Spanish”), she generally analyzes these types in terms of an implicit structural-functionalist paradigm. In other words, she isolates basic structural features of the language types, assigns them separate social functions within the Rapa Nui community, and assess how the types maintain social order on the island. Structurally, “Chilean Spanish” and “Castilian Spanish” are not described in detail, but presumably just consist of Spanish language components. Makihara does not describe what she means by “Old Rapa Nui” much either except to say it is the language of “pre-contact” Rapa Nui (Makihara 1999: 167). Makihara considers both “Purist Rapa Nui” and “Syncretic Rapa Nui” as recently invented languages (Makihara 2007: 64) in the sense anthropologists such as Keesing defined “invented traditions” (Makihara 1999: 20-22). “Purist Rapa Nui” involves the conscious avoidance of Spanish and—oddly enough—“Polynesianization” of Rapa Nui.30 She writes, “Purist Rapa Nui is not an archaic or older form of Rapa Nui but rather a newly constructed Rapa Nui speech form characterized by speakers’ purging of Spanish elements and the conscious Polynesianization of talk” (Makihara 2007: 57). “Purist Rapa Nui” is apparently “Polynesianized” by consciously inserting some “Tahitian” in places where “Spanish” normally occurs in “Syncretic Rapa Nui” (Makihara 2007: 57). Though she characterizes “Syncretic Rapa Nui” as mixing Rapa Nui with English, Tahitian, and Spanish (Makihara 1999: 175), she only foregrounds the mixture of Rapa Nui with Spanish when

---

30 As far as I know, Makihara is the first person to not consider Rapa Nui a Polynesian language. Respected historical linguistic accounts have long recognized Rapa Nui as a Polynesian language (Chapin 1978, Green 1988, Langdon and Tyron 1983).
discussing “Syncretic Rapa Nui”; thus enabling her to contradictorily contrast “Purist” language combining Rapa Nui and Tahitian, with “Syncretic Rapa Nui” combining Rapa Nui and Spanish.

“Syncretic Rapa Nui” speech is represented as combining Rapa Nui language fundamentally “with numerous Spanish borrowings” (Makihara 1999: 314-315), and incorporating extensive lexical terms as well as some grammatical features of Spanish (Makihara 1999: 182). In her characterization of “Modern Rapa Nui” as a syncretic language, she does not intend to claim that “Syncretic Rapa Nui” is a mixed language in the strong sense attributed to the Tanzanian language Ma’a; Spanish and Rapa Nui are said to exhibit only weak structural convergence (Makihara 1999: 234). “Syncretic Rapa Nui” reportedly borrows Spanish words by phonologically replacing Spanish [l] with Rapa Nui [r], and simplifying Spanish consonant clusters (Makihara 1999: 193-194). Lexical borrowing is said to involve morphological simplification of various features of Spanish; for example, transformation of Spanish verbs into forms conjugated into the third person present tense (Makihara 1999: 194-195). Besides coordinating conjunctions like the Spanish ‘pero’, “Syncretic Rapa Nui” is portrayed as syntactically structuring sentences using such Spanish grammatical forms as ‘tiene que’ among others (Makihara 1999: 204). “Syncretic Rapa Nui” sentences seem to have a range in her work though her above definition would seem to be in conflict with some of the sentences she considers “Syncretic Rapa Nui”. Consistent with the above definition she notes the sentence ‘Se mantiene pahe Consejo de Anciano ’āi’ (Makihara 2007: 56) with only two Rapa Nui terms, and the sentence ‘Me esta diciendo korohu’a otra vez (Makihara 2004: 532) with only one Rapa Nui term as examples of “Syncretic Rapa Nui”. However, she also considers sentences with only one Spanish word like ‘Ta’e ō ararua kōrua ko te nina’ (Makihara 2004: 533), and ‘He ma’u he oho ki tū nu’u era, amigo era i ma’u i oho era, etahi tanata e ha’uru ro ’ā, he ’avai i tū kokoma era i
'avai era. (Makihara 1999: 337) as exemplifying “Syncretic Rapa Nui” sentences too even though clearly these do not ‘combine Rapa Nui with numerous Spanish terms and or grammar’ like the first pair. In her dissertation she expresses ambiguity over whether sentences like the ones above that are mainly Spanish—with just one word or so of Rapa Nui—are best classified as “Syncretic Rapa Nui” or “Rapa Nui Spanish” (Makihara 1999: 228-229), but in later work that sense of ambiguity is not emphasized.31

Makihara contrasts the functional role of Spanish, “Syncretic Rapa Nui”, and “Purist Rapa Nui” to island social order. Prior to the 1960s and the development of what I called Valparaiso discourse in Rapa Nui in chapter 2, Makihara associates Chilean Spanish in Rapa Nui with a form of colonial diglossia. Chilean Spanish was apparently used in Chilean institutional and social contexts while Rapa Nui was used among Rapa Nui outside of those contexts (Makihara 1999: 8). After the development of what I have termed Valparaiso discourse in Rapa Nui in the 1960s, Chilean Spanish reportedly spread beyond Chilean institutional and social contexts, and “…Rapanui began to lose its dominance as the primary medium of local interaction” (Makihara 1999: 4). In part this is an effect of “…the increased amount of Chilean settlers on the island as well as intermarriages” (Makihara 1999: 4). In this context, Chilean Spanish reportedly shifted in significance from “… being a primary medium of Chilean domination and exclusion to becoming an instrument for local political advocacy and economic gain” (Makihara 1999: 160). For Makihara, the diglossic situation broke down as Rapa Nui and Chilean Spanish merged in such a way that Rapa Nui was no longer separate from Spanish and

31 It is perhaps noteworthy to emphasize that when Makihara says some utterance is “Syncretic Rapa Nui”, rather than “Rapa Nui Spanish” she is applying her own taxonomy and intuitive criteria for classifying sentences. I did not perform a systematic analysis of what is and is not considered a well-formed Rapa Nui sentence; however, it seems if one wants, like Makihara apparently does, to establish a real empirical generalization about Rapa Nui language, more systematic scientific analysis is in order. To figure out whether or not “Syncretic Rapa Nui” was something that made sense to Rapa Nui, and not just Makihara, among other things, Rapa Nui should at least have been randomly sampled and asked to evaluate sentences as well-formed Rapa Nui sentences or not, and what terms would be useful to distinguish types of sentences.
became “Syncretic Rapa Nui” (Makihara 1999: 166). Makihara considers “Syncretic Rapa Nui” as a “symbol” (Makihara 1999: 9) and “center” (Makihara 2004: 530) of modern Rapa Nui identity within the reportedly post-colonial world of economic and political opportunity that emerged after the 1960s (Makihara 2004: 530). 32 “Syncretic Rapa Nui”, for Makihara, is socially normative (Makihara 1999: 320, Makihara 2004: 532), and within contemporary political struggles on the island, “Syncretic Rapa Nui”, reportedly, has functionally undermined socio-linguistic hierarchy and colonial diglossia on the island (Makihara 2004: 536). It has also reportedly led to increased usage of Rapa Nui language by youth (Makihara 2004: 537). As Rapa Nui has incorporated Spanish, and become “syncretic”, it has become more of a public language (Makihara 2004: 534). Moreover, Makihara claims that as a result of mixing in Spanish, Rapa Nui “…can no longer be labeled as “unsuited” for the times” (Makihara 1999: 24). Contra a founding premise of linguistic anthropology and American linguistics (Boas 1911: 22), for Makihara, apparently Polynesian languages naturally need Westernization to be functional in the “modern” world, they cannot develop words internally as needed.

While Makihara champions “Syncretic Rapa Nui” and Spanish as important languages of opportunity and identity in Rapa Nui, she marginalizes “Purist Rapa Nui” as explicitly

32 While Makihara’s work does occasionally include a few voices form Rapa Nui who express identity in terms of speaking Rapa Nui in combination with Spanish (Makihara 1999: 240, Makihara 2004:535-536), Rapa Nui identity is not systematically explored in her research through interview data or life histories. Her interpretations of Rapa Nui linguistic and cultural identity are culled from little snippets of conversations that are not significantly contextualized. There are many problems with this dimension of her studies in Rapa Nui; problems beyond the simple methodological dilemma that identity, unlike say kinship structure, is by definition an issue of self-determination, rather than issue to be determined by an analyst. Her own work, particularly in the dissertation, notes conversations where Rapa Nui argue over whether speaking mixed forms of Rapa Nui is something to be valued or despised (Makihara 1999: 239, 242, 253; Makihara 2004: 535; Makihara 2007: 61). Perhaps most importantly however, Makihara notes that during her own field work Rapa Nui leaders of the Council of Elders organized a Rapa Nui language project to develop a Rapa Nui grammar that did not include any Spanish forms. This project was reportedly to replace the Chilean government organized educational program in Rapa Nui language coordinated by the Universidad Católica de Valparaiso (Gomez Macker et al 1988). Makihara was explicitly excluded from the Council language project (Makihara 1999: 312). Makihara fails to notice the incompatibility of her thesis of Rapa Nui identity centered upon “Syncretic Rapa Nui” and the Council of Elders (a council that is supposed to be representative of the community of indigenous extended families) language project to develop pedagogical resources absent of Spanish forms.
“unnatural” (Makihara 1999: 320, Makihara 2004: 532). “Syncretic Rapa Nui” is formulated as a “public language”, but “Purist Rapa Nui” is represented as merely “political and public oratory” (Makihara 2007: 57). She derides “Purist Rapa Nui” as less something Rapa Nui “habitually speak” than as an “ideology” symbolically exploited in “…settings such as TV and radio announcements, public events, and political meetings involving [Chilean] continental” (Makihara 2004: 536). Within such political forums, “Purist Rapa Nui” is represented as principally addressed to non-Rapa Nui speakers “…for the purpose of highlighting symbolic claims of Rapa Nui political and cultural autonomy in the indigenous movement” (Makihara 2004: 537). It is supposedly used to create “…ethnic boundaries between Chileans and Rapa Nui by metaphorically deploying linguistic boundaries” (Makihara 2007: 61). Makihara analyzes the use of “Purist Rapa Nui” in “political and public oratory” by various Rapa Nui cultural leaders and politicians throughout her publications; the latest compares its use by two competing political factions on the island: a speech by the Mayor Petero Edmunds (Makihara 2007: 57), and a speech by Juan Chavez (Makihara 2007: 61).33 Makihara fears the increased development of “Purist Rapa Nui” could ‘undermined the ethnic solidarity of “Syncretic Rapa Nui” speakers, reduce the size of the language community by excluding younger generations, and complicate the maintenance of the Rapa Nui language’ (Makihara 2004: 537). As “Purist Rapa Nui” has continued to expand during her research in Rapa Nui, she has worried that the “linguistic ideology” will “polarize social groups” in Rapa Nui, and lead to the development of “…a new form of diglossia—a form in which the Rapa Nui language is reified to approximate the

33 In 1994 the initial Council of Elders split as the first council became part of Chilean administration on the island. Part of the original council joined the Chilean Council of Elders; others formed a second Council of Elders. The Chilean Council of Elders, simply called the “Council of Elders” has been consistently pro-Chilean reform in Rapa Nui while the second council ultimately developed into a Pro-Rapa Nui Independence party in 2001 called Rapa Nui Parliament (Gonshor 2007: 241). Juan Chavez, as Makihara notes, is the president of the “second council”; she does not mention that he goes on to be president of the Rapa Nui Parliament.
supposed “high” variety in terms of its position in the sociolinguistic hierarchy…contributing to language insecurity and hastened language loss” (Makihara 2007: 63). Makihara thinks that Rapa Nui is better maintained in a syncretic form (Makihara 1999: 329). While the United Nations has been concerned to extend the human right to language to indigenous peoples in the 2007 Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Article 13), Makihara demeans Rapa Nui struggles for retaining their language in a non-syncretic form as mere language rights “ideology” (Makihara 2007: 51) and “rhetoric” (Makihara 2007: 60-61).

There are many problems with Makihara’s analysis. First, Evelyn, and her adult kin in *Te Hoe Manu*, it seemed to me during those initial months as well as later, did not fundamentally mix Spanish into Rapa Nui speech. They more or less spoke “Purist Rapa Nui” to use Makihara’s terms, or rather, spoke “vānanya titika” as they would say (roughly “speak” (vānanya) “straight” or “correct” (titika)). By qualifying Rapa Nui speech by the word ‘titika’ they highlight it as grammatically proper; Rapa Nui formulations of this genre of Rapa Nui speech thus interestingly contrast with Makihara’s political representation by the word “Purist”. Rapa Nui sense[^34] of the speech genre importantly coincides with early grammars of the language as well as grammars of the language published during Makihara’s time that she references, but does not fundamentally address when proposing her model of the language situation in Rapa Nui.[^35]

[^34]: I use the word ‘sense’ broadly in accordance with Dummett’s (1994) interpretation of Fregean semantic theory (Frege 1993a, 1993b). Dummett rejects Frege’s metaphysical appeal to a third realm to ground the sense of language (Dummett 1994: 23-25). Dummett tries to define sense more in terms of a public realm at least partially inspired, though not identical to, Wittgenstein’s language game philosophy (Dummett 1994: 161).

[^35]: There are multiple other accounts of the Rapa Nui language at this time which conflict with Makihara’s model. Robert and Nancy Weber (1999), the Summer Institute of Linguistics researchers associated with translating the Bible into Rapa Nui, as well as pedagogical materials for school children (Gomez Macker et al. 1988) do not distinguish “Syncretic Rapa Nui” and “Purist Rapa Nui” or anything similar in their models of Rapa Nui language developed since 1976 and continuing to this day. In his M.A. thesis (1988), Robert Weber proposed a textlinguistics grammar of Rapa Nui based upon discursive analysis of Rapa Nui narratives. Though he occasionally depicts sentences of Rapa Nui that include Spanish borrowings, he does not argue that mature Rapa Nui language usage is fundamentally mixed with Spanish. His M.A. thesis, based on field research beginning in 1976 through 1988, proposes a grammar of the language by analysis of traditional Rapa Nui stories he collected. He claims that this model corresponds to the Rapa Nui language used by adults at that time; a language he considered their primary
The language I encountered was clearly not an invented language like Makihara oddly proposes; it was a language that I easily recognized as reflecting the broad structural features and world view familiar to me from over seven years of Eastern Polynesian language study at the University of Hawai‘i. It was not something I observed being invented, but something noticeably transmitted through daily socialization by pedagogical processes Rapa Nui have developed over hundreds of years and perhaps over a thousand. Evelyn and her adult relatives generally seemed to code-shift to Spanish when they wanted to speak Spanish. Indexing not a collapsed colonial diglossia as Makihara insists, they code-shifted to Spanish typically when they had to speak with Chilean officials in the Chilean political institutions governing Rapa Nui, or to accommodate Chilean spouses or Chilean people that engaged them in Te Hoe Manu. Speaking vānafa titika did not seem to involve some strained conscious struggle to avoid Spanish as Makihara claims; as the data of the competing studies of Rapa Nui language would predict, vānafa titika flowed like one would expect when a speaker articulates themselves in their first language. The Spanish I noted occasionally mixed into their Rapa Nui conversations was tangential; Spanish borrowings that were not the center of their utterances. Their talk, like the majority of transcripts peppered throughout this dissertation as well as the second set of sentences I introduced from Makihara’s work, was anchored in Rapa Nui. Spanish appeared principally at the level of an occasional usage of a borrowed coordinating conjunction (use of pero “but”, for example, was not unusual)
or a borrowed Chilean Spanish term that had either had yet to be given a Rapa Nui name or was more often recognized by a Chilean Spanish term (for example, “Compañía”).

While Makihara proposed that “Purist Rapa Nui” was limited to contexts where it was contrived for political forums that included Chileans, it appeared to me in these first months as well as later during a full year of residence in *Te Hoe Manu*, that Rapa Nui was the unmarked discourse of daily life; the regular form of life (Wittgenstein 2001) among Rapa Nui family members in *Te Hoe Manu*. Therein, Rapa Nui certainly did not seem “unnatural” nor did it appear to be principally an instrument invented to gain political power and confront Chileans with in political forums. Rapa Nui of *Te Hoe Manu* certainly did confront Chileans with their language in political forums, but that was not its principle “function”. Rapa Nui was primarily a language mature and elder Rapa Nui used amongst one another, as they accomplished daily tasks like preparing a meal, cleaning and repairing the house, and raising children. The language forms that appeared marked in *Te Hoe Manu* were “Syncretic Rapa Nui”, and *Vānaŋa Tire* (Chilean Spanish). Children in *Te Hoe Manu* could be observed speaking *Vānaŋa Tire* and “Syncretic Rapa Nui” among one another, and to adults. Yet, adults regularly repaired both with *Vānaŋa Rapa Nui*. Moreover, adults regularly repaired Rapa Nui with better Rapa Nui; that is, *vānaŋa titika*. “Syncretic Rapa Nui” was not a symbol of pride in *Te Hoe Manu*, but a deeply lamented dimension of ongoing colonial assimilation policies of Chile; something elders battled daily with their little linguistic repairs of their children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren. *Te Hoe Manu* clearly had not “naturally shifted” to Spanish.36

---

36 Though I did not recognize it at the time of fieldwork, the incongruence of *Te Hoe Manu* with Makihara’s model is not entirely at odds with the model on deeper analysis; for the “natural shifts” Makihara asserts are not entirely consistent with some of the data which she cites in support of her claims. While she mentions variation in language usage across different Rapa Nui “extended families” (*hu’a’ai*) (Makihara 1999: 110), generally this variation is relegated to the background as she writes about a community level shift. According to Makihara, a study in the
Makihara has invented a taxonomy that has enabled her to make certain claims regarding the politics of language and identity in Rapa Nui, but during these initial months, and certainly afterwards, it seemed to me that her structural-functionalist analysis did not coherently model what I was experiencing in the field around *Te Hoe Manu* and beyond. In the case of Spanish, while Makihara stresses its breakdown, I noticed that colonial diglossia was very much alive on the island. As noted in chapter 2, the institutions I studied most—the library, the courthouse, the municipality, the governor’s building, and the Oficina Bienes Raíces (the office that registers the land titles, or *Titulo Dominio*)—did not operate in Rapa Nui language (“Syncretic” or “Purist”). Occasionally, I could get Rapa Nui within those institutions—typically individuals who staffed the offices rather than managed them—to talk to me in Rapa Nui, but more often it was restricted to Spanish. When I greeted Rapa Nui or Chilean in these offices with the Rapa Nui “*Iorana*”, I typically received “hola” in return. The same Rapa Nui would then return my *Iorana* with *Iroana* and speak Rapa Nui with me back in the residential areas or in other places outside the government institutions. Admittedly, and for reasons explained in chapter 5, I did not spend significant time studying the kinds of forums Makihara focused upon. I suspect that she is right: “Syncretic Rapa Nui” and “Purist Rapa Nui” likely does occur in Chilean places on the island.

---

1970s and 1980s (Weber 1990) asserted a decline in bilingualism among elementary school students from 77% in 1977 to just 25% in 1989 (Makihara 1999: 119); in other words, that by 1989 seventy-five percent of school children were incompetent in Rapa Nui and were competent only in Chilean Spanish. Importantly, this study however conflicts with another she cites. Gomez Macker later concluded, on the basis of field studies he conducted in 1975 and 1981 that there was not substantial bilingualism in Rapa Nui during this era, but a “false bilingualism” (Gomez Macker 1982). He reported that most Rapa Nui children at this time were monolingual in Rapa Nui; older Rapa Nui had trouble communicating in Spanish; and “bilingual” adults could barely conduct conversation in Spanish (Gomez Macker 1982). Problematically, whether Macker or Weber is “correct” or not, the scope of the data Makihara cites to validate her claim of a population level “shift” only documents a “shift” in children—not adults. While I think linguistic change among children and adults has occurred since the 1960s, the situation is more complicated and depends in part upon the family—some families have not “shifted” to say the least. Perhaps most importantly, the “shift” more accurately has occurred in the context of a new system of Chilean political administration in Rapa Nui; namely, the administration that followed the political resistance led by Alfonso Rapu Haoa and the subsequent establishment of Ley 16441 discussed in Chapter 2. For Fisher, community level linguistic change toward Spanish in this era is thus not a result of some naturalistic evolutionary “gradual shift”, but a result of a Chilean political administration that promoted Spanish usage on the island and cultural and linguistic assimilation (Fisher 2005: 218).
more than it did in the 1950s—a time when Haŋa Roa was a literal prison and Rapa Nui had no civil or human rights. I certainly did hear Rapa Nui in Chilean places from time to time. But an increase in Rapa Nui language genres in Chilean government institutions does not entail that colonial diglossia has “broken-down”, only that it has attenuated.

Secondly, with time on the island I noted that the stronger genres of Rapa Nui language (from vānaŋa titika to language relatively unmixed with Spanish) were not simply confined to Te Hoe Manu; they were expressed within the daily life of many extended families in their residential areas, and within a multitude of cultural domains. As I elaborate further in Chapter 5, vānaŋa titika was part of the daily pedagogy of the Lorenza Baeza Vega state school: it was taught by very knowledgeable Rapa Nui teachers (not all of whom were elders, but some relatively young professional Rapa Nui); moreover, it was studied, spoken, sung, and danced by children as well as showcased in school displays. It was also expressed in sections of the Catholic Mass hymns and sermons, as well as among the hundreds of Rapa Nui who gathered to chat after mass each week outside the church. Vānaŋa titika is the genre of choice among the multitude of Rapa Nui music groups that can be heard in public shows, on the radio, and purchased on CD and DVD. I have heard a few songs that combined Spanish, but the overwhelming majority of the songs of Rapa Nui in the approximately twenty CDs I purchased and reviewed are sung in vānaŋa titika. This genre of Rapa Nui is also the genre of choice during the Rapa Nui cultural festivals like the Tapatī Rapa Nui (a festival that dates to the early 1970s that initially was performed day and night for a week, and now two weeks annually in February), as well as smaller festivals such as the Mahana o te Re’o, and Taŋi Te Ako. Rapa Nui language is also predominant among the Rapa Nui that gather for the regular umu feasts different Rapa Nui “extended families” (hua’ai) make for the entire population at least once a month, and
sometimes more than once a month, in part to honor Catholic saints. Finally and perhaps most importantly, following the struggle of the SIL team of Robert and Nancy Weber to get Rapa Nui to read and write their own language, Rapa Nui (Pate 1985, Hucke 2008) have begun to publish traditional and new stories of their own in the genre. These books are available in local bookstores. While I am sure that Makihara is correct that some Rapa Nui prefer to speak and have identity in speaking “Syncretic Rapa Nui”, these aforementioned developments indicate that vānaga tītika is an equally important source of Rapa Nui identity, and perhaps more so. While Makihara contests, laments, and fears the professionally well documented continuous linguistic tradition of vānaga tītika in contrast to her cherished invented language of assimilation “Syncretic Rapa Nui”, Rapa Nui publically celebrate, politically speak, read and write, sing and dance, and struggle to express themselves with vānaga tītika as they fight to maintain their cultural and linguistic identity amidst Chilean assimilation and colonial domination.

This is not to say that neither language mixing nor Spanish ever occurred in Te Hoe Manu or in Rapa Nui generally. There is quite a bit of variation in language usage in Rapa Nui; however, Rapa Nui I spoke to about this did not think the variation primarily reflected differences in political or cultural identity. Variation was attributed to social differences in family resources and economic positioning in the community. Rapa Nui pointed out that the two main competing Rapa Nui political positions on the island among ethnic Rapa Nui—indipendence seekers like the initially Juan Chavez led Rapa Nui Parliament and political autonomy seekers within Chile like Mayor Petero Edmunds Paoa (voices Makihara as aforementioned notes)—both promote and speak Rapa Nui language in the community in its vānaga tītika form. Linguistic differences were seen by Rapa Nui to index different linguistic and cultural resources, and social positions of extended families in the larger community. Rapa
Nui emphasized to me that regardless of their family background and political stance, someone whose occupation situated them in Chilean institutions that were dominated by Spanish language and Chilean officials incompetent in Rapa Nui were likely to mix their speech more than someone who made a living carving in their residential area or fishing where their interlocutors were principally fellow Rapa Nui. They stressed that poor speakers of Rapa Nui usually came from “mixed-parents” and extended families with more Chilean relatives and thus more Spanish dominated conversations. Children born in households with only one Rapa Nui parent—a parent him or herself descended from one Rapa Nui parent—had less resources for speaking vānanga titika. While no one would deny that the Huke Atan hua’ai in part spoke vānanga titika for political reasons, it was stressed that they also spoke vānanga titika because they were descended from two Rapa Nui parents who were themselves both descended from Rapa Nui parents, and they tended to work in occupations that engaged their respected cultural and linguistic knowledge rather than in Chilean government institutions.

'Aita Vau E Parau Farani.

Suffice it to say that after a few months of visits to Te Hoe Manu, Makihara’s way of representing the Rapa Nui language situation on the island appeared fundamentally misconceived. On reflection, these initial months constituted what I would consider my first “paradigm shift” (Kuhn 1979, 2000) in thinking about Rapa Nui people, Rapa Nui language, and my project in Rapa Nui. The experiences suggested that learning Rapa Nui was going to be much more complex than I had anticipated. While I still thought that the preparatory years of Tahitian and Spanish instruction would continue to be useful background for completing my project, I no longer felt I would be able to work in Rapa Nui by mixing in a lot of Spanish with the Tahitian I had learned. The three months suggested that, to some extent, I needed to learn a new
language—one I really had not sufficiently understood in light of the foreign models I had studied. In December 2007, I departed Rapa Nui to visit French Polynesia contemplating how I would need to proceed in light of these revelations. The trip was compulsory on some level: I had failed to obtain an extension to remain in Rapa Nui beyond three months. I did not request permission from the Chilean authorities—it was not denied—and I needed to leave so I could return to Rapa Nui for an additional three months. I decided to make an extended visit of the trip and organized a two week tour of four islands: Tahiti, Huahine, Ra’iatea, and Ma’areva. I wanted to visit Tahiti and Ma’areva specifically because, as aforementioned, Rapa Nui had been forced to relocate there in the late nineteenth century by missionaries and planters trying to stabilize Rapa Nui for their interests. Rapa Nui have remained in both islands today as well as in other islands of French Polynesia, and I thought a visit would improve my understanding of the sense of Rapa Nui as a diasporic community. I stayed three days each on Huahine, Ra’iatea, and Tahiti, and five days on Ma’areva. As I do not know any French, I was forced to try and communicate in the only language available to me: Tahitian.

Though I had completed approximately three years of university course work on Tahitian, this was the first time I had actually tried to use it to communicate in real life. My first lesson in Tahitian by the indigenous people of the islands (Te ta’ata mā’ohi) was that the language I had been calling “Tahitian”, was more broadly known in the other islands circumscribing Tahiti by the phrase ‘Te Reo Mā’ohi’. My first extended conversation in this language occurred on Huahine: an island known for resistance to French and international development (Kahn 2003). My pension was owned by a Huahine man and located in the small town of Fare; I was the only guest upon arrival. During my first evening in Huahine I returned to the pension, and a few Huahine men were engaged in a conversation in Te Reo Mā’ohi while
drinking beer. I negotiated my way into the conversation and we discussed indigenous politics in French Polynesia in Te Reo Mā’ohi, as well as various issues of Huahine, over a few Hinano beers. We discussed the plausibility of independence from France and the future of Te Reo Mā’ohi. Though they were not certain of the immediate coherence of independence, they believed that the ultimate future for them was independence and a nation operating in terms of Te Reo Mā’ohi. After approximately an hour of conversation, a French tourist couple arrived; the conversation became more complex. I continued to speak to the Huahine men in Te Reo Mā’ohi; the couple spoke French with the Huahine men and English with me. As the night progressed the French couple increasingly spoke French only to one another, and I continued to converse with the Huahine men in Te Reo Mā’ohi. I sensed the men really did not want to speak French, that they preferred Te Reo Mā’ohi, but had pragmatically shifted to French as dutiful managers of the pension. As our discussion continued I contemplated the French speakers; a question fomented that later became critical for my fieldwork in Rapa Nui: Had I spoken in French in Huahine would I have been in a sense perpetuating a colonial situation these men ultimately hoped to end?

Philosophical reflection on Te Reo Mā’ohi continued in Maŋareva and Tahiti. On Maŋareva, as a result of rain, I was restricted to the pension most of my stay. At the pension, I ate all my meals with the Maŋarevan family that owned the pension. The family spoke Maŋarevan in addition to French and Te Reo Mā’ohi; we communicated in the only option available: Te Reo Mā’ohi. Each night, we watched the nightly televised news in Te Reo Mā’ohi; they turned the television off as the news subsequently was broadcast in French and we would discuss the news in Te Reo Mā’ohi. Though all of the family spoke French, like the men in Huahine, French did not appear the language of choice. If they could… they turned it off. I
returned to Tahiti from Ma'areva fairly confident with my ability to engage in small talk in Te Reo Mā’ohi, and an increasing sensitivity to the possibility that my own discursive practices in a small way mattered as French and Te Reo Mā’ohi competed in the “political fields” (Bailey 1969: 16) of “French” Polynesia. When a French cashier at a Pape’ete book store haughtily informed me of the price of a book written in Te Reo Mā’ohi I selected to buy in French, I replied “‘Aita vau e parau Farani. Ehia moni i te parau Tahiti?’” (I don’t speak French; how much money in Tahitian?). She glared at me; picked up a pen and paper and wrote the price in numbers. As I flew back to Rapa Nui from Pape’ete, Tahiti I reflected on Te Reo Mā’ohi and the explicit and implicit teachings of the indigenous people of the islands (te ta’ata mā’ohi); I came to some startling questions. If I did not need to speak French in French Polynesia, then why did I need to speak Spanish in Rapa Nui? By speaking Spanish in Rapa Nui was I in some sense perpetuating Chilean colonialism in Rapa Nui? Was this in a sense also what the aforementioned Rapa Nui elder repairs of the use of Spanish by their children betrayed as well between children and adults? The lessons of te ta’ata mā’ohi, in conjunction with my reflections on my initial field experiences with Rapa Nui language usage, combined to produce my second paradigm shift in understanding language in Rapa Nui. I decided that I could improve my understanding of Rapa Nui language best by decreasing concern with using Spanish while in Rapa Nui. Moreover, I needed to reconsider the political implications of any form of language usage in Rapa Nui. Makihara had exclusively marked “Purist Rapa Nui” as political among the language forms competing within the political fields of Rapa Nui while considering “Syncretic Rapa Nui” and Spanish unmarked (Makihara 1999: 230-231). My experiences with ta’ata mā’ohi suggested I might also mark the use of Spanish, as well as “Syncretic Rapa Nui”, and that my own discursive practices were imbedded in the “micro-politics” of talk.
Vai Tō Iri

Prior to my experiences with te ta’ata mā’ohi in “French” Polynesia, I had lived with the former governor of Rapa Nui, and famous Rapa Nui archaeologist Sergio Rapu in his inn named the Topa Ra’a.\footnote{Hunt’s field school stayed at Topa Ra’a in 2004; that is where and how Sergio and I met. Sergio was happy to accommodate me again, but agreed that I needed to ultimately live within the Rapa Nui residential community, not at a hotel.} I had always considered Topa Ra’a a temporary residence until I could find an opportunity to live in a residential area. During my trip, Evelyn’s “cousin” (te taina o Evelyn), Matuŋa Tuki Huke, volunteered to rent me his home in Te Hoe Manu. With Evelyn, by my request, not hers, we primarily studied Rapa Nui as an abstract grammatical system. Upon my return to Rapa Nui, not only did I become more politically conscious of the situation of Rapa Nui language for Rapa Nui and myself, but as I began to live in Te Hoe Manu and within an extended Rapa Nui family (hua’ai), I also began to study Rapa Nui language differently. In Te Hoe Manu elders of Evelyn gradually took up the cause of teaching me the language. Initially, Piru Huke Atan and Petero Huke Atan (“siblings” of Evelyn’s mother in their fifties—te taina o te matu’a vahine o Evelyn) led my studies. Later another “aunt” of Evelyn directed my language development in Te Hoe Manu: Blanka Huke Atan. My experiences within the hua’ai, led initially by Petero and Piru, and later with others, grounded further shifts in my understanding of Rapa Nui language. Ultimately, upon living in Te Hoe Manu and Vai Tō Iri within the hua’ai, I increasingly saw Rapa Nui people, Chileans, and all things Rapa Nui, in terms of what Rapa Nui call Te Vānaŋa Tupuna, and became estranged from thinking in terms of the discourses of archaeologists, linguists, and tourists. In a classic anthropological sense, I ‘came down from the veranda’ of Sergio Rapu’s inn, as Malinowski classically encouraged, and began to see life in Rapa Nui from within the houses of a Rapa Nui hua’ai.
Though sometimes she stayed in residences of kin around Haŋa Roa, Piru principally lived in the “country” (kampō) at a place Rapa Nui call Vai Tō Iri. Piru’s home is in an area next to one of the major centers of the ancestral world of Rapa Nui: Rano Raraku—the place where moai—sculptures in honor of the Rapa Nui ancestors (tupuna)—were carved and where hundreds remain in various stages of completion. Her home was a former residence of her parents and siblings. That her family had a home in the country was unusual for Rapa Nui. Her father acquired the home as a manager for the Easter Island Exploitation company. Piru, as I understand it, also somewhat unusual for a Rapa Nui woman, spent her youth at her father’s side pestering him for knowledge of all places and things of the world of the tupuna. While all of the Huke Atan sisters were recognized as having ancestral knowledge, only Piru lived in the kampō and engaged daily in its world. During my stay, Piru’s principle job was to organize coastal cleanups around the island soiled by poorly regulated fishing practices circumscribing the island. For approximately six months, Piru and I would meet three to four days a week for extensive study of Rapa Nui. Every other week I stayed with her in Vai Tō Iri; on alternating weeks we met at relatives homes around Haŋa Roa. Life in Vai Tō Iri was initially very challenging for me as the home lacked electricity and running water. Food was cooked by firewood fueled grills. Water was acquired at Vai Tō Iri either in the form of collected rain water, water tanks brought from Hanga Roa, or occasionally water brought to Vai Tō Iri by the fire department. While I worked with Evelyn partially in English, with Piru, who does not speak English, I became fully immersed in Rapa Nui as a discursive practice and as a form of daily Rapa Nui life.

Rapa Nui primarily discussed their language in terms of two words: re’o, and vānaŋa. Rapa Nui discursive practice distinguished the two. Daily use of Rapa Nui language is typically referred to by the term ‘vānaŋa’ not ‘re’o’; for example, one would say “Ka vānaŋa mai koe!”
(Speak Rapa Nui to me!); “vānaŋa titika na!” (That is “straight” or “correct/proper” Rapa Nui spoken nearby.); “Te vānaŋa ena vānaŋa ta’e titika!” (That Rapa Nui nearby is not straight or “correct/proper”); and “ ‘Ina he vānaŋa Rapa Nui a ia” (He/she does not speak Rapa Nui). The term ‘vānaŋa’ as illustrated in such usage is analogous in meaning to the family of English notions such as speech, conversation, or discourse. Rapa Nui did not use the word ‘re’o’ much when I was living in Rapa Nui. I only heard it extensively when Rapa Nui celebrated their language with an approximately three day festival called Te Mahana o Te Re’o (“The day of the language”) I observed in 2007 and 2008 and discuss in chapter 5. I noted the word ‘re’o’ also used on the instruction board of the school that begins this chapter. To me, the usage of the word ‘re’o’ in the phrase ‘Te Mahana o Te Re’o’ and on the school sign suggests Rapa Nui consider the phrase ‘Te Re’o Rapa Nui’ as referring to Rapa Nui language more as an abstract grammatical system taught in pedagogical contexts. In contrast, the use of the term ‘vānaŋa’, illustrated in the above examples and regularly in daily Rapa Nui life, suggests that Rapa Nui conceive the phrase ‘Te Vānaŋa Rapa Nui’ to mention the actual use of Rapa Nui in daily life, or in other words, the discursive practice of Rapa Nui. From a Rapa Nui perspective, I believe Piru shifted my studies from learning primarily Te Re’o Rapa Nui with Evelyn—an abstract grammatical system or langue, to the practical daily use, or discursive practice, of Rapa Nui—Te Vānaŋa Rapa Nui.

The change began to be produced as Piru altered the location, manner, and subject matter of my studies by reorganizing the pedagogical process of learning Rapa Nui. Initially we worked within the framework of Te Re’o Rapa Nui I had developed with Evelyn. I presented her sentences in Rapa Nui I thought grammatical given Evelyn’s lessons as well as various texts I
was incessantly reviewing to increase my knowledge of Rapa Nui language. Piru tolerated that for about a day. At the end of the first day she said to me write down a few things to bring for the following day and in conclusion told me to jot the down the following sentence: ‘’Apō i te po’a a Forrest he oho mai ki kampō mo oho mo hāpī ’i ruŋa i te henua ararua ko tō’ona taote o te rojoroyo!’ This statement—a kind of command—is symbolic of some of the ways in which my studies of Rapa Nui changed under Piru’s leadership. Broadly, it can be translated thus: “Tomorrow morning Forrest will come here to the country to go study upon the land of Rapa Nui together with his professor of Rapa Nui.” There are, however, details in this statement that do not lend themselves to easy translation that are worth noting.

Piru’s use of the phrase ‘ko tō’ona taote o te rojoroyo’ is significant. The phrase, which I have simplified in the above translation as “his professor of Rapa Nui” is a complex formulation of an “alternative person reference” used to accomplish particular social actions (Stivers 2007: 94). Piru identifies herself in the phrase “his professor” in terms of the third person possessive pronoun ‘tō’ona’ that, from an English grammar perspective, in this context, can be coherently translated “his”. However, Rapa Nui “possessive pronouns” are more complex than those of English. To use one, one must make a distinction that use of English possessive pronouns does not involve. The habitual discursive practice of Rapa Nui involves what the French philosopher Derrida would call a “metaphysic” (Derrida 2002: 19) or what the linguistic anthropologist Whorf (2000) would call a “world view”. To narrate some event with a Rapa Nui possessive pronoun one must distinguish whether the thing to be possessed is “a” class or “o” class (and sometimes “u” class) (Fisher 2000; Mulloy, E. R. and Rapu, S.A. 1977). One would translate the English phrase “his father” with the “o” class form. One can socially and grammatically only say

---

38 I presented Piru statements I thought coherent in light of Evelyn’s conception and various Rapa Nui grammar texts (Du Feu 1996, Gomez Macker et al) that I studied on the island from time to time.
“his” (tō’ona) “father” (matu’a tane); to say “his” (tā’ana) “father” (matu’a tane) is grammatically and socially incorrect. Similarly, in the domain of kinship one can say “his” (tā’ana) “child” (poki), but not “his” (tō’ona) “child” (poki). Though the nuances of the distinction—one that is found throughout Eastern Polynesian languages—are complex, in this context the “a” class is used for family members of the next generation below oneself, and “o” for one’s own generation and the generations above. Use of the “o” class possessive in this case positions oneself and others hierarchically within one’s family genealogy. Piru’s use of the “o” class positions herself either as equal or above me in genealogical hierarchy; use of the “a” would have established herself below me. Piru resolves any ambiguity about whether our relationship is one of equality (same generation) or hierarchy with usage of the Rapa Nui word ‘taote’ generally translated as “doctor”. Piru’s phrase pragmatically positioned herself as my superior “doctor” of “Rapa Nui” (roŋoroŋo), and by implication, me as her student or patient.

The command was not only used to establish Piru’s pedagogical authority, but also to change the method of study. Piru asserts that I am to return to “study upon the island” (hāpī ‘i ruŋa i te henua). For Piru, and other Rapa Nui elders I spoke with on this matter, Rapa Nui was to be learned primarily by walking “the island” (te henua) with elders to learn the stories of particular places and by engaging in Rapa Nui practices upon the island. Secondarily, it was to be learned engaging with elders within the residential areas who gathered on lanai to chat or simply pass the day. It was not to be learned hanging around international tourist or Chilean government centers and institutions around Haŋa Roa; nor from Piru’s perspective was it to be learned sitting at a table studying its grammatical structure as I did with Evelyn and later others.39 Piru, as the “doctor” (taote), initiated me into a complex learning process that she

39 While I embraced Piru’s methods I also continued to refine my formal understanding of the language with additional Rapa Nui teachers. I asked and received insights about grammatical distinctions, and English translations
creatively developed. Generally, this involved walking the island and learning about particular places, as well as incorporating me into her daily tasks, interests, social affairs, and coastal cleanup work. In addition to the actual learning situations I encountered as a participant in her daily life, Piru had me record the experiences in various ways and would “test” me on my understanding of the records. On the days of the week we did not meet she expected I study the records and prepare for her tests.40

Piru’s use of the Rapa Nui the word ‘roŋoroŋo’ in the above phrase is also significant. The word ‘roŋoroŋo’ in archaeological discourse is used to mention the Rapa Nui script found on wooden tablets dating to the eighteenth century called ‘roŋoroŋo’ boards or tablets. Although Rapa Nui often consider it an ancient Rapa Nui tradition, archaeologists (Flenley and Bahn 2002) and linguists (Fisher 2005) typically consider the tablets and script historical artifacts stimulated by Rapa Nui experience with written Spanish language. In this context, Piru uses the word as a formulation for Rapa Nui language, not to mention the tablets. The formulation symbolizes the new subject matter of our studies. In teaching me Rapa Nui language, Piru did not conceive herself primarily teaching me an abstract, secular, grammatical system; she saw

from Rapa Nui throughout the community whenever possible. Sergio Rapu Haoa and his mother Reina, Hilaria Tuki Pakarati, Vaihere Tuki Haoa and her mother Virginia, Ana Chavez, Tutihamen Pakarati Ika, and Susana Nahoe provided important help. Hilaria Tuki Pakarati, a Rapa Nui school teacher, was especially helpful towards the end of my stay in Rapa Nui. She refined a number of the more subtle grammatical distinctions in the language. Vaihere Tuki Haoa and I worked throughout my stay on the six different textbooks developed for primary and secondary education in Rapa Nui language. With Vaihere and Hilaria I continued the more formal study of the language of less concern to Piru.40 Piru’s pedagogical methodology was ever evolving and always challenging. The lessons she taught were initially recorded by writing transcripts of spoken Rapa Nui narratives about what we had been doing that day. While Piru often was the narrator, she also engaged others we would meet to narrate their thoughts on the day and whatever came to mind. I was responsible for writing down by hand the narrative as it was composed. This process resulted in a few hundred pages of transcribed Rapa Nui from various Rapa Nui. While there is the occasional coordinating conjunction in these narratives and things Chilean (e.g. Conaf) are named in Chilean Spanish, the transcripts do not consist of “Syncretic Rapa Nui” in the strong sense of Chilean verbs embedded in Rapa Nui syntax and extensive intra-sentential mixing of Rapa Nui and Chilean Spanish. While Piru was not keen on it, I added a dimension to this process she did not prohibit; I analyzed the transcripts for grammatical patterns and new vocabulary I later inscribed into flash cards I would study in collegian style. As my education progressed she would eventually decide that I needed to stop writing, recording, and using flash cards and concentrate exclusively on talking, listening, and experiencing with Te Vānaŋa Rapa Nui.
herself teaching me a discursive practice connected to the ways of life of her “ancestors” (tupuna). She formulated our studies as about ‘rororo’ rather than ‘Te Re’o Rapa Nui’ or ‘Te Vānafa‘a Rapa Nui’ to embed our studies within the ancestral Rapa Nui world. She alternatively referred to the subject of our studies by the phrase ‘Te Vānafa‘a Tupuna’ which can be broadly translated as “The Discourse of the Ancestors” or “Ancestral Discourse”.

Piru shifted the subject matter of my studies as we began to “study upon the land” by the various aforementioned methods. She also changed the subject matter by demanding, as the studies evolved, that I prepare an Umu Tahu to request a blessing of my work from the ancestral tupuna in conjunction with a living Rapa Nui. Broadly, an Umu Tahu is a cultural practice Rapa Nui conduct to ask “ancestors” (tupuna) to bless some activity, place, process, or thing; a living Rapa Nui is asked to receive the blessing on behalf of the tupuna. While living in Rapa Nui I saw Umu Tahu completed on a number of occasions; for example, at the inauguration of the new mayor in Rapa Nui; at the beginning of the two week cultural festival called Tapati Rapa Nui, and to bless a Rapa Nui athletic practice called Haka pei.41 The custom of Umu Tahu involves preparing a small meal in an “underground oven” (umu). It consists minimally of a “cooked white rooster” (he moa teatea) killed by the preparers of the Umu Tahu and a few “sweet potatoes” (kumara); and sometimes a small amount of po’e (a kind of cooked bread pudding of banana, taro, or some other traditional Rapa Nui crop that becomes like the consistency of a muffin) is included. To make an Umu Tahu one digs a shallow hole approximately two to three feet in diameter and about a foot deep. The hole is then filled with “stones” (ma’ea) and “firewood” (hukahuka) and the wood is burned to heat the stones. Once the stones are a glow, the remaining wood is removed quickly and the meal, wrapped in “banana leaves” (raupa maika)

41 This is an ancestral sporting practice. It involves constructing a sled from the tree trunks of banana trees and sledding down steep hills of Rapa Nui. It is a dangerous practice that regularly results in injuries. The Umu Tahu is no doubt thus done for Haka Pei to ask the ancestors to protect those sledding from injury.
ideally acquired from ancient manavai is placed atop the stones. Today, layers of canvas and sometimes thick plastic wraps are placed on top of the bundled food. Ultimately, all is covered with soil and left to cook underground for a few hours. When the food is cooked, the preparer or preparers of the Umu Tahu give the meal to someone or some group on behalf of the ancestors. Those who prepare the Umu Tahu are not allowed to eat any of the food. Those who made the Umu Tahu are enjoined to give a speech to the individual or group the Umu Tahu honors and to the tupuna who are requested to bless the proceedings. After the Umu Tahu is completed the hole must be refilled and restored to its original condition as well as possible.

I decided I would prepare an Umu Tahu for Piru at her home in Vai Tō Iri. A “nephew” (poki) of Piru, Ioni Tuki Huke, and his daughter, agreed to help me organize and prepare the ceremonial meal. After wringing the rooster’s neck and cleaning it for cooking, I was instructed to retrieve a bundle of raupa maika from nearby manavai in order to wrap the food to cook, and to contemplate the content of what I was to say as I offered the Umu Tahu to Piru and the tupuna. As I entered manavai to acquire the leaves, I looked at the hundreds of moai staring at me from nearby Ranu Raraku—an area that is, in a sense, Piru’s backyard. The mysterious moai upon Rano Raraku whom I was introduced to in 2004 in the archaeological field school to assess possible transport routes no longer appeared as parts of an ancient engineering puzzle. Nor were they simply admirable Polynesian monumental sculpture. The moai, or as Piru had formulated them many times past, “the living faces of the ancestors” (te arianga ora o te tupuna), had become my conversational addressees. My “prayer” (pule) to request permission to continue study of “Rapa Nui language” was directed to moai not as Rapa Nui artifacts, but as persisting Rapa Nui

---

42 A manavai is an ancestral Rapa Nui raised planter. Manavai are common throughout ancestral Rapa Nui residential areas. They vary in size from a few meters in diameter to several. Broadly, they consist of stones piled a meter or so high in a kind of circular form. Various crops, such as banana and taro remain planted in them throughout the island and some Rapa Nui utilize them for food production today.
“ancestors” (tupuna) personified by the moai and one of their descendants—Piru. What I had understood as an ancient artifact since first measuring manavai in 2004 as an archaeology student was now clearly different; the manavai was now Rapa Nui culture engaged in the present. When I offered the Umu Tahu to Piru and the tupuna, I thanked Piru and the tupuna embodied in the moai for the knowledge they had bestowed thus far and requested they further support my studies in Rapa Nui. Neither Piru, nor the tupuna responded in words. Piru and the other Rapa Nui who had gathered that day did however accept and eat from the Umu Tahu offered; some food and food remains though were placed in the fire pit. As was customary at many Rapa Nui meals I participated in, this was food left for the tupuna.

Analysis of one of the transcripts from one of the “island walks” with Piru reveals in more detail how Piru shifted the subject matter of my “Rapa Nui language” studies and some of the themes of Rapa Nui discourse adumbrated in the previous chapter. The narrative of Piru reviews her teachings at the ancestral Rapa Nui ceremonial complex known popularly as Tahai. The notes were constructed in situ with Piru. In this narrative, Piru is not responding to any questions of me. She is however, attending to questions of another Rapa Nui—Miha—as will be manifest in the transcript. As would be common with us, the themes we discussed at Tahai were dialogical with earlier conversations Piru and I had with other Rapa Nui. As Piru and I walked the henua each week often we would converse with Rapa Nui who later figured within conversations at places visited the following week. Piru introduced me to Miha as part of my education at Poike—another Rapa Nui place. As the three of us discussed various issues at Poike—in particular, new and old names for various places near and at Poike—Miha asked me about my knowledge of Tahai. He impressed upon me that his father helped the American archaeologist William Mulloy restore the ceremonial complex generally; and more importantly,
that his father was responsible for creating the eyes of the moai at Tahai. Piru and I went to Tahai, not as part of a tour, but to follow up on issues that developed in our conversation with Miha. This is my transcription and rough translation of part of her narrative at Tahai:

We, my teacher (māori roŋoroŋo) and I, are inside the area named Tahai. At this hour, we are in front of the elder William Mulloy. He is an American elder. His daughter married a Rapa Nui man. Nahoe is the family name [of that man]. The University of
Wyoming and the respected elder William Mulloy came to Rapa Nui and demonstrated their power (mana), and wisdom (maramarama), to link the wisdom of the Rapa Nui ancestors (tupuna). Hence, Mulloy is buried [here]; his spirit (kuhane) is beside Ahu Vai Uri. Within this great bay, this shore, the land of Rapa Nui (Te Pito o te Henua) the elder William Mulloy is tied with respect, with love within their hearts, to the people, the shore, and the children today. His beautiful spirit relaxes here. There is a great spirit here connecting people to the Rapa Nui experts that have erected the living face of the ancestors. Ahu Vai Uri, Ahu Tahai, Ahu Riku: the living faces of the ancestral experts of this land. Behind [them] lives the Polynesian oceanic world (te vai moana o Hiva). We have traversed here to study at Tahai to clarify my thoughts regarding the Moai Riku; the eyes by the father of Miha are perfectly complete. Yes, it is true. The eyes of the living face of the ancestors are awakened.

We are now descending to go inside the ocean. From Tahai we are looking ancestrally to the two canoes of the ancestors of this land Rapa Nui. I am in front of the cave at the shore, looking at the sun, it has begun to disappear. One young man is fishing for his fish; three young men are trying to snag their eel; the tide is dreaming; so beautiful. Ana o Tai is the name of this place; the name of the cave. Wow, the aura of life; so pretty—the sky, bright red, and the moai call behind. The powerful warming energy of the light is disappearing; the sun; the energy.43 At this hour, the ocean sits; the waves play… the shell fish and sea weed is dry for food, to work, to eat, the food of the ancient ancestors. The birds fly in front of the cave of Ana o Tai. Completeness.
Thank you ancestors for the knowledge and the power (mana). Like that. Yes.

Tahai is one of the grand archaeological sites tourists visit in Rapa Nui; and perhaps the most photographed place of Rapa Nui. Though some of Piru’s narrative no doubt would overlap with archaeological and tourist accounts of Tahai, her poetic representation of our experience of Tahai expresses themes of Rapa Nui discourse unlikely to be emphasized in these alternative accounts.

---

43 A translation of the Rapa Nui word ‘morī’ typically is rendered in English as “light”. I think that is part of the meaning in this transcript. Rapa Nui also discuss the “morī” of fish (its juices and oils), and of cars (its gas). I think, in light of this family of usage, the broader term of English “energy” is a better translation than “light” in this narrative.
discourses. Piru’s Tahai story begins where I have witnessed both tourist and archaeological discourse about Tahai often starts: by emphasizing that William Mulloy was the principle archaeologist who guided its scientific reconstruction. Tours tend to stop at the plaque which memorializes Mulloy at his burial adjacent to one of the entrances to Tahai; briefly note his contribution to the site; and then proceed to the ceremonial complexes where tourists compete to get the best pictures of the monumental moai. In 2004, I recall the field school lingering a bit longer on the subject of Mulloy. We discussed particular archaeological methods and the reliability of particular dates Mulloy’s team established for Tahai. Like the Tahai stories of tourists and archaeologists, Piru’s narrative is concerned with the archaeological role of Mulloy at Tahai. However, Mulloy is significant to Piru not simply because he helped restore Tahai. Her discussion of Mulloy does not dwell on his archaeological contributions; rather, it integrates Mulloy into the broader themes of Rapa Nui kinship and worldview she wants to share with me at Tahai. Mulloy is not simply an archaeologist to Piru, he is part of a Rapa Nui family; specifically, the Nahoe family. Secondly, Mulloy is no longer simply a person to Piru. She considers him a “spirit” (kuhane) now residing at Tahai beside her beloved “ancestral spirits” (tupuna). Piru’s poetics transform Mulloy from an archaeologist into a Rapa Nui family member and spiritual force at Tahai. Piru does not portray Mulloy’s work as simply restoring an archeological site; rather, she represents his work, in conjunction with the father of Miha who created and placed the eyes of the moai named Riku, as awakening the ancestors at Tahai. This place Tahai is not an archaeological site of relics where Piru contemplates archaeological methods, or snaps photos of the remains of a “lost civilization”. Tahai is a spiritual place for Piru; a contemporary place she likes to visit to contemplate her living ancestral world; a place
where she can poetically reflect upon on contemporary life of Rapa Nui elders, youth, and children engaged with Tahai.

Piru’s narrative of Tahai engages with Tahai as an ancestral place, but she does not separate the past of Tahai from its present as foreign historians and archaeologists tend to do with their ethnocentric historical frameworks of prehistory and “contact” (Hau’ofa 2008: 62). Te Vānaŋa Tupuna of Piru, in terms of the philosophy differance (Derrida 2002), differs and defers beyond its immediate place of utterance. “Where is Piru?” (‘I hē a Piru?): Piru is at Tahai and yet she is also in Poike with Miha. She is in her present situation, poetically reflecting on the fishing of fellow Rapa Nui, and yet her reflections billow to a place of her ancestral Rapa Nui. Her narrative suggested that we swam that day, but we did not actually physically enter the ocean. Like a Hawaiian kupua, as she reflects, and converses with Miha, she takes flight with the birds upon the ocean—an ocean formulated as the ancestral ocean world of her ancestors at Hiva (te vai moana o Hiva). As I sat within the cave ‘Ana o Tai, Piru metaphysically entered the ocean and journeyed within the ancestral time of the canoes of Hotu Matu’a (the founding chief and spiritual leader of Rapa Nui) to Hiva. In her completeness she deferentially thanks her ancestors for her visions at Tahai; she sees her utterances as a collaboration with tupuna—not simply her speech. She speaks to and thanks her ancestors for the power to be spoken through and thus to teach. Like Native American storytellers, Piru hence “reasons together” (Howe 2008: 330) with her ancestors. Te Vānaŋa Tupuna of Piru places her within the places, families, actions, beauty, and life of Rapa Nui today. It also disseminates her far beyond and within the ancestral worlds of Rapa Nui tupuna located at Tahai and upon the canoes voyaging to Rapa Nui from Hiva.

44 In Hawaiian “oral literature/history” (mo’olelo), a kupua is a person who can transform from human form into other forms as their nature or will dictates (Kame’eleihiwa 1996: xii).
MAUPITI

The *Umu Tahu* and the “island walks” with Piru and others resulted in my third paradigm shift in understanding Rapa Nui language and its usage. After the *Umu Tahu* and numerous adventures upon the land, I recognized that I was not simply studying an abstract linguistic system, or a secular discourse. I was studying a contemporary discursive practice embedded in a Rapa Nui world view. This practice engaged Rapa Nui cultural memory of ancestral life with the *tupuna* and the horrors of Chilean colonialism in Rapa Nui within the present as they imagined a alternative future than the one projected by the contemporary Chilean state. These experiences also grounded what could be considered my final shift in understanding; a change not fully realized in Rapa Nui, but on the island of Maupiti. In September 2008, I joined a number of Rapa Nui from various *hua’ai* for a Pacific Islander cultural gathering on the island of Maupiti near “Bora Bora” (Pora Pora) in “French” Polynesia. Rapa Nui joined representatives of Tahiti, Hawai’i, Cook Islands, Aotearoa, Man’āia, Maupiti, Rurutu, as well as Aboriginal Australia to commemorate a remembered gathering of Polynesian Chiefs in the late eighteenth century at Maupiti. Participation in these kinds of events is nothing new to Rapa Nui; a few Rapa Nui elders at Maupiti had been participating in them since Rapa Nui first became engaged in them during the 1970s (Huke 1995). This Pan-Pacific Islander gathering was one of three that Rapa Nui participated in during my residence on the island; in December 2007 a group went to Ua Pou in the Marquesas for the Matava’a o te Henua Enana, and in July 2008 some Rapa Nui went to American Samoa for the Pacific Arts festival.

While I was only able to witness the closing ceremonies and farewells in person, this was sufficient time for me to notice another important dimension of *Te Vānaŋa Tupuna*; it was used to communicate with other Polynesians. As Captain Cook learned centuries ago by watching his
“Tahitian” assistant Mahine communicate with different Polynesian groups such as Rapa Nui (Fisher 2005: 67), at Maupiti I was able to see Polynesians communicate across their native languages. While participants did recognize that communication was imperfect, there was significant communication. One Rapa Nui elder whom I visited with in Maupiti commented that this was possible in part simply because all the languages are related to older Vānaŋa Tupuna, and that all Polynesians are all ultimately “family” (hua’ai). She meant this in the broad sense that Polynesians descend from the same people, and more literally—some of her living relatives throughout the Pacific had come to Maupiti to visit one another as “family”. She emphasized also that communication was possible because they share stories, food, political problems and history, arts, and ideas. In a way, she said to me, “we are all the same” or more literally “we are one feather” (a mātou he huru etahi). She said she came to such gatherings to feel that commonality, to engage with her “Polynesian family” (hua’ai mā’ori), and to experience the sense of he huru etahi. This was, she thought, a major function of this gathering; and a fundamental reason the ancestral chiefs gathered at Maupiti in the early nineteenth century. The festival was not though simply a family reunion to her. She emphasized that they were also gathering for political reasons similar to those which they believe stimulated the ancestral chiefs to gather there in the early nineteenth century: to build connections between Polynesians against the colonial governments that continue to “cut them up into separate islands” (horehore te ŋa henua).

Most of the moai atop the “ceremonial centers” ahu in Rapa Nui face inland; one set of moai profoundly faces seaward—Ahu Akivi. The seven moai atop Ahu Akivi are known by Rapa Nui as symbols of the seven explorers sent to find Rapa Nui by Hotu Matu’a—the founding chief of the island. The moai representing these explorers are said to face Hiva to their prior
homeland; the place where Piru voyaged to during her narrative at Tahai. Te Vānanga Tupuna is similar to the majority of ahu and moai of Rapa Nui. Most of the discursive practice of Te Vānanga Tupuna is focused inland. The experiences of Maupiti connected me to the spirit of Rapa Nui expressed at Ahu Akivi and in Piru’s Tahai narrative. The trip revealed that while Rapa Nui mainly practice Te Vānanga Tupuna locally in Rapa Nui, they also use it to engage with their broader Polynesian world. Sometimes Rapa Nui travel great distances to places like Maupiti, Samoa, and ‘Ua Pou to experience that ‘ocean within themselves’ (Hau’ofa 2008: 58); other times this ocean within them is encountered at Rapa Nui. Many Rapa Nui regularly engage with their oceanic connections as they communicate with members of the Rapa Nui diaspora living throughout the Pacific Islands by phone or internet; principally in the one of the islands of “French” Polynesia, but also in Aotearoa and Hawai‘i. Most Rapa Nui also engage with their oceanic connections weekly at Sunday Mass as they recite Tahitian hymns introduced to Rapa Nui over a hundred years ago by missionaries based in Tahiti and Manareva. And many Rapa Nui live their lives within these connections as they daily converse with spouses and relatives originally from “French” Polynesia or other islands of the Pacific. To the Rapa Nui I lived with, being Rapa Nui involved being Polynesian.

Ka Hakaroŋo Mai!

In order to reflexively contextualize the significance of my subsequent analyses, I have highlighted some of the key experiences, interactions, and processes which grounded my education in Rapa Nui language and discourse, and noted how my experiences contrasted with some recent models of the language situation in Rapa Nui. Though Fisher and others are correct that Rapa Nui is influenced by “Tahitian”, it is misleading according to Rapa Nui themselves to characterize their language as “Pidgin Tahitian”. Makihara has importantly identified some of
the ways Rapa Nui is grammatically combined with Spanish, and I believe insightfully recognized that language usage in Rapa Nui is spoken along a continuum from unmixed forms of Rapa Nui and Spanish to mixed forms that combine Rapa Nui with borrowings from Spanish, English, and Tahitian. Yet Makihara has invented a typological language game that eschews serious Rapa Nui concerns with language loss and linguistic dilution within Chilean institutions in Rapa Nui. Rapa Nui have developed explicit programs to challenge the language of assimilation Makihara champions and euphemistically formulates as a “contact language”. Rather than highlighting the continuum of speech, recognizing and honoring the remaining speakers of vānaŋa tītika and their desire to transmit their heritage to youth, she “entextualizes” (Bauman and Briggs 1990: 73) their variant of speech within the ‘colonial discourse of invented traditions’ (Trask 1999a) and a racist genre of purism.45 She hence belittles the best forms of Rapa Nui language as simple political artifact, and rarefies respected elders into mere political activists. Makihara thus appears to utilize her typology to engage in what has been considered one of the most political of linguistic actions: the reduction of the heteroglossia to be found in any language, to a standardized norm useful for managing people in the interests of a nation-state (Bakhtin 2002a: 264-271). To avoid anthropological “butterfly collecting” (Leach 1966: 2), and the ethnographic, moral, and political weaknesses of a typology that, through a set of internal qualifying rules (Foucault 1981: 59), disqualifies the best Rapa Nui speakers from determining

45 Interestingly, Makihara’s use of the terms ‘purity’ and ‘syncretism’ can be seen as engaging a long-standing racial discourse genre well known in Native America (Doerfler 2009, King 2003, Wilkins 2002) as well as Hawai‘i (Kauanui 2000, 2002). In Native America and Hawai‘i, purity in blood was a criteria established by settler colonialists to divide and assimilate Hawaiians and Native Americans, as well as limit their access to lands and resources (Kauanui 2002: 77). In Native America, U.S. anthropologists working for the BIA applied the notions of “full-blood” and “mixed-blood” to limit the allotment of lands under the Dawes Act (Doerfler 2009: 317-318); subsequently, these kinds of notions were applied to restrict Native American access to broader United States federal programs (Wilkins 2002: 24). In Hawai‘i, such notions were appropriated to limit access to Hawaiian Homestead lands as well as limit who was qualified to be “Native Hawaiian” in legal cases such as Rice v. Cayetano (Kauanui 2002).
what is and is not Rapa Nui language, I include Rapa Nui texts in this dissertation without classification: they can speak for themselves.

Rapa Nui often use the command ‘Ka hakaronjo mai!’ (“listen!”) when engaging one another in speech to gain the so-called conversational floor. While perhaps from the vantage of “seeing like a state” (Scott 1998) it makes sense to represent Rapa Nui language usage in terms of “public” speech in Chilean political forums, herein I have attempted to “listen” to Rapa Nui language use within the contexts my Rapa Nui teachers felt it was better expressed: residential areas among “extended family” members, umu gatherings, Polynesian culture festivals, and island walks. For the Rapa Nui I knew best, Chilean forums and Haŋa Roa generally, were not so much “public” places as “Chilean things” (me’e Tire) a subject explored in chapter 5. Within the dissertation, the texts I have selectively “listened” to clearly range across the continuum Makihara has proposed; hence indicating that Rapa Nui, like any modern language, is “heteroglossic” (Bakhtin 2002a: 291). It is composed of multiple speech genres reflecting the diversity of linguistic and cultural resources different Rapa Nui family members have, and the multitude of discursive practices they engage in within their society given variable social position within the community. While there are multiple speech genres of Rapa Nui language, what seems constant across genres is the relationship of interlocutors: Rapa Nui mostly speak their language among kin, not to Chileans. To illuminate the “structure of feeling” (Williams 1977: 132) circumscribing this discursive practice and ground the principle data of this dissertation further—family conversations about “land titles” (Te Parau Henua)—it is important to “ethnographically thicken” (Geertz 1977) the immediate socio-cultural context of these conversations and represent some of the dimensions of “extended family” (hua’ai) life. The Rapa Nui hua’ai is a social structure the most experienced ethnographer of Rapa Nui has consistently

This is the “story” (‘a’amu) of the next chapter.
While I had already acquired a superficial understanding of the meaning of the Rapa Nui question ‘ 'A ai koe? ’ for some time, I realized a more complex cultural significance of the question in the context of a conversation with a Chilean government official: the island judge. I had positioned myself in the court which he adjudicated to observe its daily operations and significance to Rapa Nui culture. One day, after a few weeks of observation, he engaged me in conversation. I had spoken to him briefly before, simply to explain my reasons for observing the institution: this was our first extended discussion. After I reestablished that my observations were for doctoral research in cultural anthropology about Rapa Nui in Spanish, he proceeded to interrogate me about where I lived, who I had spoken with, and what I knew about various cultural issues related to Rapa Nui. Though he was ethnically Chilean, I felt I was less competent in conversing in Spanish at this time than Rapa Nui so I proceeded to answer him in Rapa Nui. His interrogation and consequent lecture subsequently shifted to broken English. Though he claimed to know some Rapa Nui words, a man who interacted with Rapa Nui on a daily basis and was responsible for making decisions that greatly affected their lives for over twenty years, admitted that he could not continue our conversation in Rapa Nui. After criticizing and questioning the competence of many Rapa Nui regarding their own culture, he proceeded to lecture me about the insignificance of various sacred sites on the island, cultural festivals such as Tāpati Rapa Nui, and political institutions like the Council of Elders. He was concerned that I

---

46 His incompetence in Rapa Nui was not aberrant for Chilean officials or Chileans generally on the island. Though I presume there are a few more, I only encountered two Chileans on the island during my stay that were considered by Rapa Nui to be fully competent in Rapa Nui and conducted daily life in Rapa Nui. Neither individual was an official of the Chilean government. A number of Chilean spouses of Rapa Nui claimed to be competent enough to broadly understand it when spoken. Chileans who spoke even some Rapa Nui were extremely rare. Moreover, many seemed to reproach its usage. When I greeted Chileans with the Rapa Nui “Iorana” I typically received “hola” in reply in conjunction with a bit of consternation. This startled me given that in Hawai’i the greeting “Aloha” is embraced by non-Hawaiian settlers and tourists to the island.
understand contemporary Rapa Nui cultural life and meaning to not have any continuity with its past, and the cultural festivals to showcase strictly contemporary inventions produced for profit. He concluded his harangue by advising me that if I really wanted to know the truth about Rapa Nui culture I should talk to Edmundo Edwards—a Chilean who had lived in Rapa Nui for a long time.

As I left the court contemplating his advice and knowledge claims an important Rapa Nui question began to ring in my head: 'A ai koe? Broadly, the question could be glossed as “Of whom are you?” in contrast to the question “Who are you?” (Ko ai koe?). Semantically, the question, asked to Rapa Nui, would be a question regarding the person’s “extended family” (hua’ai) membership, or kinship identity. Indirectly, Rapa Nui answer this question in terms of innumerable kinship practices in daily life. Formally, Rapa Nui answer the question by a process known as “reciting a genealogy” (hakaara). The significance of “genealogy” (hakaara) to

---

47 In some contexts, the question forms ‘A ai’ and ‘Ko ai’ have been translated similarly (Du Feu 1996: 35-36). Du Feu also distinguishes them as I have (Du Feu 1996: 35-36), as has the Rapa Nui Council of Elders (Hotus Chavez 1996: 36). There is inconsistency in the orthography and semantics of Rapa Nui regarding the expression ‘ai’. Six terms have been distinguished in the literature that pose some confusion to linguistic study of Rapa Nui: a demonstrative use of ‘ai’, a demonstrative phoric use of ‘ai’, an existential form written both as ‘ai’ and ‘ai’, and an interrogative form also written as both ‘ai’ and ‘ai’ (Du Feu 1996); and in contrast, a subsequential post-verbal ‘ai’, and a verb form ‘ai’ (Weber and Weber 1999: 144). In some cases the Webers consider a subsequential ‘ai’ to exist where Du Feu represents the term as either a phoric ‘ai’ and perhaps a demonstrative ‘ai’. Du Feu’s analysis of demonstrative phoric ‘ai’ is supposed to model the comparative Polynesian linguist Chapin’s (1974) seminal analysis of ‘ai’ in Rapa Nui and the rest of Polynesia (Du Feu 1996: 93). For Du Feu, demonstrative ‘ai’ occurs only in absolute word initial position and contrasts with the demonstrative phoric ‘ai’ that occurs post-verbally (Du Feu 1996: 93). What Du Feu considers existential ‘ai’ and an interrogative ‘ai’, both written confusedly by Du Feu as both ‘ai’ and ‘ai’, the Webers seem to consider a verbal form best glossed ‘to exist’ (Weber and Weber 1999: 144). Thus there is disagreement as to whether there is a subsequential ‘ai’, an interrogative ‘ai’, and an existential ‘ai’, in addition to the demonstrative phoric ‘ai’, and demonstrative ‘ai’ the Webers and Du Feu appear to agree upon. Perhaps the disagreement between Du Feu and the Webers is a result of differences of research paradigm: the Webers have worked from a text linguistics framework stimulated by the Summer Institute of Linguistics (Weber 1988: 152), while Du Feu’s grammar is designed to conform to the standards of the Routledge Descriptive Grammars Series (Du Feu 1996: iii-iv). Herein I have decided to reject the post verbal subsequential ‘ai’ asserted by the Webers and Du Feu’s existential ‘ai’. Taking a kind of Aristotelian middle ground, I only distinguish demonstrative-phoric ‘ai’, demonstrative ‘ai’, the verb ‘ai’, and the interrogative ‘ai’. In the Rapa Nui question ‘A ai koe?’ I consider the word ‘ai’ as an interrogative form according to Du Feu (1996: 35-36).

48 Structurally, a hakaara is formulated in terms of an ancestral Rapa Nui kinship system that broadly accords with the so-called “Hawaiian kinship type” in which members of a common generation are identified by the same term.
Rapa Nui is manifest in both formal and informal discursive practice. *Te Mau Hatu o Rapa Nui*, the first major publication of the Council of Elders directed by Alberto Hotus Chavez, now in its second edition, is primarily a list of *hakaara* for the Rapa Nui *hua’ai*. Interestingly, the text articulates Rapa Nui *hakaara* in terms of both Rapa Nui and Chilean discourse. *Hakaara* are represented in terms of the genealogical system introduced by Chilean officials following annexation of Rapa Nui in 1888 (McCall 1991: 19). In this system, a name such as Blanka Huke Atan is a name that includes Blanka’s father’s surname—Huke, and her mother’s surname—Atan. Following the Chilean approach, in the text Blanka is represented as both a descendant of her mother’s father’s lineage identified with the surname ‘Atan’ and as a descendant of her father’s lineage identified with the surname ‘Huke’. Thus, there are two genealogies in the book that include Blanka: one from her mother’s side and one from her father’s side. *Hakaara* are represented in the text in terms of Rapa Nui discourse in the sense that they ultimately trace a Rapa Nui genealogy to the male lineage heads associated with specific ancestral “kin regions” (*mata*) composed of a limited number of “territorial kin groups” (*aro*). The Council of Elders’

In the contemporary use of this system, members of ego’s own generation are all named ‘*taina*’: “siblings” and “cousins” are all referred to as *taina*, and gender is unmarked. One’s parents’ generation (-1) is all named ‘*matu’a*’ and gender is sometimes marked as ‘*matu’a vahine*’ for females and ‘*matu’a tane*’ for males. More commonly today, Rapa Nui use ‘*nua*’ (shortened from *nuahine*) to mention females of this generation, and ‘*koro*’ (abbreviated from *korohu’a*) to mention the males. Members of one’s grandparents’ generation as well as any generation older than them (-2) are named ‘*tupuna*’ and gender is sometimes distinguished by the expressions ‘*tupuna vahine*’ for females and ‘*tupuna tane*’ for males, but more often it is not. Similarly, members of this generation in practice are also simply referred to as *koro* or *nua* respectively. The generation of one’s children and those of siblings and “cousins” (+1) are named ‘*poki*’; the generation of one’s children’s children (+2) *hina* or *makupuna*; and the children of this generation (+3) *hinareare*. The second and third generations of children can be marked in terms of gender, but I only heard gender emphasized in terms of children. Rapa Nui kin terms sometimes compete with kinship terms of Spanish. Younger speakers often used Rapa Nui for nuclear family terms and Spanish terms for extended family. For example, members of ego’s own generation all formulated as ‘*taina*’ in Rapa Nui are distinguished as either ‘*taina*’ (siblings), or ‘*primo*’ (cousins); and one’s parents generation retains Rapa Nui ‘*matu’a tane*’ and ‘*matu’a vahine*’ for father and mother respectively (or *koro* and *nua*), while distinguishing uncles in terms of Spanish as ‘*papatio*’ and aunts as ‘*mamatia*’. One’s grandparents are accordingly distinguished as ‘*tupuna tane*’ and ‘*tupuna vahine*’ respectively, while terms that combine Rapa Nui and Chilean Spanish, *paparu’au* and *mamaru’au*, are used for grand uncles and grand aunts.
text thus broadly accords with prior anthropological research that classifies ancestral Rapa Nui kinship as patrilineal (McCall 1976: 29).

Pragmatically, Rapa Nui position themselves epistemologically and socially as members of huaʻai depending upon how they answer the question ‘ ’A ai koe? ’. Rapa Nui elders often address themselves to Rapa Nui issues—ancestral, historical, or contemporary—in the context of short or complex hakaara. On a number of occasions, when I first met elder Rapa Nui, after a bit of small talk, the person would establish their identity to me in terms of a hakaara and discuss the significance of other Rapa Nui in terms of their hakaara. Often, in meetings and conversations, particularly with Rapa Nui in their fifties and older, hakaara were incorporated into talk epistemologically. Like the indigenous epistemology of Kwa’ae Solomon Islanders (Gegeo 2001: 493), Rapa Nui often place themselves by situating themselves genealogically. By doing or noting a hakaara, Rapa Nui analyze issues within a huaʻai framework that legitimates or illegitimates a perspective on some topic. For example, in some of the huaʻai conversations about the Chilean land tenure system analyzed in chapters 7 and 8, hakaara are discussed by the interlocutors as they relate their perspective. Hakaara are not only part of the stories Rapa Nui tell about a particular topic; they are part of the justification for social actions. I was told many times that although official political elections in Rapa Nui appear to be about individuals associated with competing Chilean political parties, Rapa Nui largely voted in terms of hakaara. In other words, one voted for candidates one was related to most closely. While I did not ask the Chilean judge “ ’A ai koe? ” that day—not that he would have understood the question—in this context, to ask the question would make sense to Rapa Nui, particularly elders. As I understood from my island walks and conversations with Rapa Nui, the knowledge he claimed about Rapa Nui culture generally, and particularly various “ceremonial centers” (ahu) that are associated
with specific extended families, would require enculturation within particular hua’ai. As I knew he lacked such enculturation, I knew his knowledge, with respect to these places and general cultural issues in terms of Rapa Nui discourse, was negligible. Similarly, while Edmundo Edwards, a husband of a Rapa Nui and thus in some sense part of a hua’ai, was respected by Rapa Nui as knowledgeable, Rapa Nui I spoke with did not agree that Edmundo, as ultimately Chilean, was authoritative in comparison with actual Rapa Nui. He was considered only a knowledgeable Chilean. Rather than dignifying the judge’s questions and attempt to establish the credibility of Rapa Nui knowledge in terms of Chilean discourse, herein I situate Rapa Nui knowledge in terms of what could be said to be their form of life and regime of truth: hua’ai experience and talk. My representation is reflexively positioned in terms of my experiences as “an adopted person” (he ma’ayja) within one hua’ai, and in my regular associations with six other hua’ai. The majority of my relationships within these hua’ai were predominately with Rapa Nui in their thirties to sixties, and mainly with Rapa Nui in their fifties and sixties. Representations of hua’ai life grounded in different relationships, in associations with other hua’ai, and of other generations of Rapa Nui, no doubt would likely result in an alternative representation. While I have tried to center my account on themes that are likely broadly shared across hua’ai, I suspect hua’ai differ in terms of how they elaborate and negotiate the meaning of these themes.

Te Hoe Manu

The question ‘A ai koe?’ was occasionally posed to me after I had lived in Rapa Nui for some time when I met new Rapa Nui. I could not, as a foreigner, of course answer the question as a Rapa Nui would in terms of a hakaara. Although I generally thought I knew the answer to the question by the last third of my residence on the island, I would never give a direct
answer but would respond with a set of social facts that defined my relationship to the Rapa Nui community, specific hua’ai, and the location of my home. Consequently, I would hope that my interlocutor would provide the answer. Though I had regular interaction with seven hua’ai by the end of my stay in Rapa Nui, and sporadic contact with others, I was principally engaged with members of one hua’ai. Those who asked me the question ‘ ‘A ai koe? ’, after hearing some of the details of my social life on the island, would generally say “A Huke” or “A koe he Huke”. Rapa Nui came to identify me as an adopted member of a particular Huke hua’ai; namely, the Huke Atan hua’ai. Herein I adumbrate some of the meaning of life within the hua’ai Huke Atan by reflecting upon my experiences within and near it as “an adopted hua’ai member” (he taŋata ma’anya), and narratives of hua’ai members.

While I do not know all of their names, as I understand it, each of the residential sections circumscribing and permeating the town of Haŋa Roa are named as particular aro. As in ancestral times, different hua’ai live near one another within a contemporary aro; in contrast to the ancestral era, aro are not currently further grouped into “clans” (mata) or one of the two ancient “tribes” (mata nui). Following approximately three months of stay in Hotel Topa Ra’a as aforementioned, I moved into a home Rapa Nui would call a paepae as distinguished from a “house” (hare) in the “residential section” (aro) outside the main town of Haŋa Roa that Rapa Nui call Te Hoe Manu. Te Hoe Manu begins just above the artisanal market near the Catholic Church where many of the descendants of the Tuki Pakarati hua’ai reside, and lies above the aro of Tahai where many descendants of the Tuki Tepano hua’ai live. The dirt road leading through Te Hoe Manu from the town of Haŋa Roa to Tahai was trafficked equally by pedestrians, horse riders, motor cycles, bicyclists, taxis and cars. At the end of the ascending road to Te Hoe Manu from the artisanal market returning to Tahai live many of the descendants of the Huke Atan
hua’ai. I rented my paepae from a man approximately my age (37-38 during my stay) who had previous called the paepae his home: Matuṇa Tuki Huke—a “nephew” (poki) of Piru—who was in the process of building a hare beside his paepae. While the distinction between a paepae and a “house” (hare), in my mind blurs sometimes, generally a paepae is smaller than a hare and lacks a permanent foundation. A hare has some permanent foundation built partially with Rapa Nui stone materials or Chilean materials. The majority of the homes of Huke Atan in Te Hoe Manu were hare that had Rapa Nui stone foundations. My paepae consisted of a single room that was semi-partitioned into a bathroom, bedroom, and kitchen through the use of drapery. Though water was interrupted at least once a month—sometimes three or four times—for a few hours to days as a result of water management decisions or mistakes by the Chilean government, generally the home included running water that was accessible from the kitchen, shower, or “bathroom” sink. In theory, I had hot water; however, the hot water heater malfunctioned most of the year and for the final five months I endured with cold water. Like the water, the electricity was interrupted at least once a month and for similarly variable periods of time, yet generally the paepae was powered by electricity. A natural gas container purchased in three-to-four month supplies fueled the two burner portable stove that I used to cook food and heat the water when possible. Food was stored in a small refrigerator. Clothes were either washed by hand and hung to dry, or washed in town for me by a laundry service in Haŋa Roa—I was considered “quite lazy” (hupehupe roa) for using this service, but I endured the ridicule regularly so I could engage in other tasks I deemed more important. Contemporary Rapa Nui hare typically had full-size refrigerators, a four-burner permanent stove with an oven, and a washing machine. Rapa Nui generally line dried their clothing near the home. Excluding one French ex-patriot up the road, my immediate neighbors were descendants of the Huke Atan hua’ai.
Most of my daily life in *Te Hoe Manu* revolved around social interaction with people descended from the Huke Atan *hua’ai*. And some Huke Atan lived in other *aro*: Piru lived in *Vai Tō Iri* as discussed in chapter 3, and the eldest in the family, Elvira Huke Atan lived in an *aro* named *Apina Tupuna* with her children and their children. In addition to Piru and Petero Huke Atan, I spent significant time with their siblings Joel and Blanka, as well as their “nephew” Ioni Tuki Huke—the elder “brother” (*taina*) of Matuŋa. I also associated with members of other *hua’ai* along the roads to and from these *aro*. Within or near *Te Hoe Manu*, I regularly visited with descendants of various Tuki, Tepano, Teave, and Pakarati *hua’ai*. In *Te Hoe Manu*, the economic life of men and women was primarily embedded in the tourist industry; however, some *hua’ai* members were also employed as educators in the schools, health care workers in the hospital, or within one of the various Chilean government offices and organizations. Some of the tourist work revolved around the *aro* called *Apina Tupuna* where Elvira Huke Atan, the “mother” (*matu’a vahine*) of Matuŋa operated a small tourist inn nearby *Pea* beach. *Hua’ai* members also did work for other inns and hotels and acquired work as tourist guides for various agencies in Rapa Nui. Within *Te Hoe Manu* men often worked in the tourist industry as carvers of *moai* replicas or various other carved art forms of Rapa Nui heritage. The men were master carvers of wood and stone whose carvings not only included tourist replicas, but sculpture exhibited in contemporary Rapa Nui art shows; for example, the exhibit entitled *He Rarama Maramarama* at the Sebastian Englert Museum in *Hāŋa Roa* the month of July 2008 and reportedly later in Chilean museums. Four of the ten artists featured in the exhibit were descendants of the Huke Atan *hua’ai*. For approximately four months, Ioni Tuki Huke personally taught me how to carve stone *moai* replicas and allowed me to observe him carving various works of wood and stone inspired by or modeled upon objects and concepts of his Rapa Nui
heritage. Though Ioni could create a few medium size *moai* replicas a day, I was only able to produce about a half dozen, with his help, during these months—my final months on the island.

Ioni’s “housing area” (*kona hare*) is situated among the homes of his “aunts” and “uncles” (*te matu’a o Ioni*). Like that of his “uncle” Petero Huke Atan nearby, Ioni’s *kona hare* consists of a “sleeping house” (*hare moe*), a “cooking house” (*hare ta’o*), a “carving house” (*hare tarai*), and a small plot of land for crops. All of these homes are built upon the land of Ioni’s mother’s parents: the late Taŋaroa Huke Pakarati and Maria Apurotu Atan Tapihi whose former home lies in front of Ioni’s home. Eight of the twelve children of Taŋaroa and Maria live nearby Ioni, though all twelve have acquired land in *Te Hoe Manu* as descendants of Taŋaroa and Maria. Beside the homes of these descendants are increasingly found homes of their children. On any given day, up to five generations could be found at Ioni’s *kona hare: tupuna, matu’a, poki, hina*, and *hinarere*. *Hua’ai* members and friends gathered throughout the day at Ioni’s *kona hare* either for brief or extended visits. Food and conversation was shared as Ioni, *hua’ai* members, and I carved in front of the home or within the *hare tarai* as children amused themselves in various forms of play. Sometimes the food shared was brought to the home by me or visiting relatives, and other times Ioni hosted with fish he caught or food he purchased. Conversation flowed around carving techniques and materials, to contemporary local and global politics and history, social problems in Rapa Nui, and ancestral knowledge and stories. As noted in the prior chapter, though Chilean Spanish occasionally found its way into talks in *Te Hoe Manu* the majority of talk was in relatively unmixed Rapa Nui and *vānaga titika*, not “Syncretic Rapa Nui” or Chilean Spanish. Generally, I engaged in discussions strictly in Rapa Nui. For the adult and elder Huke Atan and some of their descendants, Rapa Nui was clearly their first language. This was most evident in their preparation of Chilean Spanish documents written in *Te*
for cultural organizations, festivals, and socio-political organization. Ideas were
discussed first among adults and elders in Rapa Nui; consequently, they were translated into
Chilean Spanish by members considered best in Spanish. Formal meetings of extended family
members, held regularly to discuss various family and socio-political issues, were conducted
always in Rapa Nui. Interestingly, French and German competed with Chilean Spanish as their
second language. If members wanted to exclude me from a discussion they shifted to French;
however, hua’ai members generally included me in discussions.

The following narrative of Blanka Huke Atan, a woman in her late fifties, can perhaps
begin to illuminate some of the meaning of the hua’ai to its members. The narrative was given in
response to my informal question “What is the story of your family?” (He aha te ‘a’amu o tu’u
hua’ai?). The conversation took place in Te Hoe Manu at an extended family gathering. As this
narrative suggests, conversations at the gathering were coded principally in Rapa Nui. The
number of people present varied from thirty to fifty people. Prior to the transcription of this
narrative in situ, Blanka and I had been engaged in small talk, but our discussion had not been
principally concerned with her genealogy or its regime of truth. Upon hearing this question,
Blanka instructed me to write down her answer; a practice Piru—her “sister” (taina)—had long
incorporated into my life within the hua’ai when topics addressed were considered important for
me to understand in detail. “The story of Blanka” (Te ‘a’amu o Blanka):

He ‘a’amu o te hua’ai Huke Atan: te tupuna tane Taŋaroa Huke Pakarati, te
tupuna vahine Maria Apurotu Atan Tepihi. A Taŋaroa ararua Maria Apurotu te hua’ai nei
i te kaiŋa nei; ko Te Hoe Manu te iŋoa. Te parau apī o te mahana nei, takataka o te
hua’ai; he makupuna o te ŋa pokī a Taŋaroa. E reka ‘ā, e koa ‘ā o te rāua hei hakaou i te
kaiŋa o te hare tupuna. Te aŋa a Taŋaroa ararua ko Maria Apurotu e hāpī i te me’e o
tetere tupuna ki te rāua ŋa pokī, ki te rāua makupuna. Tetere ra o te tupuna i hakatikea
The story of the Huke Atan family: the grandfather is Taŋaroa Huke Pakarati, the grandmother is Maria Apurotu Atan Tepihi. Of Taŋaroa and Maria Apurotu this family at this land; it’s named Te Hoe Manu. The news today is that the family has gathered; grandchildren of the children of Taŋaroa. Fun and happiness persists because their garland returns again to their home. The work of Taŋaroa and Maria Apurotu is teaching the ways of the ancestors to their children, to their grandchildren. The ways of the ancestors were shown to them by their mother and father. That is, the ways of the ancestors of the kin area of Taŋaroa of Tupa Hotu Rikiriki, of the kin area of Hotu iti. The second kin area is that of Maria Apurotu of the Miru Koro Oroŋo. These are mata of the family. From this knowledge they taught us ancestral agriculture, ancestral chant/dance, and ancestral songs. From Te Hoe Manu came forth the loincloth, ancestral war chant/dance, the ancestral songs, the talk, the ancestral culture. They are living examples of the life of the ancient ancestors.

Though I did not ask her about “genealogy” (hakaara) explicitly with my question or during our prior conversation, Blanka’s answer to my question utilizes hakaara twice and illustrates the aforementioned epistemological use of genealogy among Rapa Nui.

Blanka begins the story by providing a condensed hakaara. Importantly, at the beginning of her “story of the Huke Atan family” (te ‘a’amu o te hua’ai Huke Atan) she is implicitly answering the aforementioned critical question of Rapa Nui ‘ ’I hē koe? ’. She places our discussion within the context of the gathering of the hua’ai at the former home of Taŋaroa and Maria in Te Hoe Manu (A Taŋaroa ararua Maria Apurotu te hua’ai nei i te kaiŋa nei. Ko Te Hoe Manu te iŋoa). Blanka’s hakaara formulates the story of her family in both of the ways
represented by the Council of Elders text. In terms of Chilean discourse, she tells a story about her family by briefly tracing her mother’s patrilineal ancestry and her father’s patrilineal ancestry. The narrative discusses the ancestry of those with the surname of the father’s father—Huke and those with the surname of the mother’s father—Atan. The lineage of Taŋaroa’s mother’s father—Pakarati is not traced to an ancestral kin region (mata); nor is that of Maria’s mother’s father—Tepihi. Moreover, Blanka is silent regarding the names of their mothers’ mothers. In terms of Rapa Nui discourse, Blanka locates the ancestry of both patrilineages within ancestral “clans” (mata). Supporting McCall’s patrilineal interpretation of Rapa Nui kinship, Blanka formulates herself, her siblings (taina), their children (poki), and their grandchildren (makupuna) as descendants of Taŋaroa, not Taŋaroa and Maria. She states, “The news today is that the family has gathered; grandchildren of the children of Taŋaroa” (Te parau apī o te mahana nei, takataka o te hua’ai; he makupuna o te ŋa pokī a Taŋaroa). Though the Chilean double surname ‘Huke Atan’ formally suggests hua’ai members are equally Atan and Huke, Blanka clearly centers her kinship identity in terms of descent from Taŋaroa.

Attention to narrative details also reveals that Rapa Nui kinship is linked to Rapa Nui worldview; it is signified by the way Blanka names her late parents Taŋaroa and Maria. After noting that this narrative is “a story” (He ‘a’amū) of the “Huke Atan extended family” (te hua’ai Huke Atan) she clarifies that this is a story of “the grandfather Taŋaroa Huke Pakarati” (te tupuna tane Taŋaroa Huke Pakarati) and “the grandmother Maria Apurotu Atan Tepihi” (te tupuna vahine Maria Apurotu Atan Tepihi). Interestingly, while the above kinship terminology would suggest that Blanka should refer to her parents by the term ‘matu’a’ or ‘nua’ and ‘koro’ herein she represents both of them by the kinship term ‘tupuna’. I believe this is not an error, but that her selection of this form of “person reference” (Stivers, Enfield, Levinson 2007)
demonstrates that Blanka’s story and interpretation of her Rapa Nui kinship is not simply about “genealogy” in a secular Western sense. As was evident in my completion of the Umu Tahu ceremony in chapter 2, and Piru’s narrative at Tahai in chapter 3, Rapa Nui do not exclude ancestors from the living world once they “die” (mate). During the Umu Tahu Rapa Nui tupuna were my metaphysical interlocutors, and Piru thanked tupuna for her visions along the coast of Tahai. Blanka poetically formulates the gathering as circumscribed by her tupuna Maria and Taŋaroa. They are imagined as forming a “garland” (hei) around the gathering. The presence of the tupuna is not lamented or feared as a haunting of “ghosts” as Westerners tend to conceive ancestors within the present. From Blanka’s perspective, the ancestral garland is “fun” (reka) and “happy” (koa). Blanka clearly finds happiness in the metaphysical presence of her tupuna at the gathering.

After establishing the spiritual context of our narrative place, she proceeds to discuss the work of her parents. Her account is epistemologically centered upon their relationship to her hua’ai, not their professional roles within “Easter Island”. Though Taŋaroa had employment as a manager with the sheep ranching company that controlled the island in the early twentieth century, a coveted job for Rapa Nui, this is not the job she concerns herself with in telling her story. Her narrative focus is the work he did with his wife; specifically, that involved in teaching the ways of their ancestors to his children and grandchildren (Te aŋa a Taŋaroa ararua ko Maria Apurotu e hāpī i te me’e o tetere tupuna ki te rāua ŋa pokī, ki te rāua makupuna). It is work her use of the imperfect preverbal aspect marker ‘e’ before the verb ‘hāpī’ (“to teach/study/learn”) indicates is ongoing. In other words, their work, for Blanka, continues to teach the members of the hua’ai. Prior to elaborating the details of what specifically her parents taught, and are

49 The preverbal imperfective aspect particle ‘e’ principally marks an activity as incomplete (Weber 1988: 17).
teaching, she again involves herself in “genealogy” (hakaara). She traces the knowledge of her parents to their ancestors. What her parents taught is formulated as descended from two ancestral residential areas of Rapa Nui: those of Tupa Hotu Riki Riki and Miru Koro Orono (Tetere ra o te tupuna i hakatikea mai ai e nua ‘e koro. Peinei tetere ra’ā o te tupuna o te aro o Taŋaroa Tupu Hotu Riki Riki, o te aro era Ko Hotu Iti. Te rua aro o tetere ra’ā o Maria Apurotu o te Miru Koro Orono). Blanka identifies Tupa Hotu Riki Riki and Miru Koro Orono as the “clans” (mata) of her “extended family” (He mata o te hua’ai). She accounts for the practices and knowledge taught by her parents—knowledge of ancestral agriculture (keukeu henua), loincloth (hami), ancestral chant/dance (hoko), ancestral song (himene), language/discourse (vānaŋa), and culture (cultura tupuna)—by tracing the knowledge to her parents’ acquisition of knowledge of their ancestral ways of life among Tupa Hotu Riki Riki and Miru Koro Orono. The practices and things that are examples of ancestral ways of life (Te ha’aura’a he orara’ā o te tupuna matamu’a) her parents taught at their home in Te Hoe Manu, (Mai Te Hoe Manu i e’a mai ai te hami, te hoko, te himene tupuna, te vanaŋa, he cultura tupuna. Te ha’aura’a he ora ra’ā o te tupuna matamu’a.), are, for Blanka, things they knew as descendants of these “clans” (mata).

Blanka’s use of “genealogy” (hakaara) in this narrative is strongly epistemological. Truth, for Blanka, is dialogically based upon education from Taŋaroa and Maria, and their descent from particular “clans” (mata)—particularly the lineage traced through Taŋaroa. Blanka approaches epistemology in a way similar to how the philosopher Wittgenstein ultimately managed epistemology: sociologically. Eschewing the ultimately Cartesian rationalism of Logical Atomism (Russell 1985: 39), Wittgenstein defended what has been called a “social solidarity conception of truth” (Rorty 1991). For example, he argued that there is no absolute foundation of mathematical truths, such as those expressed in multiplication tables;
multiplication, for Wittgenstein, can only be accounted for by describing the social form of life in which it was known to be true. In the end, analysis only reveals that multiplication is something learned as a form of life (Wittgenstein 2001: 193). Blanka concludes her narrative of her hua’ai discussing the origins of “loincloth” (hami), “songs” (himene), “chants/dances” (hoko), “language/discourse” (vānaŋa), and culture of the ancestral ways of life (cultura tupuna). She considers these “living examples of the life of the ancient ancestors” (Te hā’aura’a he orara’o te tupuna matamu’a). Blanka knows about these things, in the end analysis, as things she learned as an “extended family” (hua’ai) member. Like Wittgenstein encouraged, Blanka legitimates her knowledge of these things by describing their relationship to her hua’ai form of life. Answering the question ‘A ai koe? in terms of “genealogy” (hakaara) is thus not only a way of establishing one’s kinship identity, it is a cultural practice that is “potentially” (Sapir 1970: 151) both a metaphysical and epistemological foundation of Rapa Nui life.

He Me’e Here

Rapa Nui hua’ai also provide members with many of their social values. One evening in the “residential area” (aro) of Tahai seaward and below Te Hoe Manu after dinner, amidst casual conversations oriented towards my studies, I asked an “elder” tupuna of the Tuki Tepano hua’ai “He aha te hā’aura’a o te hua’ai?” (“What is the significance/meaning of [Rapa Nui] extended family?” Or “What is an example of extended family life?”) With no delay the man responded definitively, “He me’e here!” Unfortunately our unrecorded conversation quickly shifted to other topics and ultimately I was not able to ask him to elaborate his answer. His answer however, was one I considered regularly as I participated in hua’ai life in Te Hoe Manu and elsewhere in Rapa Nui. The word ‘here’ is usually translated as “to tie”. Rapa Nui occasionally instructed me to tie something down with the command “Ka here koe!” (Tie [it] you [pointing to something]). To
hear the use of ‘here’ did not initially make sense to me. I would have expected to hear something like “aroha” which is the cognate of the Hawaiian word ‘aloha’ often translated “love”. I asked one of my Rapa Nui teachers of another hua’ai who sometimes helped me with English translations—Vaihere Tuki Haoa—if the use of ‘here’ had anything to do with “love” and she said that it did, but that the English word was not a great translation. She also emphasized that “love” was not a great translation for “aroha” either. She suggested though that if I attended to the some of the nuanced use of that term I could resolve my confusion.

Reflection on use of “aroha” initially only amplified my puzzlement; however, social interactions within Te Hoe Manu did ultimately dispel my confusion. Rapa Nui ‘aroha’ competes with another Rapa Nui greeting: the word ‘ ‘Iorana’ borrowed from the Tahitian word ‘ ‘Iāorana’. The Tahitian word is technically an abbreviation of the Tahitian command ‘Iā ora na’ translated as “May you live”, but it is understood popularly among tourists in Tahiti and Rapa Nui as “hello” or “goodbye” similar to the popular foreign sense of Hawaiian ‘aloha’. Hawaiian ‘aloha’, Tahitian ‘ ‘Iāorana’, and Rapa Nui ‘ ‘Iorana’ are understood in terms of their respective tourist discourses as ambiguous words given that they could mean hello or goodbye in a context of address. The translation of course ethnocentrically assumes that English mirrors reality and finds the Hawaiian distorted since it does not correspond to the true mirror of reality: English. Initially, I considered the Rapa Nui word ‘Iorana’ also ambiguous, yet I used it to greet and close in Te Hoe Manu and throughout Rapa Nui. Over time I learned that I overused it. As I continued to live in Te Hoe Manu my use of Iorana to hua’ai members was often repaired with “Aroha” or “Aroha nui” (“great/big love”). The explanation that I eventually acquired indeed disabused me of much of my initial confusion regarding the word ‘here’. I was told that I was to address hua’ai members with ‘aroha’ as I lived within this hua’ai because
family members greeted each other with affection and love. The greetings ‘aroha’ or ‘aroha nui’ signified that one greeted someone with love and affection while the greeting ‘Iorana’ did not. One greeted fellow hua’ai members with love and affection because one was bonded—tied—to them; and used ‘aroha’ to create or reaffirm that relationship. Rapa Nui use the word ‘aroha’ to accomplish and reinforce the ties of love that constitute a hua’ai. In other words, the use of such a greeting, like Samoan respect discourse, does not ‘…simply reflect a taken for granted world but helps to constitute that world by defining relations between speaker, hearer, referents, and social activities’ (Duranti 1997: 80). My over use of the greeting ‘Iorana’ from the perspective of Te Hoe Manu, was undermining my membership within the hua’ai; it constructed our relationship to not be one of extended family.

While the elder man of the Tuki Tepano hua’ai who formulated the meaning of hua’ai in terms of here did not discuss it, the notion of a hua’ai as he me’e here articulated strongly with an injunction I occasionally heard within the Huke Atan hua’ai: “Don’t cut things up into pieces!” (‘Ina koe ko horehore). This expression was often articulated in hua’ai discussions over collective resources. In discussions I recall with Piru about the notion of horehore, she explained that the “idea” (mana’u) was that cutting things up led to a weakened whole as members then were likely to fight over the best pieces or for bigger pieces. Instead of horehore, elders promoted the notion of “together as one” (Hokotahi nō!). Interestingly, this philosophy, as well as that of the elder Tuki Tepano was often manifest to me in the daily life of the Huke Atan hua’ai. This philosophy also accords with the structural sense of the ancestral Rapa Nui kinship system. Rather than cutting the members of a generation to pieces, the system ties them together by one term. As I participated in daily life as an “adopted man” (taŋata ma’aŋa) of the hua’ai,
this philosophy of love and togetherness appeared repeatedly in such practices as childcare, house construction, and food sharing.

Rapa Nui childcare around Te Hoe Manu, Apina Tupuna, and Vai Tō Iri, though influenced by the Chilean and Pascuense kinship systems adumbrated above, was epistemologically centered upon principles of Rapa Nui discourse. The childcare I witnessed was distributed among hua’ai members in broadly generational terms and according to values of Hokotahi nō and here. This was most transparent in the care of a child I will call “E”. “E” was in a sense the star of her hua’ai: she was one of only two great grandchildren (hinare) of the hua’ai and the only one living in the residential area. The father of “E” was never discussed and to my knowledge did not contribute any child care. While the principle caregivers appeared to be her “mother” (nua), the “grandparents” (tupuna), and “uncles and aunts” (matu’a), care of “E” was also broadly shared within the hua’ai. Moreover, hua’ai members often competed to have the privilege of caring for “E”. Typically, “E” would be cared for by different hua’ai members throughout the day. As I participated in her daily life, “great great aunts” tupuna vahine would repeatedly stop by and ask “Where is the great grand daughter? (‘I hē te hinare?”). These tupuna of “E”, “great grand aunts” of “E”, did not treat her as someone else’s hinare. She was not considered a hinare of a particular nuclear family as the Pascuense or Chilean discourse genre would suggest. “E”, for these tupuna, was all of their hinare. Often one tupuna would come just as another had taken “E” to learn and play with another. The focus of childcare between “E” and the tupuna was Rapa Nui language and culture acquisition. Tupuna taught her Rapa Nui words and statements, Rapa Nui “song” (himene), “string story-telling” (kaikai), and “necklace construction” (hui korone). Often tupuna taught “E” and other children of the hua’ai together, and the children were instructed to help one another learn whatever task was at hand.
Upon the return of “E” from visiting with one tupuna or matu’a another would come to take her again. On any given day it was common to see primary care of “E” shift two to four times throughout the day. The mother of “E” was a part of a hua’ai tapestry that cared for her. Responsibility of “E” was not something “cut up into pieces” (he me’e horehore) in which the “mother” was responsible for the biggest piece. Childcare was “shared” (hokotahi nō): the relatives of “E” worked together “to tie” (here) “E” with the love and support of their hua’ai.

Children were not the only one’s cared for in terms of the ancestral kinship system; adults cared for one another and tupuna as well. I noted this in particular during the fabrications of two houses during my stay. Generally, there are two kinds of houses built in Rapa Nui: subsidized houses designed, financed, and organized by the Chilean government; and houses acquired, constructed, designed, and organized by Rapa Nui knowledge and hua’ai labor. To receive the materials and financing for a subsidiary house, one must acquire the “Titulo Dominio” or “individual title” (Te Parau Henua) from the government for the parcel of land the house is built upon. Titles can be acquired principally three ways: one registers land acquired by hua’ai relations with the Chilean government as one’s individual property; one purchases the “Titulo Dominio” from another Rapa Nui; or one receives a “Titulo Dominio” from the Chilean government following successful government petition for land. Both homes I observed and participated in constructing were built on land acquired from hua’ai relations, not by cash payments or government petition. At the time of construction, neither home was built on land registered with the government by a “Titulo Dominio”; the houses were being built upon lands the hua’ai recognized as theirs within the Haŋa Roa colonial settlement.

The new houses were built adjacent to houses of other hua’ai members as the “extended family” had done in Te Hoe Manu for over a hundred years. They were constructed from
primarily Rapa Nui stone and wood materials, not prefabricated housing materials subsidized by the government. Both homes were constructed by significant help from hua’ai members. Assistance came in various forms: labor, construction materials, food, and shelter. Those building the houses principally slept in tents besides their homes as the construction proceeded. When inclement weather developed they slept at the homes of relatives. Hua’ai members from adjacent houses as well as more distant areas regularly lent a hand with construction itself and helped prepare food for those building the houses. Construction at both sites was done primarily by male hua’ai members; a practice McCall noted as traditional during his initial field work in the 1970s (McCall 1976: 115). Women helped by preparing and cleaning up food provided for workers, organizing work materials, and cleaning up construction processes. Construction was organized principally in terms of Rapa Nui language. Interestingly, many of the non-Rapa Nui materials like concrete and tin roofing, for example, incorporated into the house construction had Rapa Nui names; puŋa and raparapa, respectively. Some of the building techniques however with stones were potentially quite old traditional methods. At one site I learned how to build a house foundation of stones by a method called titi vaka ure, as opposed to titi kaukau. With the former, one lays down a row of stones of smaller size in the middle and then a medium size rocks on the sides. One is to stack level so that the sides and middle get built up at the same time. With titi kaukau one simply stacks the sides up with no middle layer of smaller rocks. Whether building with such traditional techniques or incorporating modern technology like electricity or concrete, both homes were developed with a sense of pride that they were constructed with hua’ai knowledge and labor, and upon hua’ai land independently of Chilean government interests and rules.
Both homes were built by hua’ai members who had been previously living in French Polynesia. The following short narrative illuminates some of the rationale for returning:

A au he poki a Taŋaroa ararua Maria. Mo rāua me’e ra’e mo hapa’o ‘e mo hā’ū’ū te henua, te hua’ai, te nu’u Rapa Nui. ’Ai Te Hoe Manu, puai nō te hua’ai ’i ruŋa o te tereiŋa o te vi’e, te taŋata, te poki. ‘Ititi nō te me’e Mauku mo hā’ū’ū, mo hapa’o. Ta’e tano, me’e rakerake. He hoki a au mo hapa’o te henua, te hua’ai, te nu’u Rapa Nui.

I am a child of Taŋaroa and Maria. For them, the first thing is to care for, and to help the island, the “extended family”, and the Rapa Nui people. At Te Hoe Manu the way of “extended family” way of life upon the women, men, and children is strong. The help and care of the Chileans (Mauku) is minimal. This is immoral; a bad thing. I have returned to care for the island, the extended family, and the Rapa Nui people.

The narrative is an answer to my question “Why did you return to Rapa Nui?” (Mo aha a koe i hoki mai ki Rapa Nui?). It was transcribed in situ in the context of casual conversation about various issues in Rapa Nui. As with Blanka’s story of the hua’ai, this one begins genealogically and expresses similar themes. However, this narrative is more explicitly political than the story of Blanka.

Like Blanka’s genealogy, this one is not used strictly to mark kinship identity. Genealogy is used in the context of a moral and political explanation for returning to Rapa Nui. The ethics and politics of returning are articulated in terms of particular membership categories. Like the selective use of Thai kinship terms in conversation (Bilmes 2009), the Rapa Nui kinship terms chosen herein are used to tell a particular kind of story. While a contemporary American might identify themselves professionally, the individual’s identity is formulated in kinship terms by the indefinite description “a child of Taŋaroa and Maria” (he poki a Taŋaroa and Maria). The individual accounts for certain values in a way that resembles Blanka’s explanation of
“loincloth” (hami), “songs” (himene), “chants/dances” (hoko), and “language/discourse” (vānāŋa). The individual emphasizes having acquired particular ecological, cultural, and social values—namely, caring for the island, extended family, and fellow Rapa Nui—as a member of a particular huaʻai which is located at a particular named place: Te Hoe Manu. These values are emphasized as “especially strong” (puai nō) because they are values taught by the parents Taŋaroa and Maria.

The category used to mention Chileans is also used to tell a moral and political story. To refer to Chileans by the metaphor “grass” (mauku) is to dialogically engage with one of the most important cultural memories of Rapa Nui. The Rapa Nui story of Chileans as mauku is the Rapa Nui story of annexation to Chile in 1888. One representation of this story is as follows:

…the Rapanui heads of family in 1888 signed an official [annexation] document in an elaborate ceremony in front of the tiny Hangaroa Church. The only provisio to the treaty was demonstrated in mime by the King, Tekana, for his erstwhile protectors: wrenching up a handful of grass, he gave that to Toro, but the earth clinging to the roots he thrust into his own pocket. The meaning was clear to Tekana and the other Rapanui who witnessed the treaty that day: the Chileans could have the use of the island for their livestock, but the land itself remained the property of the Rapanui (McCall 1994: 169).

Since annexation, Rapa Nui sometimes refer to Chileans as “grass” (mauku). By recontextualizing Chileans as mauku, Rapa Nui represent Chileans in explicitly political rather than mere ethnic terms. The mauku are also demeaned in moral terms. The care and help of the mauku is predicated as comparatively “small” (itiiti) in contrast to the care and help promoted by the parents Taŋaroa and Maria. The spare amount of state help is characterized as “immoral” (taʻe tano) and “bad” (rakerake). The individual maintains it was critical to return to Rapa Nui and help his island, family, and people and combat the immoral neglect of the Chile state. Ultimately, the explanation for the decision is represented as simply heeding the philosophy of the parents. It is what has to be done as “a child of Taŋaroa and Maria” (he poki a Taŋaroa ararua Maria).
Apina Tupuna

The values I encountered in daily life around Te Hoe Manu were also expressed at Apina Tupuna; a hub of both tourist and hua’ai life. Elvira, the “first born leader” (atariki) of the hua’ai, resided there at her inn also named Apina Tupuna. Two of her own children lived beside her in their own homes with their spouses and children, and often “children” (poki) and “grandchildren” (hina) of the huai’ai stayed at the inn. On any given day there were typically a few poki, and hina staying in the inn and helping out with the various tasks related to managing the inn. On weekends, and especially Sundays, many hua’ai members would gather at Apina Tupuna. The following narrative of Piru illuminates some aspects of life at Apina Tupuna in the context of a Sunday gathering. “The story of Piru” (te ‘a’amu a Piru):

Tā’aku aŋa ra’e o aŋarina he mahana tāpati. He tu’u mai a a u k i Apina Ruŋa ki a Pua nei. Ko noho mai ana, e aŋa ‘ā nua. He hāpī koe i te ōro i te tarake mo aŋa o te mātou kai. Te kai o te hare o Pua o te mahana nei he tarake, he tarake oro mo tunu ‘i roto i te pani mo te ahiahi. He umita i te vānaŋa hiva; he tarake ōro i te vānaŋa Rapa Nui. He to’o mai koe i te tarake he ōro. Ki oti he ano’i hai kiko oru katahi. He oho hakaou mai te rua maretī. He tarake ōro, he ano’i hai tiohta mo te tarake nene. ‘I aŋarina erua huru o te kai: kai nene ‘e kai miti. He oho a a u k i te rito maika hore mai mo aŋa o mātou po’e tarake. Ko takataka ‘ana te hua’ai o Pua i a ia nei. Paurō te mahana ararua e piri nei i Apina Ruŋa. Peira te tere o te hua’ai o te Rapa Nui, ‘e hakatere nei i te rāua kaiŋa. I aŋarina he mahana koa. I aŋarina he mahana poreko o “K”. Ko tu’u mai ana te pia i te koro nei ko Akterama. Ko pakakina ‘ā te reka hakaou. He puru koe i te puka i te hora nei.

My first job today, Sunday. I have come to Apina Ruŋa to Pua. [We] are residing here; nua [Piru] is working. You will study grating corn to make our food. The food of Pua’s house today is corn, grated corn to cook in the pan this evening. You will get the corn and grate it. When that is done, first mix pork meat [with the grated corn]. Also get a second plate, grated corn, and mix it with sugar for sweet corn. Today there are two
kinds of food: sweet and salty. I am going to cut off banana leaves to make the corn po’e [dessert bread]. The family has gathered at Pua here. All the days, together we meet at Apina Ruŋa. This is the way of life of the Rapa Nui family. [Rapa Nui family] is driving their land. Today is a happy day. Today is the birthday of “K”. The beer has arrived because of elder Akterama [he brought it]. More fun times are popping. You close the book now.

The narrative expresses Piru’s understanding of a day at Pua’s home at Apina Ruŋa—a residential area immediately behind her mother’s inn at Apina Tupuna.

Somewhat contradictorily, Piru formulates the day as both special and typical. She represents the event as a special day by noting that it is a particularly “happy day” (mahana koa) because it is the “birthday of K” (he mahana poreko o “K”). The majority of the narrative discusses how work is to be organized to prepare a birthday feast for “K”. While Piru only notes two jobs in the narrative, in the actual scene everyone but “K” was working to make the meal. It was based upon an indigenous Chilean food called ‘umita’ that consists of grated corn formed into tamales laden with a meat filling. The first person Piru mentions as having a job is me. As a man temporarily adopted into the hua’ai (he taŋata ma’aŋa), I am put to work just like any other member. Recognizing that I am there also to study, Piru combines the two tasks and tells me that I will be “studying grating corn to make our food” (He hāpī koe i te ōro i te tarake mo aŋa o te mātou kai.). She then tells me how to assist the others make “two types” (erua huru) of umita: “sweet” (kai nene) and “salty” (kai miti). I was to grate the corn while she prepared the “corn cake” (po’e tarake). Eating Chilean food was unusual. Typically, the food eaten around Apina Tupuna was prepared in a Rapa Nui style; e.g. fish grilled upon wood burning fires in front of the homes. Piru does not explicitly assert that eating umita is unusual; however, from my
experiences the meal was unique. It was a meal I never ate again within the hua’ai or in Rapa Nui generally.

While the day is represented as a special day, Piru’s use of language also constructs the event as equally something “ordinary” (Sacks 1984). Though she has established the day as a special birthday, she marks it as ordinary in part by her use of the phrase “all the days” (paurō te mahana). She equates the special birthday to any other day. She avers that, “All the days, together we meet at Apina Ruŋa” (Paurō te mahana ararua e piri nei i Apina Ruŋa). Indeed while this day involved a larger gathering and more food than an average day at Apina Ruŋa or Apina Tupuna, hua’ai members regularly gathered there to converse, eat, drink, and have fun. I spent many days—particularly Sundays—with hua’ai members and friends gathered at Pua’s home in Apina Ruŋa or in front of her mother’s tourist inn at Apina Tupuna relaxing, conversing, and eating. Interestingly, while the food was new to me and unusual, Piru regularizes it by noting its Rapa Nui name, ‘tarake ōro’, in addition to its Chilean name. While umita is a kind of Chilean food, naming it in Rapa Nui terms in part transforms it into another hua’ai food.

The umita is remade into Rapa Nui food not only through the use of language, but given its production and consumption by hua’ai forms of life. This is evident in kinship structures and sharing practices articulating in the birthday. The celebration is not focused around a kinship identity common to Western cultures, but a Polynesian form I am familiar with in Hawai’i in the case of “hanai relationships”. “K” is a young man and son of a woman who has an “adopted” (poki ma’aŋa) relationship to the Huke Atan hua’ai. “K”, also considered a poki ma’aŋa to the Huke Atan, like other hua’ai members, is fully incorporated into hua’ai life. “K”, biologically unrelated to the hua’ai, is celebrated as a poki of the hua’ai like any other poki of his generation. Like biological descendants of the hua’ai, “K” receives “great love” (aroha nui) on his day of
birth from his *hua’ai* in the form of a party that further “ties him” (*here*) to its members. He is not treated with *hore* and given a smaller piece of *aroha*. Many of the *taina*, *matu’a*, *tupuna* and the *poki* of the *hua’ai* have come to honor and participate in this day. Some have brought “meat” (*kiko*), others “corn” (*tarake*), “beer” (*pia*), and other food and drink to contribute to the party. Those that do not have food to contribute provided their labor. Piru also represents the event as ordinary by in part equating her *hua’ai* to other *hua’ai* on the island. While the house builder mentioned above distinguished the Huke Atan *hua’ai* as particularly strong (*puai nō*) compared to other *hua’ai*, herein Piru normalizes it. She starts to close the narrative by formulating her *hua’ai* way of life as generally like ‘the way of life of the Rapa Nui *hua’ai*’ (*te tere o te hua’ai o te Rapa Nui*). She elaborates further, that *hua’ai* forms of life are in a sense metaphorically “driving” (*hakatere*) “their lands” (*te rāua kaiŋa*).\(^{50}\) Piru, in a sense then, not only normalizes her own *hua’ai* form of life, but posits Rapa Nui *hua’ai* life in general as a major social force on the island.

### Tāpati Rapa Nui

Perhaps one of the most dramatic illustrations of the social force of *hua’ai* in Rapa Nui is the *Tāpati Rapa Nui*; an annual Rapa Nui cultural festival currently held the first two weeks of the month of February. I attended *Tāpati Rapa Nui* 2008. Ignorant of the history and nuances of the festival, and critical of Pacific Island tourism as a former resident of Waikiki, I initially feared *Tāpati Rapa Nui* was a kind of “cultural prostitution” (Trask 1999b). Like the Chilean official whose perspective occasioned this chapter, I feared *Tāpati Rapa Nui* was an invented cultural spectacle for profit. At first glance, *Tāpati Rapa Nui* was difficult to understand. Each

---

\(^{50}\) In some cases, the word *hakatere* is often used in association with driving a car. I often was given the command ‘*Ka hakatere koe ki te*...’ when I had a rental car at my disposal which can be translated “You drive to...”. In such a context the word ‘*hakatere*’ can broadly be translated “drive”. The root verb ‘*tere*’ is generally translated “travel” and in conjunction with the causative ‘*haka*’ it more literally means “make travel”.

day competitions are held which involve competitors of all generations in multifarious tournaments. A morning surfing contest among youth will be followed by an afternoon showdown between elder women sewing various ancestral Rapa Nui clothing items. Though the majority of the contests involve ancestral practices and technology, there are also horse riding competitions and Rapa Nui, like other Polynesian peoples, of course traditionally lacked horses. At night the stage is dominated by ancestral song, dance, and story-telling, but occasionally something like an accordion competition occurs, and scantily clad young women appear from time to time titillating the crowd. The cultural activities listed in the pamphlet are bordered by advertisements from various local corporate influences such as Lan Airlines, Escudo beer, and the Explora Hotel (a new hotel jointly owned by a Rapa Nui man and Chilean corporation and the first of its kind on the island). On the sides of the main performance area are temporary booths dispensing food and drink where large groups of international tourists indulge themselves or take seats before the stage.

A casual tourist attending the athletic events during the day and snacking at the booths and occasionally sitting down to enjoy a song and dance at night could fail to discern the broader significance of the proceedings. Those who are attentive throughout—particularly to the verbal explanations of some of the events in English and Spanish are likely to realize the festival is actually centered upon a kind of beauty pageant that integrates all the competitions of the festival. The young women occasionally titillating the crowd are each competing for the annual title of Miss Rapa Nui. All of the contestants of the other tournaments are competing for one of the three young women who are trying to become Miss Rapa Nui; each tournament winner scores a point for a particular pageant competitor. What many tourists do not typically fully appreciate is why the contestants of the tournaments are supporting the beauty queens.
Generally, the competitors representing the potential new Miss Rapa Nui are their relatives. Like house building, *umu* gatherings, and Sunday *hua’ai* gatherings, *Tāpati Rapa Nui* is principally about *hua’ai*. It is a festival that is another example of what the aforementioned elder would no doubt consider evidence that a *hua’ai* is *he me’e here*; it is a contemporary cultural practice that further “ties” Rapa Nui extended families together.

Importantly, the development of *Tāpati Rapa Nui* is intimately bound to a particular *hua’ai*. The festival began in 1974 (Huke 1995: 120) under the leadership of the *Huke Atan hua’ai*. The first two directors of *Tāpati Rapa Nui*, Joel and Carlos Huke Atan—older brothers of Piru and Blanka, organized the festival on the basis of their International Pacific Arts group *Tu’u Hotu Iti* (Huke 1995: 120). While Joel and Carlos directed the first festival, it was, as Blanka’s aforementioned narrative above attests, ultimately their parents’ Taŋaroa and Maria who inspired the festival through their commitment to teach their children ancestral knowledge, practices, and values. This is important in light of the occasioning anecdote that begins this chapter. The items Blanka lists as important contributions of her parents to the knowledge of her *hua’ai*—loincloth (*hami*), ancestral chant/dance (*hoko*), ancestral song (*himene*), language/discourse (*vānaŋa*)—are all cornerstones of the Rapa Nui cultural festival that her brothers helped organize. No Rapa Nui I spoke with considered the practices in *Tāpati Rapa Nui* or other festivals primarily inventions for profit. Rapa Nui emphasized that *hua’ai* members all take extensive time out of their jobs to help the young women of their *hua’ai* become Miss Rapa Nui. For Rapa Nui I spoke with, if anything, Rapa Nui lose money during the festival because instead of working to make money they are involved in the festival. While I did not attend the 2009 festival, I accompanied Piru for example, in July 2008 as she cut the branches of the Paper Mulberry tree she then modified by traditional pounding methods into cloth she eventually wove
Rapa Nui of course recognize that some of the practices in the festival are not traditional at all, and worry about the new corporate influences at the event. Incorporating new cultural practices was not seen as negative, but a natural and fun part of interactions with the broader world. One Rapa Nui woman, Susana Nahoe, perhaps stated the paradoxical gist of the festival best. She emphasized, in informal discussions with me, that ‘Tāpati Rapa Nui is a recent invention to maintain and strengthen the most important tradition of Rapa Nui: the hua’ai.’ She stressed that while certainly ‘not all of the tournaments and arts showcased in the festival were strictly traditional, many of dances, chants, songs, costumes, and practices were ultimately connected to remembered hua’ai knowledge of ancestral Rapa Nui ways of life’. Members of other hua’ai I spoke to on this matter also recognized their performances in the festival as commonly connected to ancestral knowledge of particular hua’ai. A number of young women I spoke to regarding the Rapa Nui artistic tradition kaikai confirmed this perspective. Kaikai—a form of storytelling women and girls tell through string manipulation—is passed through the women of a hua’ai. When I asked these young women who they learned the particular stories from they invariably mentioned elder women of their particular hua’ai and emphasized that it would be their responsibility in the future to pass on their stories to girls of the next generation. Like some anthropologists (Bauman 1997), I suspect Rapa Nui like Blanka and Susana would resist trying to analyze the festival in terms of the discourse of invented traditions. They would see many Rapa Nui cultural practices showcased in the festival or articulating in daily life not so
much as clear and distinct “inventions” in a Cartesian sense, but as blurred and complex forms of life in part dialogical with genres of ancestral discursive practices. They would not see a blurred picture of a person as failing nevertheless to picture a person (Wittgenstein 2001: 31), or a vague boundary to cease be a boundary (Wittgenstein 2001: 38). In a sense, the negotiation of that boundary is the essence of the festival: to be crowned Miss Rapa Nui, one’s hua’ai has to have demonstrated to the community at large that they are skilled in the traditional as well as modern arts, crafts, and sports of Rapa Nui. In other words, the boundaries of Rapa Nui traditions are negotiated by community members in the midst of social performances (Bauman 1997: 140). Yet like a hermeneutic circle, and as Susana Nahoe suggests, the negotiation is done within a traditional structure—the hua’ai—and this negotiation thus inevitably reproduces this most important of Rapa Nui traditional forms into processes of the future.

Mai Haŋa Roa Ki Te Kona Hare Era

Though he saw Rapa Nui families in his day as different from families of the past, McCall also thought Rapa Nui utilized traditional concepts and rules of kinship in daily life (McCall 1976: 16). Kinship, for McCall, illustrates how Rapa Nui contemporary culture is entangled in ancestral social structures:

Kinship is the only organizational feature that has a continuity with past structures on Easter Island and even in its metamorphosed state today still continues to provide the basic idiom for social relations (McCall 1976: 13).

This chapter has not challenged McCall’s basic thesis, but simply tried to complement McCall’s representation of the structural skeleton of Rapa Nui kinship, with the flesh of its discursive practice in everyday life. I have demonstrated how hua’ai lifestyles and cultural memories constitute Rapa Nui socio-cultural identity, epistemology, and ontology. By grounding Rapa Nui life within hua’ai discursive practice, some of the situated meaning of Rapa Nui engagement
with ancestral traditions is manifest in *hua’ai* gatherings, house building, child care, and festivals. From such a discursive ground, the figuration of Rapa Nui life as inauthentic by Chilean officials like the one above is unstable; it is ‘a path from which he no longer knows his way about’ (Wittgenstein 2001: 69). While it is important to work within such frameworks and re-inscribe Rapa Nui difference within indigenous discourse as the indigenous Bougainville scholar Stella suggests (Stella 2007: 171), it is also important to ask “external ontological questions” (Carnap 1988b). The language game of authenticity, from the discursive stance of post-colonial writing, is undoubtedly just ‘another ideological cage to confine the native by a set of binary oppositions that enables the West to further dominate the political, economic, cultural, and spiritual spheres of colonial worlds’ (Stella 2001: 14). Rather than trying to manage Rapa Nui discursive practice with such binary oppositions, I have provided texts of Rapa Nui language use not so much ‘to represent facts of the world but to show something ultimately quite

51 Carnap’s use of ‘external questions’ appears to be a kind of formalization of various ideas of Wittgenstein that contextualized meaning in terms of language games. His distinction between internal and external questions and their implications for questions of ontology continues to be of interest to the philosophical community and provides a different, pragmatic and relativistic rather than empiricist sense of Carnap’s “logical positivism” (Frank 1963, Norton 1977). In one of many pregnant passages related to this, Wittgenstein appears to relativize meaning in terms of language games (Wittgenstein 2001: 3). The idea being that outside a particular language game a proposition could be meaningless. In effect, Carnap develops a formal approach to Wittgenstein’s games and argues that questions of reality and irreality can only be addressed within the context of a linguistic framework—read language game—defined by a set of formal rules. External questions, that is, questions that are outside the linguistic framework constructed for deciding signfinance, lack significance for Carnap and are alternatively formulated by him as “pseudo-questions” (Carnap 1966: 20). Questions of realism and irrealism, for example, are pseudo-questions according to his distinctions (Carnap 1966: 22). Strawson (1963) points out a number of problems with Carnap’s position when it is used to silence the philosophical questions of ordinary discourse in terms of a formal framework. He argues that formal frameworks do not necessarily address the questions of ordinary discourse but create different questions (Strawson 1963: 507). Thus, the “external questions” of ordinary discourse remain important to Strawson. Referencing Wittgenstein, Carnap concedes some of Strawson’s concerns and asserts that whether ordinary or formal discourse is best used to address a philosophical question depends upon the problem at hand (Carnap 1963: 937). Yet Carnap insists that this does not dissolve the merit of his distinction: for Carnap, what is a significant question and answer still depends upon the framework—formalist or ordinary language based—assumed (Carnap 1963: 940). In suggesting here that it is important to ask “external questions” I am somewhat mixing up Carnap and Strawson’s points, but hopefully for good measure. I think Carnap and Wittgenstein are right that outside of a linguistic framework, or language game, the real significance of a proposition may be meaningless. With Strawson and Wittgenstein (Strawson was in a sense critiquing the formalism of Carnap in terms of the ordinary language philosophy stressed by Wittgenstein), external questions may nevertheless be significant because they are meaningful within a different framework/game. One can use the results of one language game, in other words, to dispute another game. That is my point herein with the use of ‘external questions’; I use this phrase elsewhere in the dissertation with the same ideas in mind.
mystical’ (Wittgenstein 1998: 187). The structure of feeling grounding Rapa Nui hua’ai life that engages Rapa Nui ancestral tradition is less a set of clear and distinct propositional facts, as a way of “being in the world” (Heidegger 2008). Rapa Nui being in the world is shown by occasioning the chapter with a Rapa Nui question ‘‘A ai koe?’’ and respectfully “listening” (hakarono) to the answers Rapa Nui relate in their discursive practices. Rapa Nui being in the world is shown by listening to Blanka’s sense of her ancestral tupuna as kind of a “garland” (hei) around her living family, and Rapa Nui girls’ retellings of the kaikai stories they inherit from the women of their hua’ai.

Throughout my stay on the island, each time I traveled the road out of Te Hoe Manu I was often asked “Where are you going?” (Ki hē koe?) by Rapa Nui along the road. When I responded “to Haŋa Roa” (Ki Haŋa Roa), I noticed there was often not only a sense of disappointment, but a concern that I did not understand what I was doing. It was only late in my stay that I began to understand how my treks to Haŋa Roa were signs that I was misunderstanding Rapa Nui life. Initially, I had assumed Rapa Nui society was centered in Haŋa Roa given that Haŋa Roa was the main and only town on the island. From such a vantage I found myself trying to fit Rapa Nui family life, culture, and language into the world of Haŋa Roa. The longer I lived in Te Hoe Manu and Vai Tō Iri I realized that was clearly not how Rapa Nui of Te Hoe Manu, nor I presume many Rapa Nui, view their island. From the vantage of contemporary Rapa Nui aro such as Te Hoe Manu, Haŋa Roa—its international commerce, languages, social life, and world—appear, in part, as something different from hua’ai forms of life. Haŋa Roa, in other words, is what Rapa Nui call “a Chilean thing” (he me’e Tire) as opposed to “a Rapa Nui thing” (he me’e Rapa Nui). This is perhaps why, on reflection, my regular walks from to Haŋa Roa were interrogated with “ki hē koe?” To such Rapa Nui it made no sense that I was trying to
learn about Rapa Nui life by going to Haŋa Roa. To the Rapa Nui I lived with, Haŋa Roa was not “the public sphere of Rapa Nui” (Makihara 1999, 2004, 2007), but the center of a strongly contested colonial Chilean government. To Rapa Nui in Te Hoe Manu, the public sphere was among kin and friends in Rapa Nui “residential areas” (*kona hare era*). The complexity of the sense of Haŋa Roa as a Chilean thing is the story of the next chapter.
The first time I recall that the Rapa Nui expression ‘he me’e Tire’ became deeply significant to me occurred approximately seven months into fieldwork after my first visit with the Rapa Nui Mayor Petero Edmunds Paoa. The meeting, in my mind, had been a success. I had requested to see the mayor to volunteer some labor for the Rapa Nui community in reciprocity for assisting me with my research. I was not sure what exactly I could offer the community, but I proposed that perhaps I could be of assistance in the school as an English teacher. The mayor thought this was a great idea and arranged for me to teach two English classes at the local public school Lorenzo Baeza Vega where the majority of Rapa Nui children and youth were enrolled. I had not consulted with any Rapa Nui about requesting a volunteer position from the mayor; I just assumed it was a good idea and thing to do for the community. The next day, before I could share with my Rapa Nui friends and extended family the news of my new volunteer job, one Rapa Nui friend quickly approached me at a family gathering. She asked me what I had been doing with the mayor. When I proudly shared that I visited him to request volunteer work, and he had arranged for me to teach English at the school, she and the group expressed consternation. I was immediately reproached and encouraged to quit the job. The problem, in essence, as one man later informed me, was that the municipality and school were “Chilean things” (me’e Tire), not “Rapa Nui things” (me’e Rapa Nui). By volunteering to help the school and the mayor, I was characterized as helping the colonial Chilean government administer the Rapa Nui. From their perspective, I had falsely assumed that both the mayor and school were Rapa Nui things; as they were ultimately established and managed by Chilean laws and institutions, I was instructed to consider them Chilean (Tire) things (me’e).
The experience with the mayor was only one of numerous times Rapa Nui emphasized this distinction either explicitly or indirectly through their discursive practices. As I learned how the distinction was used, I came to realize that answering the question ‘I hē koe?’ in terms of Rapa Nui discourse did not always involve placing or interpreting something as a me’e Rapa Nui. From the vantage of Rapa Nui houses in Te Hoe Manu, it was important to understand that much of life on the island was embedded in me’e Tire even if it was partly a me’e Rapa Nui. This distinction was the underlying premise of both the autonomy and independence movements of Rapa Nui on the island. The majority of Rapa Nui, whether they promoted social change in the form of political autonomy within Chile or independence from Chile, struggled against the predominance of me’e Tire within Rapa Nui. Thus, the preferred answer to the question ‘I hē koe?’ sometimes involved placing and interpreting oneself within me’e Tire. If one was in a situation, institution, place, etc. that was predominantly determined by Chilean discursive practices and government, it was critical to my Rapa Nui teachers that I understand myself as within me’e Tire. Herein, I review some additional experiences to further illuminate the significance of this distinction in Rapa Nui. I note first how it was used to distinguish Rapa Nui from Chilean pedagogy; secondly, how the distinction informed disputes over cultural resource management in Rapa Nui; and thirdly, how it was used to contest the significance of political elections in Rapa Nui. Analysis of these experiences reveals that what is and is not a Rapa Nui thing is negotiated in discursive practices within the community. The goal of this chapter is not so much to establish what is or is not a Rapa Nui thing, but to demonstrate how the distinction is managed in contexts of social interaction. The meaning of the distinction is thus revealed, as Wittgenstein (2001) encourages, through illuminations of its use.
TE MAHANA O TE RE’O MĀORI RAPA NUI

While I persuaded my Rapa Nui friends and hua’ai members that it was important to my work that I volunteer at the school nonetheless, I never forgot their concern. As I taught two six grade English classes, of approximately fifteen students each, two days a week for two hours from March 2008 through August 2008, I analyzed the school for features that could clarify what was meant by the distinction. Contrary to my Rapa Nui friends and extended family, I did not initially understand the school as a Chilean thing; for it included many Rapa Nui things. Most of the administrators and teachers were Chilean; however, Rapa Nui were clearly influential in determining what happened in the school. The principal of the school was Rapa Nui, and many Rapa Nui were employed as teachers and administrators; not only as staff as had been the case in institutions like the William Mulloy Library, the court house, and Office of Land Registration. Architecturally, the school was predominantly a modern Chilean school similar in size and structure to elementary schools I have visited in the United States. Yet, Rapa Nui hand carved poles with Rapa Nui aesthetic forms were incorporated into the structure of some buildings, and a number of murals with Rapa Nui cultural themes were painted across the campus. And while the school mainly functioned to educate children in terms of a Chilean curriculum, the school was sometimes transformed into a site for Rapa Nui political meetings critical of Chilean laws and policies on the island, as well as a hub for festivals celebrating and perpetuating Rapa Nui culture. Children could be regularly seen preparing for the festivals by practicing Rapa Nui dances, learning Rapa Nui athletic practices such as hakapei (mountain sledding), and skills such as making Rapa Nui mahute clothing fashioned from the bark of the paper mulberry tree. The school prepared children for these festivals, and sometimes lent its auditorium for festivals. Tānji
**te Ako**, a two day cultural festival held in November showcasing Rapa Nui song and dance competitions, was conducted entirely within the school auditorium.

Though the curriculum was predominately Chilean and I mainly heard Spanish spoken among students, faculty, staff, and administration, Rapa Nui language and culture was incorporated into the school curriculum. Classrooms often displayed Rapa Nui language instruction materials outside their rooms; and school rooms were generally given Rapa Nui names. My own schoolroom was named *Hotu Matu’a* after the founding Rapa Nui chief of the island. And Rapa Nui language was incorporated into a display cabinet in the central plaza of the school. Different domains of Rapa Nui culture and language (from Rapa Nui vocabulary for astronomical objects to maritime practices and fish names) were highlighted each month as educational resources in the cabinet. The cabinet also included stories and news written entirely in Rapa Nui language. And on most days of instruction at the school I could hear children practicing Rapa Nui songs and learning Rapa Nui in multiple classrooms throughout the school. Children were not the only ones being taught Rapa Nui at the school. While volunteering at the school, I participated in a few Rapa Nui language classes intended to help Chilean teachers understand Rapa Nui students and build curriculum in terms of Rapa Nui language and culture. The approximately ten teachers participating were instructed and tested on the fundamentals of Rapa Nui grammar, and taught lists of Rapa Nui words. Though some of the Chilean teachers seemed to be disinterested or opposed to learning Rapa Nui, the majority did appear interested both intellectually and pedagogically. A number of the teachers, moreover, were interested in studying the language further with me as they learned I had been studying the language prior to teaching, and exhibited some linguistic competence. Rapa Nui language and culture for the school thus were not only incorporated on behalf of Rapa Nui children; school administrators were
trying to transform Chileans working at the school. Rapa Nui language and culture was taught as a social resource for everyone in the community.

Though the school did seem to me a kind of Rapa Nui place, I came to realize more clearly how the school could be seen as nevertheless a Chilean thing during the 2008 Rapa Nui language festival “The Day of the Language” (Te Mahana o te Re’o); particularly, through engagement with a conflict that developed during and after the festival. The following passage is the beginning of a letter of a group of Rapa Nui cultural leaders to Chilean state officials responding to government criticism of the festival organization. Interestingly, the group met and discussed the ideas for the letter first in Rapa Nui—the first language of all the elders involved; consequently, the Rapa Nui individual in the group considered strongest in translation transformed the majority of the Rapa Nui ideas into Chilean Spanish. The letter illustrates some of the nature of the celebration and how it became a source of conflict among Chilean officials. It begins as follows:

He ku’i ku’i o te pu’oko hakatere i te kaiŋa Rapa Nui a roto i te mana o te hau Tire, he tuere kao. El Problema de las autoridades del gobierno del estado de Chile que representan en Rapa Nui, la gobernadora, por intermedio de carabinero de Chile que quería saber el porqué la bandera Chilena no está presente en el evento. Porque el estado de Chile no forma parte del triángulo Polinesia. (2) Las otras banderas: te reva o Vai Uri (Nueva Zelandia) oeste, Vaihi te ao ruŋa (Hawai) norte, Tea Nui (Rapa Nui) este Tahiti centro. Dentro del triángulo de Polinesia partiendo por Rapa Nui, fue presentado por el colegio Lorenza Baeza Vega, Hawai fue representado por el Colegio Católico Eugenio Eyraud. Nueva Zelandia fue representado por la orquesta cultural Rapa Nui. Tahití fue representado por el grupo artístico cultural mata Tu’u Hotu Iti, padre de la cultura māorí Rapa Nui, y el colegio sagrado del Corazón de Jesús de viña del mar Valparaíso. Cada años los niños de los cuatro escuela existente en Rapa Nui, juntos a sus profesores, buscan investigan y prepara durante 8 meses un trabajo arduo para el día culminante, que
es el día del idioma polinésico maorí rapa nui: Te Mahana O Te Re’o Māori Rapa Nui. Ese es el día en donde todos los niños muestran orgullosamente la riqueza de nuestra cultura, viva hoy en día, y cada vez con más fuerza y energía. Interpretando a través del idioma, canto, bailes, danzas dramática, narración histórica, juegos, diseño, teatro, pintura corporal, etc.

The head leadership upon the land of Rapa Nui within the power of the Chilean government is confused, twisted sideways. The problem is the authorities of the Chilean state represented in Rapa Nui, the governor, and the Chilean police: they want to know why the Chilean flag is not present in the event. It is because the Chilean state is not part of the Polynesian triangle. The other flags: west the flag of New Zealand, north, the flag of Hawai‘i, east [the flag of] Rapa Nui, and center [the flag of] Tahiti. Within the Polynesian triangle, Rapa Nui was presented by the Lorenza Baeza Vega school, Hawai‘i was represented by the Catholic school Eurgénio Eyraud. New Zealand was represented by the Rapa Nui cultural dance and orchestral group. Tahiti was represented by the cultural and artistic group Tu’u Hotu Iti, the head of the native Rapa Nui culture, and the Sacred Hearts of Jesus school of Vina del Mar, Valparaiso. Each year children of the four schools in Rapa Nui, join with their instructors, and work arduously for eight months researching and preparing for the day that culminates in the day of the native Polynesian Rapa Nui language: Te Mahana O Te Re’o Māori Rapa Nui. This is the day where all the children proudly show the richness of our culture, living today, and each time with more power and energy. The culture is expressed in language, song, dance, dramatic dance, historical narratives, sports, theatre, and body painting.

The letter continues by reviewing particular performances during the festival, and emphasizing their significance in terms of Rapa Nui discourse.

During my residence in Rapa Nui I observed Te Mahana o te Re’o in 2007, and participated in the festival organization in 2008. As the letter suggests, it is a day ‘where all the children proudly show the richness of living Rapa Nui culture.’ The annual festival began in 2000, principally under the leadership of Hilaria Tuki Pakarati; a Rapa Nui language teacher who
was inspired by a similar festival held in Tahiti to honor “Tahitian” (Te Reo Māohi). As is stated in the letter, the festival is organized around the youth at the four schools in Rapa Nui: from young children four and five years old, to adolescents about to graduate high school. Both of the years I attended I felt, as the authors claim, “It was a day where all the children proudly show the richness of our culture, living today, and each time with more power and energy” (Ese es el día en donde todos los niños muestran orgullosamente la riqueza de nuestra cultura, viva hoy en día, y cada vez con más fuerza y energía). Though some of the sporting events and performance arts segregated boys and girls, generally both participated in all of the festival events. And all children, Rapa Nui and Chilean, had an opportunity to participate. The festival incorporates the different schools on the island and is supported by various government institutions; for example, the Chilean Ministry of Education, the municipality of Haŋa Roa, and the Chilean National Corporation for the Development of Indigenous Peoples (CONADI). As with the more grand Tāpati Rapa Nui festival in February, each year Te Mahana o te Re’o has grown in complexity since its inception. What began as a single day festival and a small set of performances in 2000 had grown by 2008 to a three day celebration with performance arts as well as athletic contests. The first two days are focused on athletic competitions. Water sporting events such as surfing (hakanini), swimming (kau), and paddling (hoe vaka) were conducted at Haŋa Roa o Tai; and at the sports field above the beach various archery and stone throwing competitions (‘a’ati henua) were held. Outside of Haŋa Roa, at the mountain Ma’ūŋa Pu’i, youth engaged in the challenging sport of mountain sledding (hakapei). The final day was centered upon the performance arts. Dancing, drama, singing, and storytelling were performed at the outdoor stage in Haŋa Vare Vare along the coast of the town of Haŋa Roa. Unlike the Tāpati Rapa Nui festival which included overviews of Rapa Nui performances in Spanish and English in 2008, the performance
art program for Te Mahana o te Re’o was principally presented in Rapa Nui without translation. Presumably, the absence of translation was not only about logical consistency—it would be odd to have a day honoring the Rapa Nui language and incessantly represent it in Spanish or English—but the audience of the performances. Though there were tourists among the few thousand spectators, the majority of people who came to watch Te Mahana o te Re’o were Rapa Nui living on the island who came to support their children develop Rapa Nui cultural and linguistic knowledge.

As discussed in the letter, the festival involves many months of preparation of the materials needed for the festival (costumes, sporting equipment, stage decorations, temporary shelter constructions, etc.) and training for the arts and sports. The stage and surrounding area become transformed a month in advance by decorations and various temporary thatch huts constructed to display educational achievements and resources of the children. The banana tree sleds for hakapei are hand crafted and towed up the mountain. Though the schools and municipality coordinate some of the work, the majority of the labor is provided by volunteer Rapa Nui youth and adults passionate about the event. The 2008 festival was organized around a theme: “the Polynesian Triangle” (Te Pou Tupuna etoru). In light of this theme, the stage at Haŋa Vare Vare was adorned with four flags: a flag of each of the island societies at the three points of the Polynesian triangle and one flag for Tahiti at the center. On the stage itself, four sculptures complemented the four flags as symbols for the major points of the triangle. Three of the sculptures were large, hand carved, “tiki” (moai) positioned in the form of a triangle. Within the center of the triangle was a wooden, hand carved, ten foot tall “octopus” (heke). The heke symbolized the principle Polynesian deity of the ocean known as Taŋaroa in Rapa Nui who is often depicted within Polynesian images of the triangle with outstretched tentacles connecting
the different Polynesian cultures located at distant points in the triangle. Each of the *moai* on the stage were tied by long ropes to the central *heke* to simulate the tentacle connections. At the end of the festival, as the stage began to be dismantled, a small group of Rapa Nui—mainly the cultural leaders responsible for the event, emotionally proceeded to braid the three ropes together as one elder woman sang classical Rapa Nui songs softly from the microphone and encouraged them to braid on. As the sculptures were later removed from the stage the rope was detached from the *heke*, and one of the group carefully rolled up the braided cord and took it home.

Though to the participants and spectators the festival was a grand success, not everyone was happy about the 2008 *Te Mahana O Te Re’o* generally, and particularly the theme represented upon the stage of *Haŋa Vare Vare*. As the letter notes, the Chilean police and other officials of the Chilean state were alarmed that a Chilean flag was not incorporated into the festivities. They urged the highest Chilean official on the island, the Rapa Nui governor, Melina Carlolina Hotus, to have the organizers incorporate the Chilean flag and offer an explanation of why it was initially excluded. After meeting with the governor and other Chilean authorities, some of the Rapa Nui cultural leaders responsible for the theme and overall presentation of the event composed this letter as a response; they did not however, subsequently incorporate the Chilean flag into the festival. Their response criticizes the coherence of the request, in part by the use of particular formulations of the identity, language, and place of Rapa Nui people. To the Chilean officials, one presumes, the official request for a Chilean flag is reasonable because in terms of either Valparaiso or Pascuense Chilean discourse, Rapa Nui is ultimately Chile. Such a perspective, the letter suggests, locates Rapa Nui in relationship to geography to the “twisted side” (*tuere kao*) of Rapa Nui: Chile to the east. In contrast, the letter locates Rapa Nui as one side of a Polynesian place: as one “pole” (*pou*) of the Polynesian triangle. Rather than position
Rapa Nui in terms of either Ley 16441 or Ley 19253 as a Chilean place, the letter places Rapa Nui in the context of the theme of the festival: the Polynesian Triangle. The letter does not acknowledge what to the Chilean officials is the important legal fact: Rapa Nui is Chile. The letter explains the absence of the Chilean flag by assessing the Chilean question in the context of Polynesian cultural geography, not Chilean legal discourse. The Chilean flag is not present at the event, because from a Polynesian perspective, “the Chilean state is not part of the Polynesian triangle” (el estado de Chile no forma parte del triangulo Polinesia). The authors elaborate that the only flags included are flags of the principle Polynesian cultures within the triangle—New Zealand to the west, Hawai’i in the north, Rapa Nui to the east, and Tahiti in the center. Given that Chile is not, from the vantage of Polynesian geography, part of the triangle, they find the request wrongheaded and accuse the governor and the police of mental confusion; metaphorically, as having “heads” (pu’oko) filled with “bird chirps” (ku’iku’i). Clearly it makes no sense to them to include a Chilean flag any more than a French or United States flag. Interestingly, when I discussed this conflict with a Rapa Nui elder who did not contribute to the letter, he made a related point. He asked me if I recalled seeing a French flag at the Polynesian gathering in Maupiti discussed in chapter 3. I responded that though there were flags of all the Polynesian cultures at the event, indeed I never observed a French flag. He replied ‘’Ai Maupiti era ’ina he reva Fārani; ‘oira ’ai Te Mahana o te Re’o Rapa Nui ’ina he reva Tire’ (There was no French flag in Maupiti; thus at the Day of the Rapa Nui language there is no Chilean flag). From his perspective, at explicitly Polynesian gatherings, the colonial flags have no place. Rather than locate themselves in relationship to a twisted side, these Rapa Nui place themselves within the ‘sea of islands of Oceania’ (Hau’ofa 2008: 31).
This geographical point is buttressed by a related, though less explicit, linguistic argument. While in the brochures for the event, the festival was simply named by the phrase ‘Mahana o te Re’o Rapa Nui’, the letter utilizes the more complex Rapa Nui name ‘Te Mahana o te Re’o Māori Rapa Nui’, as well as the Spanish name ‘el día del idioma polinésico maorí rapanui’. The more nuanced Spanish and Rapa Nui names of the event foreground Rapa Nui language as a type of Polynesian language, and hence formulate its significance in the context of the Polynesian Triangle theme. This is accomplished through the use of the word ‘Māori’. Given usage of the word ‘Māori’, the name of any Polynesian culture or language can syntagmatically follow it. Rapa Nui language from such a perspective is just one species or variety of Māori language. By implication, just as Chile is not a part of the Polynesian Triangle, it is not part of the family of Māori languages. The flags represent the four Māori languages incorporated into the festival: Te Re’o Māori Aotearoa, Te Re’o Māori Havai’i, Te Re’o Māori Rapa Nui, and Te Re’o Māori Tahiti. As it is not the case that there exists a Re’o Māori Tire or idioma polinésico maorí chileno, there is no Chilean flag. The letter thus formulates the name of the festival and the Rapa Nui language in a way that excludes the relevance of the Chilean state to the proceedings. It creates a discursive context in which the question of the Chilean officials is circumvented.

Though the letter does not use the expression ‘he me’e Tire’ generally, nor characterize the Lorenza Baeza Vega school as he me’e Tire the letter and overall experience of the festival clarified my sense of the difference between me’e Tire and me’e Rapa Nui in the cultural domain of education. According to Ley Indígena, the Chilean government must incorporate Rapa Nui language and cultural learning materials into the state educational system. Six months of participant observation of the only Chilean state school in Rapa Nui, Lorenza Baeza Vega,
revealed that government officials have followed the law generally speaking. In terms of the typology I introduced in chapter 2, the school was a Pascuense, that is, bi-cultural place. *Te Mahana o te Re’o* in 2008 revealed the difference between Rapa Nui and Pascuense education. Rapa Nui cultural leaders incorporated Chilean institutions, children, and school teachers into the program of *Te Mahana te Re’o*. Given the opportunity to determine the pedagogy, however, Rapa Nui did not incorporate the chief symbol of *me’e Tire*: its flag. *Te Mahana o te Re’o* 2008 was not a bi-cultural festival. There not only was no Chilean flag, there also were no Chilean songs, dances, drama, sports, etc. incorporated into the program. Spanish, though dominant in the daily operation of the school, is marginalized in the program; translations were not typically given of performances. While Chilean law inscribes the island as a Chilean place, despite militant protest by Chilean officials, no Chilean flag was admitted into the festival. Rapa Nui pedagogy framed itself in terms of the *māori* cultures of the Polynesian Triangle, not Chile. Within this frame, it is not so much that Chile is politically excluded; as the letter suggests, it is more the case that Chile simply has no real place in the event. As a matter of linguistic and geographic fact, Spanish and Chile are not Polynesian. Though the cultural leaders of the event are in a sense engaging in politics, as they see it in the letter, they are simply educating Chile on the facts; disabusing them of Polynesian ignorance.

**Pū ‘Ohiro**

In the following narrative of Piru introduced in chapter 3, the distinction between *me’e Rapa Nui* and *me’e Tire* also emerges. In the narrative, transcribed by me in situ at her home outside of Haná Roa in Vai Tō Iri, Piru informs me that a place we had recently visited during our “island walks” discussed in chapter 3, is the subject of a development conflict in Rapa Nui. In her telling of this story, she is not responding to any particular question of mine about land or
development. Piru often would begin our language studies by simply informing me what had been going on since our last meeting. Sometimes she would tell me about relatively mundane things that had transpired (for example food that was eaten), other times she would discuss cultural and political issues. In this case, she discusses elder Rapa Nui resistance to a plan by “G” to move a Rapa Nui cultural resource—the sacred stone Pū ‘Ohiro—from one area in Rapa Nui to another place on the island. The “story” of Piru (Te ‘a’amu a Piru):

Te ‘a’amō o te ma‘ea era ko Pū ‘Ohiro. He tu‘u mai ki Vai Tō Iri te pa‘ari Rapa Nui mo vānaŋa mai o ruŋa o Pū ‘Ohiro. To‘ona haŋa o te aro era ko Taha Roa. A Taha Roa kona e‘a o tupuna ki ruŋa o te vaka. ‘I ira e ai ro ‘ana etahi mana tō‘ona iŋoa ko Pū ‘Ohiro. He ma‘ea hakauŋa i te roŋo ki te taŋata henua. Ra kona era ko Taha Roa kona e‘a hī i mu‘a ‘ana o te hora tahito era. Te tupuna he e‘a era ki ruŋa i te vaka hī mai i te kai mo haŋai o te taŋata; he kahi ‘ana; he ika ‘ana. ‘I ira i tapa‘o ai i te mana ko Pū ‘Ohiro mo te roŋo o te henua. ‘I puhē era i a Pū ‘Ohiro, he tu‘u ata ki ruŋa i te Motu Nui ko te aro era o te Hau Moana; ki tu‘a era o Poike ki Kava Kava Kio‘e ki Motu Maratiri; ki ‘Ana te Pahu te roa o te puhē ka oho era i te roŋo. ‘A Pū ‘Ohiro o te Mata era Ko te Ure o Mokomai. ‘I na eko tano mo hakamakenu i te varua ke mai tō‘ona ki te rua kona. Pehē ma‘ea era ko Pū ‘Ohiro e mahanī era e taŋata i ajarina? Ko ma‘ea puhē ‘ai ruŋa i a ia me‘e rahī to‘ona mana: he komari o te ʻna vi’e o te hora era e u‘i era i ‘Oroño e te taote. Ko ai te vi‘e rivariva mo te ariki e ko ai te vi‘e rakerake mo hoa ki raro era i te hora o te Taŋata Manu. I ajarina e ai ro ‘ana etahi tuare‘are‘a to‘ona iŋoa ko “G”. Ta‘e o‘ona te mata ko Ure o Mokomai. Ko tu‘u mai ‘ana te taŋata pa‘ari ko “T” tō‘ona iŋoa, he taŋata tere vaikava ira o mai a ia ki Vai Tō Iri mo ‘a’amō mai ki a au. Tō‘ona teki mai ruŋa i te ahu era ko Ata Raŋa, he ariki o Haŋa Piko. Tō‘ona tāni: pehē taŋata tere vai kava ‘ina ko haka makenu i te ma‘ea ko Pū ‘Ohiro mai tō‘ona kona tupuna ki te rua aro. Peira o kua rāua i vānaŋa ai e Haŋa Piko te taŋata tere vai kava mo oho mai mo kī a Piru mo vānaŋa ararua ko “G” mo ta‘e to‘o i te mana ke ki te rua aro o rāua te mana u nei. Ka hakare a Pū ‘Ohiro tō‘ona kaika ko Taha Roa o ira a ia. O ira tō‘ona kuhane o ira tō‘ona varua. ‘E mo

52 I have changed the name of the persons mentioned in the narrative: ‘G’ denotes the proposal author; ‘T’ denotes the Fisherman.

The discussion of the stone Pū ‘Ohiro: An elder Rapa Nui arrived to Vai Tō Iri to discuss Pū ‘Ohiro. He was interested in the kin region (aro) of Taha Roa. Taha Roa is a land area from which the ancestors embarked from upon canoes. There [at Taha Roa] is something powerful (mana) named Pū ‘Ohiro. It is a stone used to send messages to people of the island. That area Taha Roa is an area that was fished in front of in ancient times. Ancestors went out from there upon canoes to fish for food to feed the people: fish for tuna and other fish. There, the power (mana) of Pū ‘Ohiro for [sending] messages to the island is significant. The sounds blown at Pū ‘Ohiro, constituted messages that traveled far; they arrived from the islet Motu Nui to the kin region (aro) of Hau Moana; to behind Poike at Kava Kava Kio’e to islet Motu Maratiri; and to Pahu cave. Pū ‘Ohiro belongs to the clan area named Ure o Mokomai. It is not proper to move the spirit from it to a second place. How is the stone Pū ‘Ohiro to become known by people today? Upon the blowing stone there exists many powerful things: [petroglyphs of] the vulva of women inspected at ‘Oroŋo [ceremonies] by the Rapa Nui experts. Good women were given to the chief and bad women to throw down in the era of the Birdman [ceremonies]. Today there is a youth named “G”. Ure of Mokomai is not the clan area of this youth. The elder Rapa Nui named “T”, an open-ocean fisherman, came to Vai Tō Iri to iscuss with me. He traversed here from Ahu Ata Raŋa; he is a leader at Haŋa Piko [the principal fishing dock of Rapa Nui]. His cry: open-ocean fishermen cannot allow the Pū ‘Ohiro stone to go from its ancestral place to a second kin area. Hence, their group, the open-ocean fishermen at Haŋa Piko discussed to go and to tell Piru to discuss with “G” that their thought [the fishermen] is to not take the power [of Pū ‘Ohiro] to a second kin area. Pū ‘Ohiro must remain in its territorial land of Taha Roa. There is its ancestral spirit, its cosmic being. And it would be correct that “G”, a new child, wait, and search, ask the elders of this land Te Pito o te Henua. The youth should question the mother and
grandparents. Who is she? Of what kin area? How will it be for the “grandchildren” (makupuna)? How will it be for the “great grandchildren” (hinare)? The grandfather and the grandmother should know: Whose is its ancestral spirit? Whose is its spiritual being? This is the thought; it is not for “G” to come to Ure of Mokomai, a different kin and clan area. The first thing is to ask the groups of Hitn Raŋi and Tupa Hotu Rikiriki.

This narrative is as equally political as it is metaphysical and socio-cultural; moreover, it is embedded in complex Rapa Nui cultural knowledge I can only claim to partially understand. Though the Rapa Nui expression ‘he me’e Tire’ does not explicitly occur, the concept is entangled in the story. Piru’s story of Pū ‘Ohiro articulates common themes of Rapa Nui discourse; themes which conflict with a Chilean development proposal for Pū ‘Ohiro. She critiques the proposal by pointing out how it fails to understand the significance of the sacred stone to Rapa Nui. In other words, she elaborates the meaning of the stone as a me’e Rapa Nui, and dismisses the government proposal as a me’e Tire. This is not a simple task; for the proposal, as Piru presents it, is the idea of a Rapa Nui, not a Chilean. Piru critiques the proposal through the use of alternative place formulations of Pū ‘Ohiro, and by challenging the authority of “G”. Her critique draws upon cultural knowledge of the significance of Pū ‘Ohiro to the land, ocean, social organization, and spirituality of Rapa Nui.

Piru begins the narrative by contextualizing its significance in dialogical terms. She emphasizes that the story of Pū ‘Ohiro she is relating to me was stimulated by a conversation she recently had with an elder Rapa Nui man I have named “T”. “T”, one learns in the second half of the narrative, is a leading fisherman at Haŋa Piko—the central dock in Rapa Nui; a place Rapa Nui fishermen gather not only to engage in the tasks of fishing, but also to socialize and discuss life in Rapa Nui on and off the sea. “T”, on behalf of other fishermen at Haŋa Piko, has complained to, and to some extent warned, Piru about a recent proposal of “G” to move Pū
'Ohiro. The narrative concludes as Piru, engaging with the voice of “T”, questions the epistemology of “G”. In part, Piru critiques “G” and the proposal by formulating “G” as someone too young to know what is best for Pū 'Ohiro. In the context of Chilean discourse, “G” is a professional Rapa Nui positioned within a government office of significant authority; however, the narrative is silent upon this status. Piru, analyzing “G” in terms of Rapa Nui kinship, rather than in terms of the offices and titles within the discourse of Chilean bureaucracy, denigrates the status of “G”. “G” is demoted to the kinship status of an “adolescent” (poki āpi) who is to wait and seek the opinion of elder Rapa Nui (“taŋata pa’ari”); in particular, “G”’s mother (“tō’ona nua”), and other elders of the older generation responsible for managing the clan of “G” (“tō’ona tupuna tere mau o tō’ona mata”). Importantly, Piru does not suggest “G” consult the father of “G”; this is because the father is Chilean. Though “G” could have thus been challenged as a Pascuense, rather than a Rapa Nui, Piru does not suggest this is the problem. The problem with “G” is that “G” is not descended from the kinship groups associated with land circumscribing Pū ‘Ohiro. For Piru and “T”, “G” in part lacks authority to move Pū ‘Ohiro because “G” is not a descendent of the kin and clan groups associated with the traditional place of the stone. “G” is to ask descendants of the territorial groups associated with the place about what to do regarding the stone; only Rapa Nui with the proper genealogical relationship to the land of Pū ‘Ohiro, from her and “T”’s perspective, have the authority to decide what to do with the stone.

Piru and “T” also question the implicit values of the proposal. Although this is not explicitly mentioned in the narrative, Pū ‘Ohiro was currently located near a dirt road in a relatively remote area of Rapa Nui near the eastern volcano named Poike. At this location, Pū 'Ohiro was considered vulnerable to damage generated from tourists using the road, as well as
vandalism. Assuming Pū 'Ohiro can be archaeologically understood as simply a portable artifact of a tourist site which Chile can officially move within the “National Park” at its discretion, the basic idea of the proposal was to move Pū 'Ohiro away from the road to another place in the “National Park” where it could be conserved better and be accessed more easily by tourists. Tourism and archaeological conservation, however, are not the primary concern of Piru and “T’. The question for them is not how to conserve Pū 'Ohiro in the interests of archaeology, the Chilean state, and tourism, but, in part, for the sake of the future “grandchildren” (makupuna) and “great grandchildren” (hinarere) related to the land of Pū 'Ohiro. The stone is also to be conserved for its ceremonial, functional, and symbolic meaning in ancestral and contemporary Rapa Nui cultural life. For Piru and “T” such conservation cannot be achieved if it is moved; as will become clear from further analysis, moving the stone, for them, would compromise its ancestral and contemporary significance and spiritual power.

Rather than place Pū 'Ohiro in a “Chilean National Park”, Piru and “T” locate Pū 'Ohiro within a complex cultural geography of Rapa Nui. Piru places Pū 'Ohiro within the ancestral kinship area (aro) named Taha Roa; an area she locates within the clan territory (mata) of Ure o Mokomai that she associates with adjacent lands identified with two other territorial groups: Hito Rayi and Tupa Hotu Rikiriki. This area is remembered by Piru as a particularly significant ancestral place. She first foregrounds the meaning of Pū 'Ohiro and Taha Roa within ancestral fishing practices. She emphasizes that from Taha Roa, Rapa Nui ancestors launched their canoes to fish for tuna and other kinds of fish, and implies that many people were fed from the fish caught by the fishermen who embarked from this region. Pū 'Ohiro had an important function in this process: Piru stresses that the stone was used to communicate to people around the island about fishing in this region. Piru does not elaborate, but there are large holes in this rather
elongated stone that when blown through skillfully make a loud trumpeting noise for communication. Piru asserts that during ancestral times the stone was used to send messages around Rapa Nui that could be heard from the nearby islets of Motu Nui and Motu Maratiri; to the area named Kava Kava Kio’e at the nearby volcanic mountain Poike; all the way to Pahu cave [near Ahu Akivi: a place on the other side of the island]. Some of the messages sent from blowing the stone, as I understand from later discussions with Piru and other elders, signaled to the people that fish had been caught and thus announced for people to come to Taha Roa to eat. It could also be used to communicate other kinds of messages. I personally was not able to make any noise upon blowing through it; Piru could make some sounds from it. Secondly, Piru associates Pū ’Ohiro with the ancestral practices at a distant sacred place near the volcano Rano Kau in the southwest corner of Rapa Nui: ’Oroŋo. Piru notes that the stone had a function in the spiritual and political “Birdman” (Taŋata Manu) ceremonies held at ’Oroŋo. As can be observed today, there are petroglyphs carved upon Pū ’Ohiro. The petroglyphs include vulvas modeled upon those of young girls involved with the ceremonies at ’Oroŋo. The girls who wanted to participate in the festivities were evaluated by Rapa Nui experts, and their vulvas were carved upon Pū ’Ohiro. According to Piru, those who were judged positively joined the “Birdman” ceremonies; those that received negative marks were cast out of the proceedings.

Pū ’Ohiro is not only significant because it is associated with ancestral practices; Piru, through the use of reported speech of “T” in the second half of the narrative, asserts that Pū ’Ohiro and its territorial place are also significant to contemporary practices and life in Rapa Nui. “T” and the fishermen of Haŋa Piko have emphasized to Piru that Pū ’Ohiro has “spiritual power” (mana) as part of a particular kinship area (aro) named Taha Roa. Pū ’Ohiro not only has “spiritual power” (mana) to the fishermen; it is associated with two kinds of “spiritual
entities” Piru and the fishermen locate in *Taha Roa: varua* and *kuhane*.\(^{53}\) They worry that taking *Pū 'Ohiro* to a kinship area other than *Taha Roa* will thus disrupt the “spiritual power” and “spiritual beings” associated with *Taha Roa* and *Pū 'Ohiro*. Together, Piru and “T” thus place *Pū 'Ohiro* within a complex spiritual ecology. Though the terms certainly differ, this spiritual ecology, like “Hawaiian Geography” (Hō‘ike Honua Hawai‘i) is entangled in kinship (Andrade 2001: 46). Piru and “T” link *Pū 'Ohiro* and *Taha Roa* to particular living kinship groups, not only Rapa Nui ancestral clans; namely, those contemporary “extended families” (*hua'ai*) descended principally from *Ure o Mokomai*, but also those associated with nearby *Hito Raŋi* and *Tupa Hotu Rikiriki*. Moving *Pū 'Ohiro*, to Piru and the fishermen, undermines contemporary Rapa Nui “family” (*hua'ai*) connections to the sacred stone, as well as its rich, historical, and spiritual place.

Analysis of the narrative thus reveals how interpreting something as a *me'e Rapa Nui* does not necessarily depend upon being Rapa Nui. Piru, “T”, “G”, and Piru are all Rapa Nui, and recognized as such within the narrative. As represented by Piru, “G” though not formulated as Chilean or Pascuense appears to interpret *Pū 'Ohiro* in terms of Chilean discourse. As “G” is concerned with *Pū 'Ohiro* for conserving the stone in the interests of Chile, tourism, and archaeology, not simply Rapa Nui people, she fails to understand the complex significance of the stone. For Piru and “T”, “G” treats *Pū 'Ohiro* as an archaeological artifact of a Chilean National Park, not as a sacred part of the spiritual ecology of *Taha Roa*. Importantly, Piru and “T” do not suggest that this development conflict is to be resolved by engaging with “G” in the Chilean

\(^{53}\) I have translated these two slightly differently to enunciate the difference, but translation is awkward because English translations of the terms both are given as “spirit”. The English word ‘ghost’ might be another translation, but I have not used that term given its potentially negative connotations and Hollywood type associations. Like Rapa Nui possessive pronouns, I suspect Rapa Nui “spirits” are more complex than English spirits and ultimately that the categories do not ultimately match well. I cannot say exactly what the difference is between a “spirit” (*kuhane*) and a “cosmic being” (*varua*), beyond saying that they are apparently different types of spiritual beings to Rapa Nui.
institution she staffs. As might be expected in light of previous chapters, Piru and “T” suggest that “G” can learn the true meaning of Pū ’Ōhiro by discussing the matter with Rapa Nui elders of her hua’ai, not Chilean officials or state archaeologists. Piru and “T” thus situate the meaning of Pū ’Ōhiro within the kinship regime of truth elaborated in chapter 4. As far as I know, within this regime of truth the significance of Pū ’Ōhiro remains: it was not moved when I left Rapa Nui a few months after this conflict emerged.

Reoreo Mai

The stories of Pū ’Ōhiro and Te Mahana te Re’o both reveal that events, places, and things in Rapa Nui can be me’e Tire, even though Rapa Nui people contribute to their interpretation or organization. This dimension of the meaning of the distinction between me’e Tire and me’e Rapa Nui was also manifest in the formal political arena. For approximately two months in 2008, the town of Hanga Roa was buzzing with excitement over political elections. While my friends and family in the United States were enthralled with the U.S. Presidential election, I was busy attending to the processes circumscribing the election of the new mayor and city council (concejal) in Rapa Nui. Some significance of the process can be gleamed by analysis of the following transcript of part of a speech by a Rapa Nui cultural leader. It was spoken during the inauguration of the new mayor and city council in October 2008. The speech was uttered in the context of conducting an Umu Tahu ceremony—a ceremony first described in chapter 3—to bless the newly elected government officials. The inauguration ceremony itself lasted approximately two hours; the Umu Tahu ceremony lasted approximately twenty minutes, though the speech itself was about five minutes long. It was delivered to an audience of approximately eighty people outside the auditorium of the public school Lorenza Baeza Vega. The Umu Tahu ceremony was attended by Rapa Nui; however, Chilean military leaders, government officials,
Chilean media correspondents, and Chilean citizens living in Rapa Nui were also in attendance. As far as I know, access was unrestricted; anyone could observe it. The ellipses at the beginning and end of the speech were preceded or followed by opening greetings and closings by the Rapa Nui cultural leader. Portions of these openings and closings were not fully intelligible in my recording due to wind noise, and thus have been omitted. There are also short utterances that precede the ellipses in the body of the speech which are also omitted due to partial unintelligibility. As with the rest of the speech, these utterances were coded in Rapa Nui. The text begins as the speaker started to discuss and explain the significance of the *Umu Tahu* after a few minutes of greeting the crowd:

…Te Umu Tahu i tau mātāamua i hakatere ena, me’e hakatere, me’e hakarivariva o te kuhane; hakarivariva te roro; hakarivariva te mahatu ‘e hakatitkia te rāua aŋa a roto i te rivariva, a roto i te ma’itaki, a roto i te ma’e ha, a roto i te mori, a roto i te me’e paurō. ‘Oira to’ona haura’a o te mana o te umu tahu. …Pure atu! ‘E te atua o te raŋi ē, hakamana mai ki te mahana nei; he mahana ‘āpī o te nu’u nei ka noho nei i ruŋa i te pepe hakatere i te kāiŋa itiiti nei. ‘E te atua o te raŋi ē, hakamana mai i a rāua; hakapuai mai te mōrī; to’o tahi te inoino i roto te manava, i roto te māhatu. … ‘E te atua o te raŋi ē, hakamana mai koe mai ruŋa ki te Umu Tahu nei o te mahana nei. Te Umu Tahu nei te moa tea ararua ko te kumu mea mo te aŋa hakarivariva o te kāiŋa. ‘E te ariki, ‘e Hotu Matu’a ‘e Ava Rei Pua ‘e te mau ariki tere moana, tere tokerau, tere henua, hakamana mai korua i te mahana nei. Avai mai te mana i te tavana ‘āpī o te henua, hakatere ta’ana pukuraŋa…

…The *Umu Tahu* since the beginning of ancestral times was something for governing and blessing the spirit; blessing the mind; blessing the heart and making all their conduct proper, good, clean, and clear. That is the significance of the *Umu Tahu*. Let us pray! God of the heavens, spiritually empower this day; a new day for the council that now is to administer this small land. God of the heavens, spiritually empower them; strengthen their energy; remove all of the evil within their gut and heart. …God of the
heavens spiritually empower this *Umu Tahu* today. This *Umu Tahu* contains the white rooster and the red sweet potato for blessing the land. Chiefs, Hotu Matu‘a and ‘Ava Rei Pua and chiefs of the ocean, wind, and land spiritually empower this day. Give spiritual power to the new mayor of this island to govern her people…

The cultural leader and his two teenage children prepared the majority of the *Umu Tahu* for the ceremony. I assisted with some of the initial construction of the “underground oven” (*umu*), and was present for the entire ceremony. The *Umu Tahu* was prepared for the newly elected mayor and city council of Haŋa Roa. As the speech concluded, small portions of food from the *Umu Tahu* were distributed to the elected mayor and council members, as well as to a few of the observers of the ceremony. As is customary, and discussed in chapter 3, none of people involved in the preparation consumed any of the *Umu Tahu* food.

In isolation, the speech appears to formulate the inauguration of the mayor and city council in terms of *me‘e Rapa Nui*, not *me‘e Tire*. Many of the themes of Rapa Nui discourse that have been illuminated throughout the dissertation are present in the text. While all of the elected positions and processes of election were established by the Chilean discourse of *Ley Pascua*, the performance of an *Umu Tahu* ceremony seems to transform the event and offices from a *me‘e Tire* into a *me‘e Rapa Nui*. The text itself, though mentioning the new mayor (*tavana ‘āpī*) and council (*nu‘u*) in Rapa Nui language, does not include any specific reference to Chile (*Tire*); and I am confident the speech in entirety also fails to mention Chile. The speech contextualizes the significance of the *Umu Tahu* in explicitly ancestral Rapa Nui terms. The text begins by foregrounding the history of the *Umu Tahu* as a cultural practice of Rapa Nui that dates to the inception of Rapa Nui culture: the “original” or “first” (*mātāamua*) “temporal era” (*tau*). This aspect of the *Umu Tahu* is further stressed in the text as it is later associated with the
founding chief and chiefess of Rapa Nui: Hotu Matu’a and ‘Ava Rei Pua. The speaker, genealogically reasoning through his ancestors as indigenous theorists commend (Howe 2008: 338), implies that the *Umu Tahu* was brought by Hotu Matu’a and ‘Ava Rei Pua to Rapa Nui from their original homeland of *Hiva*. In part, the speaker has transformed an ostensibly Chilean event into a *me’e Rapa Nui* by dialogically “entextualizing” (Bauman and Briggs 1990) the event within an alternative discourse genre; namely, narratives of Rapa Nui ancestors.

The genealogy of the *Umu Tahu* however is not introduced simply to historicize the ceremony. Hotu Matu’a and ‘Ava Rei Pua are spiritually figured within the narrative. The speaker requests that Hotu Matu’a and ‘Ava Rei Pua, as well as the chiefs of the “ocean” (*moana*), “wind” (*tokerau*), and “land” (*henua*) empower the new mayor and city council with “spiritual power” (*mana*). Ancestral chiefs are not the only entities from whom the speaker solicits *mana*. The speaker also asks “the god of the heavens” (*te atua o te raŋi*) to empower the elected officials with *mana*. The speaker’s use of the phrase “the god of the heavens” (*te atua o te raŋi*) as well as the association of this god with *mana* is significant. The speaker might have simply stated “God” (*te atua*); an utterance not uncommon among the predominately Catholic Rapa Nui. Use of the phrase “the god of the heavens” (*te atua o te raŋi*), rather than “God” (*te atua*) implies that that the “the god of the heavens” is part of a family of gods within Rapa Nui cosmology; a pantheon that includes *Taparoa*—“the god of the ocean” mentioned earlier this chapter as the center of the *Haŋa Vare Vare* stage and Polynesian Triangle—among others. And the speaker might have just requested a “blessing” (*hakarivariva*) from *te atua*. These alternative formulations would entextualize the *Umu Tahu* ceremony more strongly within the discourse genre of Western theology. Yet, the speaker does not only request a “blessing” from “the god of the heavens”; he beseeches *te atua o te raŋi* to give the elected officials *mana*—a spiritual power
that has no clear translation in Western theology. Further, the ceremonial practice engaged to bless and bestow *mana* has nothing to do with the rituals held weekly at Sunday Mass in *Haŋa Roa*. For the speaker, the method for obtaining a blessing of these officials and empowerment with *mana* is the *Umu Tahu*. Rather than ingesting the Eucharist, the speaker implores the elected officials to eat the meat of a “white rooster” (*moa te’a*) and “red sweet potato” (*kuma me’a*); the traditional food cooked for an *Umu Tahu*, and food symbolic of the colors of the Rapa Nui flag. As with *mana*, there is no coherent translation of the *Umu Tahu* into Western theology. Thus, the speaker also seems to have also transformed the Chilean inauguration into a *me’e Rapa Nui* by a complex ritual practice that embeds the inauguration of the elected officials within a Rapa Nui cosmology.

Yet the *Umu Tahu* was not an isolated event; it was just the opening scene in a larger social drama. Immediately following the *Umu Tahu* ceremony, Chilean state officials proceeded to inaugurate the mayor and city council in the school auditorium. The following text is a segment of a speech by a Chilean official within the auditorium shortly after the *Umu Tahu* ceremony was completed just outside of the auditorium. It was preceded by two songs collectively sung by the audience coordinated by audio recordings of the songs: first, the Chilean National anthem; and secondly, the traditional Rapa Nui song *Te Pito o te Henua*. After relating that the election results were developed in conformity to the constitution of Chile in terms of an official Chilean speech genre, the Chilean official stated the following tabulation of votes for the mayor:

---

54 Interestingly too, one aspiring foreign Protestant Christian minister I met on the island, was seriously disturbed by the practice of *Umu Tahu* generally; he saw it as a kind of sacrificial offering antithetical to Western theology. It was a discursive practice he wished Rapa Nui did not perform generally, and particularly when discussing “the god of the heavens” (*te atua o te raŋi*).
En la comunidad Isla de Pascua, en su autoridad definitivo de la votación fuerza mente: lista B, Pacto para Chile Limpio, Pascual Pakarati Gonzales 216 votos; lista C Pacto Concepción Democrática, Luz Sasso Paoa, 878 votos; lista D Pacto Punto Podemos Mas, Hugo Guz Paoa, 74 votos; Lista A, Pacto Independencia, Akahaña Rapu Tuki 701 votos. En consecuencia, se proclama la candidata en la comunidad Isla de Pascua definitiva electa Doña Luz Sasso Paoa.

In the community of Easter Island, by definitive authority of electoral power: list B, Party for a Fair Chile, Pascual Pakarati Gonzales 216 votes; list C, Democratic Conception Party, Luz Sasso Paoa, 878 votes; list D, Party for More Collective Power, Hugo Guz Paoa, 74 votes; List A, Independent Party, Akahaña Rapu Tuki, 701 votes. In consequence, the definitively elected candidate of the community of Easter Island is Mrs. Luz Sasso Paoa.

Following a formal acceptance of the office of mayor by Luz Sasso Paoa, the Chilean official proceeded to list the tabulated results of the elections for the city council members; these results too were followed by formal acceptance speeches by the elected officials. Some of the city council members and mayor spoke partially in Rapa Nui or Pascuense while accepting the offices; however, the inauguration and acceptance speeches were primarily coded in Chilean Spanish. The number of attendees numbered approximately two hundred people; however, in contrast to the Umu Tahu ceremony, the inauguration audience was predominately Chilean. Interestingly, many of the Rapa Nui who were present at the Umu Tahu ceremony, did not attend the Chilean segment of the inauguration. As I recorded in my field notes for this day, during my entire residence in Rapa Nui, I can never recall ever seeing so many Chileans gathered in a single place on the island. I spotted all of the Chileans I knew in Rapa Nui among the audience; however, very few of the Rapa Nui with whom I had developed relationships. Despite the
opening *Umu Tahu* ceremony, the main act of inauguration day seemed to be a *me’e Tire*. Was it?

As with any major issue in the Rapa Nui community, the answer is likely to vary individually somewhat, as well as depend upon the *hua’ai* of the individual and the situation in which the issue is discussed. Yet however Rapa Nui might answer such a question, few would likely deny that many Rapa Nui were fundamentally engaged with the election process. In the last few months prior to the election, Rapa Nui candidates for mayor and city council regularly participated in radio debates regarding many political issues of concern within the community. While some of these debates were moderated by Chilean officials and coded in Spanish, other debates were facilitated by fellow Rapa Nui and coded in Rapa Nui. Many of the debates discussed questions formulated by audience members who had an opportunity to personally question the candidates on the air through the telephone. As the elections drew increasingly near, candidates assembled caravans of cars and paraded through town promoting their election. The day before the election, a significant portion of the community attended at least one of the promotional parties held for the leading Rapa Nui candidates for mayor: Luz Sasso Paoa, or Akahaŋa Rapu Tuki. The party for Luz Sasso Paoa took over the entirety of main street *Haña Roa*. Perhaps a thousand people lined the sides of the streets as she paraded down the street along with city council candidates she supported. The party lasted late into the night as her supporters chatted, ate, and listened to music along main street performed by the popular Rapa Nui music band *Matato’a*. Nearby, the supporters of Akahaŋa Rapu Tuki congregated around a massive feast prepared within the traditional “underground oven” (*umu*) outside of one of the homes of Akahaŋa’s relatives. Perhaps a thousand people cheered him as he mingled around the party in full Rapa Nui ceremonial dress.
In contemplating whether or not the inauguration and entire election process is a *me’e Rapa Nui* or *me’e Tire*, it is important to note that Rapa Nui participated in the process. As the tabulated votes stated in the official speech attest and I observed, a large portion of the Rapa Nui voted. As with *Te Mahana o Te Re’o*, the public school Lorenza Baeza Vega was the seat of voting. Segregated by sex, men and women filed into classrooms—principally staffed by Chilean officials—in order to cast their votes for mayor and city council. Voters filled out ballots within a private, draped booth and subsequently dropped the ballots within boxes. However, it is also equally important to note that a significant number of Rapa Nui did not vote; the 1,869 votes cast for mayor is significantly lower than the estimated 5,000 total population on the island; at least half of which is Rapa Nui. Even if the total possible adult voters are significantly less than 5,000, certainly mainly possible votes were not cast. I suspect some people did not vote simply because they were not politically engaged with the island or lazy that day. Yet, some elders I spoke with indicated that their failure to vote was a conscious decision. Many of these elders stated that “they do not vote” (*‘ina he vota*) simply because they do not feel comfortable participating in what to them is ultimately a *me’e Tire*. Some of these elders claimed they had not voted for some time and did not plan to vote in the future if the political system in Rapa Nui remains determined in Valparaíso according to Chilean institutions and laws. Like the speaker of the narrative in Chapter 2 who characterized Chilean men, women, and children as thieves, such elders did not want to participate in *me’e Tire*; they wanted Chileans to take ‘their people, evil, and flag and return to Chile.’ To such elders, elected officials like Luz Sasso Paoa and members of city council could never be *me’e Rapa Nui*; for ultimately, Chilean votes significantly contributed to who was and was not elected, not simply the Rapa Nui who participated. When I asked one elder what she thought the function of Rapa Nui in such Chilean offices was, she responded, “lie to
me” (*reoreo mai*). When I asked another elder whether he thought the new officials would create important changes for Rapa Nui I received a similarly cynical reply “[They are all] of a common feather” (*huru etahi*).

Interestingly, the cultural leader of the *Umu Tahu* also disputed the idea that Rapa Nui participation in the election and inauguration made the event a *me’e Rapa Nui*. After the inauguration concluded, I found him back at home with his children. I asked him what he thought of the Chilean segment of the inauguration. He said he had no thought because he and his children did not attend. I asked him why not and his answer was direct: “That is a Chilean thing” (*me’e Tire na*). While he considered the performance of an *Umu Tahu* important for engaging the elected officials with *me’e Rapa Nui*, he did not think the ritual itself transformed the event into a *me’e Rapa Nui*. For the cultural leader of the *Umu Tahu* and Rapa Nui who emphasized “I do not vote” (*’Ina he vota*), in asking whether or not the inauguration and general electoral process in Rapa Nui was a *me’e Tire* or *me’e Rapa Nui* I thus posed a false dilemma. The inauguration and electoral processes, though influenced by Rapa Nui, were nevertheless *me’e Tire*. Like the daily operation of the school, the elections were bi-cultural, Pascuense things, but Chilean things nonetheless. In light of the conflict during *Te Mahana o te Re’o*, one would expect that if the elections were *me’e Rapa Nui*, the Chilean national anthem, like the Chilean flag on the stage of *Haŋa Vare Vare* would be conspicuously absent. Further, the attendance of the inauguration would not be a measly few hundred people primarily Chilean. Like the *Mahana o te Re’o*, the audience would be large, primarily Rapa Nui, and the tabulated votes would be announced in accordance with a Rapa Nui constitution. Derrida (1973) emphasizes that to interpret the meaning of a sign one must consider what alternative sign is
absent in its presence. Chileans were noticeably present at the inauguration; perhaps, more significantly, the inauguration should be understood by who was largely absent.

**Me’e Rapa Nui**

In the colonial world of Rapa Nui, the distinction between *me’e Rapa* and *me’e Tire* emerges as one discursive tool Rapa Nui employ to contest Chilean state power in Rapa Nui and assert an alternative vision of their future. Herein I have sketched how the distinction is used by cultural leaders to develop Rapa Nui pedagogy. Though the Chilean state attempts to extend its juridical power to plant its flag in places like the stage of Haŋa Vare Vare, where its power is “…less legal in character” (Foucault 1980: 97), Rapa Nui resist by defining *me’e Rapa Nui* as Polynesian rather than Chilean. While the Chilean state attempts to colonize the minds of young professional Rapa Nui like “G” and teach them to think of their cultural heritage as archaeological artifacts to move within a Chilean National Park, Rapa Nui elders like Piru and “T” resist by engaging “G” in an ancestral, kinship logic that challenges “G” to consider *me’e Rapa Nui* within the context of a rich spiritual ecology of *mana*, *varua*, and *kuhane* that articulates in contemporary forms of Rapa Nui life and cultural memory. As the Chilean state tries to blur the boundaries of *me’e Rapa Nui* and *me’e Tire*, by incorporating spiritual practices such as *Umu Tahu* into the inauguration of new elected officials, Rapa Nui resist by simply being absent. I suspect they resist in part because they know how to distinguish *me’e Rapa Nui* from *me’e Tire*. They are not confused by the “*reoreo mai*” of *me’e Tire*. Had I not learned the distinction, I might have developed a different ethnography of the meaning of law and land in Rapa Nui; one based in what some Rapa Nui would consider *me’e Tire*. This is another story; it’s the story of the next chapter.
After approximately six months on the island, as I began to attain a degree of linguistic and cultural competence, I began to seriously inquire about the meaning of Chilean law in Rapa Nui. Propitiously, I met an English speaking Rapa Nui woman in the museum library who was preparing to take her Chilean law exam, and was currently working in the legal system on the island as an attorney: Tiare Hey. For approximately two months we agreed to meet regularly to discuss the history and significance of Chilean law in Rapa Nui. I asked her about her own legal interests, and her opinion with respect to major legal conflicts in Rapa Nui. Much of her legal work at that time was focused on translating Rapa Nui adoptions into terms of Chilean adoption laws. On the Chilean mainland, she stressed that adoption required formal legal procedures; for Rapa Nui, adoption was informally accomplished by oral agreements between *hua’ai* members that reflected Rapa Nui customs of childcare. Establishing that a Rapa Nui person, long recognized as adopted within Rapa Nui customs as adopted within the Chilean legal system thus required significant cultural translation. Generally, Attorney Hey emphasized that cultural translation problems were not limited to adoption law; she thought all legal work in Rapa Nui was complicated by translation problems. Besides adoptions, legal issues of land tenure in Rapa Nui were noted as worthy of anthropological investigation. Attorney Hey encouraged me to read Rochona-Ramirez’s *La Propiedad de la Tierra en la Isla de Pascua*, an official account of the Chilean land tenure system which I review in more detail in Chapter 9, to understand the history and contemporary legal framework the Chilean state uses to translate and resolve land conflict in Rapa Nui, and attend court proceedings to witness actual cases of land conflicts on the island. As a result of these meetings I began to explore the possibility of focusing my ethnography of Chilean law in Rapa Nui on the meaning of the Chilean land tenure system to Rapa Nui. I began
to informally and formally ask Rapa Nui friends and members of my adopted hua’ai their perspective on the system. I wanted to learn why Rapa Nui might reject the system, and why they might want to utilize it. I also started to ask state institutions for statistical information about the frequency of legal conflicts over land tenure, and attended court proceedings to investigate the substance of land tenure conflicts within the Chilean court on the island.

According to Rochona-Ramirez, the basic structure of the land tenure system operating during my time of residence on the island was established by the former Chilean dictator Pinochet by legal decree 2885 in October 1979 (Rochona-Ramirez 1993: 54). Known as “Titulo Dominio” in Chilean Spanish, and “Te Parau Henua” in Rapa Nui, the system enabled Rapa Nui to acquire a “dominion title” (Titulo Dominio) or “land paper” (Parau Henua) for parcels of land within the main town of Haŋa Roa. Subsequently Rapa Nui were enabled to acquire titles to additional lands circumscribing Haŋa Roa in the 1990s and in the 2000s (Fisher 2005: 249-251). Generally, legal decree 2885 enabled Rapa Nui to claim title to lands in Haŋa Roa that were distributed in 1917 according to the policy administered by the Chilean Navy known as Temperamento Provisorio (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 45). According to the naval records, 221 provisional titles were allotted for a total of 1,150 hectares of land to different hua’ai at this time (Rochona-Ramirez 1993: 45). In simple terms, contemporary land claims within Haŋa Roa are based upon whether or not one had a claim to lands based upon these initial provisional titles. Rapa Nui who acquire Titulo Dominio for lands according to legal decree 2885 basically acquire pieces of the parcels distributed in 1917 to the different hua’ai. Attorney Hey emphasized, however, that the Pinochet system was embroiled in many kinds of conflict. For example, she noted that it was not always clear who had legal right to a piece of a parcel, and descendents of a hua’ai were known to fight over who had these rights. In many cases rights were thought to be
difficult to resolve because they were often based upon conflicting oral agreements between *hua’ai* members that were no longer alive. Secondly, she emphasized that some Rapa Nui refused to acknowledge or register their land in terms of Chilean legal titles, just like many Rapa Nui refused to register or acknowledge adoptions formally within the Chilean legal system. Over the years, the number of Rapa Nui completely rejecting use of the system has declined; however, there remains a significant percentage of the population that continues to reject it. In 1988 most Rapa Nui approached the Chilean land tenure system similarly: almost ten years after the creation of the Titulo Dominio land tenure policy only 30% of the total land available in *Haŋa Roa* for title was registered by Titulo Dominio, 60% was not, and 10% was reserved for state use (Rochona-Ramirez 1994: 56). By 2008, according to government statistics recorded by the “Easter Island Provincial Office of the Ministry of National Goods” (Ministerio de Bienes Nacionales Oficina Provincial Isla de Pascua) 14% of the total land available in *Haŋa Roa* for title remained unregistered by Titulo Dominio.

Various experiences in Rapa Nui illustrated the first kind of legal problem with the Chilean land tenure system Attorney Hey mentioned. For example, a Rapa Nui friend informed me that he was involved in a complex struggle for a land he acquired in conjunction with his brother approximately twelve years ago on land generally known to belong to descendants of their *hua’ai*, but at that time not in formal use by any descendants. The brother had decided to fence a portion of this land for his home, but needed help to accomplish the task. My friend was invited by his brother to help him fence the land and establish the house in exchange for half of this land. He helped; the two brothers established their houses next to one another; and they agreed to share the land. Following his brother’s death problems surfaced. His brother’s girlfriend, a non-Rapa Nui woman, tried to obtain individual legal title for the entire land in the
name of her husband’s children. She demanded that my friend abandon his house and his part of the land as he lacked Titulo Dominio for the land. He refused in light of his agreement with the brother, and noted that such oral agreements were legally honored in light of various laws protecting indigenous peoples of Chile. Moreover, he argued, she should be aware that it could be that she had to give up the brother’s house and return all the land to him given that she also lacked Titulo Dominio. As he was the senior surviving male of the hua’ai, he emphasized that in terms of Rapa Nui culture, it was likely that he, not the non-Rapa Nui woman who had the power to determine the future of the land. Following discussions within various Chilean institutions in Rapa Nui, my friend, his nephews, and his brother’s girlfriend agreed to continue the agreement he had established with his brother—they agreed to share the land and acquire separate individual titles. The only problem that remained for my friend upon my departure was how to draw boundaries for the separate land titles; that too had been established orally between the two brothers. Upon my departure from Rapa Nui the boundaries of the lands remained disputed and a new series of meetings within Chilean institutions had been scheduled to resolve this new conflict.

As I began to investigate the meaning of the Chilean land tenure system, I provided a few Rapa Nui voice recorders and asked them to record their perspective on the system. Rapa Nui given the recorders were asked to respond to a question similar to the one that ultimately became question #1 of my questionnaire. In some cases, those given the recorders were also given a written form of the question; in other cases, I simply told them the question orally and asked them to answer at their convenience. In this case, the Rapa Nui woman had the written question. The narrative was articulated by a Rapa Nui woman in her late fifties at her home under
conditions she determined. The following transcript is the bulk of her answer; a few sections that were not audible to me have been omitted. Here is the response:

Pō nui! Parauti’a nui “X” au. E pahono ‘ana i te ‘ui o te repa nei ko Forrest. Tā’ana ‘ui, ‘ui mai nei, pe hē te mana’u o te taŋata o te kāiŋa, Te Parau Tire ena i tuha’a mai ena? Tō’oku ‘ite kāiŋa nei ko Rapa Nui o te ariki nui o Hotu Matu’a i hakarei aí mo tā’ana mau kōura tere henua. Mo te nu’u ta’e ‘ite te henua nei eru’a pa’eŋa i vahi ai e te ariki nui era Hotu Matu’a. ‘Ai tita’a vahi henua i roto te haŋa era o Haŋa Rau e noho era. Etahi pa’eŋa Kava Tu’u; etahi pa’eŋa Kava Aro. Kava Aro o te pa’eŋa nei tātou e noho nei o te ariki vahine o Ava Rei Pua. Kava Tu’u te pa’eŋa era o Hotu Iti o te Mata Iti o Hotu Matu’a. E kī ena, o Hotu Matu’a te ariki nui te pa’eŋa era. Te parau henua o te tupuna ko tapa’o mai era ‘ā mai tahito mai ‘ā hai moa, hai pipihoreko, hai ahu, hai avaŋa, hai hare moa, hai hare vaka, hai hare tupa, hai tupa, hai petroglypho. Ko tapa’o tahi mai era ‘ana te me’e o te tupuna mai tau tahito mai matamu’a mai ‘ā. ‘Oira, ‘ina eko haŋa ki te parau o te Tire mo haŋa o’oku mo oho mo noho i ruŋa o te henua o tō’oku tupuna. Mai tahito mai ‘ā ki te mahana nei ko anjarina, te Rapa Nui he hatu o te rāua kāiŋa. Rapa Nui tātou i haŋa era mo oho mo noho i ruŋa te rāua tupuna. He oho rāua he noho. Tā’aku pahono mo tā’ana ‘ui o ruŋa i te parau Tire era i tuha’a mai ena, me’e ta’e tano. Ta’e mo te Tire i oho mai, i avai mai te parau ki a au i noho i ruŋa o te henua o tō’oku tupuna, o te ariki nui a Hotu a Matu’a. I te tereiŋa o te taŋata i ruŋa o te kāiŋa nei, eko tano te mana’u o te Tire ki te mana’u o te Rapa Nui. Eko tano terer’a o te Tire ki te terehaŋa o te Rapa Nui. Tereiŋa ke, tereiŋa ke. Cultura ke, cultura ke. ‘E te Tire kai ‘ite te mahiño ‘e te vānaŋa he cultura. ‘O kona hē i oho mai ai, i tu’u mai ki ruŋa ki te henua nei? Te Rapa Nui ‘ina kai hoa i te rāua re’o. I oho mai te tātou matu’a ki a tātou, ki te ŋa poki. Hāpī nei tātou. Ta’e hāpī te me’e ki te ŋa poki, eko ‘ite te ŋa poki.

Greetings tonight! An important truth is I am of the “X” extended family (the name is deleted to preserve anonymity). I am answering here the question of the friend Forrest. His question, the question asked of me here, what is the thought of the people of the land, about the Chilean land title paper? It is my knowledge that the land of Rapa Nui belongs to Great Chief Hotu Matu’a and that he left the land of Rapa Nui for his true descendants to govern. For those without knowledge, the Chief Hotu Matu’a divided the island into
two sections. The island was divided at the bay Haŋa Rau where Hotu Matu’a lived. One side is Kava Tu’a; the other side is Kava Aro. Kava Aro is the side of the chiefess Ava Rei Pua and the side where we all reside. Kava Tu’u is the side of Hotu Iti of the smaller tribe of Hotu Matu’a. It is said that Hotu Matu’a is the chief of that side. The land title of the ancestors is marked since ancient times with moai, with “stone pile territory markers” (pipihoreko), with “ceremonial centers” (ahu), “burials” (avaŋa), “stone chicken houses” (hare moa), “stone canoe shaped houses” (hare vaka), with “stone tupa style houses”, and with petroglyphs. All of the things of the ancestors are marked from the ancient time of origins to this day. Hence, as I live upon the island of my ancestors, the Chilean land paper is not wanted by me. From ancient times to this day, today, the Rapa Nui have had ownership of their land. We Rapa Nui want to go and reside with our ancestors. They will go and reside [with them]. My answer to the question regarding the Chilean land paper dividing the land is that it is unjust. It is not for the Chileans to come here and give a paper to me to live upon the island of my ancestors, of the Great Chief Hotu Matu’a. Regarding the governing of the people upon the land, the ideas of Chileans cannot be just to the thoughts of the Rapa Nui. The way the Chileans govern will not be just to the way Rapa Nui govern. [The Rapa Nui form of] governance is different, the Chilean form of governance is different. The Rapa Nui culture is different, the Chilean form of culture is different. And the Chileans do not understand the Rapa Nui community and culture. From where did you come from and arrive upon this island? The Rapa Nui have not thrown away their language. Rapa Nui elders came to all of us, and to the children. We all learned from them. If children are not taught things [of the ancestors], the children do not know [the things of the ancestors].

The answer concludes a few seconds later with a closing that reiterates that her answer is addressed to my question and project in Rapa Nui.

The narrative articulates a strong sense of the second legal problem noted by Attorney Hey. While the aforementioned friend had trouble resolving his land conflict in terms of the Chilean land tenure system, he nevertheless wanted to use the system to resolve it. In contrast, it is clear this elder Rapa Nui woman rejects the authority and significance of Chilean law in Rapa
Nui land conflict. The second kind of problem with the Chilean land tenure system rejects the basic legal discourse the Chilean state uses to ‘structure and control communication’ (Arno 1985, 1993, 2009) about land in Rapa Nui. Rejection is accomplished, in part, by re-contextualizing the meaning of the Chilean land tenure system through “discursive practices of substitution, deletion, and addition” (Leeuwen 2009: 150). Rather than assess the policy in terms of the history of laws of official Chilean discourse, she analyzes it in terms of a kinship discourse articulated through particular formulations of person reference and place. Kinship discourse provides an alternative “discursive ground” (Duranti and Goodwin 1997: 3), for assessing the meaning of the Chilean land tenure policy; a ground in which the narrator gains authority to delete the significance of Chilean interpretations of land.

After the initial greeting, the narrator begins to re-contextualize the significance of the Chilean land tenure system through the use of a formulation of person reference that represents herself not in absolute terms by a proper name, but by the relative terms of kinship (Stivers, Enfield, Levinson 2007: 17). The narrator refers to herself as a member of a specific hua’ai. Her representation in terms of kinship is not only used to establish recognition—an elementary function of formulations of person reference (Stivers, Enfield, and Levinson 2007: 12-13). Her use of person reference in kinship terms does more than refer to achieve recognition (Stivers 2007: 75). Recognition could have been accomplished with a simple focal marker like ‘ko’ preceding the name of the hua’ai and the subsequent first person singular pronoun ‘au’. Instead of using the focal marker and pronoun, the kinship reference is asserted in the context of an epistemological claim. She does not simply identify herself as a member of a particular hua’ai;

---

55 Legal discourse can be said to structure communication about land in Rapa Nui in Arno’s terms to the extent it ‘establishes the basic categories and codes for communicating’ (Arno 1985: 43) about land in the society. Law controls communication to the extent social processes and structures prevent alternative discourses from resolving conflict. Law, for Arno, is typically just one discourse available for controlling communication; religion and psychology are alternative discursive resources for resolving conflict (Arno 1985: 43).
her identity as a member of the particular *hua‘ai* is marked as “an important truth” (*parauiti’a nui*). Her *hua‘ai* membership appears to establish her authority to talk about particular issues related to the Chilean land tenure policy. On the one hand, her authority to speak is, in part, represented as typical. In the second to last sentence of the narrative she frames herself as simply one Rapa Nui among many that learned about the genealogy of land from elders. She thus speaks as one of many students of her elders. On the other hand, she also distinguishes herself from others. In speaking to “those without knowledge” (*Mo te nu’u ta’e ‘ite*) in the sixth sentence, the narrator portrays herself as someone with knowledge others might lack. Those without knowledge are not simply foreigners she anticipates might “listen” to her recording by reading my dissertation. In the final sentences, the narrator comments on ‘Rapa Nui children that do not have knowledge’ (*eko ‘ite te ηa pokī*) to question the Chilean land tenure system because they did not learn the language and things of the ancestors. Presumably, it is the aforementioned important truth of her particular kinship identity that establishes her authority to discuss what she claims some Rapa Nui, from her perspective, do not know and need to teach their children. Descent from this particular *hua‘ai*, in terms of Rapa Nui kinship regimes of truth discussed in Chapter 4, identifies herself as someone who did learn the language and things of the ancestors and hence is qualified to discuss the meaning of land in Rapa Nui.

*Hua‘ai* membership also epistemologically grounds her authority to assess the policy in terms of kinship discourse. While a Chilean might analyze the policy by attending to political and legal acts of Pinochet, particularly the details of the aforementioned legal decree 2885, the narrator begins to analyze the policy by dialogically considering the relationship of land to the founding chief of Rapa Nui Hotu Matu’a and addressing Rapa Nui progeny. Rather than continence that Chile has authority over land in Rapa Nui, she asserts that it is “her knowledge
that the land of Rapa Nui belongs to Great Chief Hotu Matu’a” (Tō’oku ite kāiŋa nei ko Rapa Nui o te ariki nui o Hotu Matu’a). By formulating the place of the island dialogically in terms of cultural memory of Hotu Matu’a she deletes the coherence of thinking of Rapa Nui as Chilean land. She adds coherence to the significance of thinking about Rapa Nui land in terms of Hotu Matu’a by insisting that “the Great Chief Hotu Matu’a left the land of Rapa Nui for his true descendents to govern” (te ariki nui o Hotu Matu’a i hakarei ai mo tā’ana mau kōura tere henua). In emphasizing genealogy, the elder, has dissolved the authority of the Chilean system to speak. She has, in a sense, proposed qualification rules (Foucault 1972: 225-227) for speaking about land in Rapa Nui which logically exclude Chileans from participation. The reformulation of the land in terms of Rapa Nui ancestors and progeny disqualifies Chileans from participation in determining the truth about land in Rapa Nui. To speak about land in Rapa Nui, according to the narrator, one must be able to produce a Rapa Nui “genealogy” (hakaara) that identifies oneself as one of the true descendents of the Great Chief Hotu Matu’a. In terms of a Rapa Nui kinship regime of truth, “statements” (Foucault 1972a) about lands in Rapa Nui without a genealogical epistemological ground lack a coherent “enunciative network” (Foucault 1972a: 99) from which to speak. Lacking Rapa Nui genealogy, Chileans and their “political anatomy” (Foucault 1995: 28), are disqualified from speaking; hence, perhaps, the absence of a detailed consideration of particular laws and policies associated with the land tenure system within her talk. The elder woman falls silent on the details of Chilean legal decree 2885 because she considers its statements meaningless.

In asserting that, “It is not for the Chileans to come here and give a paper to me to live upon the island of my ancestors” (Ta’e mo te Tire i oho mai, i avai mai te parau ki a au i noho i runja o te henua o tō’oku tupuna) the elder woman also adduces some insightful philosophical
and empirical reasoning to support her position. After she elaborates some of the details of how Hotu Matu’a is culturally remembered as having divided the land, she interestingly contrasts the sense of a Chilean title to the island lands with material evidence that Rapa Nui have title to the lands. She asserts that the “ancestral paper title” (Te parau henua o te tupuna) to lands of Rapa Nui “is marked” (ko tapa’ō mai era) by such physical objects as the world-famous moai sculptures, and its accompanying culture complex of stone houses, burials, and boundary markers. She also claims to reject the Chilean land tenure system because she believes it imposes a different cultural, political, and psychological order upon Rapa Nui people. She represents the Chilean land tenure system as something “incommensurable” (Kuhn 1970, 1979, 2000a, 2000b, 2000c) with Rapa Nui culture and ways of governance. In her words, the Chilean land tenure system is part of a “different culture” (cultura ke) and a different way of “governance” (tereiŋa ke). As an instrument of a different culture and form of governance, the land tenure system consists of “ideas of the Chileans that cannot be just in the thoughts of Rapa Nui” (eko tano te mana’u o te Tire ki te mana’u o te Rapa Nui). There is thus a complex rationale for why the elder woman asserts “the Chilean land title paper is not wanted by me” (‘ina eko haŋa ki te parau o te Tire). She not only provides reasons why Chile lacks authority to speak about land title in Rapa Nui, she also notes philosophical and empirical reasons why she cannot accept the Chilean land tenure system. While it is not specified herein, the elder woman stressed subsequently that despite incessant requests by the Chilean state to register her land for decades she had not registered her land with the Chilean state. She was emphatic that she would go to the grave not registering the land with the Chilean government, and adamant that those succumbing to state pressure to register their lands were making a mistake. When I asked her to record her opinion on the Chilean land tenure system, I had no idea of any of this. She was very excited to have

56 In Chapter 10, I spell out in detail how Kuhn’s concept relates to the conflict at hand.
recorded her thoughts on a matter that has weighed upon her mind for decades and is dear to her heart. This was her big issue with the Chilean government and she was a proud member of the remaining 14% of Rapa Nui not signing a Chilean paper.

Importantly, her answer is broadly similar to the answer of a woman in her early forties from an altogether different hua’ai.

Tō’oku mana’u me’e nei he Titulo Dominio. ’Ina he riva mātou mo to’o i te me’e nei. He aha ta’e riva te me’e nei te Titulo Dominio? Te ha’aura’a: E avai mai ‘’ā te Tire, te hau Tire, i te henua ki mātou. A mātou, mātou henua i rava’a ai: ta’e o te hau Tire; me’e hakaara mai a Hotu Matu’a. Mo mātou te kāiŋa. I te hora tuai, te matahiapo o te ariki to’o mai, he vahi te kāiŋa; vahi i roto i tā’ana poki era erima. I te vahiiŋa i vahi ai he oho mai ki te hora nei hai mata. Te tātou mata o nei o Rapa Nui, e ai rō ’ā te rāua parehe. I te hora nei o aŋarina te ha’aura’a: au i tuha’a mai ai i tō’oku kona. Kona ke nō atu. Ta’e o’oku te aro era. E ai rō ’ā te mata; o rāua ra aro. I te hora nei, ta’e te hua’ai i noho ai i roto te rāua kona era o te rāua mata tahito. Hakanohonoho, hakahapehepe ’ā te tuha’aiŋa o te henua tuai. He aha kī era pe nei ēe? Me’e ta’e au ra me’e. E ai rō ’ā te kuhane i ruja o te henua. Te me’e nei he kuhane, mātou tupuna. Oira te nu’u o nei ta’e au te tuha’aiŋa o te hora nei o te henua. I roto te Rapa Nui, e ai rō ’ā te nu’u e ma’u nō ’ā te mana’uiŋa tahito era. He hakaterere, he oho mai mo te rāua matu’a mai te rāua tupuna. Te ha’aura’a ki te matu’a, ki te ŋa pokī. He hakaterere, he oho mai pe mu’a. Tō’oku mana’u me’e nei, me’e hauha’a mo hāpī ki te ŋa pokī. Me’e hauha’a rahi mo hakama’a ki te ŋa pokī, mo ma’a i a rāua i te me’e nei, mo mo’a takoa. Tā’ato’a ahu, e ai rō ’ā tō’ona mata, e ai rō ’ā tō’ona hua’ai. O rāua te ahu, te moai. Te ariki i vahi ai hai mata.

My thought of this thing Dominion Title. It is not good for us to take this thing. Why is it not good this Dominion Title? The meaning of this thing: Chile, the Chilean government, gives land to us. We, our land was already acquired: not from the Chilean government; it is established by a genealogy traced to Hotu Matu’a. The land is for us. In ancient times, the eldest son of the chief [Hotu Matu’a] acquired [land], divided the land; divided the
land among his five children. The way of distributing the divisions until this hour was
done by “tribe” (mata). All of the tribes of Rapa Nui have a piece of land. At this time
today, here is the significance: I have divided my land area. It is a strange land area
without purposeful meaning. It is not my land “section” (aro). It is of a tribe; this section
is of them. Currently, extended families do not reside upon the land areas of the ancestral
tribes. They are made to reside on lands, ancestral divisions render false. What is said
about this now? It is something unsuitable. There is a spirit upon the island. These spirits
are our ancestors. Thus, groups of people do not consider the current divisions of the
island suitable. Within Rapa Nui, there are groups of people who carry the thoughts of
the ancestors. They would govern by coming to their elders and ancestors. This is
significant to parents and children; to govern this way in the future. My thought is that
this, this is valuable to teach to the children. It is of great value to give this knowledge to
the children, for them to know these things, for them to respect these things. All of our
“ceremonial centers” (ahu), belong to particular “tribes” (mata), and particular extended
families. The moai and ahu belong to them. The chief divided the land by tribe.

The transcript concludes where the recording ends. The woman subsequently recorded another
narrative that detailed the particular location of lands associated with her hua’ai.

Interestingly, while the elder fundamentally refused to acquire Chilean title to her land,
this woman appears to have it. This is implied in her claim that, “I have divided my land area”
(au i tuha’a mai ai i tō’oku kona). Importantly however, she assesses her land registered by
Chilean title in negative terms. In her words, “It is a strange land area without purposeful
meaning” (Kona ke nō atu). While her explanation is not identical to that of the elder woman, the
two women of different generations and hua’ai often assess the meaning of the Chilean land
tenure system in terms of similar themes and methods. Like the elder woman, this woman
explains the meaningless of her registered land in terms of Rapa Nui kinship discourse. While in
her words, “The Chilean system gives land, Chile, the Chilean government, gives land to us” (E
avai mai ‘ā te Tire, te hau Tire, i te henua ki mātou), according to her reasoning, the Chilean
land title is “not good for us to take” (“Ina he riva mātou mo to’o i te me’e nei”). In other words, though she has acquired title she does not approve of the Chilean land tenure system. The woman provides tribal, genealogical, and spiritual reasons why Rapa Nui should not acquire Chilean titles to Rapa Nui land and why her own registered land is in a sense meaningless to her.

Unlike the elder, the woman emphasizes that all ancestral land divisions were by “tribe” (mata), and that all Rapa Nui hua’ai members identify with land associated with the particular tribal groups. For her, the Chilean land tenure system violates the tribal organization of Rapa Nui land fundamental to hua’ai identity. Under the system, “Currently extended families do not reside upon the land areas of the ancestral tribes. They are made to reside on lands, ancestral divisions render false” (I te hora nei, ta’e te hua’ai i noho ai i roto te rāua kona era o te rāua mata tahito. Hakanohonoho, hakahapehape ’ā te tuha’aiŋa o te henua tuai). This is the case with respect to her registered land. In her words, “It is not my land “section” (aro). It is of a tribe; this section is of them” (Ta’e o’oku te aro era. E ai rō ’ā te mata; o rāua ra aro). Land is thus meaningful to her to the extent it ultimately is based upon the original land divisions of Rapa Nui. While the details of the genealogy differ—for example, the younger woman emphasizes the role of the son of Hotu Matu’a in dividing land in Rapa Nui while the elder woman did not mention the son—both women ultimately trace the genealogy of land divisions to the Great Chief Hotu Matu’a. The woman does not think it is good to take Chilean title in part because “our land was already acquired” (mātou henua i rava’a ai). Chilean land title claims conflict with her knowledge that Rapa Nui land claims are already “established by a genealogy traced to Hotu Matu’a” (me’e hakaara mai a Hotu Matu’a).

The Great Chief Hotu Matu’a and the lands of Rapa Nui generally have a spiritual significance to the woman not highlighted by the elder. According to the woman, “there are
spirits upon the island” (*E ai rō ’ā te kuhane i ruŋa o te henua*) which she equates with the “ancestors” (*tupuna*). The spiritual ecology of the island is expressed in part in material cultural heritage associated with the ancestors of particular tribes and extended families. In her words, “All of our “ceremonial centers” (*ahu*), belong to particular “tribes” (*mata*), and particular extended families. The *moai* and *ahu* belong to them” (*Tā’ato’a ahu, e ai rō ’ā tō’ona mata, e ai rō ’ā tō’ona hua’ai. O rāua te ahu, te moai*). While perhaps in ancestral times the *moai* and *ahu* had additional cosmological significance (Van Tilberg 1994: 126-145), as symbolic memorials to chiefs of particular tribes the *moai* today are, as I noted Piru stressed in Chapter 3, “the living faces of the ancestors” (*te arii a ora o te tupuna*), and thus a form of representation of “the spirits upon the island” (*te kuhane i ruŋa o te henua*). The woman stresses that the ancestral spirits, and their material symbols, retain contemporary significance to some Rapa Nui. In her words, “Within Rapa Nui, there are groups of people who carry the thoughts of the ancestors” (*I roto te Rapa Nui, e ai rō ’ā te nu’u e ma’u nō ’ā te mana’uija tahito era*). Such Rapa Nui, she avers, “They would govern by coming to their elders and ancestors” (*He hakatere, he oho mai mo te rāua matu’a mai te rāua tupuna*). Maintaining a ground of Rapa Nui kinship discourse, the woman proposes that for this to occur, “It is of great value to give this knowledge to the children, for them to know these things, for them to respect these things” (*Me’e hauha’a rahi mo hakama’a ki te āa pokī, mo ma’a i a rāua i te me’e nei, mo mo’a takoa*). It is thus clear why, according to the narrator’s analysis, the Chilean land tenure system is considered as “something unsuitable” (*Me’e ta’e au ra me’e*). Those Rapa Nui “people who carry the thoughts of the ancestors” (*te nu’u e ma’u nō ’ā te mana’uija tahito era*), according to the woman, cannot accept the Chilean land tenure system because, in a sense, it undermines their spiritual, as well as tribal and genealogical understanding of the island lands and themselves. The Chilean system,
for these Rapa Nui, appears to construct a cartography that violates their genealogical and spiritual identity to tribal lands associated with their particular kin groups.

**Te ’UiUi A’aku: My Research Questions**

The problems the two women have with the Chilean land tenure system can perhaps best framed as critical in contrast to the operational problems of the Rapa Nui man above. The man’s problems, while involving complex cultural translation and negotiations could be, and I assume were, ultimately resolved within the Chilean land tenure system. After establishing that both the man and his brother’s children could register legal title to the disputed land with “the Ministry of National Goods” (El Ministerio de Bienes Nacionales), the two parties could petition the courthouse and other Chilean institutions to determine the appropriate boundaries of the two land titles. The critical discourse of the two women, however, suggests that Chilean law is only one possible way to communicate about land in Rapa Nui. Their narratives indicate that law is only one conflict discourse system available for ‘structuring and controlling communication’ about land. As a conflict discourse, law, for Arno, ‘identifies events and issues in terms of its own categories of analysis, provides a way of talking and reasoning about situations, identities of persons and their respective rights and duties, exerts authority to resolve conflict, and sets out a blueprint for future conduct’ (Arno 2009: 44). Rapa Nui kinship discourse, as articulated by the women, appears to dispute the Chilean legal categories for talking and reasoning about land in Rapa Nui and constructs an alternative discourse for structuring and resolving conflict communication about land in Rapa Nui. Rather than embracing a Chilean identity for themselves and a Chilean cartography for their land in Rapa Nui, the women identify themselves and their land genealogically. They hope to pass this genealogical reality to future Rapa Nui progeny, rather than trammel them to Chilean state blueprints for Pascuense identities.
While I was, and am interested in the operational problems of Chilean land tenure policy, I doubted I could adequately study this aspect of it. I surmised at the time that to investigate the operational problems, I would have to become more focused on Chilean discourse. Study of the operational problems likely involved extensive analysis of the discourse used in actual conflicts within the courtroom and in El Ministerio de Bienes Nacionales as well as documents associated with the proceedings. Generally Chilean Spanish was the language used in these processes, not Rapa Nui. Having abandoned extensive study of Chilean Spanish after three months of research in Rapa Nui as discussed in Chapter 3, the prospects of successfully completing a dissertation based upon Chilean Spanish seemed dim. Were I somehow to manage the language barrier through assistants and a return to extensive study of Chilean Spanish however, such a focus seemed doomed to encounter the kinds of criticism my volunteer work at the school initially encountered. Such a focus would be seen as studying “a Chilean thing” (*he me’e Tire*) as described in Chapter 5. I would be studying the conflicts of Rapa Nui within a Chilean institution. Such a study would fall silent on those who questioned the Chilean system in general in terms of Rapa Nui kinship forms of life. Further, some Rapa Nui would see such a study as in a sense legitimating *me’e Tire*. To study El Ministerio de Bienes Nacionales and the courts could be seen as accepting the authority of these institutions to resolve the conflicts of *Te Parau Henua*. Such a research strategy would not respect and “listen” (*hakaroŋo mai*), as I wrote in chapter 3, to those Rapa Nui who understood *Te Parau Henua* as lacking a coherent epistemology; it begged the question.

To respect these voices I developed a research methodology I hoped would enable me to learn more about Rapa Nui understandings of the Chilean land tenure system that did not silence those Rapa Nui who had epistemological conflicts with it. While I had no reason to doubt that
the themes of Rapa Nui kinship discourse the two women applied to answer the initial question I posed were themes other Rapa Nui would apply—they were themes I heard in everyday talk in *Te Hoe Manu* and other places in Rapa Nui regularly—I created a methodology I hoped would enable me to demonstrate the extent to which they were shared by other Rapa Nui. In other words, whether Rapa Nui kinship discourse about land on the island was a structural feature of Rapa Nui discursive practice; that is, a “...normal pattern of meaningful exchange that constitutes accepted social reality” (Arno 2009: 28) for Rapa Nui. Building upon the questions I initially posed to these two women and others, I developed a short questionnaire (see appendix) that requested Rapa Nui to meet with *hua‘ai* members and record a discussion of three questions related to land and the Chilean land tenure system. To avoid being accused of studying principally *he me‘e Tire*, I created a questionnaire that requested Rapa Nui discuss the questions within their own language and with *hua‘ai* members in settings chosen at their own discretion and without me present. The final version of the questionnaire resulted from a month of discussion with six Rapa Nui. I consulted with Rapa Nui I had developed significant relations with during my stay in Rapa Nui by that time (over six months). Those consulted descended from four different *hua‘ai*; three of the six were women; four of the six were over fifty. The questionnaire was first written by me in Rapa Nui; I then presented it to these Rapa Nui for evaluation. The questionnaire was rewritten at least six times in response to suggestions for content and grammar changes. While my initial research topic and the questions I posed were not strictly created by the Rapa Nui community as is ideal for scholars of Indigenous Studies (Gegeo 2001, Smith 2002: 173), Rapa Nui fundamentally participated in the question formation, and the questionnaire is thus in some sense “collaborative” (Greenwood 2008: 329). My discussions with these consultants and my general interactions with members of the Rapa Nui community during
eight months of residence in Rapa Nui strongly influenced the problems and questions I ultimately researched. While some of the community members I consulted had at times worked in government institutions in Rapa Nui, at the time of my study none currently held any political office. Thus, broadly speaking I developed the questionnaire at a “grass roots” level.

While the questions I posed changed and evolved as I discussed my questionnaire with my consultants, I never modified my request that respondents discuss the questions in the Rapa Nui language. At that stage of my field work, this seemed the ideal format for the questionnaire given my own abilities, as well as the types of Rapa Nui I wanted to hear from. As I expected to primarily ask older Rapa Nui to discuss my questions—Rapa Nui at least older than forty and typically over fifty—asking for responses in Rapa Nui was, from my ethnographic experience, simply asking elders to speak their first language. Had I been principally interested in the opinions of Rapa Nui youth, I likely would not have requested conversations in Rapa Nui. Had I been interested in Rapa Nui understanding of Chilean television soap operas, something they primarily experienced in Chilean Spanish, Chilean Spanish would be the reasonable choice for conversations—not “island land” (*te kāinga o te henua*). Given that I was asking Rapa Nui to discuss *hua’ai* land in Rapa Nui—contemporary and ancestral—and I had learned that Rapa Nui language use was fundamentally a discursive practice engaged in the places and *hua’ai* of the Rapa Nui, Rapa Nui seemed the logical choice. Only one of my consultants, a younger one, challenged my idea to restrict conversations to Rapa Nui; she thought I should allow Rapa Nui to decide. Given that the other five disagreed, my anticipated concern that I might not be able to understand Chilean Spanish conversations, and my own sense that Rapa Nui conversations were the best code choice given my interest in *hua’ai* level conversations, I ignored the one dissenting view and requested all Rapa Nui to respond in their indigenous language.
I initially created the questionnaire with the hope that Rapa Nui could engage in conversations within their hua'ai, not only to avoid the aforementioned political problem, but because, like McCall (1976), participation observation indicated that hua'ai were a fundamental dimension of all the Rapa Nui lives. Moreover, because the questions were about something that in part defined a hua'ai, the hua'ai seemed the obvious context of conversations. While my experiences revealed that elder Rapa Nui life involves considerable interaction within institutions that are not exclusively kinship based, for example within processes of international tourism and the Chilean State, the elder Rapa Nui I encountered most in my daily life did seem to live most of their life within their hua'ai. No doubt there are many important sites of meaning in elder Rapa Nui lives outside the hua'ai —for example, the Catholic Church, political and social meetings, discussions with tourists, chats with friends at the Feria market place, drinking at the local pubs, or simply watching television; however, I suspect it is rare to find an elder Rapa Nui who fails to find a significant portion of their life’s meaning from daily interaction among kin of their hua’ai—I for one never met one. Perhaps as participants in the global postmodern condition, it is a mistake to continue to speak of Rapa Nui forms of life in the modernist terms of McCall and speak of the foundations of Rapa Nui identity as kinship based. Yet however fragmented elder Rapa Nui life has become within the collage of their postmodern ethnoscape, I sense that at least the hua’ai remains a pivotal dimension of their life if not its foundation. None of my consultants challenged my suggestion that conversations be conducted among kin; indeed, all of them strongly encouraged me to keep my studies focused on hua’ai and their places.

The first question of the questionnaire is basically the initial question I posed to the aforementioned group of Rapa Nui that recorded monologues about their perspective on the Chilean land tenure system. This question was a transformation of an earlier question that asked
Rapa Nui for their general understandings of Chilean laws about land at the recommendation of an initial Rapa Nui I consulted. A second Rapa Nui I consulted suggested I change this question to a question with the more specific focus on problems associated with *Te Parau Henua*. The initial recordings made in response to this question like those above suggested I was on the right track. Further discussions with Rapa Nui continued to suggest that this was a valuable first question. An early formulation of question number two was created by me upon reflection of my aforementioned friend’s conflict over registering his land against protest from his nieces and nephews, and the difference between the two women’s answers regarding registering Chilean title. The narratives and experiences indicated that some Rapa Nui were recognizing their land in terms of the Chilean system while others analyzed it in terms of Rapa Nui kinship discourse. I hoped the question would reveal the extent to which Rapa Nui understood their land in terms of kinship as opposed to the contract of the Chilean land tenure system. My consultants generally liked this question and helped me articulate it in a clearer form than I initially proposed. A few had reservations which, it turns out, bore out in the data collected, and on reflection were already manifest in the two women’s answers. Question two, for some of my consultants, creates a false dilemma: it assumes that Rapa Nui either recognize the land in terms of Rapa Nui kinship discourse or the Chilean land tenure system, but not both. As the woman above points out, some Rapa Nui, while they ultimately see the land in kinship terms, due to political economic pressure, pragmatically register their land in terms of Chilean titles. The topic of the third question—Rapa Nui thoughts about ancestral lands not currently occupied (*kāiŋa o te kōrua Mata tahito*)—was one that also emerged in the initial monologues. The younger woman emphasizes that Rapa Nui live on lands that did not belong to their original tribe. It was also commonly a topic of conversations I had with my Rapa Nui consultants. My consultants were fundamental in the
creation of the question as it involved difficult vocabulary. Ultimately, all the Rapa Nui that I consulted agreed that these questions were good questions to ask to begin learning about Rapa Nui land issues and problems of Te Parau Henua. While I discussed other questions with my consultants, I decided that these were useful questions to ask.

Questionnaires were given to Rapa Nui I had developed varying degrees of report with throughout my tenure on the island. The Rapa Nui I solicited had different statuses and jobs in the community: a few were currently involved in government positions with the municipality; a few were Rapa Nui I met at the Catholic Church and while working at the school; some were Rapa Nui I met while engaging in life within and near Te Hoe Manu and at cultural gatherings such as Tapati Rapa Nui and Te Mahana o te Re’o; others were Rapa Nui I met at the markets, and shops; and some were simply friends of Rapa Nui friends. The majority of those given questionnaires were between forty and seventy years old. While in a few cases these elder Rapa Nui chose to discuss the questions with younger Rapa Nui, the majority discussed issues with Rapa Nui within this age range. No questionnaire was given to a Rapa Nui younger than mid-twenties and I am not aware of any recordings that include discussions with anyone younger than this age. An equal number of men and women were asked to respond. I explicitly requested in the questionnaire and orally that all conversationalists be Rapa Nui speakers and of Rapa Nui descent. I am not aware of any recordings that include people that are not of Rapa Nui descent and Rapa Nui speakers. Though it is clear that control of Rapa Nui language varies within the conversations, the overwhelming majority demonstrate a strong level of control; a level one would expect only from fluent, first language speakers.

As the questionnaire states in the appendix, those given the questionnaires were asked to meet with at least one other hua’ai member to record a conversation about the questions within a
setting of their choice. Whether they were to have a conversation with many members or just one was left to their discretion. Whether they chose to discuss the questions for an hour or five minutes or less was also left to their discretion. All recordings were completed in settings and with hua’ai partners determined by those who received questionnaires and recorders. The majority of recordings were duets, though a few were multi-party conversations. A few returned the recorders with recordings of conversations as well as monologues. And a few returned a set of conversations in which they had different hua’ai members record separate conversations. The recordings ranged from a few minutes to over an hour. Most of the recordings were approximately ten minutes in length. While I was present at three, the overwhelming majority were conducted in settings in which I was not a party to the conversation. A few conversations were recorded with me nearby, but only upon their request. The majority of recorders were returned after a few weeks; a few were not returned for months—much to my chagrin. Only two returned the recorders without completing recordings of any type; these two later agreed to record at a more convenient time.

CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

The conversations of chapters 7 and 8 are analyzed in terms of principles of Conversation Analysis (CA) understood as a method, as opposed to a paradigm of social research (Hammersley 2001), that can be usefully applied in discursive analytic work in conjunction with other methods (Duranti and Goodwin 1997, Goodwin 1994, Wetherell 1998, Wetherell, Taylor, and Yates 2009) irrespective of some of its theoretical problems (Billig 1999a, 1999b, Hammersley 2001). While as much as possible the conversations analyzed in chapters 7 and 8 are examined in terms of orthodox CA methods, given the ethnographic nature of my research, some of these methods are slightly relaxed. My analysis is based more in ethnographically
oriented Conversation Analysis (Bilmes 1998, Moerman 1988), or so-called Culturally Contexted Conversation Analysis (Moreman 1988), than orthodox CA. This form of Conversation Analysis investigates the meaning of conversations in terms of both conversational and cultural context (Moerman 1988: 28, Bilmes 1998: 185), as well as biographical, historical, and social factors analysis reveals relevant to interpreting the significance of talk (Moerman 1988: 8). Supplementing Conversation Analysis with ethnographic materials deviates from the canonical form of CA exemplified by Schegloff (1991, 1997) that promotes analysis of conversations that does not depend upon contextual information exogenous to talk—a matter to be detailed below. Ethnographically oriented CA, more concerned with the meaning of talk than simply its sequential organization (Moerman 1988: 20), asserts that both analyses of cultural context and sequential organization are necessary for interpreting the meaning of conversations (Moerman 1988: 28). Context exogenous to talk is introduced by ethnographically oriented CA to provide cultural context considered necessary for understanding the nuances of meaning in conversational materials of unfamiliar cultures and languages. This is deemed necessary because canonical conversational analysis analyzes materials in terms of cultural membership knowledge often not available to analysts of ethnographic materials (Bilmes 1998: 184-185). For example, while orthodox CA can analyze talk that involves legal issues in a U.S. court perhaps without exogenous contextual information about U.S. law in terms of CA, such an analyst requires such information to study Thai legal talk as the analyst lacks cultural membership knowledge of Thai law (Bilmes 1998: 184). Exogenous contextual information is introduced to interpret the talk and to show how the significant socio-cultural features of a people, such as gender and class, are accomplished and managed in talk (Moerman 1988: 7).
Accordingly, my investigation of the meaning of the Chilean land tenure system to Rapa Nui analyzes Rapa Nui hua’ai conversations in terms of both conversational and cultural context. As ethnographically oriented CA encourages, I introduce “exogenous” cultural context into analysis where the introduction helps clarify the meaning of talk to the participants to non-Rapa Nui readers. Moerman seems, in some cases, to demand a definition of “meaning” and “understanding” that, in part, necessarily includes conversational terms (Moerman 1988: xi). This discursive stance appears to be rhetorically designed as part of a polemic against competing discourses about meaning; e.g. practice theory (Moerman 1988: 18), structuralism (Moerman 1988: 88), and hermeneutics (Moerman 1988: 90-92). While I use his approach methodologically, I do not thereby want to suggest this is the only appropriate way to analyze either “meaning” or “understanding”. Following Wittgenstein’s *Philosophical Investigations*, these notions are used in different language games besides the language game of conversational interaction; e.g. in writing and contemplating a monologue, poem, or song. The notion of “meaning” may need to be used differently by analysts and regular folk not concerned with conversational meaning and understanding; e.g., the externalist accounts of meaning by the philosopher Hilary Putnam (1993) of particular concern to natural science. While I find heuristic value in applying the CA language game in my project, I respect that there are other language games to consider in assessing the broad range of significance of alternative uses of these notions. A fundamental premise of Schutz’s phenomenological sociology assumed within the epistemological foundations of Conversation Analysis is that the immediate social interaction involved in a talk (for example, questioning and answering, formulations and their assessments) ‘constitutes a legitimate area of inquiry in itself’ (Garfinkel and Sacks 1970: 342). In Wittgensteinian terms, with this premise, CA has ‘drawn a boundary around language use for a
particular purpose’ (Wittgenstein 2001: 117). This drawn, not discovered, boundary of CA discursive practice, one could say, problematically, has constructed a context which Wittgenstein could find worrisome: for the boundary creates a context in which ‘language idles’ (Wittgenstein 2001: 44) out of synch with its broader form of life. The boundary drawn by ‘professional vision to highlight and code’ (Goodwin 1994: 627) the immediate social interaction of sequential turns involved in a talk ‘decontextualizes and then recontextualizes’ (Riesegel and Wodack 2009: 90) the meaning of talk within the “discursive ground” (Duranti and Goodwin 1997: 3) of a language game that “figures” (Duranti and Goodwin 1997: 3) conversational turns against this discursive ground and backgrounds, or idles, the broader form of life in which the language use is actually working. An enthymeme is at work here: an “enunciative field” (Foucault 1972: 27-28) or “linguistic framework” (Carnap 1963, 1988b, Strawson 1963) focused on a drawn context of talk—its sequential composition—has thus been used to replace, by smuggling in a kind of “substitution rule” (Carnap 2002: 36-37) suppressed by Schegloff and orthodox CA, a context of unbounded language use within the “manifold” (Kant 1998) of socio-cultural and natural life.

Like it does with the notions of structure and rule (Bilmes 1988), CA has refashioned what ‘social’ and ‘empirical’ is used to mention when it claims to study the social interaction of talk. CA is not concerned, for example, with the broader fabric of socio-cultural “felicity conditions” (Austin 1999) that ethnographic research could empirically show as requisite for a command to produce the illocutionary effect of say actually marrying a couple, or the perlocutionary effect of causing the spouses to cry—aspects of a wedding many regular folks would consider the really important social action of the command. CA would, rather, study the way the “command” worked within a sequence of “turn-constructional units” (Schegloff 2007b: 3-7) between the priest, the bride, and the groom. CA is, as is it maintains that it is, analyzing
something “social” and “empirical”, but ironically enough given the sometimes vituperative attacks upon other analysts for not being empirical and social, the terms ‘social’ and ‘empirical’ are used by CA in a very unfamiliar rarefied way. A technical empirical and social context, one to be clarified further below, is drawn and given foreground by CA, while contrary to CA I insist, a more complex sense of the empirical and social context, what the talk-in-interaction comes to do within the historical form of a socio-cultural and global political economic world, is placed in the background. CA investigates what others have considered to be only one of the four major components of the context of language use (Reisigl and Wodak 2009: 93).

At the heart of critiques of CA focused on its analysis of context, I believe, is a dispute over the substitution of a technical context of talk for a broader sense of the context of talk. Schegloff implies that the CA approach to the contextual meaning of talk, in his typically disputatious and uncompromising non-Aristotelian way of rejecting the possibility of a middle ground, is the only way to clarity (Schegloff 1999a: 562). However, a more philosophical student of language use suggests that analysis of parts does not always lead to clarity regarding a whole. He comments,

When I say: “My broom is in the corner”, --is this really a statement about the broomstick and the brush? Well, it could be at any rate be replaced by a statement giving the position of the stick and the position of the brush. And this statement is surely a further analyzed form of the first one. --But why do I call it “further analyzed”? --Well, if the broom is there, that surely means that the stick and brush must be there, and in a particular relation to one another; and this was as it were hidden in the sense of the first sentence, and is *expressed* in the analysed sentence. Then does someone who says that the broom is in the corner really mean: the broomstick is there, and so is the brush and the broomstick is fixed in the brush? --If we were to ask anyone if he meant this he would probably say that he had not thought especially of the broomstick or especially of the brush at all. And that would be the right answer, for he meant to speak neither of the stick nor of the brush in particular. Suppose that, instead of saying “Bring me the broom”, you said “Bring me the broomstick and the brush which is fitted on it.” Isn’t the answer: “do you want the broom? Why do you put it so oddly?” --Is he going to understand the further analysed sentence better? --This sentence, one might say, achieves the same as the ordinary one, but in a more roundabout way. --Imagine a language-game in which someone is ordered to bring certain objects which are composed of several parts, to move them about, or something else of the kind. And two ways of playing it: in one (a) the composite objects (brooms, chairs, tables, etc.) have names, as in (15); in the other (b) only the parts are given names and the wholes are described by means of them. --In what sense is an order in the second game an analyzed form of an order in the first? Does the former lie concealed in the latter, and is it now
brought out by analysis?—True, the broom is taken to pieces when one separates broomstick and brush; but
does it follow that the order to bring the broom also consists of corresponding parts? (Wittgenstein

CA has detached Wittgenstein’s brush from the broom so to speak and asked us to examine only
the brush. Like the philosophy of Logical Atomism (Russell 1985: 37-38, Russell 2001),
Schegloff seems to suggest analysis of talk-in-interaction leads to a clearer picture of its
meaning. From such a vantage, CA is not strictly “empirical”, it is a kind of “logical
reconstruction of a world” (Carnap 2003: 158-159) that involves a blurred boundary between the
empirical and rational (Quine 1996) as well as aesthetic and other features involved in the use of
any language (Jakobson 1960). Using the rhetoric of a discourse back upon itself as post-
structuralism encourages (Derrida 1973a: 5), CA is not strictly “empirical” because its cultural
members socially “place” conversation in an analytically constructed context, the technical
context designated by the explicatum “sequential environment” (Wilson 1991: 24) that
reflexively indexes the cultural membership categories, identities, and topics of analysis of
interest to CA members (Schegloff 1971: 129), not some language independent natural reality—
the explicandum. The CA brush of talk-in-interaction, one could say is not identical to the
totality in which it is a part, the analyzed part “…does not belong to the totality (is not part of the
totality), the totality has its center elsewhere. The center is not the center” (Derrida 1978: 279).

To understand more of the nuances of the manifold of contexts of discourse, in the ‘age of the
world target one must defer reference’ (Chow 2006: 11), and reflect beyond the ‘context shaped
and renewed’ (Heritage 1984: 242) by orthodox CA. A sensibility not lost upon one of
Schegloff’s more philosophically minded teachers: Garfinkel (Heritage 1984: 140).

While orthodox CA has rejected the incorporation of ethnography into its methodology
(Nelson 1994), this critique does not entail that ethnography has nothing to gain from
incorporating CA. Orthodox CA as defined by Schegloff has consistently policed its boundaries
not only from ethnography, but CDA (Schegloff 1997b, 1998), DA (Wooffitt 2005: 182), FDA (Wooffitt 2005: 157), MCA (Schegloff 2007), and rhetorical psychology (Schegloff 1999a, 1999b). While CA practitioners are of course free to determine what should or should not be incorporated into CA, it does not follow that Schegloff and others in his spirit get to determine whether CDA, DA, ethnography, FDA, or rhetorical psychology can appropriate ideas from CA. While I am sympathetic to perspectives like those of Billig (1999a, 1999b), Hammersely (2001), Moerman (1988), and Wetherell (1998) who have identified limitations in the CA approach and consequently suggest that discourse analytic work will progress better by not being doctrinaire, but incorporating insights from other discourse analytic work, that is not my argument here. In defense of Schegloff and CA, I think those who have critiqued him in some cases have failed to confront the fact that the basic discursive stance of Schegloff is to defend that he can accomplish what he has defined as the necessary and sufficient goals of CA without supplementing his methods with theory and methodology from other disciplines. Like Humpty Dumpty, Schegloff can say contextual meaning in CA is whatever he likes as long as his team of Alices are willing to agree that that is what it is. If one peers through the looking glass however, it appears, that CA has introduced a rule governed linguistic framework and attempted to insulate it from “external questions” (Carnap 1963, 1988b, Strawson 1963). Despite his pleas to the contrary, Schegloff and orthodox CA, like “spectatorial” epistemology of early versions of logical positivism, cannot define “meaning” without presuppositions (Rorty 1967: 39). There is no way to defend a discourse-analytic program, CA or others, without presuppositions any more than there is an independent manner in which to ground a philosophy:

To know what method to adopt, one must already have arrived at some metaphysical and some epistemological conclusions. If one attempts to defend these conclusions by the use of one’s chosen method, one is open to a charge of circularity. If one does not so defend them, maintaining that given these conclusions, the need to adopt the chosen method follows, one is open to the charge that the chosen method
is inadequate, for it cannot be used to establish the crucial metaphysical and epistemological theses which are in dispute (Rorty 1967: 1).

While my focus is an investigation of meaning broadly emergent from culturally contexted, sequentially organized Conversation Analysis (Moerman 1988: 97, 45), contrary to many Conversation Analysts, I do not think meaning has to be limited to conversational terms. My perspective here is similar to Carnap’s so-called principle of tolerance in regard to what rules of logic should or should not be applied to engage in the language game of logic:

Let us grant to those who work in any special field of investigation the freedom to use any form of expression which seems useful to them; the work in the field will sooner or later lead to the elimination of those forms which have no useful function. Let us be cautious in making assertions and critical in examining them, but tolerant in permitting linguistic forms” (Carnap 1988b: 221).

Some will want to find a family resemblance between their language games and the language game of CA and use it in their different games, while Schegloff and others will want to keep CA “pure”. Some will want to use the orthodox CA framework and play this language game, while others will be more curious about the big world of discourse and think of orthodox CA in the spirit of Wittgenstein and metaphorically conclude “”You seem to be thinking of board games, but there are others. You can make your definition correct by expressing restricting it to those games” (Wittgenstein 2001: 3).

Meaning is explored in chapters 7 and 8 partially in terms of ethnographic CA, not because I think it is the only way to look at meaning, but because the method is particularly strong at extricating native meaning in native terms. Having hopefully represented the “broom handle” that is the form of life that holds the “brush” of talk-in-interaction in Chapters 2, 3, 4, and 5, Chapters 7 and 8 attend to the sweeps of the brush. As the critique above suggests, I am aware that looking at the brush is not identical to looking at the broom. Like the ancient insight that it is philosophically rewarding to consider that ‘man is said of man but is not necessarily in him’ (Aristotle 1963: 4), I consider it rewarding to philosophically consider what Wittgenstein’s
comment suggests about the distinction between any explicandum and explicatum. I foreground the CA explicatum, so to speak, not because I am a CA Alice and think Humpty is right that there is no other way to analyze the broom of context in discourse. Any contextual analysis is in part political:

The ability to define contexts in essential or any other terms involves the issue of power. The ability of one agent to impose his or her definition of relevant context upon others as a kind of hermeneutic hegemony is a political act (Dilley 1999: 35).

My choice of method is political. The CA method of analyzing context is one of the strongest methods known for extricating the meaning of a discursive context from “…the perspective of an actor actively operating on the world in which he or she finds him or herself embedded” (Duranti and Goodwin 1997: 5). As my goal is to “listen” to how Rapa Nui, rather than the Chilean state defines and interprets the meaning of Te Parau Henua, CA is a logical choice of method. In a colonial world where Rapa Nui voices in their own language are rarely heard and much less represented, a world that increasingly silences those voices with direct military violence noted below in Chapter 11, I find the analytical focus of CA upon participant meaning of value. There are broadly two forms of CA research: analysis of conversations for ‘mechanisms of sequential organization’ in any talk, and analysis of the ‘dynamics of particular cases of talk-in-interaction’ (Wilson 1991: 36). The two types of analysis in CA both assume the phenomenological premise of Schutz that the immediate social interaction involved in a talk (for example, questioning and answering, formulations and their assessments) ‘constitutes a legitimate area of inquiry in itself” (Garfinkel and Sacks 1970: 342), but differ in terms of their emphasis on the relevance of social conditions to talk. In an attempt to show systematic structures organizing any talk, research into the sequential mechanisms of talk, like adjacency

57 A technical account of the difference between explicandum and explicatum and notions of equivalence and identity can be found in Carnap (1988a: 7-23).
pairing, backgrounds the social conditions of particular talk (Wilson 1991: 36). In contrast, CA study of the dynamics of particular cases of talk investigates social-structural features, or context, involved in talk (Wilson 1991: 36). It is this second form of Conversation Analysis that is applied to Rapa Nui conversations in chapters 7 and 8; mechanical sequential structures organizing Rapa Nui talk are only of interest to the extent they help illuminate the dynamics of particular conversations. The two structures that interest me most however, are noted below.

Orthodox Conversation Analysis applied to extricate the meaning of a particular talk-in-interaction investigates a limited sense of the socio-structural features of a conversation. While CA acknowledges that numerous socio-cultural features could influence the meaning and organization of a conversation, Conversation Analysis is supposed to only investigate participant orientations to context within the conversation. Schegloff’s perspective on participant orientations is seen as exemplary of the orthodox approach:

Schegloff (1992) argues that talk has many potentially relevant contexts including what he calls distal or external contexts (such as the class, ethnic, gender composition of an interaction, the institutions and ecological, regional and cultural settings in which they occur) and proximate contextual variables (such as the sort of occasion participants take an interaction to be, the speaker/listener slots or roles available, and so on). The crucial thing, however, in the face of this omni-relevance and the infinitude of possible perspectives on what happened is what is relevant for the participants. Analysis, then, in this view, must be compatible with what Schegloff calls the internal sense of an interaction. It must take seriously the object of inquiry in its own terms and must recognize the hugely advantageous feature of studying talk-in-interaction that this is one socio-cultural site furnished internally with its own constitutive sense, with, as Schegloff (1997) states, a defeasible sense of its own reality (Wetherell 1998: 392).

The orthodox position argues that the contextual information necessary and sufficient for Conversation Analysis is made explicit within the conversation by the interlocutors themselves (Schegloff 1997: 197). Unformulated dimensions of the context of talk are not assumed irrelevant to the organization and social action of conversation (Schegloff 1991: 51); however, unformulated dimensions of the context that cannot be demonstrated as relevant to the talk are not supposed to figure within orthodox Conversation Analysis (Schegloff 1991: 64).
As with its use of ‘structure’ and ‘rule’ (Bilmes 1988), and as I mentioned above its use of ‘empirical’ and ‘social’, CA in a sense, reformulates the notion of context for its analytical purposes. Technically, CA replaces the more traditional sociological notion of contextual analysis of talk in terms of external Durkheimian social-structures with analysis of the “sequential environment” of talk:

The concept of sequential environment is relatively unproblematic: it refers, in the first instance, to the action immediately preceding and following a particular action, and, relatedly, to environments created through such devices as asking a question, beginning a story, and the like (Wilson 1991: 24).

To analyze the meaning of talk in terms of its sequential environment, CA appeals to two methodological tools: the principle of relevance, and next-turn proof procedure. Socio-cultural structures important to interpreting talk-in-interaction must be demonstrated by CA to be sequentially relevant to the interlocutors within the conversation. According to the principle of relevance,

…any claim to have explained a distributional phenomenon, such as the association between categorical and discourse identities or a regular alteration of the mechanisms of sequential organization, within or across interactions, by reference to features of social structure must be secured by a detailed analysis showing how the distributional phenomena arises via the orientation of the participants to those social-structural features. In the absences of such a demonstration, institutional “explanations” must be regarded as speculative no matter how plausible they may seem (Wilson 1991: 38).

Demonstration relies on the next-turn proof procedure:

…speakers display in their sequentially ‘next’ turns an understanding of what the ‘prior’ turn was about. That understanding may turn out to be what the prior speaker intended, or not; whichever it is, that itself is something which gets displayed in the next turn in the sequence. We describe this as a next-turn proof procedure, and it is the most basic tool used in CA to ensure that analyses explicate the orderly properties of talk as oriented-to accomplishments of participants, rather than being based merely on the assumptions of the analyst (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2001: 15).

Thus, CA demonstrates, for example, that talk between an emergency complaint receiver and a potential emergency patient is a conversation that engages the socio-cultural context of the roles of complaint receiver and emergency patient to the degree next-turn proof procedure can illustrate that these roles are conversationally relevant to the interlocutors within the sequential environment of the talk (Wilson 1991: 31). Similarly, a segment of talk-in-interaction between
interlocutors within a political debate (Bilmes 1999) engages the socio-cultural context of the political debate to the extent application of the next-turn proof procedure can be applied in a way that demonstrates the political identities involved in the debate are relevant to that particular segment of talk. Once a socio-cultural context is shown to be demonstrably relevant to the interlocutors of a talk in terms of CA methods, this context is assumed to continue to be relevant until the context can be shown to change in the talk by next-turn proof procedure and the principle of relevance (Wilson 1991: 25).

The Rapa Nui conversations listened to in Chapters 7 and 8 are thus analyzed to extricate the socio-cultural context the interlocutors orient to within the conversations in terms of the principle of relevance and next-turn proof procedure. One conversational structure of particular interest in my analyses of Chapter 7 and 8 is conversational assessments (Goodwin and Goodwin 1997, Heritage and Raymond 2005, Pomerantz 1984, and Sacks 2000), and another is formulation (Bilmes 2009a, 2009b, Carlin 2010, Edwards 1991, Hester and Eglin 1997, Sacks 2000, Schegloff 1971). Formulations perform social actions within talk; for example, they constitute the socio-cultural identities of interlocutors within a talk (Sacks 2000: 318), and can be instrumental in social control (Sacks 2000: 48). They can also be used to tell particular kinds of moral narratives; for example, the use of one kinship category rather than another equally referential in a sequential environment, in some cases, may be fundamental to narrating a different kind of story in Thai culture than its alternative (Bilmes 2009a: 31). In other words, formulations in talk are important resources for constructing the context of talk-in-interaction (Bilmes 2009a: 37). The sequential organization of assessments within talk-in-interaction provides empirical evidence for agreement and disagreement within a conversation (Goodwin and Goodwin 1997: 182). Assessments are also fundamental discursive resources interlocutors
utilize to collaboratively produce the conversational context of talk-in-interaction (Goodwin and Goodwin 1997: 169). Analysis of the assessment forms within a conversation, further, reveals some of the epistemological struggles at work within a conversation (Heritage and Raymond 2005). Interlocutors utilize assessments to both undermine and bolster the epistemic authority of one another’s talk (Heritage and Raymond 2005: 18-19). Rapa Nui understanding of the socio-cultural contextual significance of Te Parau Henua is examined in Chapters 7 and 8 by primarily attending to the conversational structures of assessments and formulations sequentially organizing their talk-in-interaction.

**DATA**

Ultimately, I acquired thirty conversational recordings from the questionnaire, and ten monologues. All of the conversations and monologues recorded focused on the first question, and most did comment on each of the questions; however, some did not directly discuss the second and third questions. In some cases this is because they were already answered within the initial answer to question one, and perhaps in some cases Rapa Nui either did not want to comment or did not want to take the time to comment. In some cases, towards the end of the data collection process I had simply abandoned questions 2 and 3. In the case of question 2, generally those serious about giving an answer to my questionnaire often felt they had answered the second question with their answer to the first, and this was as far as I can tell true. Question 3 posed a different kind of problem. As I learned that I could not typically transcribe the answers to the third question and preserve anonymity, it turns out the answers to the third question cannot be utilized in the dissertation. That said, the third question was, for those who did answer it, not a difficult question for Rapa Nui. I encountered no Rapa Nui who did not have a basic understanding of where their ancestral land was located. What varied in the answers to question
3 was only the detail of knowledge of the ancestral land. Some provided more complex genealogies of land than others, and some identified features of these lands in more complex terms than others. In retrospect, it would have been sufficient to simply have asked the first question.

The recordings selected for detailed analysis were selected according to the following criteria: (1) audibility, (2) length, (3) level of conversational interaction, (4) presence of kinship discourse, (5) complexity of conversational content, and (6) speaker descent. For various reasons, a number of recordings had audibility troubles. Unfortunately a set of four recordings facilitated by one Rapa Nui woman with interesting conversation, kinship discourse, and of significant length was plagued by wind noise that complicate precise transcription. These recordings, though audible generally, were not suitable for transcription given the occasional interruption of the wind at key points in the talk. A fragment of one of these is however discussed in Chapter 10. Many of the recordings were not long and lacked significant interaction; they were more or less Rapa Nui interviewing another Rapa Nui, rather than what I hoped for—conversations between Rapa Nui. While in many of these cases there was interesting talk, however short, they did not lend themselves to CA investigation and thus were not great candidates to be transcribed for detailed conversational analysis. One of these however, is discussed in Chapter 10. Three dimensions of Rapa Nui kinship discourse were of interest to me in the recordings: dialogism with ancestors, addressivity to progeny, and rejection/criticism of the Chilean land tenure system as a “Chilean thing” (me’e Tire). All of the conversations and monologues included, in one form or another, a rejection/criticism of the Chilean land tenure system as a “Chilean thing”. The significance of this consensus is explored in most depth in Chapter 10. Only one conversation attempted to say something positive about the Chilean land
tenure system; I say attempted, because after beginning an answer in which the individual was
going to talk about both the good and bad, the individual never ended up discussing anything
good. Progeny and ancestors were comparatively less often topics in the conversations and
monologues not transcribed herein than the topic of it as a me’e Tire, but these topics were
relatively common nonetheless. While there are additional conversations that would have been
good to transcribe, I think these six conversations reveal many of the basic themes of Rapa Nui
kinship discourse about Te Parau Henua. Interestingly, only six of the total monologues and
conversations discussed what I have termed above operational problems with Te Parau Henua.
This seems to suggest, like in the case of the narrative of the younger woman above, that while
Rapa Nui increasingly registered their lands since 1988 they are not content with that
registration. It is perhaps something they feel compelled to do by the state, but not something
accepted.

There are an estimated 28-33 different individual names of hua’ai (Rapu, Huke, Tuki,
etc.) that are descended from Rapa Nui ancestors apparently in use on the island (Makihara 1999:
334). My goal was to have recordings that included descendants of each of these hua’ai. If one
thinks of each Rapa Nui as composed of two such names, I am aware of at least 19 different
hua’ai within my sample of conversations and monologues, and assume 2-5 more hua’ai
descendants could be in the sample (a few of the recordings include Rapa Nui I do not know).
The overwhelming majority of those responding had two Rapa Nui last names according to the
Chilean naming system, rather than one Rapa Nui name and one Chilean name or other
patronym. As far as I know, the names of the few cases that are not Rapa Nui are names that are
longstanding in the community, though not actually Rapa Nui names; names like the English
name ‘Edmunds’ that arrived in the turn of the nineteenth century. Except potentially 1 or 2
speakers in transcript 6, the speakers in the monologues of this chapter and all of the speakers in each of the transcripts of Chapters 7 and 8 are known to have two Rapa Nui patronyms. This does not entail that all of these speakers are “full” Rapa Nui because someone with two Rapa Nui patronyms could still be descended from parents that had Chilean or foreign mothers. While it is unclear that these speakers are exclusively of Rapa Nui descent, they are all of a high degree of Rapa Nui descent. While I am uncertain of a few of the names in the dialogues, I estimate that the individuals involved in both the two monologues in this chapter and the individuals of the six transcripts in Chapters 7 and 8 derive from a total of 15 different hua’ai where one individual is counted as deriving from typically two different hua’ai. Were I to include the potentially four Rapa Nui hua’ai an individual could be descended from in my initial number of 21-24 in the total sample, as well as the 15 in the transcript sample, then the breadth of the sample could be considerably higher. In selecting transcripts in terms of descent, I chose recordings that would increase the breadth of my sample rather than narrow it. Thus, if I had already included a recording from descendants of a particular hua’ai in a transcript, then I preferred to select a recording with members of different hua’ai to make the next transcript.

CONCLUSION

No doubt within the context of an embraced epistemological and ontological crisis in ethnographic research (Clifford 1986a, Clifford 1988a, Marcus and Fisher 1999, Rabinow 1986, and Tyler 1986), and writing (Abu-Lughod 1991, Clifford 1986b, Crapanzano 1986, Marcus 1980, Marcus and Cushman 1982, Rabinow 2007, and Watson 1991) the coherence, implications, and politics of ethnographic interviewing have become questioned. Among other things, ethnographic interviewers have been faulted for failing to recognize the collaborative, indexical, and reflexive nature of an interview (Briggs 1986: 3). Interviewers tend to delete the
interactive, situational, and metacommunicative dimensions involved in the production of ethnographic interviews and think that what is said by an interviewee is “...a reflection of what is “out there” rather than as an interpretation which is jointly produced by interviewer and respondent” (Briggs 1986: 3). In other words, the results of interviews tend to be falsely interpreted as representing data independent of the interview process (Briggs 1986: 118-119). In reflecting on the conversations analyzed in Chapters 7 and 8, as well as the monologues herein, I see collaboration. While the data was produced without an actual interview according to conditions determined by the Rapa Nui who chose to participate, I consider myself an abstract participant in the conversations and monologues through the presence of the questionnaire. Yet, compared to more standard interviews, I am significantly less present. As I was not physically present, I did not disrupt the “interview” with interruptions and topic changes that are seen as strongly distorting the significance of an interview (Circourel 1986: x-xi).

Rather than embracing the objectivist/subjectivist epistemology and ontology both Briggs and Circourel seem to retain in a way, the pseudo-questions of realism versus irrealism they conjure (Carnap 1996: 20, Wittgenstein 2004: 413f), and asking to what extent the data collected represent a world out there rather than a world primarily within me, I suggest the data and my interpretation of it as knowledge produced within a particular context of power (Foucault 1980b: 131). It is knowledge acquired in a context of perhaps three interacting dispositifs (Agamben 2009, Deleuze 1989, Foucault 1980c); the socio-cultural and political apparatuses of anthropology, Chile, and Rapa Nui. In terms of dispositifs, one sees not “partial truth” (Clifford 1986a) in the application of torture, but “...the functioning of juridical torture, or interrogation under torture, as a torture of the truth” (Foucault 1995: 40). Chile, has from a Rapa Nui perspective, been engaged in a kind of colonial torture of Rapa Nui for some time. While Chilean...
physical torture of Rapa Nui seems to have reduced since the state literally imprisoned Rapa Nui within their homeland for more than fifty years from the late nineteenth century to the middle twentieth century, as will be demonstrated in Chapter 11, physical state violence against Rapa Nui has been renewed upon the island since August 2010.

I did not witness direct torture during my stay in Rapa Nui, but some of the structural and epistemic violence long considered a hallmark of colonial experience (Fanon 1963) was manifest daily in the contexts I have represented throughout the preceding chapters. How else can one define a courtroom of Chilean judges and attorneys imposing Chilean laws noted in Chapter 3 upon Rapa Nui “defendants” in their own homeland but as torturous? How else can one define the Rapa Nui experience noted in Chapter 5 of a circuit of armed military officers descended from those that assisted the execution of the last Rapa Nui king trying to hoist a Chilean flag amidst a Rapa Nui cultural festival, but as a kind of psychological torture? How else can one define a habitus confined by laws, not walls, to a town that one’s elders daily remember as a literal prison where Rapa Nui grandparents and great grandparents were starved, infected with leprosy, and torn apart on steel chairs like was described in Chapter 2? The truth my data speaks is produced in a context of ongoing colonialism. From outside the “Gherry house” of Rapa Nui, the meaning of these kinship talks may appear unstable. As suggested in Chapter 2, there are at least five discursive grounds by which this data and any of my Rapa Nui data and experience could be interpreted. I think many things can be heard in the data. I hear myself. I hear Rapa Nui. I hear militant and violent Chilean government. As serious scholarship of the political and legal history of Hawai‘i must begin with analysis of Hawaiian language sources (Silva 2004: 2-3), I think it is imperative to begin to analyze the meaning of the Chilean land tenure system in terms of Rapa Nui discourse. Rather than attempting to “lock down” what the data is from a
“cosmopolitan ethnographic stance” (Appadurai 1991) like that introduced in Chapter 2, I “listen” to how Rapa Nui contextualize and place the meaning of the Titulo Dominio land tenure system within their daily form of life: kinship talk.
HE HENUA HINARERE
Chapter 7

The conversations of Chapter 7, like those of Chapter 8, are analyzed to determine the extent to which some of the themes of Rapa Nui kinship discourse identified in the narratives of the two women in Chapter 6 are in a sense part of an “interpretative repertoire” (Gilbert and Mulkay 1984, Potter and Wetherell 2009, Wetherell and Potter 1988, Wetherell 1998, Wooffitt 2005: 66) that ‘structures and controls communication’ (Arno 1985, 1993, 2007) among Rapa Nui about island lands and socio-cultural life in general. Interpretative repertoires, to recall the foundational distinctions of the dissertation noted in Chapter 2, to some extent link the little ‘d’ sense of discourse initially studied by linguists and the big “D” Discourse introduced by Foucault. They account for regularities in discursive interactions (Wetherell and Potter 1988: 172). In other words,

Repertoires can be seen as the building blocks speakers use for constructing versions of actions, cognitive processes, and other phenomenon. Any particular repertoire is constituted out of a restricted range of terms used in a specific stylistic and grammatical fashion. Commonly these terms are derived from one or more key metaphors and the presence of a repertoire will often be signaled by certain tropes or figures of speech (Wetherell and Potter 1988: 172).

Interpretative repertoires bear a Wittgensteinian family resemblance to what has also been referred to as “discourse models” (Gee 2005: 71), “orders of discourse” (Fairclough 2009: 164), “social cognition” (Van Dijk 1993, 2009, 2010), and speech genres (Bakhtin 2002a, 2002b, Briggs and Bauman 1992, Maybin 2009, Volisnov 1986). I appeal to interpretative repertoires, rather than social cognition, orders of discourse, or discourse models given that interpretative repertoires are applied in hybrid discourse analytic work that utilizes both Conversation Analysis Foucauldian subject positions, and various other insights from the broad field of discourse analysis (Wetherell 1998). Interestingly too, Wetherell and Potter applied the notion to understand differences between Maori and New Zealand discourse (Wetherell and Potter 1988);
a comparison which overlaps with an investigation into the differences between Rapa Nui and Chilean discourse.

While Potter and Wetherell focused primarily on key terms, tropes, and metaphors to distinguish interpretative repertoires in Maori and New Zealand, taking a clue from the founding father of this family of notions, in Chapter 7 and 8 I begin to spell out some of the “building blocks” of Rapa Nui kinship discourse by examining the conversations for a Bakhtinian theme: addressivity and dialogism—themes I noted of interest in Chapter 2. Having established dialogical and addressive interlocutors of Rapa Nui kinship discourse in Chapter 7 and 8, I return to some of the key terms, tropes, and metaphors—or taxonomic features—of the interpretative repertoire manifest in the conversations in Chapter 10. The narratives of the two women in Chapter 6 negatively assessed the Chilean land tenure system by dialogically reflecting upon the world of Rapa Nui ancestors and addressing themselves to an imagined future of Rapa Nui progeny governed in terms of the system. Analysis of the conversations of Chapter 7 provides evidence that assessment of the policy and its implications for Rapa Nui progeny is a common “building block” of the interpretative repertoire. Chapter 8 provides evidence that Rapa Nui ancestors are an equally important component of Rapa Nui kinship discourse about the Chilean land tenure system.

Each conversation examined in Chapter 7 is between a pair of Rapa Nui “cousins/siblings” (taina). The first two conversations are between elder female taina; the last conversation is between two elder male taina. While the concerns of the hua’ai members vary across the conversations, there is a shared concern with the implications of the Chilean land tenure system for Rapa Nui progeny. All three express deep fears that the policy will not be sustainable for future generations, and discuss problems with the policy confronting current
generations. What future aspect they fear most for Rapa Nui children varies, however, in all three conversations there is a fear among the speaker that the future of Rapa Nui children will be undermined by the perpetuation of the Chilean land tenure system. In part, the hua’ai members reject a future determined by the Chilean land tenure system for the sake of Rapa Nui progeny. Analysis suggests Rapa Nui progeny are fundamental features, a kind of discursive ground, of the interpretative repertoire Rapa Nui utilize to figure the contextual significance of the Chilean land tenure system.

**HE ME’E RAKERAKE**

Transcript 1 is a section from an approximately five minute dialogue between two Rapa Nui women at their place of work: the local artisanal and produce market, as well as café, named the Feria in *Haŋa Roa*. The woman denoted ‘N’ for *nua* is a woman in her fifties who agreed to record a family discussion of my questions. The woman represented by ‘T’ for *taina* is an elder “cousin” (*taina*) in her early seventies. I was not present at the dialogue; the conversation was organized by *nua*: she invited her *taina* to talk, and chose to conduct the talk at the Feria. While the Feria is not a traditional site of Rapa Nui social life like “residential areas” (*kona hare*), it is an area Rapa Nui commonly socialize, discuss issues such as the Chilean land tenure system, and speak Rapa Nui. The recording begins with some discussion between *nua* and her *taina* about recording the conversation and also some talk between various people at the Feria, and then proceeds with discussion of each of the questions of my questionnaire. The conversation between *nua* and her *taina* primarily focused on the first question. With respect to the aforementioned anonymity issues discussed in chapter 6, I have only provided transcript for discussion of the first question. I conclude the transcript as *nua* negotiates with her *taina* to discuss a second question; the conversation subsequently shifts to discussion of the second and third questions.
Generally, the two *taina* are found to agree with one another throughout the dialogue with respect to the significance of the Chilean land tenure system, and the meaning of land in Rapa Nui. During their discussion there are few interruptions and repairs, and no direct challenges of one another’s assessment of the policy. The interruptions and repairs that do occur in the dialogue related to the policy primarily elaborate one other’s ideas; they do not contest them. Of particular analytical interest are lines 9-21. This section of the transcribed dialogue is the most conversationally interactive part of the dialogue and thus the part which displays the strongest sense of the social meaning of Chilean land tenure system for the two *taina*. Therein the two *taina* reveal their broad assessment of the policy, and a rationale for suspending the policy couched in terms of Rapa Nui kinship forms of life.

Broadly, *nua* and her *taina* demonstrate agreement in lines 1-21 that the Chilean land tenure system is a bad policy. The initial conversational turns in the provided transcript establish the proper code of the dialogue, the identity of the interlocutors, and the question *nua* requests her *taina* to address. The principle section of disagreement (lines 4-5) is not a disagreement about the meaning of the Chilean land tenure system. At line 4, *nua* refuses the question of her *taina* at line 3 regarding my identity. She commands her *taina* to note that she is Rapa Nui and asks if she has understood everything. The *taina* interrupts her at line 6 affirming that she understands. At lines 7 and 8, *nua* formulates two different versions of questionnaire question number one: she first asks “all of our opinion” (*tātou mana’u*) about the land title system and subsequently “her opinion” (*tu’u mana’u o’ou*). A complex assessment of the policy by the *taina* begins from lines 9-14. After establishing that she is indeed a Rapa Nui in line 9 in response to the demand of *nua* that she identify as Rapa Nui in line 4, the *taina* begins to provide her opinion (*tō’oku mana’u*) of the policy in response to the second formulation of the
questionnaire question. Consequently, she insinuates in line 10 that others in the island share her opinion, and hence addresses herself to the first formulation of the question by nua. Within lines 9-11, the taina assesses the policy negatively as something “bad” (rakerake) and consequently, “not good” (ta’e rivariva). The taina formulates the problem of the policy as a failure of purpose (‘Ina etahi serve) at line 12. At lines 13-14, the taina suggests the policy be removed (hakakore) so that Rapa Nui can return to living like they did in the old times (hora tuai era). Nua interestingly interrupts her taina with an affirmation at line 15 which suggests agreement with the initial negative assessment of her taina of the policy as well as her proposal to remove the bad policy.

The two taina also agree that the policy is “bad” (rakerake) and something to “remove” (hakakore) because they fear the policy will result in alienation from the land they need to provide for, and properly bury, Rapa Nui. Following the affirmation of nua regarding the policy assessment of her taina, at lines 16-17, the taina elaborates her assessment of the policy’s failure. The problem, for the taina, is not simply that it lacks purpose, but that it is seen as undermining the future of Rapa Nui children. The taina asserts that it will result in the sale of land typically given to the children. Nua demonstrates agreement as she upgrades the assessment of the taina at line 18 and suggests that there will not be any available land to bury the great grandchildren as a result of the policy. The taina concurs at line 19 with a partial repetition of assessment of nua: “there will not be one land left” (‘Ina etahi kona toe). She proceeds to further upgrade the assessment by asserting that there is already a burial problem at lines 19-20. At line 21, she dramatically jokes that the people will have to be buried above ground. The laughter of nua and repetition of part of the assessment of the taina at line 22 suggest a shared concern with the problem. The interruption of nua does not attempt to challenge or repair the negative evaluation
of the policy given by the taina. Nua finds humor in the clever, oxymoronic claim that people will have to be buried above ground. The repetition by nua of the word “bury” (tanu) given by her taina, and consequent laughter, while not explicitly indicating agreement with the taina, does nevertheless suggest sympathy with her humorous account of the policy as flawed. She laughs with her, not at her.

The taina continues her assessment of the policy at lines 23-31 by reflexively considering land problems in her own family, as well as issues of unemployment she associates with the policy. It is not clear that nua fully agrees with the further assessments of her taina at line 32. At line 32 nua does not affirm any of her explicit ideas with interruptions such as “indeed” (e ho’i) or amplifications as she did earlier in the dialogue, but simply moves to the second question of the questionnaire. Yet, there is no evidence that she disagrees either. At lines 23-25, the taina expresses fear about her own burial, as well as those of her parents and “siblings/cousins” (taina). She disturbingly jokes that she will be “buried” above her mother. After again criticizing the policy as “unsuitable” (te me’e hope’a o ta’e au) at line 26, she begins to shift discussion to unemployment problems at lines 27-28. She asserts “there is not a single job” ([‘ina] etahi aŋa). It is ambiguous exactly why she has shifted to talk of unemployment; for nua provides no response to guide an interpretation. Perhaps the taina is anticipating a criticism of her association of the policy with alienated land. Maybe she is asserting there are no jobs to explain why Rapa Nui cannot simply buy land made available for purchase by the policy. Alternatively, the taina could be discussing unemployment simply because it is another problem, and having discussed the problem of land it makes sense to her to now discuss the problem of unemployment. Importantly however, the taina returns to concerns with children at lines 29-31. She appears to worry about the prospect of telling them there is no land for them and that they have nowhere to
go (Ka oho koe! 'I hē?) in a context of bleak job opportunities. Nua interrupts the taina at line 32 and proceeds to negotiate a discussion of the second questionnaire question. As nua tries to formulate the second question, she does not challenge the account of the policy or the associated troubles of finding work. Perhaps she interrupts her taina to obstruct a fairly morbid reflection of the taina at line 27: “We are quickly ending” (Horou tāua ki oti).

Interestingly, the dialogue reveals the taina assess the policy in terms of values they have as hua’ai members; notably absent from their analysis of the policy is any reference to reforming the policy in terms of the Chilean government or any legal case involving the policy. In contrast to the talk-in-interaction discussed in the next chapter, this taina conversation expresses more addressive than dialogical concerns of Rapa Nui. The talk analyzed in Chapter 8 challenges the authority of the Chilean land tenure system in terms of alternative cultural memory of Rapa Nui land history; these talks are organized by dialogical resources of hua’ai members. In this conversation, issues of addressivity predominate. Elders (tupuna) figure in this conversation, but cultural memory of elder arrangements of land, and elder agreements with Chilean officials for rearranging land tenure, are not of explicit concern to these two taina. The two taina evaluate the significance of the policy by addressing it to the needs of contemporary elders about to pass on, and the needs of future Rapa Nui children. The sustainability of the policy is evaluated in terms of progeny and elders; not Chilean officials, law, or Rapa Nui political figures involved in managing the Chilean land tenure system. The taina assess the policy as unsustainable given its anticipated effects on great grandchildren and current elders. While I imagine the first thing a contemporary United States citizen would consider in evaluating a land tenure policy is its capacity to generate profitability, the taina do not express interest in profiting from the sale of land. On the contrary, they are concerned that a policy that results in profitable sales of land will
exclude Rapa Nui from having land needed to care for future children and their dead. While not articulating the details of the land tenure system Rapa Nui applied prior to the Chilean land tenure system, the conversation at lines 13-14 illustrates the taina would prefer the land tenure system of old times (te hora tuai era) to that of the Chilean state. They prefer, in other words, a system of land tenure decided by Rapa Nui family conversations (’a’amu hua’ai), rather than by paper titles administered by the Chilean government. Unlike the aforementioned Rapa Nui lawyer and friend introduced in chapter 6 who grappled with ways of translating family conversations into paper titles, these taina prefer to stick with family conversations.

HE ME’E TA’E TANO

Transcript #2 is an approximately eight minute selection of a fifteen minute dialogue between two female taina that is focused explicitly on the questions of my questionnaire. The recorder and questions were given to the woman noted herein as ‘N’ for nua. I advised her to meet with whomever she desired from her family to discuss the issues, and she asked her taina denoted ‘T’ to discuss the issues. Nua is in her late fifties, perhaps early sixties; her taina is in her late sixties, perhaps early seventies. In this case, I was informed that her taina was indeed a “cousin” rather than a “sibling” of nua. The conversation was recorded at the home of nua under conditions she determined without me present. The transcript begins as their conversation starts; it ends just before the taina begin to discuss question three. Of particular interest is the final section of the transcript where, like transcript #1, the taina are seen to assess the Chilean land tenure system in terms of Rapa Nui progeny. I review some of the general conversational meaning of their talk, however, before attending to the final section to elaborate some of the broader conversational context of the dialogue. While the taina initially appear to fundamentally disagree about the significance of the policy, ultimately, their “similar assessments” (Goodwin
and Goodwin 1997: 182) suggest the two taina are generally in agreement. They both assess the policy in similar economic and political terms; and ultimately, they also agree that the land tenure system is problematic in kinship terms. They hope to remove the policy for the sake of future Rapa Nui children so they can live as Rapa Nui used to live.

In the beginning of the dialogue (lines 1-11), the two taina appear to disagree about the policy. The discussion and transcript begins as nua asks her taina a slightly reformulated first question of the questionnaire in lines 1-4. Her taina immediately assesses the policy in negative terms; specifically, as “something unjust” (me’e ta’e tano) at line four. After rhetorically asking herself why at line four, the taina proceeds to explain from lines 5-9 in political and economic terms. As one might expect in light of my analyses in chapter 5, she emphasizes first, at line 5, that the policy is politically “unjust” because it is inherently a Chilean, rather than a Rapa Nui policy. Yet, it is not “unjust” to her simply because it is a Chilean thing. The taina elaborates from lines 7 that she considers the policy economically “unjust” because it is a policy she believes is designed to take land from Rapa Nui. At lines 8-9, she provides an epistemology for that belief; she notes that she has “investigated” (kimi) “the discourse of the policy” (te vānaŋa he Titulo Dominio). She does not elaborate therein what exactly she has investigated; she just comments that she has given this subject some reflection. Interestingly though, at line 10 she seems to contradict her previous analysis. She proposes that, in light of these negative qualities, it is a policy wanted in Rapa Nui. The taina does not say that the Rapa Nui people want the policy, nor does she say that the Chilean government wants the policy. Perhaps sensing a self-contradiction, she asks nua to repeat her question at line 10.

The response of nua at line 12 indicates that she hears her taina as suggesting the Rapa Nui people want the policy; an assessment of the policy she rejects. At line 12, instead of
repeating the question, she retorts that “the people do not want the land policy in Rapa Nui” (‘Ina te nu’u haŋa ki te Titulo Dominio o Rapa Nui). Rhetorically, she asks at line 13 what it is exactly that is wanted. Within lines 14-21, she introduces two reasons why no one wants the policy: one economic, and one political. First, she notes from lines 14-19 economic reasons why the policy is a problem. She asserts that the policy is part of a government housing program she associates with poverty on the island. Secondly, at lines 20-21 she introduces political reasons why the policy is unwanted. She questions the value of the policy in light of her perception that Rapa Nui lack rights upon the island. Similar to her taina, she does not elaborate how exactly the policy is leading to poverty or how it relates to a lack of rights for Rapa Nui; she just proposes this is the case. Though neither point explicitly elaborates those of her taina, her response affiliates with her initial thesis that the policy is “an unjust thing” (He me’e ta’e tano). For nua, the policy appears to be “unjust” because she associates it with the subsidized housing program she perceives as contributing to island poverty, and a lack of Rapa Nui rights upon the island. Thus, while the two taina initially appear to disagree as to whether the policy is wanted or not; they appear to agree that the policy is “unjust”. Moreover, both taina seem to agree—though for slightly different reasons—that the policy is “unjust” for both economic and political reasons.

The immediate, without delay “indeed” (e ho’i) of the taina at line 22 suggests the two taina are also in agreement that the policy is not only “unjust” but unwanted by Rapa Nui. Subsequent talk indicates that the two taina reject the policy also for similar reasons. The taina continues her turn at talk, not by challenging nua’s critique of her assessment that the policy is something wanted, but by elaborating further concerns regarding the policy. At line 22 the taina assesses the situation in terms similar to her initial diagnosis of the problem: that it is a Chilean thing. While she does not address the economic problems introduced by nua, her comments
elaborate the political problem introduced by **nu**. She seems to explain that Rapa Nui lack rights because the island now belongs to Chile. Further that Rapa Nui people “are in the hand of Chile” (‘I rote rima o te Tire tātou) and subject to its power. Her additional comments, from lines 23 to 25, that a Rapa Nui organization (actual name deleted) is working to have the island returned to the native people suggest that this is clearly a power relationship she rejects. After accepting **nu**’s repair of her assertion at line 27 that they are working to return the island not simply to the native people but “to the Rapa Nui” (ki te Rapa Nui), the **taina** further aligns herself to the perspective of **nu** by upgrading the assessment of **nu**. The **taina** asserts at lines 28-29, not simply that the policy is something unwanted, but that in light of these aforementioned points, that the goal is “thus” (oira) to have the Titulo Dominio “removed” (hakakore). At line 30 she further concurs with **nu** that the Titulo Dominio is indeed contributing to poverty on the island. With help from **nu** from at lines 30-32, the **taina** adds that she fears the persistence of this policy will make poverty the general way of life for Rapa Nui on the island.

At line 33 **nu** indicates that she shares this fear. **Nua** emphasizes that the policy poses a grave danger to Rapa Nui. At line 33, she extends the analysis of her **taina** and asserts that if what her **taina** says is the case, then Rapa Nui are finished and Chile will control the entire island of Rapa Nui. She continues at line 34, dialogically appropriating the language of her **taina**, by stating that the policy indeed does place the Rapa Nui in the hand of Chile. The economic housing and poverty issues related to the policy are thus associated by **nu** as dimensions of a broader Chilean strategy to entrench their political power over the island. **Nua** begins to develop her argument further beginning on line 40 as she stresses that the housing and poverty issue is indeed only one aspect of the policy that is problematic. **Nua** suggests with her rhetorical question at lines 41-42, that the real issue is that the policy distracts Rapa Nui from a more
pressing issue. Her rhetorical questions propose that Rapa Nui should not be asking about individual titles to lands, but Rapa Nui title to the whole island. Title to the entire island is what is wanted; not individual titles to the lands in the colonial settlement of Haŋa Roa. Acquiring individual title to particular pieces of lands, according to nua at line 43-44, is worthless. Houses built on such land, when Rapa Nui lack title to the island itself, are built to no purpose. Nua asserts that one should not be concerned with taking titles to individual lands when such a practice has led to poverty and fails to establish Rapa Nui title or general political rights upon the entire island.

The subsequent responses of the taina generally affiliate with the negative assessments of the policy articulated by nua, however, there appears to again be at least some disagreement between the two taina. As is somewhat characteristic of second assessment agreements of the same evaluative type (Pomerantz 1984: 65-66), without delay, the taina responds to nua at line 48 with a kind of “me too”. She notes that although she has land, she has resisted acquiring title to it. Further, she elaborates at lines 49 that she has given a land to her “child” (poki) and thus far the “child” has not acquired a title either. At 50 the taina appears to provide some explanation for not acquiring title to the land. She notes at line 50 that this land was acquired from her mother and implies that because of this fact she did not take the title; and further, at line 52, that she does not want the title. She proceeds to contrast her perspective to that of the Chilean government at lines 53-54. The Chilean government, and perhaps those Rapa Nui influenced by them, she proposes, encourages her to register the title. She again states at line 53 that she has not taken it, and elaborates further, at line 54, with a kind of Rapa Nui idiom that she tells such people to go away (more literally, “to the road”). She seems to indicate that because the land was given to her by her mother there is a conflict with accepting a Chilean title to the land. The taina
thus formulates the land as land of her *hua’ai*; and thus, not land appropriately registered in terms of a Chilean title. *Nua* demonstrates agreement with her *taina* at line 55 with her interruptive “indeed” (e *ho’i*), though some disagreement subsequently develops. The *taina* asserts at line 56 that though she clearly has not wanted to take the title it is taken because people are not thinking about the issues involved. *Nua* does not appear to agree with this assessment and the two appear to argue briefly from 57-59. Whatever the nature of brief disagreement consists of—I am not sure exactly because of the incompleteness of some of the assertions and the interruptions—it is clear subsequently, that the two *taina* are largely in agreement at lines 60 to 61. The *taina* at line 60 summarily asserts that the title system is “not good” not only for her, but “not good for all of the Rapa Nui people” (*me’e ta’e rivariva pa’i mo te mo te Rapa Nui mo te Rapa Nui tā’atoa*). Though she later reintroduces their initial disagreement about whether the policy is wanted or not, *nua* initially establishes agreement with her *taina* at line 62. She considers the aforementioned point of her *taina* as “a good thing” (*Bueno me’e nei ho’i*).

After establishing agreement with her *taina* at line 62, *nua* introduces more political reasons from lines 62-64 to explain why Rapa Nui do not want the policy. The reasoning is nationalistic. Her claim that the ocean and island require your land at line 63, and further at line 64, that the nation is the one truth contrasts individual ownership of land with the needs of the Rapa Nui as a single nation. *Nua* seems to argue that the land policy undermines the nation of Rapa Nui. Interestingly however, the *taina* does not orient to the nationalistic argument of *Nua*. Instead, at lines 65-68 she introduces kinship terms for questioning the policy. Like the *taina* of transcript 1, she looks to the ancestral way of life as better than the individual property system. She proposes at line 65, that Rapa Nui should return to the way it was before when there was just one overseer of land. She continues, at line 66, that in respect to the “grandchildren” and “great
grandchildren” the policy needs to be removed. The immediate interjection of the same assessment by nua “to remove” (hakakore) establishes agreement with her taina. Subsequent discussion between the two taina further formulates the problems with the policy in kinship terms. The taina follows the interjection of nua with a reiteration that the policy needs to be removed for the sake of Rapa Nui progeny from lines 70-71. The consequent comments of nua from lines 72-77 are expressed in an emotional tone and in somewhat incomplete statements that renders her response not fully understandable to me, though I think I get some of the gist. It does seem that her comments affiliate with those of her taina. She does not challenge her taina by reiterating the nationalist perspective of her earlier turn at talk, but discusses some of the same topics as her taina. At lines 72-73 she appears to support the idea of her taina that Rapa Nui should return to ancestral ways of life. She proposes at line 73 explicitly that this would “make things just” (hakatano). At lines 73-74 she continues this theme and emphasizes that returning to the ancestral ways will enable Rapa Nui to begin (ha’amata) to straighten (hakatitika) life like it was in the ancestral era. From lines 75-76 she suggests counterfactually that if Rapa Nui do not begin to straighten life in ancestral terms that she fears this policy will lead to the disappearance of Rapa Nui. At line 77 she returns to the topic of Rapa Nui progeny. She seems to emphasize, like her taina, that this is a matter that needs to be resolved for the benefit of future Rapa Nui. In suggesting that something needs to be left for the children I assume her idea is congruent with their prior talk. I believe what she is trying to say is that the island needs to be left restored for the sake of the children.

Consequent talk between the two taina does not assess the policy in kinship terms; it returns to political themes previously discussed. At lines 78-79 the taina argues that Rapa Nui have worked to make the United Nations return the island to Rapa Nui. She is confident at lines
81-82 that this strategy could be successful. For her, it is “not a problem” (’Ina he problema) for the United Nations to return the island to Rapa Nui. Interestingly, she seems to suggest that this work though has simply resulted in Chile dividing the island and returning pieces of the island to Rapa Nui. Nua interrupts her narrative at line 84 and asserts that this is what the Titulo Dominio is about. The taina agrees with this assessment immediately at line 85 but proceeds to elaborate from lines 85-87 that Rapa Nui need to challenge the discourse of the Titulo Dominio. She emphasizes that the way the policy cuts up the land of Rapa Nui is a Chilean practice, not a Rapa Nui custom. Like her turns at talk in the beginning of the transcript, she formulates the problem in terms of sovereignty concerns. The problem then, for her, is not simply that the land be returned, but that Rapa Nui themselves organize this process. Nua appears to agree with her at line 88 with her immediate “yeah” followed by an assertion that “they have this thing” (e ai ro ‘ā te me’e). She continues the discussion by elaborating some of the additional details about what work has been done at the international level to try and have the island returned to Rapa Nui. I have not included these details as names are mentioned that would compromise the anonymity of the data.

HE ME’E HAPE

Transcript 3 is a selection of an approximately hour conversation between two male taina. The recorder and questionnaire was given to the man denoted ‘K’ for “elder man/father” (koro); he asked his “brother” designated ‘T’ for taina to come discuss the questions. As we learn herein, koro is in his mid-fifties; his taina is sixty. The recording was completed at the home of koro according to terms he established. He and his taina, as well as other hua’ai members, typically gather after Sunday Mass to discuss issues, share brunch, and enjoy life. I was instructed to bring the recorder and questions for them to discuss during their regular
Sunday gathering. I was initially present in the conversation as the two taina had me turn on the recorder; I subsequently left the home while the men talked and returned after they were finished discussing the questions. The transcript begins with the taina asking koro the first question of my questionnaire shortly after I have left the conversation. It concludes as the taina proceeds to ask koro the second question. During the initial few minutes of the conversation the wife of koro and a son of the taina were present; however, both left the conversation almost immediately after the recording began, and neither contributed talk to the discussion. Herein I analyze, where possible, explicit agreement and disagreement between the two taina. Unlike the two taina of the first two transcripts these two do not often change turns speaking; these two taina take extended turns at talk and then close their turn to let the other talk. I focus initially herein on how koro answers the first question from lines 4 to 95; and consequently, on how his taina answers the question from lines 96-152. Within analysis of the response of the taina, I note the extent to which his answer agrees with koro. I first represent how koro contextualizes the significance of his answer and the narrative form of his answer; secondly, I analyze some of the broad themes of his answer. Consequently, I analyze how his taina answers the question and the extent to which the two taina assess the policy and land in Rapa Nui in similar terms and methods. Both men discuss Rapa Nui land and Chilean policy in the context of historical narratives that no doubt are difficult to follow without any knowledge of the history of Rapa Nui. In my analysis of their conversation, I add historical information occasionally to clarify their talk.

The answer of koro is part autobiography and historical narrative, and part political commentary. From lines 4 to 95, koro relates some of his own life history upon the land of Rapa Nui, as well as a broad outline of the history of Chile in Rapa Nui. Koro distinguishes three historical periods in this narrative. He discusses the first era of concern at lines 12-13; the second
at line 36; and the third at line 69-95. The first era distinguished by koro is that period associated with the arrival of business oriented settlers and the confinement of Rapa Nui to Haŋa Roa. The second era highlighted is the one marked by the arrival of the Chilean government to Rapa Nui and the annexation of the island by its representative Policarpo Toro. He distinguishes the third period as the contemporary era. Each of these three historical periods is associated with particular problems for Rapa Nui. Koro relates his perspective on the land of Rapa Nui and his assessment of the Chilean land tenure policy of “Titulo Dominio” (Te Parau Henua) in the context of cultural memories about the first two eras, and reflections upon experiences in the third period—the contemporary era. Interestingly, koro also situates the significance of his narrative by noting some of the features of the place in which this conversation occurred and its relationship to current events in Rapa Nui; namely, the Rapa Nui cultural festival “Day of the Language” (Mahana o te Re’o) discussed in chapter 5. As koro relates his perspective on the land of Rapa Nui and the Chilean land tenure system, his cultural, familial, linguistic, and political identity emerges.

After the taina asks basically verbatim the first question of my questionnaire at lines 2-3, koro responds with a complex narrative from lines 4-95, that first emphasizes his own birth upon kinship land in Rapa Nui. Koro, from lines 4-36, begins his story autobiographically and genealogically. The narrative begins at lines 4-10 with him noting location and date he was exactly born on the island. After establishing his age at lines 4 to 5 as fifty-four, he proceeds to locate where he was born at lines 6-10. Though it is somewhat difficult to note from the transcript given my deletions, he identifies his place of birth at a house within a specific residential area of Rapa Nui at line 9. He refines that location formulation further at line 10 by identifying his birth place as a specifically named kinship place within that residential area.
Significantly, *koro* therein answers the critical question of place introduced in chapter 2 ("I hē koe?") with his use of the phrase “this area here” (*te kona nei*), and moreover, establishes that his place of birth is also the area wherein this recording is taking place. *Koro*, like many Rapa Nui, lives his life within the same residential area he was born. His placement of his land in terms of these particular, proper named, residential areas formulates his land in explicit kinship terms. This theme is further elaborated genealogically at line 11 as he emphasizes that this “piece of land” (*parehe henua*) is “cut” (*hore ‘ā*) “from his ancestors” (*mai i tō’oku mau tupuna*). These ancestors, he qualifies at line 12, ultimately are descended from the founding chief of Rapa Nui: Hotu Matu’a.

With just a few utterances (only eight lines of transcript), *koro* has done quite a bit of epistemological work. First, in light of my analyses in chapter 4, he has provided a Rapa Nui epistemology to legitimate his authority to answer the question. He grounds his knowledge of the Chilean land tenure system upon his identity as an elder male Rapa Nui, who was born within a particular *hua’ai* associated with a specifically named residential area of Rapa Nui. Second, he uses this identity to reformulate the question I have, via his *taina*, posed. While he does answer the question ultimately within his extended turn at talk from lines 4-96, *koro*, in the initial section of the narrative from lines 4-55, in some sense, does not directly answer the question of his *taina*. From a conversation analytic point of view, he defers a direct answer and begins to insert an extended narrative that develops the contextual significance of his answer. More technically, *koro* develops an alternative discursive ground for answering the question his *taina* has asked on my behalf. My question appears to have grounded the question of land in Rapa Nui in terms of the “Titulo Dominio”, terms he at least initially does not want to address. Rather than immediately assessing the land in terms of my framework, *koro* creates an alternative context for
answering my question. He introduces ground for understanding land in Rapa Nui in terms of his current and genealogical kinship relationships. For him, undoubtedly, to begin an assessment of Rapa Nui land in terms of “Titulo Dominio” begs an altogether fundamental question; namely, why should land be assessed in Chilean terms at all. As he later elaborates more directly from lines 56-61, and as I will analyze more directly subsequently, koro explicitly rejects the reasonability of assessing Rapa Nui land in Chilean terms. Rapa Nui land, for koro, is to be assessed genealogically and in terms of kinship. Koro does not analyze his land in terms of Chilean land tenure policy, but as a kinship land given to him by his hua’ai; a hua’ai descended from Hotu Matu’a.

After establishing his identity in the initial part of his narrative, koro proceeds to elaborate some of the political economic history in Rapa Nui that led to the Chilean policy “Titulo Dominio”. He situates the meaning of the policy in the context of the first aforementioned foreign developments of Rapa Nui he associates with the policy. From lines 12-35, he discusses how a company and the Chilean government first created the conditions for the policy. He emphasizes, in lines 12-14, that when foreigners arrived they wanted land for cattle and horses. These foreigners he clarifies on line 21 are the people associated with the “compañía” (company), and, as he notes at lines 15-16, Chilean government officials associated with the company. The compañía koro is referring to here is the company introduced in chapter 2: La Compañía Explotadora de la Isla de Pascua (“The Easter Island Exploitation Company” or CEDIP); a subsidiary holding of the British based transnational corporation Williamson, Balfour Company that leased the island from Chile from 1898 to 1953. The company, as aforementioned in chapter 2, transmogrified the island into a kind of company state embedded in the global wool
market (Porteous 1981: 107). Interestingly, while the Chilean government has officially tended to blame the compañía for abuses of Rapa Nui at this time (Vegara 1939), and Porteous tends to fuse the two, koro emphasizes the role of the Chilean government in this development. While he discusses the era as the “hour the company arrived” (hora era tu’u mai te compañía), he does not explicitly associate the compañía with the events that transpired during this historical period. His narrative focus is the Chilean government; a government he derides at line 15 as a kind of banana republic with the Rapa Nui phrase ‘hau kakaka’ (kakaka “banana leaf/paper”; hau “government”). At line 15, koro stresses that it is the Chilean government that took the island of Rapa Nui, not the compañía. Without introducing a new grammatical subject from lines 16-20, he proceeds to list other events that presumably he holds the Chilean government responsible for, more so than the compañía. He emphasizes at lines 16-17 that ancestral things, of Rapa Nui as well Rapa Nui people, were taken from the rural areas of Rapa Nui and brought to Haŋa Roa where they were imprisoned. Koro reformulates the details of this event in personal kinship terms by noting from lines 18-19 that the generations of his “grandparents” (tupuna) and parents (matu’a) were among those brought to Haŋa Roa. And further, from lines 19-20, that he remains in this “prison” (he hare ma’auri)—the place of his birth.

From lines 22-35 koro elaborates some of the destructive consequences the imprisonment had upon Rapa Nui culture. At lines 22-23 he contrasts the condition of Rapa Nui people with cattle and sheep of the compañía: while Rapa Nui lived upon “only a single little piece [of land]” (etoiti no parehe itiiti), the cattle and sheep were three sections of island (Etoru parehe o te henua) and none of these sections is characterized as “small” (itiiti). During this era, Rapa Nui, 58 With offices in Argentina, Brazil, Peru, Equador, Colombia, Bolivia, Canada, the United States, West Africa, and the Philippines the Williamson, Balfour Company has been likened to a kind of empire (Porteous 1981: 66). The company intensified wool production on Rapa Nui that had been developed initially by Brander and Bournier from and subsequently Merlet. The company reportedly attempted to acquire the land of Rapa Nui after Merlet defaulted upon a loan secured through the Williamson, Balfour Company in 1898 (Porteous 1981: 68).
according to koro at lines 23-35, though mostly confined to their prison plots in *Haŋa Roa*, would sometimes have an opportunity to visit the world of the ancestors. He notes at lines 23-25, that when they were given permission to leave *Haŋa Roa* to fish or shear the sheep, Rapa Nui would try to observe and enter their ancestral world. He emphasizes, at line 26, that certainly he would go to this world. He laments, from lines 29-32, however, that because this world was not taken care of, but simply pillaged for portable valuables, that not much remains of it. Koro seems to suggest Rapa Nui contributed to this process; he elaborates at lines 27-30, that one would adventure into this world with a bag and try to collect things to bring back home. All that was left, he emphasizes at lines 31-32 are the boundary stones, caves, ceremonial centers (*ahu*), and the sculptures (*moai*); the rest has basically disappeared.

Hence, for koro, the little piece of land on which he was born and upon which the Chilean government now requests Rapa Nui register with the Chilean government in the form of individual titles, is deeply polysemic. On the one hand, the initial utterances (lines 4-12) suggest that koro is truly endear to his little piece of land. It is a land he complexly places in terms of toponyms within the kinship area that his parents were born upon; a land he ultimately traces genealogically through his ancestors to the founding Chief of Rapa Nui Hotu Matu’a. Yet on the other hand, his little land is associated with painful cultural memory. He has represented his land not as only a kinship land genealogically tied to Chief Hotu Matu’a, but also as a kind of prison cell. It is a cell of confinement and humiliation. In the political ecology of Rapa Nui at this time, Rapa Nui and their cultural heritage were treated inferior to sheep. The majority of the island was for the sheep; Rapa Nui, in contrast, were relegated to little pieces of land. The Chilean government, for koro, had Rapa Nui imprisoned to make more room for sheep. Though the sheep were cared for, Rapa Nui watched their own cultural heritage attenuate and some aspects of it
disappear. As koro will subsequently note, this is not the future Rapa Nui had agreed to when consenting to Chilean annexation of Rapa Nui.

Beginning at line 36, koro proceeds to represent how Rapa Nui land became transformed following annexation in 1888. From lines 36 to 39 he asserts that the arrival of Policarpo at this year is associated with what he calls a second organization of the island by outsiders. Significantly, his narrative proceeds by dialogically engaging with a particular Rapa Nui cultural memory that has become highlighted in assessments of the nature of Chilean annexation of Rapa Nui in 1888 (Makihara 1999: 62, McCall 1994: 169, Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 30) and was discussed explicitly in chapter 4 in my analysis of the word ‘mauku’ by the house builder in Te Hoe Manu. During the ceremony of annexation, as discussed, an important discussion and symbolic interaction developed between Policarpo Toro—the representative of the Chilean government authorized to annex Rapa Nui for Chile—and the Rapa Nui King Atamu Tekena. Koro stresses, at line 42, that there was a statement of Atamu Tekena—who he simply formulates as “chief” (ariki)—to Policarpo Toro. According to koro, from lines 43-46, the statement was intended to establish, like any contract one might say, a kind of reciprocal exchange between the two governments. Atamu Tekena offered to provide island resources, like “grass” (mauku), to feed the animals under the control of Policarpo Toro in exchange for, among other things, “protective care” (hapa’o) from the Chilean government. The cultural memory of koro is very similar to McCall’s representation introduced in chapter 4. Koro, as far as I can tell, does not discuss the pocketing of the soil discussed in other accounts of the story such as that by McCall; however, the mauku part of the tale is nearly identical to McCall’s version of the story. From the perspective of koro and McCall, land was not given to Chile as state property, but only the “grass” (mauku) that grew on top as a resource to feed the animals in exchange for protection
of Rapa Nui. This agreement, koro laments at line 48, “is falsified” (hakahape) immediately. He notes, from lines 49 to 54, that as new people, including missionaries from Tahiti arrived, the discourse of the settlers changed. Like in his discussion of the first major change of concern to him, koro does not elaborate herein who precisely these new people are; however, the people he is discussing are again the people of the Easter Island Exploitation Company and the Chilean state. The Chilean state leased the island for a period of more than fifty years. This “development”, to be discussed in more detail in chapter 9, involved a complex international legal conflict over “ownership” of the land of Rapa Nui that involved courts in Santiago, Chile as well as Papeete, Tahiti and Burdeos, France. The courts ultimately decided in favor of Chileans over much of the land. Subsequently, and without consulting Rapa Nui or even notifying them for thirty years, they registered the entire island as Chilean property. When koro stresses from lines 55-56, that they began to claim that the entire island was their island, and gave Rapa Nui only “one piece of land” (etahi parehe henua), he is discussing this process.

Subsequently, from lines 56-61, koro explains why he thinks that this Chilean perspective must be rejected. His explanation emphasizes values of Rapa Nui kinship. First, he dialogically challenges the Chilean perspective in ancestral terms. After noting that the Chilean government proposes to empower Rapa Nui with single plots of land at line 56, he emphasizes from lines 57-58, in the form of a rhetorical question, that this proposal is premised upon the assumption that the Chilean government has the authority to give pieces of land to the Rapa Nui. At line 59 he disputes the assumption. He stresses that “The island is the island of the ancestors” (Te henua o te tupuna te henua). Secondly, he disputes the Chilean perspective by addressing the issue to future Rapa Nui progeny. He emphasizes at lines 60-61 that the ancestors “left the island” (hakare) for the “great grandchildren” (hinare) and “grandchildren” (makupuna, hina), not the
Chilean government. Koro herein has now offered what I would consider a kind of specific answer to the initial question of my questionnaire posed by his taina. Unlike the first transcripts, where the policy is assessed in negative terms, koro does not really offer an assessment. Basically, koro rejects the validity of the question. As Wittgenstein is said to have done to classic philosophical questions (Fann 1969: xi), koro has in effect dissolved the question. His use of the rhetorical question from lines 58-59 and consequent reformulations of land in terms of me’e Rapa Nui such as hinarere and tupuna dissolve the coherence of the question. Wittgenstein once wrote, “Language is a labyrinth of paths. You approach from one side and know your way about; you approach the same place from another side and no longer know your way about” (Wittgenstein 2001: 69). Having reformulated the significance of the land in terms of an alternative form of life—me’e Rapa Nui, koro suggests that he really does not know his way about the policy. The policy really makes sense to the extent the land can be considered Chilean; once that assumption is abandoned, the question dissipates.

Interestingly, koro represents his analysis as epistemologically grounded upon the perspective of his particular hua’ai (line 57); a perspective he contrasts with the majority of the Rapa Nui people on the island (line 61-67). The majority of the Rapa Nui people, he laments from lines 61-64, seem to have become confused by the Chilean government. From lines 63-87 he introduces two reasons for the confusion, both of which appear to be associated with the third era of Chilean policy he distinguishes at line 69. He proposes that they have become confused because they have become brain washed; they have allowed their minds to be directed by the Chilean government and language. Rather than thinking in terms of the cultural logic of hua’ai, according to koro from lines 66-69, the majority of Rapa Nui people have become distracted by conflicts on the island instigated by Chileans. Koro appears to see this as the political goal of the
Chilean government, not an accident, but a result of strategic planning. On line 69, he characterizes this kind of planning as indicative of the third era of Chilean policy on Rapa Nui. Further, koro seems to suggest that the majority of Rapa Nui have become confused not only because they have been distracted by Chilean created conflict on the island, but because they are increasingly dominated by Chilean language. He implies that the majority of Rapa Nui people are confused because they are losing their linguistic identity in a society increasingly dominated by Chilean Spanish. At line 80 he stresses that Chilean Spanish has become dominant “in all areas” (te kona ta’atoa); for example, he notes from lines 83-87, the bank, the hospital, and the municipality.

Koro resists these trends. He notes from lines 88-89 that this development makes him sick. He finds identity not in the Chilean Spanish engulfing his society, but in Rapa Nui cultural festivals designed to counter the increasing hegemony of Chilean Spanish like “The Day of the Language” (Te Mahana o te Re’o) that he notes at line 70 has just been celebrated on the island. As was discussed extensively in chapter 5, Te Mahana o te Re’o in 2008 contextualized the significance of the Rapa Nui language by symbolically incorporating the Polynesian triangle into the organization of the festival. The groups which participated in the festival presented song, dance, and storytelling from different Polynesian societies within, and constituting, the points of the Polynesian triangle. Koro emphasizes this fact with his expression “three corners” (pini etoru) in line 71. He emphasizes thus at line 71 that the Rapa Nui language connects one to one’s ancestors: one’s Rapa Nui ancestors and one’s fellow Polynesian ancestors. From lines 73-76 koro constructs himself as politically active in helping the youth understand these connections. He emphasizes that he hopes to bring the language to the youth to care for them, and enable them to think and dream in their own language. Interestingly, his use of reported speech from the
festival from lines 77-78, highlights the difficulty of his struggle. He asserts, at line 77 that some man at Te Mahana o te Re’o a man perhaps mockingly asked what language he was speaking at the festival and cynically disputed that the island belonged to the Rapa Nui. Koro reports though from lines 80-81 that he simply informed him that the island was Rapa Nui and the language was Rapa Nui too, or more technically, the language is a Rapa Nui form of Polynesian language.

After koro notes at line 90 that his prior turn from 4-89 is his answer to the first question, he humbly qualifies his answer from lines 91-94 as just one perspective among many in Rapa Nui. He emphasizes that “other people” (taŋata ke) are likely to have “different ideas” (mana’u ke). This enables him to close his turn at talk at line 94, and ask his taina at line 95 his perspective on the question he initially asked. As his taina himself notes at line 96, the taina makes a shorter answer than koro. The taina begins his answer at lines 96-98 by dialogically engaging in the issues of annexation mentioned by koro. While, as noted above, koro considered the agreement of annexation to have ultimately been “falsified” (hakahape) at line 48, he did not explain many of the details of the failure. Koro only elaborated a major sense of the failure: the Chilean government subsequently took the land and everything of value to the Rapa Nui though that was not part of the initial agreement between Policarpo Toro and King Atamu Tekena. The taina focuses on details he perhaps implies koro left out. From lines 98 to 105, the taina reviews some of the details of the signing process of annexation. After noting that all the Rapa Nui responsible for signing did sign the annexation agreement upon the Bible—which he references in Rapa Nui terms (te puka ’i ruŋa o te Makemake) at line 101, he asserts a significant point.

Though Chile later took the land of Rapa Nui, and insisted that this was legitimate, in part, given the agreement of Rapa Nui to annexation, the taina emphasizes at line 106 that what was signed

59 The name ‘Makemake’ is commonly the name Rapa Nui associate with the Judeo-Christian concept “God”. Makemake is an indigenous deity that sometimes is equated with the “God” they are taught within Catholic church.
by everyone did not mention anything about land. In his own terms, "not one" (ʻIna etahi) "land" (kona) is [written] "upon" (ʻi ruŋa) it [the annexation agreement]. For the taina, this is what is wrong with later Chilean interpretations of the agreement. Koro critiqued the Chilean claim to own the island in kinship and genealogical terms; in contrast, the taina disputes the claim by analyzing the nature of the contract signed. For the taina, given that Rapa Nui did not sign anything that detailed lands permanently given to Chile, or the island itself, Chile cannot claim any lands or the island itself. For the taina, Chile can be known to have violated a formal contract, not on the basis of cultural memory of the mauku story, but by simply studying the details of the contract itself.

The taina continues by elaborating additional points about annexation and the immediate consequences introduced by koro. While at line 50 koro had mentioned the arrival of missionaries from Tahiti around annexation, he did not really detail the significance of the event. The taina appears to add details to clarify their significance from lines 107-113. While some of this section is difficult for me to fully understand given the use of reported speech—in particular lines 108-109—the broad idea is clear in light of historical analysis of this period. Rapa Nui was reportedly visited just before annexation occurred by the man they mention at line 114—Tepano Jaussen, the bishop in Tahiti who advised Rapa Nui to accept annexation by Chile (Vegara 1939: 32). The taina thus is likely reporting cultural memory of the advice of the bishop. Like Chilean legal scholar Vegara, the taina appears to consider the advice of the bishop fundamental to Rapa Nui acceptance of annexation. At lines 110 and 113 the taina suggests the bishop encouraged annexation by formulating the process in terms of friendship; friendship based in the church. The taina hence appears to be providing a kind of discursive explanation of Rapa Nui annexation. Rapa Nui agreed to annexation, according to the taina, in part because it was legitimated by
Catholic discursive practice. As new converts, Rapa Nui had faith in annexation because it was supported by the bishop and signed upon the Bible.

From lines 114-135, the *taina* listing a series of betrayals of Rapa Nui following the signing of the contract. Like *koro* he notes that Rapa Nui were not protected by Chile as promised, but incarcerated. He emphasizes on lines 118-123 that within three days Rapa Nui heritage and people were imprisoned. At line 121 he asserts that this was immoral and, like *koro*, he appears to establish some of the immorality of this treatment in terms of political ecological reasoning. On line 123 he argues that Rapa Nui were imprisoned to facilitate cattle ranching. Imprisonment is not the only betrayal. On lines 124-125 he notes that elder Rapa Nui were placed in the hospital though they were not sick. While he does not elaborate the point, the *taina* here is discussing the incarceration of Rapa Nui within the Leprosy Colony introduced in chapter 2. Like Papiano, the *taina* believes Rapa Nui people were infected with Hanson’s disease after admission to the colony. Though *koro* did not mention it, the *taina* reviews another immoral Chilean action from lines 126-134; the Chilean registration of the island as government property in 1933. Therein, at lines 130-132 he notes that the registration was authorized by the Chilean Bishop to secure the island from others also interested in Rapa Nui. Completely absent in his narrative of the registration of the island in 1933 is consultation with Rapa Nui. This silence is not coincidental. Unlike the original agreement, Rapa Nui people were never consulted; moreover, they were not even informed the island was registered as state property (Rochona-Ramirez 1993: 39) as will be detailed in chapter 9.

Like *koro*, the *taina* from lines 138-155 develops a more direct answer to my question by contrasting his genealogical knowledge of land in Rapa Nui with that established by the Chilean land tenure system. The contrast is expressed in the context of a narrative about a land conflict he
has with the Chilean government. At lines 138-139, the taina introduces reported questioning by Chilean officials regarding title to a land he claims as his ancestral land. He asserts that someone (hokotahi) has asked him “Where the title is [for his land]?” (‘I hē te parau?’). Instead of answering the introduced question by identifying that he does or does not have Chilean title, the taina appeals to Rapa Nui kinship logic to justify ownership of the land. He notes first, on line 142, with a place name I have deleted and replaced with the letter ‘M,’ that he lives upon this land. He proceeds from lines 142-143 to note that he has lived on this land for sixty years. At lines 143-144 he begins to trace a genealogy for the land. He notes that his maternal grandfather whom I have denoted ‘H’ and maternal grandmother who I have denote ‘E’ were the first people to live at M. Consequently at line 145, he notes that their child, who I have denote ‘R,’ was born on this land. R, we learn at lines 146-147 is the mother of the taina. Interestingly, though given my deletions it is impossible to understand, the taina is tracing his land through his mother while his brother, koro, traced his through his father. The taina lives on land he acquired from his mother; koro on land from his father. Having established the genealogy of the land, the taina notes further Rapa Nui evidence that it is his land. He notes at line 149-150 that he has “fenced” (titi) this “land” (henua) and built a house upon it “for his child” (ma tā’aku poki). While it is clear to the taina that this is his ancestral land to be given to his child, he introduces further reported speech that indicates the Chilean government disagrees. He notes at line 150-151 that the Chilean officials he mentioned earlier denies his land claim and considers his land property of “the Chilean government” (o te fisco). As he concludes his answer, he emphasizes that he considers his answer a kind of “testimony” (testimonio) against the Chilean government on lines 152-153 for future land fights with the government. The taina concludes his story at lines 154-

60 Quite likely, the taina is referring to a particular person nicknamed “hokotahi nō”; namely, Alberto Hotus Chavez, the Rapa Nui man recognized by the Chilean government as the head of the Council of Elders. Alberto is further discussed in Chapter 10.
155 by explicitly noting that this is the answer to the question, although it is not short as he promised. He proceeds to close his turn, like koro, by beginning to ask the second question of the questionnaire on line 156.

In sum, the two taina assess the Chilean land tenure system similarly. Differences between the answers, index not disagreement but alternative emphases and narrative concerns. The taina frames his answer as a formal testimony against the Chilean government’s history of betrayal and dismissal of his kinship knowledge of his own land. While clearly his epistemology is centered in his kinship regime of truth, his assessment of the policy also emphasizes historical details that index some technical concern with legal and religious discourse. Koro, in contrast, assesses the policy in the context of a narrative that establishes his own affiliation with collective Rapa Nui struggles to maintain their language and culture in the face of Chilean “brain washing”. Though their narratives diverge, many of the themes overlap. Like koro, the taina formulates a more or less direct answer to the question of the questionnaire from lines 138-155 only after he develops a historical context for the answer. His answer generally elaborates themes introduced by koro; often complementing the ideas of koro with additional details. His direct answer, like that of koro, rejects the authority of the Chilean system to establish the meaning of land in Rapa Nui. He does not answer the reported question introduced at lines 138-139 about whether he does or does not have a land title. Rather than dignify the question with an answer, like koro, he formulates the significance of his land in kinship terms. Koro stressed that the land of Rapa Nui belongs to the ancestors and future Rapa Nui children. The taina seems to explicitly agree. He knows his land not by a title, but because he received it from his mother and maternal grandparents and has lived upon it for sixty years. He hopes to continue his family tradition and pass it to his child. While he acknowledges that the Chilean government denies his land claim in
terms of the official discourse of Titulo Dominio, he testifies to his brother that he knows they are wrong. His brother does not challenge any these claims of his elder taina. These complex answers to the first question are followed by equally complex answers to the second and third questions. In these subsequent answers both taina elaborate further genealogical relationships to lands as well as additional conflicts on these lands with the Chilean state.

**CONCLUSION**

Each of the three conversations illustrates Rapa Nui negotiating the meaning of the Chilean land tenure policy from the “discursive stance” (Johnstone 2008: 137) of a Rapa Nui kinship regime of truth. All three transcripts assess the policy in the context of formulating their own identity, in part, within particular hua’ai, and problems they confront as members of specific hua’ai. While the concerns of the taina vary within and between these conversations, the interlocutors of all three conversations assess the Chilean land tenure system in the context of addressing the implications of the system for imagined Rapa Nui progeny. In transcript #1, the taina agree that the Chilean land tenure system is creating a shortage of land that places future Rapa Nui children in jeopardy. They fear these children will not only lack land to sustain a way of life, but that they will not be able to fulfill their obligation to properly bury their elders. In transcript #2, the two taina fear that the policy distracts Rapa Nui from a more important concern about land: Chile’s claim to hold title to the entire island. These two taina generally seem to agree that if Rapa Nui continue to acquire individual titles, Rapa Nui progeny will continue to lack the more important land title: Rapa Nui collective title to the island. The taina of transcript #3 emphasize slightly different problems with respect to Rapa Nui progeny and the policy. The second speaker of transcript #3 provides testimony that the Chilean land tenure policy is obstructing his desire to transfer land he obtained from his mother to his own son. His brother,
koro, suggests that the Chilean land tenure system, in conjunction with language policies and other Chilean institutions, is undermining the ability of Rapa Nui progeny to retain their linguistic and cultural identity. A basic building block of the interpretative repertoire Rapa Nui often utilize to assess the contextual significance of the Chilean land tenure system is its sustainability for Rapa Nui children. Imagined Rapa Nui progeny are key interlocutors of Rapa Nui conversations about the meaning of the Chilean land tenure system.
Interestingly, the two Rapa Nui women of Chapter 6 stress a contextual dimension of their understanding of the Chilean land tenure system that is similar to the way Hawaiians have been characterized as generally addressing conflict:

It is as if the Hawaiian stands firmly in the present, with his back to the future, and his eyes fixed upon the past, seeking historical answers for present-day dilemmas (Kame'eleihiwa 1992: 22).

Both of the Rapa Nui women of Chapter 6 address themselves to the problematic future they anticipate for Rapa Nui progeny in light of the Chilean land tenure system by turning back to ‘read their landscapes in terms of ancestral worlds’ (Hau’ofa 2008: 73). Chapter 8 explores the nuances of this dialogical dimension of the Rapa Nui interpretative repertoire. The chapter analyzes three different Rapa Nui conversations that discuss the Chilean land tenure system more in the context of cultural memory of the past, rather than an anticipated future in Rapa Nui. The first two transcripts (#4 and #5) are conversations between two different married Rapa Nui couples. The last transcript (#6) is a conversation between five members of a hua’ai. All three conversations involve “narratives of Rapa Nui ancestors” (‘a’amu tupuna). While each of the conversations engages what could be classified “scripts” of Rapa Nui cultural memory of ancestors, analysis demonstrates the situated as opposed to abstract cognitive significance of the “scripts” (Edwards 1994). Rapa Nui within each of these conversations use the scripts of ‘a’amu tupuna to tell different stories about the meaning of land and identity in Rapa Nui. Transcripts #4 and #5 both discuss the significance of the Chilean land tenure system in the context of cultural memory of the most significant ancestor to Rapa Nui, its founder Chief Hotu Matu’a. However, these two transcripts relate different stories of Hotu Matu’a. In transcript #4, the wife’s general cultural memory of the land divisions created by Hotu Matu’a is accepted and engaged in
her husband’s account of colonial history in Rapa Nui. In transcript #5, the wife’s cultural memory of a specific traditional story of Hotu Matu’a is also the focus of her husband’s analysis of the meaning of the Chilean land tenure system. In transcript #6 it is not Hotu Matu’a, but the nineteenth century Rapa Nui King Atamu Tekena who is referenced in assessments of the Chilean land tenure policy. While the nuances of the conversations differ, the three conversations all assess the significance of the Chilean land tenure system in terms of a discursive ground that stresses the cultural memory of Rapa Nui ancestors, rather than issues of official Chilean discourse. Analysis thus suggests Rapa Nui genealogy is another fundamental feature of the interpretative repertoire Rapa Nui people utilize to figure the contextual significance of the Chilean land tenure system.

**Hotu Matu’a**

Transcript #4 is a segment of a conversation recorded by a Rapa Nui couple: the wife is denoted ‘V’ for “wife/elder woman” (vi’e) and the husband ‘K’ for “elder man/father” (koro). The husband and wife were in their late fifties at the time of recording. I left the recorder with the couple to record a conversation between themselves and any fellow kin they wanted to invite to talk. The couple recorded a dialogue with one another at their home without me present, and according to conditions they determined. Their recording comprises approximately ten minutes: the first six minutes consists of dialogue that answers the questions of my questionnaire; the final four minutes consists of parts of three ancestral songs the couple sung which elaborated themes of their dialogue, but are not provided in the transcript. This transcript focuses on their answers to the first and second questions. Their answers to the third question—which include detailed descriptions of the locations and meaning of ancestral lands—are omitted to retain their anonymity. Of general interest herein is the couple’s explicit formulation of the meaning of land
in Rapa Nui in terms of Rapa Nui as opposed to Official Chilean discourse. The husband and wife emphasize different genres of Rapa Nui discourse in answering my questions about the Chilean land tenure system. The wife, in lines 1-13 and more explicitly in lines 24-30, represents land in Rapa Nui in terms of Hotu Matu’u as opposed to the Chilean policy. Unlike transcript 5, she does not discuss the significance of Hotu Matu’a in the context of a particular story, but in terms of her general cultural memory of Hotu Matu’a and his significance in understanding land in Rapa Nui. The wife’s story of Hotu Matu’a does not discuss the genealogy of Hotu Matu’a, but the relationship of his actions to the Rapa Nui people today. Interestingly, she also emphasizes the role of a female chief in the history of indigenous Rapa Nui land tenure: his “sister” (taina) Ava Rei Pua. The husband does not challenge the details of his wife’s story, but does question its completeness at line 14. He appends her story at lines 16-24 with a representation of some of the colonial history of the land of Rapa Nui. In conjunction, the perspectives of the husband and wife both recognize the Chilean land tenure system as an artifact of a colonial government whose authority they both reject. They demonstrate an understanding of the island and themselves as Rapa Nui, not Chilean. They challenge the significance of the Chilean land tenure policy by recontextualizing it in terms of Rapa Nui memory of the ancestral world and Chilean colonial history on the island.

Within the initial segments of the transcript, lines 1-15, the wife explicitly orients their talk to question one of my questionnaire: “What are your thoughts about the lands of Rapa Nui and the land title system of the Chilean government?” After greeting her husband at line 1, the wife identifies the initial topic of conversation in lines 1-2 as “the first question to read and answer” (Te ‘uihe tai’o etahi. Pahono) that is included in my questionnaire. She specifies that this question regards their thoughts on “the lands of Rapa Nui” (te mātou... te ‘a ‘amu o te kāiŋa
o te Rapa Nui). After providing a temporal context for the talk at line 3, the wife provides a metalinguistic frame for interpreting the impending talk: “it’s the truth” (he vānaŋa parauti’a) at line 4. Subsequently, she tells a story of Hotu Matu’a as an answer to my first question. Interestingly, at lines 5-6 she formulates the name of the island of Rapa Nui in terms of its founding chiefs, not a single chief. She identifies the island not as simply Rapa Nui, or even as the island of Hotu Matu’a; she names the island by the complex noun phrase “the island of Rapa Nui of our chief Hotu Matu’a and Ava Rei Pua” (Te henau nei ko Rapa Nui o tō mātou ariki era ko Hotu Matu’a ’e ko Ava Rei Pua). In other words, she formulates the island as the land of Chief Hotu Matu’a and Ava Rei Pua who she clarifies, at line 11, is the “sister” (tō’ona taina vahine) of Hotu Matu’a and hence is also a “chief” (he arikī tako’a). At lines 6-9 the wife emphasizes that Hotu Matu’a had children with his wife Vakai o Hiva; and that Ava Rei Pua had children with her husband Tu’u Ko Iho. The wife herein asserts that Hotu Matu’a divided the island. She asserts at lines 9-11 that Hotu Matu’a divided the island in half: one half to himself and by implication the progeny of him and his wife Vakai o Hiva; and the other half to his taina Ava Rei Pua and by implication her progeny with Tu’u Ko Iho. She links the ancestral children of Hotu Matu’a and Ava Rei Pua to the Rapa Nui children that have been subsequently born to this day at lines 11-12, as well as the children that will continue to live and be born in the future in lines 12-13.

The husband’s question at line 14 and subsequent narrative beginning at line 16 through line 24 does not challenge the truth of her story, but it does qualify her story as incomplete. His use of the “tag question” following her first assessment of the policy, rather than overt markers of agreement, epistemologically positions himself to reassess the policy in alternative terms (Heritage and Raymond 2005: 30). His narrative suggests she has forgotten to relate an important
series of historical events; namely, the colonial history of Chile in Rapa Nui. At line 14, he asks her, one might say in a colloquial American English sense, “That’s it?” In response to her affirmative answer at line 16, he proceeds to elaborate a different kind of story and assessment of the history of land in Rapa Nui. Though unrelated to the author of the narrative of chapter two that characterizes Chileans as all “thieves” who should leave the island, his talk expresses similar colonial themes. At lines 16-17, he too sees Chile as stealing Rapa Nui land and its people. In contrast to the narrator of chapter two, his emphasis is on how Chile officially steals its people and land. He emphasizes at line 18 that Chile robs the Rapa Nui people through its administrative power of identification cards and passports. Importantly, he stresses at line 19, that the Chilean government did not consult with Rapa Nui in developing its Chilean passports and identification cards for Rapa Nui. It created such documents, he asserts at lines 20-21, in situations where Rapa Nui did not know about identification cards and passports. Today, he emphasizes at line 22, Rapa Nui understand these things. Rapa Nui now recognize, he notes at lines 23-24, that Chile asserts power over Rapa Nui through their capacity to write Chile on their passports and administer the island by Chilean identification cards. Given that he does not challenge explicit details of her story but simply adds another story, his use of the tag question and alternative second assessment does not undermine his wife’s policy analysis, it simply complements it.

The wife extends the conversation not by challenging his addition to her analysis or revising her prior account, but by proceeding to the next question. Thus, there is no interactional evidence that she disagrees with her husband’s colonial representation of the policy. Her next question is my question #2 in the appendix (Do you understand/recognize the lands of your family by the land title system of the Chilean government or the knowledge of your family?
What are your thoughts?), although she refers to it as “question #3” (te toru) at line 25. The wife calls this “question #3” rather than question #2, because, as she told me later, she considered my first question as actually involving “two questions”. She orientates to this question explicitly at line 25 by reformulating “question #3” as a question about “the land paper of the Chilean government within Rapa Nui families” (He parau o te Tire ‘i roto o te hua’ai). At lines 25-27 she somewhat rejects my formulation of the question as a false dilemma. For her it is not a matter of whether one recognizes one’s land by Te Parau Henua or family knowledge. She asserts that the Chilean government does not give Rapa Nui that option: “Chile obligates Rapa Nui to identify their land by Te Parau Henua” (O te Tire he obliga ki te taŋata Rapa Nui mo to’o mai i te parau nei e kī nei ‘i rote re’o Tire Te Titulo Dominio). In other words, she implies that she has acquired a land title for her land and believes she was obligated to acquire the individual land title. Yet, at line 27, she assesses the obligation as “unjust” (‘Ina he tano). It is unjust, for the wife, in part, because it fails to respect Rapa Nui identity as Rapa Nui. More specifically it is unjust in the discursive context of Rapa Nui identity culturally remembered as “children of the chief” (he ŋa poki te ariki) dating from the era of Hotu Motu’a until this day. It is also unjust because it ignores Rapa Nui identification with the land as the land of the Rapa Nui. Thus, while she admits to “recognize” the land in terms of Chilean land tenure system in the sense of acquiring the Titulo Dominio out of obligation, ultimately she does not culturally identify the land in terms of official Chilean discourse. For the wife, “the land of Rapa Nui belongs to us” (Ko mātou te henua nei ko Rapa Nui), not Chile. The wife’s use of the pronoun “we” (mātou) is noteworthy. It represents her perspective as a cultural perspective of Rapa Nui, rather than as simply her own or one she shares with her husband. Among other formulations, she alternatively could have said that “for her” (mā’aku) or to “her husband and herself” (a māua ko tō’oku kenu).
the island belongs to Rapa Nui, not Chile. Presumably, she uses the exclusive first person plural Rapa Nui pronoun ‘mātou’ rather than the inclusive first person plural form ‘tātou’ to explicitly disassociate Chileans from owning the land of the island.

After presumably affirming his wife’s assessment of the policy with “yes” (Ēe) at line 34, his very delayed response—six seconds—portends disagreement (Pomerantz 1984: 65). Generally, the husband’s answer at lines 34-35 appears to support his wife’s policy analysis; however, there are some subtle differences between the two answers and perhaps some disagreement. Many of the terms he uses to answer the question are similar or identical to those of his wife. Like his wife, his response at lines 34-35 utilizes mātou. The husband, like his wife, represents himself as a cultural representative of Rapa Nui people, not as an individual or husband. While he does not explicitly orient to her use of the indefinite description, his terms are compatible with his wife’s characterization of Rapa Nui as “children of the chief” (he nga poki te ariki). Like his wife, he also presumably uses the exclusive form of the first person plural pronoun rather than the inclusive form to explicitly exclude Chile from claims to the island land.

Yet his identity is formulated in more complex terms than his wife. He considers himself not only “a native Rapa Nui” (he ma’ori Rapa Nui). He nests his native Rapa Nui identity within a broader Polynesian identity. He places Rapa Nui identity within “Polynesia” (te moana nui o Hiva). Unlike his prior turn at talk, disagreement is not indexed by the elaboration of an additional perspective to complement his wife’s perspective. He does not introduce an entirely new set of issues in his answer following a tag question that challenges the epistemological integrity of his wife’s answer. Disagreement can be inferred not from talk that explicitly challenges the perspective of his wife, but given that he does not explicitly orient his answer to one of her fundamental theses; namely, that Chile obligates Rapa Nui to acquire land titles
through the state land tenure system. The husband’s rather curt answer is not addressed to anything Chilean. His silence on the potential obligatory dimension of the Chilean land tenure system is quite telling in light of how he formulates his answer in particular categories of cultural identity. The silence of the husband regarding what his wife considers an obligatory dimension of the Chilean land tenure system, in a sense, refuses to dignify associating the land of Rapa Nui with anything Chilean. By identifying himself as a native of Polynesia and Rapa Nui, he seems to represent himself as one who does not and cannot consider the land at all in terms of Chilean policies. His use of the complex Polynesian and Rapa Nui identity terms is perhaps a way to circumventing discussing Rapa Nui land in any Chilean terms. The husband has not provided an explicit “corrective contrast” (Deppermann 2005: 295) to his wife’s perspective, but a silence that nevertheless disaffiliates with his wife’s at least partially Chilean framework of analysis.

His wife does not explicitly challenge his nested identity in the immediately subsequent talk, nor respond to her husband following a long pause. She respects the answer of her husband and simply moves on to the next question. In summation, while the husband and wife articulate different perspectives on the meaning of land and the Chilean land tenure system in Rapa Nui their views are more complementary than opposed. Both the wife and the husband oppose understanding land in Rapa Nui in terms of the Chilean land tenure system. Neither the husband nor the wife identifies themselves as Chileans, though both could claim citizenship in Chile. While the wife does express an obligation to register her lands in terms of the Chilean land tenure system, she privileges the division of island lands by Hotu Matu’a over any Chilean land tenure system. The wife sees herself as a “child of Hotu Matu’a”, not a Chilean. The husband does not acknowledge the relevance of Chilean land tenure policy. He sees himself as a native of Rapa Nui and Polynesia, and explicitly rejects the Chilean forms of identity inscribed upon his
passports and identification cards. Generally, the husband and wife refuse to analyze the significance of Rapa Nui land in terms of Chilean land tenure policy. This opposition is further buttressed by the traditional songs sung in the recording not included in the transcript. Interestingly, the songs also suggest that perhaps I requested the couple to assess the meaning of the Chilean land tenure system in an overly restrictive genre of Rapa Nui discourse. The couple not only wanted to talk about their opposition to the Chilean system, similar to the Yaqui who dance the truth of their identity and land claims (Shorter 2009), this couple sings it.

**Hiva**

Transcript #5 is about a four and a half minute segment of an approximately ten minute conversation recorded by a Rapa Nui couple in their late thirties at their home: ‘F’ denotes the talk of the wife; ‘M’ denotes that of the husband. The couple recorded the conversation in their home without me present and according to conditions they determined. I encouraged them to discuss the questions together or with other family members. They chose to record their ideas as a couple. The recording begins with the initially transcribed turns of conversation, and concerns some of the basic themes of a story about the founding chief and hero of many Rapa Nui stories: *Hotu Matu’a*. The transcript stops just before the couple briefly change topic to discuss the knowledge of another Rapa Nui regarding related matters, and subsequently returns to relate additional details of the story. Interestingly, as the wife returned the recording to me she expressed concern that I would not be able to understand the conversation as responding to the questionnaire exactly as I posed it. She emphasized to me that she consequently added a few additional recordings in monologue form to clarify and elaborate ideas she discussed with her husband. This additional talk is not included. Upon my initial review of the conversation—one of the first conversations that was recorded and listened to—I indeed found her concerns warranted.
I feared they had decided to talk about an “ancestral story” (‘a’amu tuai) and neglected to answer my questions. I pondered whether I should ask them to do it again. I suspect that I did not initially recognize the answer, in a sense, because I did not know ‘what I had asked’ (Briggs 1986). As a result of inexperience with the referential frame and range of discourse genres utilized by Rapa Nui to answer such questions (Briggs 1986: 47-51), I could not initially recognize the answer. The wife no doubt worried about her answer, because she anticipated that I may have been too ignorant of Rapa Nui knowledge to understand. After further analysis and experience with other answers however, I noticed the answer. While there was no answer to my specific questions in the sense I anticipated and indeed most of the conversation is about an ancestral story, their discussion of the story can be seen as related to my questions. Certainly, the couple see themselves as answering the questionnaire at lines 37-42. From a Conversation Analytic discursive stance, that is really all that matters: it is an answer because the interlocutors themselves recognize it as an answer. Of particular interest are lines 34-42 where the couple relates that the story is told as an answer to my questionnaire, and 43-61 where the couple analyzes and positively assesses the role of Hotu Matu’a in initially dividing land in Rapa Nui. Like transcript 4, this transcript is thus significant as it illustrates Rapa Nui conversations that analyze the significance of land in Rapa Nui by dialogically engaging with ancestral stories, rather than by analysis of Chilean policies and law.

The content of much of the initial turns of talk (lines 3-36) develops a story about the origins of Hotu Matu’a. Perhaps importantly, these turns of talk appear to be in part dialogical with a recently published version of a specific story in part about Hotu Matu’a entitled Pua A Rahoa: La Historia de la migracion del primer Rey Hotu Matu’a (Frontier 2008) that was well received in the community. While the husband does not seem to be familiar with this story of
Hotu Matu’a, I assume that the wife is, at least in part, telling her husband this story as a reflection of a recent reading or discussion of some of the book. The published story could alternatively be simply a part of oral traditions she is familiar with independently of the book and the publication just stimulated her to think about the story. The story thus might be an elaboration of her own ideas of the story—a story learned from elders, or a synthesis of ideas from the book and her own family socialization. Ultimately, influenced or not by the publication, the story within the conversation is not a monological cognitive script of the published story; it is an occasioned collaboration (Edwards 1994). Like any conversational story, the details of this telling are artifacts of particular sequentially organized talk (Jefferson 1978). The husband and wife interject assessments of the story that do not inherently relate to the telling of the story itself as a tale of Hotu Matu’a and the origins of Rapa Nui. The assessments and analyses of the story beginning at line 37 are clearly proffered to address the story to my questionnaire, not simply to tell the story, and much of the talk following line 37 has no connection to the published story.

As the conversation starts, the couple quickly orients towards a description and history of ancestral chiefs of Rapa Nui, and proceed to discuss some of the details of the genealogies of Rapa Nui chiefs. The conversation begins as the wife suggests, at line 1, an interest in telling her thoughts about the government of Rapa Nui to their origins from a Polynesian homeland known as Hiva, not by directly posing questions of my questionnaire like all of the other transcripts in chapters 7 and 8. The wife begins to tell the story at line 3, after her husband signals interest in hearing her thoughts about the government of Rapa Nui to the time of Hiva with his “Uhmmm” at line 2. The story subsequently is jointly told as the wife elaborates details of the story that he notes of interest; e.g. that there were ten high chiefs (line 4); and Matuŋi is one of them (line 6). The wife elaborates the significance of “kohu tohu” in lines 10-11, only after he expresses an
interest in the notion at line 9. She explains the significance of the concept in part by code shifting to a translation in Chilean Spanish: “profesional”. She continues the story by enumerating a set of “high chiefs” (ariki ma ‘ahu) at line 13; and after clarifying a confusion at line 15 of the husband regarding the name of one of the high chiefs—Pō—she emphasizes, at line 18, that Moe Hiva is the first of this set of high chiefs. The husband expresses confusion about the genealogy of Moe Hiva at line 19 initially, but ultimately demonstrates acceptance of her repair of the confusion at line 20 with a repetition of her repair at line 21. As the couple continue to discuss the story from lines 22-36 Hotu Matu’a emerges as a topic of focus. The lineage of chiefs that includes Moe Hiva, Dēranji, Pō, and Heŋa traced by the wife from lines 22-23 is not of explicit interest to the husband at line 24, and she makes no further analysis of them from lines 25-29. It is only her mention of Hotu Matu’a at line 29 that piques his interest. He repeats the name at line 30 signifying his concern with Hotu Matu’a. From lines 31-36 she does mention Hotu Matu’a again, but does not dwell on him; she is more concerned to place him within a more complex genealogy of Rapa Nui chiefs.

From lines 37-64 the couple negotiates the relevance of the genealogical story to my questionnaire. At lines 37 the husband interrupts her and signals that he is confused about the significance of her genealogical story; at lines 37-38 he asks her if this story has something to do with the questions of my questionnaire. After answering him with a “yes” (‘Ēe) at line 39, and hearing his agreement at line 40, she begins to elaborate how it is related to the questionnaire beginning at line 41. She proposes that the high chiefs she has been discussing in part are answers to my questionnaire. The husband supports her analysis at line 41 with the relatively strong affirmation of “indeed” (E pa’i) at line 42. The wife proceeds to discuss more precisely how her cultural memory relates to my questionnaire at lines 43-45. The wife rhetorically asks
the question at line 43 “From what source [the land divisions]?” (…mai hē te tumu?). She answers herself at line 45: “it was for Hotu Matu’a to divide the land of Rapa Nui” (O te ariki pe te kaiŋa e vahi). The husband adamantly agrees with her assessment at line 46. The wife refines her analysis and assessments of Hotu Matu’a and his role in the ancestral division of island land as the conversation continues from lines 47-61. At lines 47-52, she asserts that Hotu Matu’a did not first divide the land, but the people. She asserts that Hotu Matu’a did not first divide the lands exactly, he divided the people into the two tribes of the island: Mata Nui and Hotu Iti. Technically, she elaborates at lines 48-50, the tribes themselves divided the lands. After identifying the relationship of Roroi to the tribe Hotu Iti at line 50-52, she begins to assess the land divisions of the tribes as good for everyone: the chief, and land owners, and good for rest. After her husband interrupts her briefly at line 53 with a secondary assessment to concur, the wife explains why the divisions were good. The divisions were good because she notes at lines 54 that few lazy people lived under these conditions and the island thus produced abundance. She elaborates further from lines 57-61 that the chief observed the divisions and, finding them just, approved them. As she asserts that the chief then began to divide the two tribes further, the husband begins to interrupt her at line 62. The wife responds with “make smaller” at line 63 which he affiliates to by repeating her at line 64. From lines 65-87, the couple continues to jointly tell the genealogical story as they interject comments about various contemporary Rapa Nui. As the conversation proceeds the story becomes more focused on a tidal wave that reportedly crashed upon the island and caused death and destruction, than Hotu Matu’a. They do not again discuss the questions of the questionnaire directly.

While the initial interruption of his wife at line 37 suggested the husband doubted that they were addressing my questions, analysis of the talk-in-interaction from lines 37-64
demonstrates that they are in agreement that their genealogical story of Hotu Matu’a is explicitly addressed to the questions. This theme of transcript 5, though articulated differently overlaps considerably with transcript 4. The wife of transcript 5, speaking primarily “grammatically correct Rapa Nui” (vānaja titika), interestingly adds details regarding the division of island lands by Hotu Matu’a absent in the account of these divisions by Hotu Matu’a given by the wife of transcript 4—a woman perhaps twenty years her senior. The wife of transcript 5 suggests that Hotu Matu’a first divided the Rapa Nui people into two tribes and let the tribes divide the lands on their own. Subsequently, she argues, Hotu Matu’a then assessed and approved the divisions established by the two tribes he created. Interestingly, the sister of Hotu Matu’a, Ava Rei Pua who figured prominently in the story of the older wife, is not a concern of the wife in transcript 5. In comparison to the couple of transcript 4, the couple of transcript 5 is even less concerned with Chilean frames of analysis. Like the husband of transcript 4, the couple of transcript 5 refuses to acknowledge that any aspect of the land of Rapa Nui should be assessed in Chilean terms. The wife avoids discussing my direct questions about the Chilean land tenure system by initially asking her husband a different question about the relationship of land divisions to Rapa Nui ancestors than the one I posed on the questionnaire. As the husband tries to reorient her back to the questions, she emphasizes the divisions of Hotu Matu’a and the two tribes of Rapa Nui ancestors—Mata Nui and Hotu Iti—not Chilean Titulo Dominio. Regardless of the differences, both transcripts refuse to discuss the significance of land in Rapa Nui primarily in terms of the Chilean land tenure system. The meaning of land in Rapa Nui, for both couples, is grounded upon a pillar of Rapa Nui worldview: cultural memory of Hotu Matu’a.
Atamu Tekena

Transcript #6 consists of three segments of an approximately one hour discussion between five members of a *hua’ai*. The age of the *hua’ai* members ranges from thirties to seventies: the man denoted ‘T’ for *taina* is in his thirties; the man denoted ‘K’ for *kenu* (“husband”) is in his early forties; the woman named ‘V’ for *vi’e* (“wife”/ “woman”) is also in her early forties and is the wife of K; the woman denoted ‘N’ for *nuai* is in her seventies; and the man denoted ‘Ta’ for *taina* is in his later forties. I asked the woman denoted ‘V’ to record the conversation. She selected these *hua’ai* members to discuss the issues and recorded the discussion in a residential area without me present. The first segment analyzed is an approximately three and a half minute discussion among the *hua’ai* members that articulates some of their basic assessments of the policy as well as an understanding of its history. I end this segment as the conversation begins to dwell on issues of particular individuals that would compromise Rapa Nui identities, and because it shifts to a discussion of a different topic—the possibility that a *moai* would be sent to Europe for a cultural exhibition. The second segment analyzed is an approximately five minute discussion among the *hua’ai* members that refines their initial assessments. Like the other two transcripts of this chapter, within the second segment there is analysis of the Chilean land tenure system in terms of cultural memory of ancestral Rapa Nui at lines 108-117. The second segment also discusses the land title system in relation to Rapa Nui progeny and hence might have been included in Chapter 7 instead of Chapter 8. Overall, I thought the transcript fit better with themes of Chapter 8 than 7, and since it includes issues of Chapter 7, I thought it would be a good way to end the section on Rapa Nui *hua’ai* conversations about the Chilean land tenure system. The third segment follows closely after the second segment of talk and is really just a continuation of the same themes of the second segment. The
talk separating the second and third segments was difficult to transcribe, and because it is also
about the form the discussion should take rather than substantive talk between the hua’ai
members I decided not to struggle with the transcription.

The first segment analyzed begins basically where the recording begins. From lines 1-30
the hua’ai members negotiate both the meaning of the Chilean land tenure system (lines 1-20),
and the proper way for them to discuss its meaning (lines 21-29). In analyzing this initial
segment of talk, I am concerned with the latter only to the extent it helps clarify the former. In
these initial lines of talk, the hua’ai members appear to agree that the Chilean land tenure system
is something negative for Rapa Nui people, and something they would like removed. The
members seem to disagree, or at least cannot be demonstrably shown to fully agree upon the
implications of removing it. The first conversational turn of the wife V is a response to her taina
T who began the recording with an inaudible statement. At lines 1-3, the wife V basically poses
the first question of my questionnaire to her hua’ai. Referring to me by the name ‘Taro’, one of
the Rapa Nui names I was given, she emphasizes, at line 2, that this is the “first” question of my
questionnaire. As she begins to qualify her question at line 4, she is interrupted by an immediate
answer from her taina T. He offers a negative assessment of the policy; namely, that it “lacks
value” (’ina etahi valor). The consequent second assessment of her husband K at line 6 seems to
offer a kind of explanation of why it lacks value; it does not upgrade or challenge the first
assessment of the taina T. As he will throughout the conversation, the taina T at line 7
commands the husband K to “be quiet” (Ka mou e [X] ē) and elaborates upon his idea that the
system “lacks value”. At line 8 he proposes that it would be best that “we all” (tātou) “remove”
(hakakore) the system. His use of the inclusive first person plural ‘tātou’ is significant; it
implies that he is suggesting all Rapa Nui should remove it, not simply his “extended family”.
Between lines 8-9, he argues that upon its removal it would be “best” (ki te hope’a) that “Rapa Nui govern” (hakatere Rapa Nui). At line 9 he elaborates further that the Chilean land tenure system should generally “fall” (topa), or one might say in English “collapse”. Thus, the initial assessment of the Chilean land tenure system by the taina T is not only that it is without value, but that it should be collapsed and replaced by a system governed by Rapa Nui.

At lines 10-11 the wife V somewhat challenges “the epistemic priority of the first assessment” (Heritage and Raymond 2005: 26) of her taina T with a question that implies she has perhaps more knowledge than he to assess the Chilean policy. She questions, at lines 10-11, the implications of such a “collapse” of the Chilean system when she asks her taina T in effect “And then what?” (‘Oira ho’i ki hē?). Rather than wait for an answer, she suggests that were this to occur, then a Rapa Nui system of land tenure could be developed as an alternative. The taina T does not answer her question or comment upon her policy assessment, but shifts to a new topic at lines 12-13: something about a ship. While the wife V does continue the new topic at line 14 with a question about the ship, the hua’ai members do not seem to follow the topic change at lines 12-16. Hence the taina T, while answering the wife’s question at line 15, again shifts topic at lines 17-18. He returns to the initial topic of the Chilean land tenure system. Although it is not entirely clear, he appears therein to relate the issues of the Chilean land tenure system to issues of having a Chilean state system in Rapa Nui generally. His assertion that the Chilean state system in general is foreign to Rapa Nui on line 17 seems to articulate with his earlier claim that the land tenure system lacks value. He seems to argue that the land tenure system is worthless, in part, because it is an extension of a state system that also lacks meaning in Rapa Nui. His taina Ta challenges this idea at lines 19-20. The taina T does not engage the challenge at line 21, but tells him to be quiet. As I see it, the taina Ta is disputing that Rapa Nui lack a state concept, not
that the Chilean state lacks meaning in Rapa Nui. His use of the expression “again” (hakaou) in line 20 seems to imply that, for him, the Rapa Nui had an indigenous concept of a state and they could have it again. As the taina T does not engage the challenge at line 21, but tells him to be quiet, unfortunately, the nuances of their disagreement will have to remain unclear.

In lines 30-57, the hua’ai members further elaborate their assessments of the policy and negotiate the origins of the policy. From lines 30-48, the wife V and her taina T further discuss the meaning of the policy. After the discussion of the proper way to talk about the issues from lines 21-29, the wife V, at lines 30-31, attempts to refocus the hua’ai explicitly on the land tenure system issues. In asking them to discuss the policy she interestingly formulates the question as a question regarding Rapa Nui perspectives in general given her use of the inclusive first person plural pronoun ‘tātou’ and her emphasis on “the Rapa Nui”. The taina T first gives a general answer to the question of the wife V; consequently, he introduces personal experiences with the policy from lines 34-37. Somewhat substantiating his initial assessment of the policy at line 5, he notes that he has not acquired a Titulo Dominio for his land at lines 34-35. In asking at line 37 the purpose of such an acquisition, he thus appears to ask rhetorically, as his answer is somewhat already given at line 5. Perhaps, the wife V does not disagree with the assessment of her taina T; for rather than re-engaging the hua’ai with these questions at line 40, she asks where the system in effect comes from. Her question however, is not answered from lines 41-48. Her taina T, at line 41, rejects the topic change and successfully re-engages the earlier questions. His talk from lines 41-48 indicates that he is not concerned with the question of the wife V about the origins of the system, but the meaning of the system. His question at line 41 appears to be rhetorical as he answers his own question at line 42: he asserts that through the system the island has been taken. After the wife V agrees at line 43, he clarifies that it is Chile who has taken the
island at line 44. From lines 45-48, the wife V and her taina T establish agreement that by taking the island through this policy, Chile has taken valuable goods of the Rapa Nui. While the wife V does not explicitly draw out the implication of this agreement with her taina T, she has developed a dialogue that has undermined the initial assessment of her taina T. Initially, the taina T argued that the Chilean land tenure system lacked value. In Socratic fashion, the wife V has demonstrated that the Chilean land tenure system is quite valuable. It is a system that controls perhaps the most important valuable to Rapa Nui: their land.

From lines 49-57, the hua’ai members discuss the origins of the Chilean land tenure system. While her question about the origins of the system was not answered at line 40, the second attempt from lines 49-50 is addressed by the hua’ai members. From lines 49-50 the wife V asks both where the system comes from and when it was established. Her taina T answers, at line 51, that it comes from Kete.61 The person formulation ‘Kete’ is a nickname for the Chilean supported President of the Council of Rapa Nui Elders: Alberto Hotus Chavez. Interestingly, the wife V does not address the possibility that it comes from Kete or comment upon Kete. At line 52, she implicitly undermines the assessment of her taina T as she asks if the system comes from Pinochet instead. Her husband K as well as her other taina Ta both answer her question in the affirmative on lines 53 and 54 respectively. Consequently, after the husband K and the wife V repeat that it originates in Pinochet at lines 55 and 56, the taina T also concurs that it comes from Pinochet at line 57. Thus, although the assessments of hua’ai members clearly differ on certain points related to the land tenure system, and do not always agree on the proper way to discuss the

---

61 The person formulation ‘Kete’ is not elaborated by the taina T or other hua’ai members in this segment of talk; but generally, Rapa Nui the name ‘Kete’ is a nickname for the Chilean supported President of the Council of Rapa Nui Elders: Alberto Hotus Chavez. The nickname is derogatory: it can be glossed as “pocket” and is a way of saying Alberto Hotus is "in the pocket of," or corrupted by, Chile. While not all Rapa Nui would approve of calling Alberto Hotus “Kete”, I did hear the term used quite often. During my stay there was a deep dissatisfaction with “Kete”. Many Rapa Nui felt he had betrayed Rapa Nui for money, power, and status within the Chilean system.
policy, they generally do demonstrate explicit agreement that the land tenure system was
developed by Pinochet and was used to “take” the island valuables of Rapa Nui. Importantly,
while the answer is proximately correct in terms of the historical record, it is noteworthy that this
answer is complicated by deeper historical analysis like that given by the two male taina of
transcript #3. Though those men would likely not disagree that the Chilean land tenure system
operating at the time comes from Pinochet, they would likely identify the origins of the system in
Chilean practices that date to the nineteenth century. Interestingly, and as will be illustrated
below, such Rapa Nui cultural memory is evident later in the conversation.

After discussion of various topics not explicitly related to the Titulo Dominio policy, the
wife V re-engages the hua’ai members at lines 58-60 with the issues of the policy. From lines
61-80 the hua’ai members negotiate additional meanings of the policy. Interestingly, at lines 61
and 62, the taina T and elder nua N assess the question posed as simplistic. At lines 64-65 the
wife V responds to their negative assessment of the questions posed at lines 58-60 with a refined
question. She poses a dilemma for the hua’ai members to consider: ‘Do Rapa Nui accept the
policy or not?’ From lines 66-70 all the hua’ai members except the taina T appear to agree that
the wife V has posed a false dilemma. At line 66, the taina Ta answers the reformulated question
of wife V with an assessment of the policy in alternative terms. He asserts that the issue is not
whether one accepts the policy or not; like the couple of transcript 4, he considers the policy
obligatory. The use of the grammatical perfective aspect form ‘ko’ by the elder N slightly
upgrades the assessment of the taina Ta at line 67, but more or less repeats the assessment of the
taina Ta. The wife does not challenge the elder or her taina Ta at line 68 but basically duplicates
their assessment that the policy is obligatory; her husband K appears to agree with his wife and
the others at line 70 with his “yes” (Ēe). Any question that he is not agreeing with her at line 70,
but supporting a comment of the elder N, is dissolved by his assertion at line 77 that the policy is obligatory. Similar to her proposed dilemma, the hua’ai members reject the strong claim of the wife V at line 71 that the policy will “finish” the Rapa Nui. The taina Ta downgrades this assessment at line 72; he asserts that the policy only threatens Rapa Nui. The wife V appears to concur at line 73 as her assessment basically duplicates that of her taina Ta. The responses of the elder N and the taina T from lines 74-76 do not explicitly establish agreement with this policy assessment of the taina Ta and the wife V; however, nor do they suggest any explicit disagreement. The comments of the taina T at lines 74-75 are not policy assessments, but directives for managing the conversation. The husband K at lines 77-78 adds additional complexity to the assessment of the policy. He proposes that the problem with the policy is not simply that it is threatening, but that the Rapa Nui people do not analyze it. The elder N broadly agrees with the husband K at line 79, but reformulates his assessment. She asserts that it is a matter of failed “understanding” (aŋiaŋi). As the husband basically repeats the earlier statement of his wife, presumably he agrees with her. Thus, from lines 58-80 the hua’ai members appear to generally agree that Titulo Dominio is a Chilean political obligation that threatens the Rapa Nui people, and a policy they regret is not well understood by Rapa Nui people.

From lines 81-96 additional issues related to the Titulo Dominio are discussed principally between the wife V and the taina T, but also the elder N. From lines 81-85 the taina T emphasizes that the policy is taking the land of future Rapa Nui. At line 81 he asserts that future Rapa Nui will be excluded by the policy. This is problematic for the taina T because in light of his engineering studies he mentions at line 82, he thinks that there could be land for these Children. Chile, he emphasizes at lines 83-84, could have helped Rapa Nui children, but instead took their land. At line 85, the secondary assessment of the wife V attempts to connect the ideas
of the *taina* T to the subsidiary housing program associated with Titulo Dominio as noted in chapter 6. The subject matter unfortunately is not clear from lines 86-89 as I do not know what the *taina* T tears at line 87 and this seems to be a key part of what he is trying to say between lines 88-90. The problem he wants to end at line 90 could refer to what he tore or the Titulo Dominio system; I assume though that what is torn and the Titulo Dominio system are likely related. Perhaps he tore a Titulo Dominio or a piece of paper meant to be symbolic of one. At line 91, the wife V introduces a new assessment of the system; she asserts that it is discriminatory. It is unclear in lines 92-94 whether or not the *taina* T concurs with the wife V on it being discrimination or not. He seems to shift to a different assessment of the policy; however, he could also be seen as elaborating the assessment of the wife V. His utterance form lines 92-94 represents the Titulo Dominio as, in effect, a Chilean device for keeping one within the Chilean system. He emphasizes at line 93 that it is connected to establishing “dominion” within Chile, and at line 94 acquiring Chilean identification. The response of the elder N suggests agreement. The *taina* T had argued from 92-94 that Rapa Nui identity within Chile was constructed by the Titulo Dominio system and that this could be ended only with the collapse of the Titulo Dominio system. The elder N responds to this hypothesis in the affirmative at line 95. She thinks that indeed the Titulo Dominio system can be collapsed.

From lines 96-122 there appears to be further agreement generally between the *taina* T, the wife V, and the elder N. From lines 96-107 the *taina* T, the wife V, and the elder N again assess the land title system in negative terms. At line 96 the wife V answers the question of the *taina* T regarding what is wrong. For the wife V, what is wrong is that under this land tenure system Rapa Nui are Chilean. While the *taina* T repeats the question twice more at line 97 the repetition is not used to question the answer of the wife V; it appears to be rhetorical. From lines
the taina T assesses the policy negatively and proposes that it be removed. At lines 98-99 he formulates the “gist” (Heritage and Watson 1979) of his assessment of the land title system. He asserts that the land title system is threatening Rapa Nui. At lines 100-101 he accounts for his negative assessment of the land title system negatively in terms of identity statements. He appears to reject the land title system both because it is a Chilean system, and because rejection is supported by his “clan” (mata). From lines 102-117 the wife V generally seems to support this perspective of her taina T, yet she assesses the land title system in alternative terms. The wife V, at least initially, is concerned with epistemology more than cultural identity. From lines 103-106 the wife V explicitly agrees with the taina T that the land title system be rejected. Yet she rejects it not because it is simply a Chilean system like the taina T, or in terms of her “clan” identity, but because she disputes the authority of the Chilean government to give lands to Rapa Nui. At lines 105-106 she proposes that Rapa Nui remove their titles from the island. Her taina T explicitly concurs with her suggestion at line 107.

The wife V continues her policy analysis of Titulo Dominio from lines 108-117. Central to her analysis is cultural memory of the aforementioned symbolic action of Rapa Nui King Atamu Tekena at the time of annexation discussed in Chapters 7 and 2. Interestingly she contrasts the action of King Atamu Tekena with the contemporary Rapa Nui Mayor Petero. From lines 108-110, she emphasizes that with the administration of the mayor one does not own the island soil but just one’s home on the surface. The soil, she emphasizes at line 110 remains with Chile. This inverts the land tenure system remembered as established by Rapa Nui King Atamu Tekena. From lines 111-113, she emphasizes that King Atamu Tekena gave the surface “grass” (mauku) to Chile, while King Atamu Tekena reserved the soil for himself and the Rapa Nui people. Her subsequent moral critique of the land tenure system from lines 114-117 appears to be
grounded in this cultural memory. On line 114 she comments that the current system of land tenure is not like the one established by the King Atamu Tekena. At line 116 she implies that the land tenure system is not moral because it violates the agreement between the King and the Chilean government during annexation. She emphasizes that Rapa Nui conform to the land policy because they are obligated at line 116, not because it is a morally sound policy. It is not only problematic for wife V however because it is immoral, but because she sees it as leading Rapa Nui to extinction on line 117. Titulo Dominio, for the wife V at line 117, could result in the “death” (mate) of the Rapa Nui as a people. In asserting, on line 116 that the Titulo Dominio system is not “moral” (tano) and proposing on line 117 that it is, in effect, killing Rapa Nui as a people, she is clearly not excluding the mayor from condemnation. In light of chapter 5, it appears that in discussing the mayor, an ethnic Rapa Nui, she is not dissociating him from her critique of the Chilean government. Mayor Petero, working within the Chilean institutional system, is presumably “a Chilean thing” (me’e Tire) to the wife V to recall the language of Chapter 5. He is part of the Chilean government that lacks authority to give land titles. He is part of the Chilean land tenure system she perceives as killing Rapa Nui as a people.

While the immediately subsequent talk is somewhat unclear, the talk of nua and the taina T at this juncture in the conversation clearly does not explicitly reject the policy analysis of the wife V. From lines 118-122 there is some interaction between the elder woman nua, the taina T, and the wife V that suggests the three are broadly in agreement. Nua begins to repeat part of the prior statement of the wife V before being interrupted by the taina T. Her use of the term “obligation” affiliates with the analysis of the wife V at line 116 as well as others in prior turns that represent the land tenure system as obligatory. The elder nua does not really get a chance to elaborate her position. The taina T seems to more explicitly support the analysis of the wife V
given that he simply reiterates his proposition that the Chilean land tenure system is threatening at both lines 120 and 122. Overall, the conversational interaction at this point suggests that nua, the taina T, and the wife V potentially agree that the Chilean land tenure system is an immoral obligation that threatens Rapa Nui as a people. Hua’ai member agreement is less clear from lines 123-141. The wife V, from lines 123-125, and later from lines 127-128, seems to propose that the solution to the threatening land tenure system is the abolition of the system and the replacement of it with something strictly determined by Rapa Nui. This is of course not a new idea in terms of this conversation; this was basically the initial policy assessment of her taina T at the beginning of the transcript (lines 7-9). What is new is her analysis of the solution in terms of symbols of Rapa Nui nationality. From lines 123-126 and lines 128-129, the wife V does not discuss the land tenure system in terms of the “clan” identity issues brought up by her taina T in lines 100-101, but in more nationalistic terms. Contrasting with her claim of the immorality of the Chilean land tenure system at line 116, at line 123 she proposes that what is moral is to see “Rapa Nui as a people” (He nuna’a Rapa Nui). From lines 124-125 she elaborates what the implications of seeing Rapa Nui as a people involves. It would include, she claims on line 124, recognizing Rapa Nui as “an enclosed territory” (he cercado territorio). As a people, she imagines at line 125, Rapa Nui would thus need to have their own “identification card” (carnet Rapa Nui), as well as a “Rapa Nui flag” (reva Rapa Nui). In other words, she summarizes with a gist formulation, they would need to have “everything Rapa Nui” (me’e tā’ato’a Rapa Nui) that symbolizes them as a people. As her taina T tries to change the topic at line 127, she responds by again insisting from lines 128-129 that Rapa Nui need to have their own territory.

Although the transcript is incomplete in this section, it is not evident that any of the hua’ai members explicitly reject her analysis of the issue in nationalist terms. What is evident is
that the *hua'ai* members are not fully in agreement about the plausibility of a nationalist solution to the issues of the land tenure system. Given some gaps in the transcript from lines 130-132, it is difficult to fully understand the subsequent response of the *taina* T to the wife V. Yet in light of his later more intelligible talk from lines 130-132, it seems that the *taina* T agrees with the wife V to some extent regarding the formal establishment of a Rapa Nui territory. At line 131 he repeats some of her proposed criteria for establishing Rapa Nui as a people. He appears to concur with the wife V that Rapa Nui need their own “identification cards” (carnet Rapa Nui). He is, however, apparently somewhat skeptical about when such a possibility could be realized. His proposal at line 132 that something will be bequeathed to his *taina* Ta when that moment arrives meets with laughter by the wife V at line 133. However, the *taina* T, from lines 134-136, does not betray that he considers the matter a joke. Like Rapa Nui of other *hua'ai* expressed in transcripts of chapter 7, the *taina* T thinks about the future in terms of Rapa Nui progeny. Apparently, at lines 135-136, he thinks that future Rapa Nui children and grandchildren will realize a national identity. The wife V, at line 137, agrees with her *taina* T by repeating his idea that national identity could be something for the “future”. Interestingly however, at line 138 the “elder woman” (*nua*) questions the proposal that national identity be deferred to future generations. She asks, “How many more generations?” (*Ehia generación hakaou toe?*).

Unfortunately, once again the *taina* T refuses to answer other *hua'ai* member questions. At lines 140 and 142 he encourages her to be quiet until he is finished speaking. Generally, she follows his command; however, she does not fully concede to his demands. While the *taina* T proposes that her comments confuse “discussion“, she insists, at line 141, that she is not confusing the issues, but “correcting” (*titika*) the perspective of the *taina* T. The *taina* T does not respond to her analysis, but simply tells her to wait to talk after he is finished. Thus, while the three *hua'ai*
members appear to agree on the importance of a Rapa Nui administered land tenure system and a national identity, they partially disagree about who will be responsible for establishing such socio-cultural change and when such a revolution could practically develop.

Following the collapse of coherent dialogue about the issues for approximately one minute, the husband K begins, at line 143, to re-engage the hua’ai members in some of the national identity issues introduced by his wife V. He insists, at lines 143-144, that Rapa Nui need their own passport. After his wife V adds that a passport is important for being recognized in the world at line 145, he interrupts her and begins to qualify what form of recognition he has in mind. At lines 146-150, he elaborates that the recognition he desires is in terms of Rapa Nui identity. He notes, from lines 146-149, that the current passport of Rapa Nui reads Chile and that Rapa Nui are understood as Chilean when traveling outside the island. At line 150 he explicitly rejects the official Chilean passport identity; he insists that despite what the passport suggests, he and the rest of the Rapa Nui consider themselves Rapa Nui, not Chilean. His wife V subsequently appends his assessment by emphasizing that Rapa Nui are Polynesians. Neither the taina T at lines 152-3, not the husband K from line 154-159 explicitly orient to this second assessment; however, both emphasize a concern with the Chilean passport. After reiterating from lines 154-156, that he is identified as Chilean in his passport, the husband K stresses that this is a problem for him at line 157. At lines 158-159 he insists that although his passport identifies himself as Chilean, he explicitly considers himself Rapa Nui. The contrasts of the husband K from lines 154-159 as well as from lines 146-150 are thus not semantic, but sequentially organized and rhetorical (Deppermann 2005: 292-293). In light of the notion of Pascuense discourse introduced in Chapter 2, it is not necessary that Rapa Nui identity be contrasted with Chilean identity. Clearly Pascuense discourse tries to link the two forms of identity. In light of
Chapter 3 and the story of Maupiti it is also evident that Rapa Nui identity is sometimes tightly linked to being Polynesian. In these two segments, the husband K constructs a “soft” contrast between Rapa Nui and Polynesian identity and an intense contrast between Rapa Nui and Chilean identity. The husband K is adamant about the contrast between Rapa Nui and Chilean identity, but does not comment on the relationship between being Rapa Nui and being Polynesian in this segment.

Though nua does not speak from lines 160-165, the other hua‘ai members explicitly and implicitly orient towards the contrastive analysis of the husband K. It is noteworthy that four seconds elapse before the taina T responds to the husband K. My own sense, one supported by the comments of the taina T at line 160, is that the husband K has effectively summed up many of the issues the hua‘ai has been discussing. The husband K, a man who did not speak much prior to these turns in the conversation after the taina T demanded that he be quiet in an early turn at talk—line seven—seems to have reduced the group to silence. The response of the taina T at lines 160-161 concurs with this interpretation. The taina T asserts that the husband has ‘completed the discussion’ and captured the gist of the Chilean system. The taina Ta responds at line 162 to the first assessment with a question regarding the status of Rapa Nui rights. The question does not so much dispute the first assessment, as ‘challenge the epistemic priority of the first assessment’ (Heritage and Raymond 2005: 30) relative to the knowledge base of the taina Ta. The taina Ta seems to want to discuss the political implications of the Chilean passport; he appears to want to analyze whether this issue constitutes a kind of human rights violation. His taina T, however, once again refuses to relinquish the conversational floor or the primacy of his own assessment. Rather than discuss human rights or further political implications of the Chilean system in Rapa Nui, he simply tells the taina Ta to be quiet. Interestingly, the entire hua‘ai
becomes silent after the wife V briefly utters an umhmm at line 164. While it would have been interesting to see the hua’ai answer the question of the taina Ta, the five seconds of silence following the wife V are perhaps equally significant. Like the taina T suggested at lines 160-161, it seems the husband K has closed the discussion. While later conversation returns to these issues occasionally, the hua’ai does not focus on these exact issues again.

CONCLUSION

Transcripts #4 and #5 clearly are concerned with cultural memory of Rapa Nui ancestors significantly more than the transcript #6. In transcript #6, King Atamu Tekena is much less of a focus than Hotu Matu’a is in transcripts #4 and #5. In all three transcripts however, Rapa Nui ancestors are cited as a critique of a basic assumption of the Chilean land tenure policy: that Chile indeed holds title. The spouses of transcripts #4 and #5, in part dispute this assumption by insisting that only Hotu Matu’a had the authority to divide the island. Their perspectives of course echo those of the women in Chapter 6. In transcript #6, the wife V, but presumably the other hua’ai members too, dispute the basic Chilean assumption by insisting that King Atamu Tekena did not give Chile land in Rapa Nui—only “grass” (mauku). Like koro in line 59 of transcript #3, the interlocutors of these transcripts all seem to all agree that “The island is the island of the ancestors” (Te henua o te tupuna te henua), not Chile. To understand the degree of difference between the hua’ai based understanding of land in Rapa Nui, and the Chilean state, it is important to clarify the Chilean position. This is the goal of the next chapter.
During my residence on the island, Rapa Nui and Chileans emphasized two Chilean government texts as important “Chilean stories” (‘a’amu Tire) about the history of land and Chilean law in Rapa Nui: Victor M. Vergara’s seminal study *La Isla de Pascua: Dominación y Dominio*, and Susana Rochona-Ramirez’s more recent book *La Propiedad de la Tierra en Isla de Pascua*. The two texts both analyze early Chilean history in Rapa Nui; Rochona-Ramirez’s work analyzes Rapa Nui and Chilean relationships through the late twentieth century. Herein, I first review what I consider the main content of the two texts emphasizing particular passages written in the original Spanish, accompanied by English translations. Therein I note major themes, arguments, as well as significant historical silences seminal in the production of Chilean “national memory and forgetting” (Florez 2002: xv) in Rapa Nui. Secondly, I examine how the texts compare and contrast broadly as different “conflict discourses” (Arno 2009, 1993, 1985); and specifically in terms of discourse genres, discursive stances (Johnstone 2008: 137), regimes of truth, and rhetoric.

*La Isla de Pascua: Dominación y Dominio*

Vergara’s text was supported by a Chilean government commission to study the judicial history of Rapa Nui and provide the government the first official book on the subject (Vergara 1939: iii). It synthesizes analyses prepared by investigators working on behalf of the commission at various Chilean universities (Vergara 1939: iv), and according to the preface author, Anibal Bascunan Valdes, there is nothing to add—the analysis is complete and sufficient (Vergara 1939: vi-vii). The text consists of approximately 100 pages distributed into three sections as well as an epilogue and preface; it is complemented with an appendix which includes over a hundred and
fifty pages of copies of primary documents the Chilean state has collected to archive its national memory of Rapa Nui. The first part represents the island geography and the purported history of Rapa Nui prior to Chilean annexation as well as interaction with Rapa Nui. The second part mainly articulates Chile’s legal argument for registering Rapa Nui as a property of the Chilean state. The third section principally reviews the development of Ley 3220 that establishes Rapa Nui as subject to Navy rule from within the Chilean district of Valparaíso and the constitution of Rapa Nui as a Chilean National monument. Vegara’s epilogue, like the preface of Valdes, emphasizes the military and commercial value of Rapa Nui to Chile, and claims that as a result of Chilean government in Rapa Nui, the life conditions of Rapa Nui people have generally improved. The epilogue concludes with a list of particular acts and policies of the Chilean state that have led to progress on the island. While the first section is interesting in the way it represents Rapa Nui history prior to the Western colonial and imperial era, my focus herein is on the second and third sections, as well as the epilogue. Therein lies what appears to be the primary goal of the text: an explanation and legitimization of Chilean registration of the island as a property of the state.

Vegara’s historiography represents Chilean registration of Rapa Nui as a national property as a rational political decision given Chilean annexation and legal codes, and consequent conflicts between the Chilean state and the Easter Island Exploitation Company. He recalls that Policarpo Toro, Chile’s official agent of colonization, persuaded the Chilean government to annex the island in light of the potential military and commercial value of the island:

En sus visitas a la Isla concibió la idea de tomar posesión de ella para Chile, por su situación geográfica con respecto a nuestras costas y por estimar que al abrirse el Canal de Panamá, llegaría con el tiempo a ser base de abastecimiento de los barcos que
fueron de Europa y América a Australia y Nueva Zelanda, con lo cual su importancia estratégica y comercial sería indiscutible (Vegara 1939: 30).

In his visits to the island he conceived the idea to take possession of it for Chile, due to its geographic situation with respect to our coast, and estimating that a time would arrive in which with the opening of the Panama Canal [Easter Island] would be a base to supply the ships of Europe, America, Australia, and New Zealand; this is why its strategic and commercial importance is indisputable.

Vegara stresses that before Policarpo Toro raised the Chilean flag as part of the pageantry of annexation, Chile followed international, national, religious, and civil protocol. Annexation was accomplished according to the precepts of international law as outlined by the 1885 Berlin conference that divided Africa among the European powers (Vegara 1939: 35-37). The conference enumerated a number of conditions and principles which could legitimate an annexation (Vegara 1939: 34-35); Chile is reported to have annexed Rapa Nui in terms of the principle of *res nullius*:

Desde luego procedió a ocupar una Isla que constituía un *res nullius* sobre el cual no se ejercitaba la soberanía de Estado alguno y sus habitantes eran un punado de hombres diezmados por las epidemias y la lepra, perseguidos y explotados por los piratas y ocupantes particulares que habrían llegado a la Isla en busca de botín, que Vivian miserablemente y que aun habían sido abandonados por los misioneros que habrían ido a predicarles el Evangélico, pues no tuvieron quien los amparase de los atropellos y persecuciones que contra ellos cometía un aventurero y Capitán de Marina Mercante el francés Dutrou Bornier que pretendía haberse casado con la Reina Koreta y se sentía dueño y señor de esas tierras (Vegara 1939: 37).

Of course they occupy the island that constitutes a *res nullius* on which it did not have the sovereignty of any state, and its inhabitants were a handful of men decimated by epidemics and leprosy and chased and exploited by pirates and particular occupants that had come to the island in search of bounty, and that lived miserably and that had even been abandoned by the missionaries that went to preach the Gospel; they did not have
anybody to shelter them from the outrage and persecution that were committed against them by the adventurers and Captain of the Marina Mercante, and the French Dutrou Bornier that pretended to have married Queen Koreta and felt lord and owner of these lands.

Chilean officials consulted the fundamental individuals associated with the Catholic mission on the island as well as in French Polynesia and Santiago (Vegara 1939: 37), and created a contract on behalf of the Chilean government to purchase the purported lands held by the sheep ranch (Vegara 1939: 30). Vegara insists that annexation was accomplished by consent of Rapa Nui leaders:

…la apprehensio, se efectuó por medio de la “toma de posesión” que como vimos comprendió dos fases: la cesión a Chile de la soberanía de la Isla por parte de los Jefes indígenas plena, entera sin réserve y la proclamación de Chile como soberano en forma permanente (Vegara 1939: 37).

…the apprehension was done through the “taking possession” that as we saw included two phases: the complete cession to Chile of the sovereignty of the island by part of the indigenous leaders, and all of it and without reservations, and the proclamation of Chile as sovereign in permanent form.

Thus, from Vegara’s perspective the annexation was internationally legal, militarily and economically sound, and civil. Annexation involved Chile exercising its ‘Christian duty to impose sovereignty on an unclaimed land and bring civilization to savages’ (Vegara 1939: 36).

Following annexation in 1888, Vegara notes that Chile became embroiled in a series of legal conflicts over land titles claimed upon the island by foreign residents. He reviews many of the details of the various claims; for example, those of the heirs of the Brander and Dutrou-Bornier estate, the Catholic Church, Merlet, and the Easter Island Exploitation company. The Chilean government ultimately denied that any of these claims were valid:
En atención a lo expuesto, tenemos que la Compañía Explotadora de la Isla de Pascua no adquirió un derecho real de dominio sobre los terrenos o bienes raíces de la Isla, sin perjuicio, naturalmente de los derechos personales que por esas escrituras hubiese adquirido contra el vendedor. Por lo demás, Merlet nunca tuvo dominio sobre los terrenos de la Isla de Pascua que había comprado a Mr. John Brander, por las mismas razones que no lo tuvo la Compañía Explotadora ya que jamás pudo inscribir su título, por lo que no se operó la tradición (Vegara 1939: 55).

In attention to what was stated we have that the Exploitation Company of Easter Island did not acquire a real right of dominion upon the land or real estate upon the island, as it was naturally without purchase of the personal rights that these deeds had acquired against the seller. And for the rest, Merlet never had dominion upon the lands of Easter Island that had been purchased from Mr. J. Brander for the same reasons that the Exploitation Company did not have it either, since they were never able to register the title and for which the exchange never happened.

The government claimed that as Merlet never technically registered title to the lands he purchased from the Brander and Dutrou-Bornier estate heirs in the proper Chilean institution, the Oficina Bienes Raíces del Departamento de Valparaíso, the lands subsequently purchased by the Easter Island Exploitation Company did not have legal title in Chile (Vegara 1939: 48). To prevent further claims and clarify the scope of Chilean power upon the island, he notes that Chile subsequently registered the entirety of the island as state property:

En conformidad a lo expuesto y en cumplimentero de lo ordenado por el Primer Juzgado de Letras en lo Civil de Mayor Cuantía del Puerto de Valparaíso, en auto de fecha 11 de Noviembre de 1933, el señor Conservador de Bienes Raíces, procedió a inscribir la Isla de Pascua como propiedad de dominio del Fisco de Chile, a fojas 2.400 bajo el N. 2424 del Registro de Propiedades del Conservador de Bienes Raíces del Departamento de Valparaíso, correspondiente al año 1933 (Vegara 1939: 61).

In conformity to everything expressed before executed by order of the first judge of letters and civil mayor of Valparaiso, November 11, 1933 the office of the
Conservador de Bienes Raíces registers Easter Island as a property of the Chilean government, at pages 2,400 below Number 2424 of the Registry of properties of the office of the Conservador de Bienes Raíces from the Department of Valparaiso in the year 1933.

Despite extensive legal protest, Vegara notes that the Easter Island Exploitation Company ultimately signed a deed that ceded all former and future land titles to the Chilean government in order to secure a new twenty year lease in 1936 (Vegara 1939: 65-68).

While state registration is represented as resolving the conflicts between the Chilean state and the Compañía, Ley 3220 is portrayed as ending conflict between the Rapa Nui people and the company. Ley 3220 established a labor code upon the island:

With the dictation of Law 3220, the inhabitants of Easter Island were put under immediate control of Naval Authority. Later, making use of faculties given to the Naval Authority through Law 3220, when dictating Internal Rules of Life and Work on Easter Island and given the always growing interest with which the Navy has seen of its little colony, all of its inhabitants have been put under the rule of this statute that, like we have said, regulates all the features of life of Easter Islanders.

For Vegara, Ley 3220 is just one of the many positive contributions of the Chilean government to the Rapa Nui people listed in the epilogue to the text: for example, denouncement of Compañía Explotadora treatment of Rapa Nui in 1911; the institution of improved meat rations
in 1916; assistance with the construction of a Leper colony in 1917; and improvement of the water supply in 1921 (Vegara 1939: 80-81). Indeed from a government perspective, Chile sees itself as always benevolent and humane towards Rapa Nui:

La innumerable labor desarrollada por la Marina de Chile en la Isla de Pascua, es de un positivo valor científico, civilizador y patriótico. Comienza con la “Toma de Posesión” de Pascua, en la cual cupo a la Armada tan importante papel y aun no termina; esta labor es cada vez más intensa y de grandes beneficios para los pascuenses, para la economía nacional, para el país y para l defensa nacional. Desde la anexión de Pascua a nuestra soberanía, la Marina de Guerra se ha sentido estrechamente vinculada a esa lejana posesión colonial y se ha venido preocupando constantemente de sus necesitas. Cada vez que se ha presentado la oportunidad, y puede decir es que anualmente, un buque de nuestra Armada ha arribado a las costas de Rapa Nui, sirviendo así de único lazo de unión entre los isleños y su lejana Patria. Siempre los marinos han sido gentiles portadores de las dádivas y obsequios que envían los chilenos del Continente a sus hermanos los chilenos de la Isla de Pascua, y han estado pronto para solucionar los conflictos que se suscitando entre los nativos y los concesionarios explotadores de la isla (79-80). Los comandantes de los buques de nuestra Armada que han recalado en Pascua, siempre informaron a los Autoridades Navales sobre las necesidades de la Isla, adelantándose a recomendar las medidas necesarias para satisfacerlas (Vegara 1939: 79-80).

The work of the Chilean Navy on Easter Island has positive scientific, civilizing, and patriotic value. It begins with the “Taking of Possession” in which the Navy had an important role that has not ended; work that is more and more intense and of great benefit for Easter Islanders, the national economy, the country, and national defense. Since the annexation of Easter Island to our sovereignty the Navy has been constantly worried with the needs of its colonial possession. Every time that they had the opportunity, and we can say yearly, a ship of our Navy had arrived to the coasts of Rapa Nui being the only bond of union between the islanders and its distant homeland. The Navy has always been kind porters of gifts and presents that the Chileans send from the continent to its Chilean brothers of Easter Island, and they have been there soon to solve conflicts between the
natives and the Exploitation Company on the island. The commanders of the ships of our Navy that have docked at Easter, always informed the naval authorities about the needs of the island and were the first ones to recommend the measures necessary to satisfy them.

Chile, according to official national memory, has always cared for Rapa Nui as part of its civilizing, patriotic, and scientific duty.

Chilean registration of Rapa Nui as a state property and its imposition of the labor code according to Ley 3220 are clearly not however, only done to resolve conflict between the state, the company, and the Rapa Nui people. Vegara emphasizes that these political acts are part of a broader Chilean military and political economic strategy. The final statements of the epilogue are as follows:

En resumen, podemos decir, sin temor de ser disentidos, que la Marina de Chile, con el aporte entusiasta y decidido de todo su personal, ha sido la mantenedora en esa lejana posesión del concepto de Patria, trabajando constantemente en favor de los pascuenses y demostrando que el espíritu que animara al Comandante don Policarpo Toro, al concebir y ejecutar el plan de anexión de la Isla de Pascua a nuestra Soberanía, e mantiene latente en todos los miembros de esta gloriosa Institución. Debemos también reconocer que, gracias a labor de nuestra Marina de Guerra, somos los dominadores, del punto más estratégico en medio del Gran Océano, de una Base de Aprovisionamiento de primer orden, que será la llave de las comunicaciones entre las Américas y el Oriente. En tiempo no lejano en la ruta de Panamá a Australia, ha de salir al paso de los barcos que la siguen. Y, en un futuro, tal vez muy próximo, ha de ser una fortificación colosal, con Apostadero Naval y Base Aérea, donde tengan el centro de sus operaciones, los dueños del Pacífico (Vegara 1939: 82-83).

To summarize, we can say, without fear of being refuted, that the Chilean Navy, with the enthusiastic support of all its personnel, has been the keeper of that distant possession of the concept of homeland, working constantly in favor of the Rapa Nui and
demonstrating that the spirit that animated Commander Toro, to conceive and execute the
plan of annexation of Easter Island to our sovereignty stays latent in all members of this
glorious institution. We must also recognize that, thanks to the work of the Navy we are
the rulers of a point of strategic significance in the middle of the ocean, a base of supply
of first order that will be the key to communications between the Americas and the
Orient. In no time, it will be along the route of ships between Panama to Australia. And
in the near future, it will be a colossal fortification, with naval station, and aerial base
where the lords of the Pacific will have their center of operations.

While Ley 3220 and state registration of Rapa Nui are thus in part explained by a purported civil,
patriotic, and scientific duty, Vegara thus ultimately legitimizes these legal acts in geopolitical
terms. Securing Rapa Nui is not simply about stabilizing and expanding an imagined Chilean
community; it is part of a broader imperial strategy of making Chile an economic and military
‘lord of the Pacific’.

La Propiedad de la Tierra en Isla de Pascua

Rochona—Ramirez’s *La Propiedad de la Tierra en Isla de Pascua* was supported and
published by two state political organizations representing the indigenous peoples of Chile, la
Corporación Nacional de de Desarrollo Indígena (CONADI), and la Comisión Especial de
Pueblos Indígenas (CEPI). The organization and commission of the book developed in 1993
around the passing of *Ley Indígena* in Chile. Rochona-Ramirez considers the text an extension of
earlier state investigations into the history and contemporary politics of land in Rapa Nui
initiated in 1990 (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 66) as well as the first official investigations into the
matter collected and analyzed in Vegara’s text reviewed above (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 14).
While the text is principally based upon analysis of archives and contemporary government
documents relating to the island, it is also informed by field experience in Rapa Nui. In 1977 she
first visited the island, but her research is based on investigations completed in December 1989, March 1990, and January 1993 (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 14). Her report to CONADI and CEPI consists of 85 pages of analysis and 15 pages of copies of documents listed in an appendix. Following a brief 12 page review of the general history of Rapa Nui prior to annexation, the majority of the text—35 pages—is devoted to a analysis of the history of major political and legal acts of the Chilean government in Rapa Nui. Four actions are scrutinized most: annexation, the establishment of Chilean labor code upon the island by Ley 3220, state registration of the island, and the Titulo Dominio land title system of Decree 2885. The book concludes with 20 pages of reflection upon land conflicts and policies proposed for their resolution near the time of publication of the text. It is the second and third parts that are of concern herein.

While like Vegara, Rochona-Ramirez’s text is analytically focused upon the history of Chilean law and policy with respect to land in Rapa Nui, her investigation is not patently concerned with the rights of Chile over the land of Rapa Nui, but those of Rapa Nui people. Her concern with Rapa Nui land rights is represented as engaged with what she considers the fundamental concern of Rapa Nui:

Sin duda alguna, la tierra constituya la demanda fundamental de los rapanui. El reconocimiento del territorio rapanui en Isla de Pascua y los derechos de los isleños como primitivos dueños y señores. Independientemente del sector productivo o color político a que se adscriban los isleños, todos concuerdan en considerar legítimos sus derechos a la tierra de Isla de Pascua. Para los rapanui la Isla de Pascua es su territorio, su única patria, y el que las tierras hayan pasado a ser propiedad del fisco (mediante un auto decreto de la parte interesada) constituye a ojos de la comunidad una usurpación inaceptable. Es su negativa fundamental ante el colonialismo chileno. Aun entre aquellos que aceptan de buen modo la administración fiscal—y los títulos individuales—no existe ninguno dispuesto a describirse como dueño de un terreno en la Isla de pascua, sino en realidad,
como habitantes de un territorio que les pertenece desde siempre y al que tienen derecho por nacimiento (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 81).

Without a doubt, land constitutes the fundamental demand of the Rapa Nui. The acknowledgement of the Rapa Nui territory on Easter Island and the rights of islanders as primitive owners and lords. Independently of the productive sectors or political color to which the islanders adhere, they all agree upon the legitimacy of the rights to the land of Easter Island. For the Rapa Nui, Easter Island is their territory, their only fatherland, and the fact that the lands have become property of the state (through a self-decree of the interested parties) constitutes in the eyes of the community an unacceptable usurpation. Even amongst those that welcome the state administration—and individual titles—there is not a single one willing to describe himself as owner of a plot of Easter Island, but rather as an inhabitant of a territory that belongs to them since time immemorial and to which they are rightfully entitled by birth.

Contrary to Vegara, her analysis is intended to legitimate Rapa Nui, not Chilean, rights to land on the island. She concludes her report chastising Chile for a history of colonial abuse of Rapa Nui and demands Chile treat Rapa Nui better:

Estamos frente a un rechazo a las imposiciones colonialistas por parte de un pueblo—étnicamente diferenciado—que no ha sido ni derrotado en Guerra, ni conquistador militarmente, sino integrado al país en forma pacífica, mediante un acuerdo de voluntades. Los resentimientos de los isleños ante las injustas consecuencias que ha tenido la anexión a Chile, incluyendo los sesenta años de arredramiento y abandono frente a la Compañía Explotadora, los anos de sometimiento a un régimen naval y la imposición de medidas legales injustas y expropiatorias, no pueden ser ignorados. Hay una deuda social y política con los rapanui por parte del pueblo chileno, que debe ser reconocida por las entidades gobernantes. No caben excusas para una país que se plantea—a fines del siglo XX—como un modelo de desarrollo económico y democrático para la América Latina (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 85).

We are facing a rejection of the colonialist impositions by a people—ethnically unique—that has not been defeated in war, nor militarily conquered, but integrated into
the country peacefully through a voluntary agreement. The resentments of the islanders toward the unjust consequences that has followed Chilean annexation include: sixty years of leasing and abandonment by the Exploitation Company, years of subjugation to a Naval regimen and the imposition of unjust expropriating legal measures that cannot be ignored. There is a social and political debt toward the Rapa Nui owed by the Chilean people that must be acknowledged by the governing entities. There is no room for excuses from a country that presents itself at the end of the twentieth century as a model of economic and democratic development for Latin America.

Her main concern in the text is to document how Rapa Nui lost their land rights during Chilean colonial administration of the island:

El tema de esta obra son los derechos a la tierra de los habitantes de Isla de Pascua. Es el recuento de cómo se perdieron estos derechos a través del contacto con los europeos y luego, con el gobierno de Chile. ¿Cuál ha sido el proceso histórico que determino que los rapanui, sus originales habitantes, fueron relegados a una pequeña superficie de la isla, mientras que el resto del territorio se constituía en propiedad del fisco Chile? (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 13-14).

The main topic of this work is the rights to the land of the inhabitants of Easter Island. It tells how these rights were lost through contact with Europeans and then with the government of Chile. What has been the historical process that determined that Rapa Nui, its original inhabitants, were relegated to a small piece of land of the island while the rest of the land was established as property of the government of Chile?

Following her account of this process, she provides a relatively detailed analysis of five competing proposals for the restitution of Rapa Nui land rights.

Rochona-Ramirez’s historical explanation of how Rapa Nui were unjustly “relegated to a small piece of land of the island” emphasizes first annexation, and the implementation of the labor code and state registration, and lastly the implementation of the Titulo Dominio land tenure
system. Her account of the initial actions highlights many of the same historical events and processes emphasized by Vegara; however, she clearly does not find his analysis “sufficient and complete”. Like Vegara, she contextualizes annexation within Chile’s broader geopolitical history and interests. She too sees annexation as motivated by state military and capitalist strategy (Rochona-Ramirez 1993: 28). Annexation of Rapa Nui is framed as occurring on the heels of a Chilean victory in the Pacific Wars of 1879, and the expansion of continental Chile into the indigenous spaces of the Mapuche and Hulliche in the south, and the Amaras in the north (Rochona-Ramirez 1993: 27). However Rochona-Ramirez notes a dimension of annexation Vegara did not mention. As some Rapa Nui noted in a few of the conversations analyzed in chapters 7 and 8, Rochona-Ramirez emphasizes that Rapa Nui did not see themselves as ceding title to the land of Rapa Nui when they consented to annexation. She writes,

De acuerdo a la versión isleña, el rey Atamu Tekena señaló en aquella ocasión muy claramente que la soberanía cedida solo afectaba el usufructo del suelo. Cuentan los rapanui que Atamu Tekena se agacho frente a Policarpo Toro y recogiendo un punado de pasto y tierra del suelo, le alargo a este ultimo el pasto, guardándose la tierra en el bolsillo. Este gesto—fielmente conservado en la tradición oral moderna de la isla—indica que los rapanui estaban bastante claros respecto a lo que se transaba en la Anexión. El gobierno chileno podía quedarse con lo que crecía sobre la tierra, pero esta permanecería como propiedad de los rapanui. El sentido es prácticamente el mismo que señalamos con respecto a las ventas de tierra a los europeos: se transa el uso pero no la propiedad. Sin embargo, para Toro y el gobierno chileno la interpretación era diferente y así ha sido demostrado en la relación con los isleños durante los cien años transcurridos desde entonces (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 30).

According to islander perspective, King Atamu Tekena noted on this occasion very clearly that ceding sovereignty only affected the use of the land. Rapa Nui say that Atamu Tekena bent in front of Policarpo Toro and took a handful of grass and soil from the ground he handed the grass to him [Policarpo Toro] and put the soil in his pocket.
This gesture—sacredly conserved in oral tradition—indicates that Rapa Nui were clearly aware in respect to what annexation implicated. The Chilean government could keep what was grown on the ground but the land would be kept as Rapa Nui property. The meaning is practically the same that we noted in respect to the selling of the land to Europeans. You can make a deal regarding use of land but not regarding ownership. However, for Toro and the Chilean government, the interpretation was different and it has been like that regarding the islanders during the one hundred years since then.

As noted above, Vegara formulated annexation in terms of cession by a group of elder Rapa Nui he calls “indigenous leaders” (los Jefes indigenes), not “King Atamu Tekena” (el rey Atamu Tekena). Indeed, there is no mention of “King Atamu Tekena” in the text. Rochona-Ramirez has revealed an important historical silence (Trouillot 1995: 53) in the national archive Vegara used to narrate the event. According to Rochona-Ramirez’s account, Rapa Nui qualified the meaning of annexation; King Atamu Tekena established conditions of annexation. Annexation was not constituted as passive acceptance of a *tabula rasa* to be dictated by Chile, but an agreement—contract—between two political entities. Interestingly however, Vegara can be said to be not the only Chilean writer guilty of silencing the Chilean past in Rapa Nui. Rochona-Ramirez’s representation of annexation is silent upon another political dimension of the event—one aforementioned in chapter 2. While Rochona-Ramirez and Vegara note only a Chilean flag flown at annexation (Rochona-Ramirez 1993: 30), according to one early Chilean history of the proceedings there was also a Rapa Nui flag. Atamu Tekena is reported not only to have insisted that Policarpo Toro fly the Rapa Nui flag in addition to the Chilean flag but above the Chilean flag that day; and so it was (Bienvenido de Estella 1920: 141). Apparently, what happened at annexation involved more that what was said to have happened (Trouillot 1995: 2) by the ‘*a ‘amu Tire* written by both Vegara and Rochona-Ramirez.
Vegara and Rochona-Ramirez also differ fundamentally with respect to Chilean treatment of Rapa Nui between the annexation period, state registration of the island, and the implementation of a Chilean labor code upon the island. At a basic level, Rochona-Ramirez faults the Chilean government for failing to consider or consult with Rapa Nui during the various lease renewals and state registration of the island. She comments:

It is interesting to note how through all these conflicts between the state and leases, the rights of the islanders to land fade until they disappear entirely. The islanders themselves were too preoccupied with survival and reproduction to take care of these changes and events that occurred in spheres they did not have access, and they were kept ignorant of these measures for years. The Rapa Nui were alienated from their land without even noticing it. The lawsuits and fights were between others—the government and the landlords—and through these legal conflicts their ancestral properties were drained. To the islanders, having not declared war like the Mapuche, they were ignored, considered inexistente for all legal purposes.

The problem, for Rochona-Ramirez, is not simply though that Chile ignored Rapa Nui, but that it eschewed Rapa Nui in a political context in which Chile was officially responsible for them
according to the treaty of annexation. Rather than heeding responsibility, Rochona-Ramirez argues that Chile simply blamed the Compañía:

El gobierno de Chile se desentenderá, por más de medio siglo, de su responsabilidad directa con los habitantes de Isla de Pascua, culpando a los administradores de una sin duda compañía explotadora, de descuidar lo que era una obligación del gobierno chileno, es decir, velar por el bienestar de sus protegidos (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 33).

The Chilean government will wash its hands for more than a half century, of its direct responsibility to the inhabitants of Easter Island, blaming the managers without a doubt of the Exploitation Company, neglecting what was an obligation of the Chilean government, that is to say, watch over the well being of its protégés.

Vegara’s preoccupation with the relationship between the state and the Compañía is misconceived from Rochona-Ramirez’s point of view: he should have been analyzing the rights of the Chilean government given its political agreements with Rapa Nui; e.g. King Atamu Tekena’s conditions for annexation.

Yet the problems of this era for Rochona-Ramirez are not simply issues of dialogical neglect. Vegara highlighted improvements upon the island associated with the installment of the new labor code; however, he failed to mention that the Chilean government did not change what Rapa Nui cultural memory considers one of the greatest abuses of this era. Ley 3220 which Vegara lauded as caring for Rapa Nui, Rochona-Ramirez indicates, did not abolish the imprisonment of Rapa Nui within Hanga Roa:

En este reglamento se establecían desde las condiciones sanitarias de la isla (incluyendo horarios y costos de las curaciones médicas), hasta las condiciones y el tenor de los contratos de trabajo entre la Compañía y los isleños. Sin embargo, en lo que
respecta a derechos y libertad de tránsito de los rapanui, se mantuvo esencialmente igual a las medidas del Temperamento Provisorio (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 43).

This regulation outlined the sanitary conditions of the island (including time schedules and costs of medical services), and the form of labor contracts between the Company and the islanders. However, in regards to the rights and freedom of movement of Rapa Nui, the regulation essentially stuck to the measures of the Temperamento Provisorio.

This law that Vegara associates with providing all the care Rapa Nui needed—“its Chilean brothers of Easter Island” (sus hermanos los chilenos de la Isla de Pascua)—also suspended all constitutional rights upon the island including judicial process, suffrage, property, and detention rights (Rochona-Ramirez 1993: 45). At a broad level, Rochona-Ramirez emphasizes that contrary to Vegara, this code is not to be understood as an illustration of Chilean humanitarianism in Rapa Nui. The code and related treatment of Rapa Nui during this time index gross abuse of Rapa Nui rights by the Chilean government. She states:

En Isla de Pascua, al igual que en muchos otros lugares donde la población indígena fue desplazada de sus territorios, se procedió como si la población no existiera o, en el mejor de los casos, como si no tuviese ningún derecho. Primero, el gobierno arrendó la isla sin siquiera mencionar la existencia en ella de un pueblo, de quien había obtenido la cesión de su soberanía pocos años antes. Luego, a pesar de las acciones y discursos oficiales, toleró de facto los excesos de la Compañía Explotadora con los isleños, en sus afanes comerciales. Prueba de esta indulgencia so las leyes dictadas que legitimaban los abusos, como las restricciones de pesca y circulación, y el pobre papel de los subdelegados marítimos. Con la inscripción fiscal, el Estado chileno terminó por demostrar su indiferencia con respecto a la población rapanui. Al aplicar el artículo 590, es decir, son bienes del Estado todas las tierras que, estando situadas dentro de los límites territoriales, carecen de otro dueño, el gobierno de Chile confirma nuestro planteamiento. Los derechos indígenas no existen en la legislación nacional ni están considerados por los
gobernantes. En este caso, lo que importaba era cautelar los intereses de la soberanía, y en este afán se obvio la presencia de los rapanui en Isla de Pascua. Cuando en los años ochenta se empieza a legislar la regularización de la propiedad isleña, los únicos espacios que a los isleños les serán reconocidos son los de la reserva de Hanga Roa. De esta forma, el gobierno legitima la injusticia cometida por la Compañía al trasladarlos al encierro forzoso que soporto por muchos años el pueblo (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 41-42).

In Easer Island, as in many places where the indigenous population was displaced from its territories, it [Chile] has proceeded as if the population did not exist or, in the best of cases, as if they had no rights. First, the government leased the island without even maintaining the existence of a town, from whom they obtained the cession of sovereignty a few years prior. Then, not withstanding the actions and official discourse, tolerated in fact the excesses of the Exploitation Company with the islanders, in their commercial eagerness. Proof of this indulgency are the laws that legitimated the abuses like fish circulation restrictions, and the poor role of the maritime sub-delegates. With state inscription the Chilean government demonstrated indifference with respect to the Rapa Nui population. The application of article 590 establishing that all lands situated within the territorial limits lacking owners are assets of the government confirms our argument. The indigenous rights do not exist in national legislation and were not even considered by the government officials. In this case, the only thing that mattered was to protect its sovereign interests; in their eagerness, the presence of the Rapa Nui on the island was ignored. When in the eighties they started to legislate the regularization of the property of the islanders, the only places that are recognized as for the islanders are the ones in the Hanga Roa reserve. In this way, the government legitimated the injustices committed by the company by transferring the forced incarceration that the people had to suffer for many years.

To Rochona-Ramirez, Chile did not simply neglect to consider Rapa Nui voices in state decisions; they legalized social conditions on the island that perpetuated a “habitus” (Bourdieu 1995: 72) of structural and physical violence.
The legislature that Rochona-Ramírez alludes to in the preceding quote refers to the implementation of the Titulo Dominio land tenure system during the military dictatorship of Chile by General Pinochet (1973-1989). The land tenure system is represented as established by Decree 2885 in October of 1979, in a context in which cooperatives and community organizations, and municipal functions on the island, were terminated as a military governor was installed to administer the island (Rochona-Ramírez 1993: 52). She notes the system was modeled upon a similar one instituted to administer the lands of the indigenous Mapuche on the Chilean continent—Decree 2568 (Rochona-Ramírez 1993: 54). As was in the case of state registration, Rapa Nui were reportedly not consulted about the decree; it was simply imposed (Rochona-Ramírez 1993: 52). She emphasizes that while a minority of Rapa Nui supported Decree 2885, specifically those few with financial resources to purchase titles made available under the system (Rochona-Ramírez 1993: 55), the majority of Rapa Nui opposed. She suggests the following general reasons why:

Aquellos que estaban en contra de la ley se organizaban en torno al Consejo de Ancianos de Rapanui. El consejo se opuso a la aplicación de la ley desde el primer momento, y mantiene consecuentemente su posición hasta el día de hoy. El argumento principal de este sector—argumento con el que se identifican, sin embargo, todos los isleños—es la negativa a reconocerle al Estado chileno facultad para entregar títulos sobre una tierra que los isleños consideran es de ellos. Se expresa en esta frase de un anciano rapanui al la ley: ¿Cómo voy a aceptar que otro me regale lo que ya es mío? Los argumentos de oposición a la ley se expanden a otras áreas de conflicto. Afirman la necesidad de mantener la tierra en manos de los isleños, como comunidad, y distribuirlas a través del sistema familiar tradicional. De este modo, al no haber dueños particulares, nadie puede vender las tierras, y estas permanecerán al interior de cada familia. Aparte de la preocupación por proteger el patrimonio rapanui, se considera inaceptable que alguien puede vender lo que ha obtenido gratis. Otro punto que preocupa a este sector es que el carácter comunal de las tierras garantiza la solidez de la estructura socioeconómica...
Rapa Nui, basada en la cooperación y el intercambio. La introducción de la propiedad individual constituye, en este sentido, una disrupción no solo cultural, sino también económica (Rochona-Ramirez 1993: 55-56).

Those that opposed the law were organized around the Rapa Nui Council of Elders. The Council opposed the application of the law from the beginning, and consequently has maintained its position to this day. The main argument of this faction—an argument with which however, all the island identifies—is the refusal to recognize the authority of the Chilean state to grant titles over land that the islanders consider theirs. An elder Rapa Nui expresses this sentiment upon learning the letter of the law: *How am I going to accept that another gifts me what is already mine?* The arguments of opposition to the law expand to other areas of conflict. They affirm the need to maintain the land in the hand of the islanders as a community and to distribute them through the traditional family system. In this way, since there are no particular owners, nobody can sell the lands, and these will remain within each family. In addition to the concern to protect the Rapa Nui heritage, it is considered unacceptable that someone can sell what was obtained for free. Another point that concerns this faction is that the communal character of the lands guarantees the soundness of the Rapa Nui socioeconomic structure based on cooperation and exchange. The introduction of individual property constitutes, in this sense, not only a cultural disruption, but also an economic one.

Rapa Nui resistance to the decree is expressed not only in Rapa Nui discourse, but in practice. Rochona-Ramirez notes that after almost ten years of opportunity to register individual land titles, only thirty percent of the total available land to register by Rapa Nui had been registered (Rochona-Ramirez 1993: 56). Opposition to the Titulo Dominio system is reported to have been one of the primary concerns of the initially unified Council of Rapa Nui elders (Rochona-Ramirez 1993: 56). On the eve of the centennial of annexation, the council, representing the majority position among Rapa Nui, is noted as filing a formal complaint in Santiago that legally
challenged the legitimacy of state registration of the island in 1933, and that demanded the return of nearly the entirety of the island land to the Rapa Nui people (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 59).

Following the end of the Pinochet era, a 1991 legislative proposal to President Patricio Alywin is created that calls for the return of the entirety of the island to a Rapa Nui determined development cooperative. However, the proposal is defeated by the Chilean right wing. Consequently, as important Rapa Nui leaders against the Pinochet regime are incorporated into new Chilean government institutions, new proposals for land reform become more modest in scope. Alberto Hotus for example, the president of the initial Council of Elders concurrently becomes the mayor of Hāŋa Roa in 1992 and consequently a member of the board of directors of SASIPA (the state organization that manages the lands reserved for the state farm) (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 66). Subsequently, the Council of Elders no longer lobbies for the return of the entire island, nor land distribution according to Rapa Nui kinship, but sectors of the island distributed according to individual titles like those established by decree 2885 (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 56). Rochona-Ramirez insists however, that while Rapa Nui become conflicted over the best way to redistribute land at this time, the proposals nevertheless occurred in a post-Pinochet era in which Chileans, as well as Rapa Nui retain high expectations of reform. She comments:

Lo fundamental de este periodo para Isla de Pascua es que se abren espacios de participación. El pueblo rapanui puede discutir y plantear propuestas para su propio desarrollo. Se inaugura, como recién señalamos, con el Congreso para el Desarrollo de la Isla de Pascua. …Al momento del cambio de gobierno, las posibilidades que se le presentan al Consejo son enormes, aunque también lo son las expectativas creadas en la comunidad (62).
What is fundamental about this period for Easter Island is that spaces of participation become open. The Rapa Nui can discuss and propose issues for its own development. This process is inaugurated, as we recently indicated, with the Congress for the Development of Easter Island. …At the time of the change in government, the possibilities available to the Council are enormous although so are the expectations created in the community.

Though Rapa Nui demands were not heeded by the government, and Rochona-Ramirez proposes contradictions in Alberto Hotus’s nested political identity in Rapa Nui (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 66), she generally seems to highlight the changes as indexing progress in Rapa Nui and Chilean relations. Rapa Nui institutions like the Council of Elders that were not officially recognized during the Pinochet years have, for her, importantly gained dialogue with the new government.

The new proposals are represented as primarily designed to resolve a practical rather than political problem on the island; namely, that the land initially allotted to Rapa Nui in the town of Hanga Roa is no longer able to support the increasing population. Four major proposals are reviewed; those of the mayor, governor, la Oficina Bienes Nacionales en Isla de Pascua, and la Oficina Bienes, Nacionales en Santiago. She also comments upon the implicit proposal of archaeologists involved with the island, and informal proposals of Rapa Nui groups not formally part of the Chilean political system like the Council of Elders, but who argue for radical change like the Council did before it was incorporated into the state (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 81-82). The explicit proposals are, in a sense, extensions of the initial Titulo Dominio land tenure system established by decree 2885. The new proposals suggest additional territories on the island be released to the Rapa Nui community for registration by individual title. They differ in terms of which territories are recommended for release and the criteria for redistribution to individuals. While the same cannot be said for the proposals of the Oficina Bienes Nacionales en Isla de
Pascua or the Oficina Bienes, Nacionales en Santiago, the proposals of the mayor and governor—which she calls Rapa Nui proposals (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 73)—are said to be guided by a two dimensional strategy. She comments:

Los rapanui manejan una doble estrategia frente al problema: están ciertos de que la tierra e por derecho de ellos y, por lo tanto, consideran que pedirle al fisco chileno un pedazo es más que un mero acto de administración. Son capaces de distinguir entre su necesidad inmediata—un pedazo de tierra—y la necesidad común de recuperar el derecho a su territorio. Con su solicitud no quieren legitimar las pretensiones de propiedad del fisco, sin únicamente acceder a un determinando espacio para sus familias. Más de un siglo de sobrevivir en condiciones restringidas les han enseñado a ser prácticos y cautelosos, incluso oportunistas. Como ambos propósitos no son excluyentes—recuperar sus derechos como pueblo y obtener espacios nuevos para vivir—se puede avanzar simultáneamente en ambos sentidos. De algún modo se obtiene una síntesis entre ambas, puesto que a medida que se consiguen más terrenos, efectivamente hay una recuperación—aunque sea parcial—del territorio. Mientras tanto, los rapanui educan a sus hijos y se desarrollan políticamente. Apoyan las demandas del Consejo y de cualquiera que se ofrezca a recuperar tierras, al mismo tiempo que se preocupan por garantizar un pedazo de terreno para su familia bajo las condiciones presentes. Se podría plantear, que con el actual nivel de escolaridad de las jóvenes generaciones, los rapanui estarán capacitados para asumir—even un futuro no tan lejano—el control de su propio desarrollo como pueblo (82-3).

The Rapa Nui utilize a double strategy to confront the problem: they are certain that the land is rightfully theirs and they deem asking the Chilean state for a piece as merely an administrative act. They are capable of distinguishing between their immediate needs—the piece of land—and the communal need to recuperate the right to territory. They don’t want to legitimate the state’s claim of ownership/through their requests but rather to have access to a certain space for their families. More than a century of survival under restricted conditions has taught them to be practical and cautious even opportunistic. Given that both goals are not exclusive of each other—recovering their rights as a people and obtaining new spaces to live they can simultaneously advance in
both directions. In a way a synthesis between the two is obtained, given that as more lands are obtained there is indeed a recovery—though partial—of the territory. Meanwhile the Rapa Nui educate their children and they evolve politically. They support the demands of the council and of whomever offers to recover lands, while at the same time securing land for families under the present conditions. It could be said that under the current education level of the younger generations, the Rapa Nui will be capable of assuming—in a not so distant future—the control of their own development as a people.

Rochona-Ramirez thus appears to have faith that Rapa Nui can work within the Chilean system for more lands and power and increased democratic participation within the Chilean state.

Me’e Tire

While the historiographies of Vegara and Rochona-Ramirez analyze relations between Rapa Nui and Chile in fairly disparate terms, both texts can be broadly considered conflict discourses. Vegara and Rochona-Ramirez both propose institutional methods for resolving conflict between Rapa Nui and Chile that ‘define who can speak with authority, proper forums and means for conflict resolution, and the particular roles for antagonists’ (Arno 2009: 91). Antagonistic relationships between Rapa Nui and Chile are represented in these texts in a “…regularized way of talking about conflict that grows out of and recursively modifies a way of life or a set of social practices” (Arno 2009: 91). As conflict discourses, the historiographies both diverge and converge in terms of the discourse genres they apply, their discursive stances, regimes of truth, and rhetoric. Their divergence is fairly transparent. From principally a discursive stance and genre of Chilean nationalism, Vegara analyzes Chilean relationships in the context of truth regimes of national and international law. He assesses land disputes in Rapa Nui not by dialogically engaging Rapa Nui voices, but the land claims of a multinational corporation, Chilean codes of law, and international legal tribunals. Vegara defends Chilean claims to land in
Rapa Nui, and disputes the claims of la Compañía without acknowledging potential alternative claims of Rapa Nui. After mentioning Rapa Nui voices that apparently ceded sovereignty to Chile, Rapa Nui perspectives on the island fade from Vegara’s analysis. He represents land disputes in Rapa Nui as conflicts over legal title to land on the island between Chile and la Compañía where he might have considered the issue as a conflict between three parties (Rapa Nui, Chile, and la Compañía) or two different parties (Rapa Nui and Chile). “Isla de Pascua” is truly Chilean property, for Vegara and the Chilean government, because Chile acquired the island according to the standards of international law established at the 1885 Berlin Conference, as well as by proper Chilean national codes of law. The state recognizes political and legal problems between itself and la Compañía; however, problems of Rapa Nui people are represented as individualized conflicts with la Compañía, rather than as fundamentally political and legal conflicts between Rapa Nui and the state.62

Vegara’s nationalist discursive stance does not appear to be addressed to Rapa Nui people, but directed to fellow Chilean bureaucrats, investors, and military leaders. The concluding paragraph of the text, as noted above, does indicate a concern with the conditions of Rapa Nui people; however Rapa Nui, while noted in the statement as a concern of the government are relegated to the background. The text highlights the island not as the place of an indigenous Polynesian people, but as a potential “very strategic point” (punto más estratégico) for the Navy and commercial trade between Panama and Australia. Rapa Nui are considered

For Trouillot, such a distinction prevented France from recognizing the political nature of conflicts in Haiti before the revolution. Haitian struggles against French power and domination were simplified as individual conflicts, rather than as political resistance. Initially French officials assumed slaves ran away not because they had a human capacity to be conscious of social and political injustice, but because an individual master was excessive (Trouillot 1995: 83). French could not see Haitians as Black Jacobins because the Haitian political resistance seemed to fundamentally contradict “…most of what the West has told both itself and others about itself” (Trouillot 1995: 107). In other words, the political resistance simply did not accord with the ‘general discourse genre’ (Shapiro 2009) the French relied upon to interpret their world empire.
more in the sense of colonial subjects than as fully human people. Though as noted above, Vegara’s text does formulate Rapa Nui at one point in terms of equality—specifically, as “Chilean brothers” (sus hermanos los chilenos de la Isla de Pascua (Vegara 1939: 79))—it more typically represents them as savages of a *res nullius* it is Chilean Christian duty to civilize (Vegara 1939: 36). Despite the particular formulation of equality, Rapa Nui were not generally depicted by Vegara in humanist terms, but as mere “inhabitants” (habitantes) of their “little colony” (pequeña Colonia): “they were to be placed under the rule” (han sido colocados bajo el imperio (Vegara 1939: 79)) of the state, not consulted as equals. Such representations suggest Vegara and Chilean discourse at the time embraced the quantificational definition of humanity grounding Western mythology at the time: “some humans were more so than others” (Trouillot 1995: 76). As Rapa Nui were only partially human to Chile, they were not included in their political negotiations with la Compañía. Similar mythological Western logic no doubt grounded their decision not to inform Rapa Nui that their island was registered as Chilean property. To early twentieth century Chilean officials, it would have seemed no doubt oxymoronic to discuss national policy with “the savages of Isla de Pascua”. Rapa Nui are constructed by Vegara as colonial subjects of the Chilean state, not participants in a Chilean democracy. By applying the discourse of civilization and savagery to the historical field of Rapa Nui, the state disqualified Rapa Nui from being historical actors in the Chilean nationalist drama of “Isla de Pascua”. By registering Rapa Nui as Chilean property and reportedly implementing labor codes on the island to improve the social conditions on the island, Chile portrays itself as civilizing Rapa Nui people and developing the island into an important geopolitical and commercial national resource. Development problems on the island are thus redressed by new state policy directly addressed to the la Compañía, not dialogue or direct engagement with Rapa Nui.  

---

63 Island problems are

---

63 Apparently this strategy was followed by other colonial states at the time; for example, in the late nineteenth
managed by eschewing direct state responsibility to Rapa Nui as a people or as real “Chilean brothers”.

Rochona-Ramirez challenges Vegara less in terms of an internal critique than in terms of “external considerations” (Carnap 1988). Rather than interrogating the coherence of the history of international law in indigenous spaces as others have (Grovugui 1996, Krishna 2001), or questioning whether or not the unilateral application of the various national legal codes was indeed valid given the initial collaborative dimension of annexation, Rochona-Ramirez introduces an alternative regime of truth for assessing the legitimacy of Chilean land claims in Rapa Nui: Rapa Nui cultural memory. Throughout the book, Rochona-Ramirez recognizes at least some Rapa Nui voices, and considers them as criteria for ascertaining truth. She investigates the truth of Chilean land claims by testing them against Rapa Nui cultural memory, reported speech, and quoted documents published by the Council of Elders. Rapa Nui are thus represented in her text, not as mere subjects of a “pequeña Colonia” of the Chilean state who must obey state legal codes and policies unilaterally dictated by Chilean officials, but as fellow Chileans with civil rights to democratic participation in state decisions and policy. The official Chilean story of owning Rapa Nui is contested in a sense as “recontextualizing” (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 2001: 119) the significance of the event by suppressing Rapa Nui cultural memory of King Atamu Tekena’s symbolic action. The labor code Vegara celebrated as an index of Chilean humanity in Rapa Nui is dismissed as a grave injustice of “forced incarceration” (encierro forzoso) (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 42). The series of policy agreements between la Compañía and Chile are contested by Rochona-Ramirez as the state failed to consult Rapa Nui. She sees

---

century Belgian Congo, King Leopold sold rights to use lands in the reported “crown lands” of Belgium. Some eight million people of the Congo died at the hands of ruthless corporations that bought these “rights” (Peoples and Bailey 2009: 363).
this as incompatible with “the obligation of the Chilean government” (obligación del gobierno chileno) to “watch over the well being of its protégés” (velar por el bienestar de sus protegidos) (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 33). For Rochona-Ramirez, Chile had an obligation not to the company, but to Rapa Nui people it “watched over”.

The solutions to land conflict in Rapa Nui that Rochona-Ramirez proposes are clearly not only dialogical with, but addressed in part to Rapa Nui people. In her analysis of recent struggles over land in Rapa Nui she engages Rapa Nui voices. Similar to some of the Rapa Nui voices in the transcribed conversations analyzed in chapters 7 and 8, Rochona-Ramirez introduces some Rapa Nui speech that contests the land tenure system General Pinochet forced upon Rapa Nui. She notes a Rapa Nui woman finds the system unacceptable because the policy “gifts me what is already mine” (me regale lo que ya es mío) (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 56). In her assessment of possible solutions to the conflict she proposes that Chile cannot continue simply to grant Rapa Nui increased “spaces of participation” (espacios de participación) within the Chilean government institutions in Rapa Nui (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 62); she demands some form of state restitution to Rapa Nui. Impart this involves the gradual return of “state land” in Rapa Nui to Rapa Nui people. Rochona-Ramirez generally supports the “double-strategy” noted above of the mayor and state appointed governor of Rapa Nui to pragmatically acquire increasingly greater amounts of land on the island a few parcels at a time through Chilean organizations and policies in Rapa Nui. Yet additionally for Rochona-Ramirez, the state must also recognize “There is a social and political debt toward the Rapa Nui owed by the Chilean people” (Hay una deuda social y política con los rapanui por parte del pueblo chileno)” (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 85). The full legitimation of Rapa Nui land claims, apparently for Rochona-Ramirez, involves both the return of the majority of island land to Rapa Nui, as well as, some sort of compensation
for, and acknowledgement of, the abuses and suffering the government imposed upon Rapa Nui as it allowed the island to be exploited by la Compañía and government officials who imagined themselves a “lord of the Pacific”.

Though convergence is not patently obvious, Vegara and Rochona-Ramirez do ultimately analyze Rapa Nui and Chilean relations in terms of common meta-historical poetic tropes of historiography (White 1973). Vegara dramatizes the Chilean registration of Rapa Nui in the context of what could be said to be a liberal romantic nationalist narrative. It is liberal historiography (White 1973: 22) in its emphasis on a future ideal that can be realized through rational incremental steps. Vegara conceives Rapa Nui not as a tool for fortifying a more authentic Chilean past in the present, but as an instrument for constructing an idyllic future Chilean state that will march into the Pacific. Fortifying Chilean power in Rapa Nui is no doubt just one of the many small liberal steps Chilean bureaucrats conceive as requisite for building a Chilean empire in the southern hemisphere. It is a romantic history (White 1973: 9) as it narrates the Chilean past in Rapa Nui as a story of good over evil, as well as redemption and heroic transcendence of the world. Vegara portrays Chilean imperialism in Rapa Nui as a story of national good triumphing over the evils of savagery and corporate excess. He imagines Chile as romantically able to transcend its former continental condition of colonial subjection to Spanish rule by incorporating indigenous spaces like those of the Rapa Nui and Mapuche into its project of empire. Rochona-Ramirez’s story of Rapa Nui, while seemingly radical, on analysis, exhibits the narrative form of a nationalist liberal tragedy. It is a tragic historiography (White 1973: 9) because she does not imagine Rapa Nui as fully able to transcend their colonial subjectivity; she tethers Rapa Nui futures to those of Chile. At best, she conceives Rapa Nui controlling development on the island as “protégés” of Chilean educational and governing systems. It is
liberal historiography in its emphasis on a future ideal—the day Rapa Nui can control development—and the method by which it suggests that ideal can be achieved: incrementally acquiring land through the “double-strategy” of acquiring a few pieces of land at a time. For Rochona-Ramirez, Rapa Nui can improve their lot by dialectically reforming the Chilean system as they gradually increase their role in the “spaces of participation” (espacios de participación) Chile has graciously provided them as its “protégés”. Rather than fully embracing the more radical idea that Rapa Nui should and could be Polynesian “Black Jacobins” (James 1989), or “Polynesian Bolivians”, Rochona-Ramirez continues to subjugate Rapa Nui futures to those of a Chilean “imagined community” (Anderson 1991).

While Rapa Nui is embedded in a ‘surplus play of signification’ (Derrida 1978: 289), ultimately the discursive stance of both Vegara and Rochona-Ramirez limit Rapa Nui history and possible futures by applying a rhetorical trope perhaps first classically applied by Ranke: synecdoche (White 1973: 177). They suggest that Rapa Nui history, and its imagined future, can be adequately symbolized in terms of only one of its dimensions: its recent Chilean part. While Rochona-Ramirez disputes the validity of Chilean land claims in Rapa Nui and condemns Chilean treatment of Rapa Nui, she neither questions Chilean sovereignty in Rapa Nui, nor a state framework for resolving conflict between Chile and Rapa Nui. Ironically, though commissioned by two ostensibly pro-indigenous organizations, CEPI and CONADI, Rochona-Ramirez never suggests political independence or even self-determining political autonomy is currently a viable political option for Rapa Nui. As noted above, she proposes that perhaps in the future, with more education—that is, Chilean education—Rapa Nui will one day be able to control the development of their island (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 82-3), but this is a much weaker claim than that in the future Rapa Nui will govern their own island as they see fit.
Ironically, despite ostensibly great disparity in analysis of Chilean history in Rapa Nui, both Rochona-Ramirez and Vegara ultimately adopt a pro-Chilean discursive stance, and imagine conflict resolution in Rapa Nui as determined by the discourse genres of Chilean law and national policy. They seem to differ only in the role they assign to Rapa Nui within these Chilean discursive spaces. Rochona-Ramirez, in a sense applying the discursive genre delineated in chapter 2—Pascuense discourse—promotes a special role for Rapa Nui people in potentially a bicultural space: Isla de Pascua. Vegara fails to even locate a role for Rapa Nui within the Valparaiso discourse genre delineated in chapter 2; Rapa Nui are simply colonial subjects permitted to live in a military territory of Chile. It would be misleading however to characterize the proposals of Rochona-Ramirez as post-colonial and those of Vegara as colonial. Rochona-Ramirez never suggests that Rapa Nui, even after the establishment of Valparaiso and Pascuense discourse is post-colonial. The form of governance in Rapa Nui set up by Valparaiso and Pascuense discourse in Rapa Nui was developed primarily by Chileans. From the vantage of a Harvard educated, indigenous Seneca legal theorist, Chilean governance in Rapa Nui thus remains involved in “…the exercise of power and control over one people by another” (Porter 2009: 87); that is, one technically called colonial, not “civil”.
Pascuense discourse, like that of Rochona-Ramirez’s proposal, broadly accords with the way the Chilean political system has addressed conflict between Rapa Nui and Chile since the 1990s, and as I examine in Chapter 11, this is how the conflict continues to be represented in mass media. Herein I further examine Rochona-Ramirez’s Pascuense discourse under the assumption that it is a useful model of contemporary Pascuense approaches to the conflict. In emphasizing Pascuense discourse, I do not mean to deny that the Valparaiso type Chilean discourse, as represented in Chapter 2, which denies special status of Rapa Nui as an indigenous people of Chile, continues to operate within official state circles. As adumbrated in Chapter 9, interpreted as a conflict discourse in Arno’s terms, Rochona-Ramirez’s Pascuense discourse structures and manages conflict between Rapa Nui and Chile in a manner that limits both the scope and possible resolution of conflict. Further analysis of the scope and forms of resolution it limits, from the vantage of Foucault’s philosophy, reveals a form of power known as “governmentality” (Foucault 1991) operating within the discourse. This can be illuminated by attending to some of the “statements” (Foucault 1972) the discourse utilizes to represent the meaning of land and conflict in Rapa Nui, and the identity and role it assigns to Rapa Nui in this circumstance. The statements ‘police the possible truth’ (Foucault 1981: 61) about Rapa Nui land and identity in terms of a contestable dispositif. Scrutiny of some of the discursive Rapa Nui data represented throughout the dissertation and some additional data presented in this chapter indicate that this Pascuense discourse is in conflict with the Rapa Nui interpretative repertoire I have explicated; further analysis illustrates that Rapa Nui actively contest the “subject position” (Foucault 1983) the discourse constructs for Rapa Nui.
Rochona-Ramirez’s liberal Chilean nationalist solution to the struggle of Rapa Nui against the Chilean government, as explicated above in Chapter 9, is represented as a means to ultimately end a Chilean history and present she explicitly contests as colonial (Rochona Ramirez 1996: 85). For Rochona-Ramirez, “Without a doubt, land constitutes the fundamental demand of the Rapa Nui” (Sin duda alguna, la tierra constituya la demanda fundamental de los rapanui.) (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 81), and this land conflict can be resolved by the “double strategy” of individual Rapa Nui working to incrementally get more individual land returned from the Chilean government in a way that ultimately adds up to a complete return of island land to Rapa Nui (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 82-83). While perhaps it was not her intention, I believe Pascuense solutions like those that she proposes in this statement will not liberate Rapa Nui from Chilean colonialism. Analysis, in terms of cross-cultural comparison and various discourse analytic traditions, suggests such a double strategy is likely to intensify Chilean colonialism in Rapa Nui. Though apparently supportive of the plight of Rapa Nui, such a statement “rarefies” (Foucault 1981: 59) conflict between Rapa Nui and Chile in a way that “depoliticizes” (Fairclough 2009: 173) much of the conflict, and its possible forms of resolution, in terms of “modern colonial governmentality” (Scott 2005).

At the core of modern colonial governmentality is a manifold of tactics for

…disabling old forms of life by systematically breaking down their conditions, and with constructing in their place new conditions so as to enable—indeed, so as to oblige—new forms of life to come into being. …Where the stories of modernization conceive of this break as producing an expansion of the range of choice, the expansion of freedom, [modern colonial governmentality is seen to involve] the reorganization of the terrain in which choice as such is possible, and the political rationality upon which that reorganization depended (Scott 2005: 25).

Such tactics of “political rationalities” are associated with a discursive and non-discursive field of operation in which the targets of colonial power are constructed into particular kinds of known human subjects (Scott 2005: 25). Colonial governmentality manages its field and target in terms
of power designed to produce human subjects known as intelligible things to maneuver within a new social and legal space (Scott 2005: 41). The state of governmentality is not primarily concerned with justice or administration, just population control and security (Foucault 1991: 103-104). Laws, within such a framework, become less vehicles for justice, as tactics of a governing apparatus, or dispositif, mechanically organized for “...the pursuit of the perfection and intensification of the processes which it directs” (Foucault 1991: 96). The dispositif, or governing apparatus as it is often translated, is a fundamental notion in Foucault’s governmentality studies of the 1970s (Agamben 2009: 1); it is a concept that replaced his 1960s archaeological investigations of “positivities” (Agamben 2009: 3). A broad overview of the notion is stated by Foucault in an interview:

What I am trying to pick out with this term is, firstly, a thoroughly heterogeneous ensemble consisting of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions—in short, the said as much as the unsaid. Such are the elements of the apparatus. The apparatus itself is the system of relations that can be established between these elements. Secondly, what I am trying to identify in this apparatus is precisely the nature of the connection that can exist between these heterogeneous elements. Thus, a particular discourse can figure at one time as the programme of an institution, and at another it functions as a means of justifying or masking a practice which itself remains silent, or as a secondary re-interpretation of this practice, opening out for it a new field of rationality. In short, between these elements, whether discursive or non-discursive, there is a sort of interplay of shifts of position and modifications of function which can also vary very widely. Thirdly, I understand by the term ‘apparatus’ a sort of—shall we say—formation which has as its major function at a given historical moment that of responding to an urgent need. The apparatus thus has a dominant strategic function. This may have been, for example, the assimilation of a floating population found to be burdensome for an essentially mercantilist economy; there was a strategic imperative acting here as the matrix for an apparatus which gradually undertook the control or subjection of madness, mental illness and neurosis (Foucault 1980c: 194-5).

---

64 Scott appropriated and extended Foucault’s notion of governmentality to explain socio-cultural changes in colonial Sri Lanka during the nineteenth century. Although much of the academy has considered social reforms in this era as forms of democratization and liberation, he sees merely a shift from mercantile colonialism to forms of colonial governmentality (Scott 2005: 44). Mercantile colonialism emphasized the production of commodities, while colonial governmentality was more concerned with the production of colonial subjects that could extend modern British imperial power in the region (Scott 2005: 37-38).

65 Interestingly, for Agamben, Foucault has actually engaged with a concept genealogically entangled in a long history of Christian theology. The dispositif is connected to theological concerns with the trinity and oikonomia between the second and sixth centuries A.D. (Agamben 2009:9). Agamben writes, “The Latin term disposition from which the French term dispositif, or apparatus, derives, comes therefore to take on the complete semantic sphere of the theological oikonomia. The “dispositifs” about which Foucault speaks are somehow linked to the theological legacy (Agamben 2009: 11). For the ancient theologian, ‘the oikonomia of apparatuses was supposed to govern and guide them toward the good’ (Agamben 2009: 13).
There are thus three dimensions of a dispositif: knowledge, power, and subjectivity (Deleuze 1989: 159). All three aspects dynamically interact within a dispositif to constitute historically particular “regimes of light and enunciation” (Deleuze 1989: 160). The regimes productively constitute space and the subjects within a dispositif (Deleuze 1989: 160) and “make one see and speak” (Deleuze 1989: 160) in limited ways. The dispositif constitutes and distributes the visible and invisible “things” within it (Deleuze 1989: 160). It is difficult to assess the ontological status of “things” and their qualities within a dispositif; for it appears Foucault prefers to speak of regimes more than things (Deleuze 1989: 160). Perhaps it makes sense to say, thus, that within a dispositif ontology is replaced with governmentality—this is my sense anyway. It is clear that for Foucault, the regime of light and enunciation operative within a dispositif does not reduce to the state, but is

...at once internal and external to the state, since it is the tactics of government which make possible the continual definition and redefinition of what it is within the competence of the state and what it is not, the public versus the private, and so on; thus the state can only be understood in its survival and its limits on the basis of the general tactics of governmentality (Foucault 1991: 103).

The contemporary dispositif mechanically “…aims at nothing other than its own replication” (Agamben 2009: 22), not human redemption (Agamben 2009: 23) or the good like was the case in the theological oikonomia (Agamben 2009: 13).

Rochona-Ramirez’s Pascuense discourse depoliticizes conflict between Chile and Rapa Nui, in part, by individualizing conflict and proposing that land be administered technically within a dispositif managed by demographically minded state officials striving to balance the concerns of archaeologists and tourists, the Chilean military and state, and the Rapa Nui people. Interestingly, the Pascuense proposal to individualize resolution of the “land conflict” is analogous to other cases of colonial administration; for example, initial French resolutions to the Haitian revolution, and early Australian/Papua New Guinea representations of the “Bougainville
Crisis” in the Western Pacific. According to Trouillot, French officials initially avoided confronting the political nature of conflicts in Haiti before the revolution by representing conflict in Haiti as individual social disputes, rather than as collective political resistance to colonial domination:

On the one hand, resistance and defiance did not exist, since to acknowledge this was to acknowledge the humanity of the enslaved. On the other hand, since resistance occurred, it was dealt with quite severely, within or around plantations. …Close as some were to the real world, planters and managers could not fully deny resistance, but they tried to provide reassuring certitudes by trivializing all its manifestations. Rather, each case of unmistakable defiance, each possible instance of resistance was treated separately and drained of its political content. Slave A ran away because he was particularly mistreated by his master. Slave B was missing because he was not properly fed. Slave X killed herself in a fatal tantrum. Slave Y poisoned her mistress because she was jealous (Trouillot 1995: 83).

French could not see Haitians as Black Jacobins because the Haitian political resistance seemed to fundamentally contradict “…most of what the West has told both itself and others about itself” (Trouillot 1995: 107). In other words, the political resistance simply did not accord with the general discourse genre the French relied upon to interpret their world empire. Though the events differ considerably in space and time, some of the initial Western representations of the “Bougainville Crisis” also avoided formulating conflict between indigenous Bougainville, Papua New Guinea, and Australian mining as a political issue (Griffin 1990); conflict was portrayed as primarily about individual Bougainvillean problems with excesses of the mine (Reagan 1998: 277). Whether in Bougainville or Haiti, the individualization of conflict avoids confronting collective resistance as a systemic political problem: “To acknowledge resistance as a mass phenomenon is to acknowledge the possibility that something is wrong with the system” (Trouillot 1995: 84). By resolving “land conflict” in Rapa Nui by only giving out new individual parcels, Pascuense discourse attempts to circumvent the fact that Rapa Nui are less concerned with individual pursuit of land as collective return of the entire island. Rapa Nui are aware of this tactical dimension of the land tenure system; e.g. the Rapa Nui women of transcript #2 critique
the policy in largely these terms. No doubt individualization is also a tactic to destabilize Rapa Nui collective identity. Rochona-Ramirez suggests that individualization will ultimately sum to a collective return; however, individualization has historically been associated with a more standard colonial tactic: divide and conquer.

By formulating the conflict between Rapa Nui and Chile as primarily a “land conflict,” Rochona-Ramirez’s Pascuense discourse backgrounds, or makes invisible, another fundamental political dimension of the conflict that legitimates particular regimes of light and enunciation for seeing and speaking about conflict in Rapa Nui and reproducing these regimes into the future. In other words, her favored solution to conflict between Rapa Nui and Chile is grounded upon significant political “textual forgetting” (Shapiro 2009: 322). She initially represented early actions for the return of the entirety of island land by the original Council of Elders, an organization independent of the Chilean state initially, as only one half of Rapa Nui interests. The original demand, a demand she acknowledges remained important to at least some Rapa Nui, insisted not simply that land be returned, but that land be distributed according to Rapa Nui family traditions and on Rapa Nui determined terms (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 56). This dimension of the conflict is forgotten as Rochona-Ramirez highlights some Rapa Nui voices as politically rational and others as irrational. She provides relatively complex reviews of the plans the mayor and governor propose for redistributing Rapa Nui land (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 73-76). These plans are situated next to plans of the Chilean state and proposals of archaeologists that are also evaluated in considerable detail (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 77-85). None of these plans makes reference to the ancestral forms of land tenure and the sense of meaning Rapa Nui kinship discourse often emphasizes. Rapa Nui that still insist on Rapa Nui self-determination are demoted as controversial, racist—because they don’t want Chileans to be included in political
decisions—and unreasonable (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 69). While some of their protests against the navy and government are noted (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 83-84), the details of their plans for a Rapa Nui future are not mentioned. The double-strategy she generally favors silences those Rapa Nui struggling to achieve what the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples asserts is currently a Rapa Nui right as an indigenous people—self determination (United Nations 2007: Article 3). For those Rapa Nui struggling to determine governance in Rapa Nui, the conflict is partly about land, but more importantly about political power and authority in Rapa Nui. These Rapa Nui, for Rochona-Ramirez however, are marked as irrational protestors; only those Rapa Nui working within the allotted Chilean space of participation are considered politically rational voices.

Though Rochona-Ramirez promotes a policy with the potential to indigenize Chilean governance on some level, it is clearly not designed to “nativize governance” (Gonzalez 2008). For Gonzalez, like other indigenous theorists (Porter 2009: 93), state developed plans for indigenous peoples are obviously not equivalent to plans organized and determined by indigenous forms of governance (Gonzalez 2009: 300). Moreover, recent political actions by the Rapa Nui leaders working within Chilean structures indicates that in practice they have not contributed to “indigenization” of governance in Rapa Nui as much as further assimilation into Chile and the global political economy. As noted in Chapter 9, following the state rejection of the nativized model of governance initially proposed by the unified Council of Elders operating independently and antagonistically to the official Chilean government (namely, a model demanding return of the entirety of the island land to a Rapa Nui organization that would distribute land according to traditional family methods), Chile, like French officials in colonial Madagascar (Cole 2001: 57) appear to have incorporated Rapa Nui leaders into official
government positions on the island. Alberto Hotus, the leader of the initial council, became mayor and a Rapa Nui representative in various Chilean organizations on the island, and is associated with the transformation of the original pro-Rapa Nui Council of Elders representing each of the Rapa Nui hua’ai into an official arm of the Chilean government in Rapa Nui. While Hotus retained the name ‘Council of Elders’ for the now Chilean institution, all Rapa Nui I spoke with regarding Hotus—Rapa Nui across the political spectrum—during my field study complained that it had nothing to do with the original council. The Chilean Council of Elders, indeed, was claimed to no longer be a council with members that represented each of the hua’ai in Rapa Nui but simply an individual: Alberto Hotus. They referred to Alberto Hotus by such nicknames as “only one” (hokotahi nō) at this time to belie this point; they also called him “pockets” (kete) to insinuate that he was simply in the pocket of the Chilean state. It was stressed that there were never any meetings with each of the hua’ai leaders as was the case in the original council. While he was known to occasionally meet with a few other family leaders that shared his positions, they met with him non-publically, and no one I met suggested these meetings functioned to represent all of the collected elders of each hua’ai. The organization considered most identical to the original Council of Elders at the time was Rapa Nui Parliament—an organization that promoted political independence from Chile. Multiple times a week Rapa Nui Parliament convened to discuss issues. Hua’ai leaders would attend these meetings in a way I was told the original Council of Elders met. The meetings were determined by Rapa Nui, within buildings on hua’ai lands, not in Chilean offices on the island. The mayor, Petero Edmunds Paoa, initially promoted by Rapa Nui, was also seen as corrupted by Chilean power when I was on the island. On various key political issues, like the proposal to develop a casino on the island, Mayor Edmunds and Alberto Hotus backed Chilean development while the majority of the Rapa
Nui population loudly protested (Gonshor 2008: 238-239). Amidst the extensive protests in August 2010 to be discussed in Chapter 11, Petero Edmunds, at the time the new governor, resigned under harsh accusations of selling off lands and favors to ethnic Chileans on the island. A man that at one time was embraced, as was Hotus early on, deeply by the Rapa Nui community at large, it appears left political office in total disgrace and seen as “he me’e Tire”.

Incidentally, the discourse not only limits the kinds of voices in Rapa Nui that can speak and determine the politically rational, it limits the acceptable role of Rapa Nui voices in determining the politically rational. The subject position the discourse constructs for Rapa Nui to occupy to resolve “land conflict” in Rapa Nui is a complex one. As noted in Chapter 9, the “double strategy” the discourse supports places Rapa Nui voices within a matrix of voices. Land to be returned to Rapa Nui in terms of the “double strategy” is supposed to be consistent with the plans of archaeologists, as well as demographically and tourist developmentally minded Chilean officials (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 81-82). Thus, Rochona-Ramirez’s strategy, in the context of the dispute over the potential movement of the sacred stone Pū 'Ohiro discussed in Chapter 5, would suggest that the elders’ demand that Pū 'Ohiro not be moved to maintain the spiritual ecology of the stone in that place be assessed further by other administrators of the dispositif: the state, the archaeologists, the military, etc. In light of Rochona-Ramirez’s comment about education, however, it is evident that not all of the voices within the matrix are equal. Rapa Nui voices within the Chilean dispositif administering land and resolving conflict are not provided an equally powerful “space of participation” compared to the other voices. Rochona-Ramirez’s Pascuense discourse emphasizes that Rapa Nui cannot equally contribute to discourse within this matrix in light of her statement that Rapa Nui need to “politically develop” (desarrollan políticamente) through more Chilean education (Rochona-Ramirez 1996: 83). If the other voices
disagreed with Piru and the other elders regarding Pū ’Ohiro, it is likely that the state would attempt to illegitimate the elder position as “uneducated”. Such a statement articulates a common trope of colonial discourse well known in Papua New Guinea and other indigenous places transmogrified by Western colonial and imperial discursive practice: the sense of “the indigenous as child” (Stella 2007: 100).

Knowledge, power, and subjectivity—the three dimensions of any dispositif—strongly articulate within this trope. To suggest that an indigenous people is in need of education constructs a racial social inequality between peoples, and their forms of knowledge, in terms of a number of Manichean binary oppositions (Stella 2007: 100-139). Genealogically, the more subtly racist trope of the indigenous as child is derived from the more patently racist trope of the indigenous as savage (Stella 2007: 100); that is, to suggest Rapa Nui are children Chile needs to educate is to some extent euphemism for Rapa Nui remain savages that Chile must civilize. Representations of a people in terms of “savagery” function as tools of social exclusion and subjection. To portray a people as “savage” is to exclude them from full, independent participation in humanity (Stella 2007: 139). Exclusion from humanity, however, is only partial; the discourse constructs a context in which complete humanity can be obtained through Western intervention (Stella 2007: 139). Interestingly, because intervention is embedded in pedagogical terms, the trope conveniently “re-contextualizes” (Reisigl and Wodak 2009: 90) colonial dominance. The trope creates a discursive ground for “reading” a policy of Chilean education as a kind of philanthropy rather than colonialism (Stella 2007: 101). Chile in this context appears as a benevolent sponsor of Rapa Nui education, not a colonizer replacing indigenous knowledge and reality with Chilean imagined reality and community. Perhaps most significantly of all, as any educational program is potentially inexhaustible, the proposal for more of it is easily
transformed into something permanent. Such tactics were extensively applied in colonial Papua New Guinea: colonial administrations were always adding new reasons why further education was needed (Stella 2007: 116). The trope of the indigenous as savage child thus constructs a political rationality that provides the state a convenient discursive resource for perpetually deferring self-determination. Contrary to Rochona-Ramirez’s apparent rejection of colonialism in Rapa Nui, her proposal’s demand for increased education for Rapa Nui constructs a subject position for Rapa Nui that could maintain, legitimate, and perpetuate colonialism indefinitely.

Inequality is not just constructed at the level of social structure, but in terms of knowledge. To represent indigenous peoples as in need of education is, in a sense, to pour acid upon indigenous epistemology and ontology and imagine indigenous bodies, lands, and minds as a kind of Lockean tabula rasa for state inscription (Stella 2007: 110). While Piru, as I noted in chapter 3, taught me that to learn how to walk the “island” (henua) and understand its stories, families, and history I needed to become a child to her and other Rapa Nui elders, Rochona-Ramirez’s plan silences the indigenous meanings of land in Rapa Nui. Within the matrix of voices she imagines for resolving land conflict in Rapa Nui, Rapa Nui are not teachers, they are students needing education from archaeology, the Chilean state, and tourist development organizations. Once indigenous peoples are constructed as students and children, the student-teacher relationship tends to seed future student-teacher relationships (Stella 2007: 113). The trope thus not only legitimates a form of paternalism, but to the extent it comes to structure governance in terms of a parent-child opposition, it also creates a context of asymmetry to be dialectically amplified and expanded. Ironically, recent investigations into the history of applications of Chilean knowledge to Rapa Nui, by a European “development expert” invited by
Chilean officials to evaluate the island’s political economic potential, suggest Chilean knowledge has long failed island ecology. He commented,

...Rapa Nui now is almost a world example of unprecedented and amazing mistakes of land-use planning and management, almost a symbol of what should not absolutely be done to manage an island of these conditions. The causes or bottlenecks for such a strange “disaster” situation are a permanent decision making crisis and the inherent incompetence of the manpower in charge of such a management (Di Castri 2003: 126).

A basic source of this failure he attributed to Chilean officials lacking an understanding of Polynesian ecology (Di Castri 2003: 128). His proposed solution was to recruit scientific experts from French Polynesia, Hawai‘i, and New Zealand to coordinate future development in Rapa Nui and help educate Rapa Nui people on how to manage it (Di Castri 2003: 128). Of course it never occurs to Di Castri that Rapa Nui people have sufficient knowledge to manage the island, and that plans neglecting Rapa Nui knowledge in any further development plan for the island could undermine the foundations of Rapa Nui ways of life and consequently the sustainability of the development plan.

Rochona-Ramirez’s Pascuense plan and Di Castri’s international plan both “de-contextualize” (Reisigl and Wodak 2009: 90) the significance of land articulated in Rapa Nui kinship discourse. Land is represented as a resource for resolving demographic stress and facilitating tourist development, rather than as “kinship territory” (kāiŋa) of genealogical significance to contemporary members of particular hua‘ai. Such a representation bears a Wittgensteinian family resemblance to the problems “Native Hawaiian Geography” (Hō‘ike Honua) must confront in addressing cartography constructed in terms of “Geography of Hawai‘i” (Andrade 2001: 106). And a similar problem confronts indigenous Western Apache (Basso 1996) Banoni of Bougainville (Stella 2007: 36-40), Kwara’ae of Solomon Islands (Gegeo 2001), Tanna of Vanuatu (Bonnemaison 1994), and Wamira of Papua New Guinea (Kahn 1996) in
addressing their respective colonial geographers. The crux of the conflict between Hō‘ike Honua and Geography of Hawai‘i, is what in some sense could be considered their overlapping units of analysis. Geography of Hawai‘i is principally analyzing “land”, while Hō‘ike Honua is analyzing “‘āina”. While perhaps in terms of classical semantics (Frege 1993a, 1993b), the two terms can reasonably be said to share a reference, like Frege’s celebrated comparison of the “Morning Star” and the “Evening Star” the sense of “land” and “‘āina” diverge. ‘Āina is not secular land, but in terms of “Hawaiian language” (‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i) something ultimately cosmological. For example, ‘āina is associated with “storied places” (wahi pana) of spiritual significance as well as kulāwi: “…the land in which the bones of our ancestors are buried” (Andrade 2001: 269). It is also associated with “ancestral spirits” (‘Aumakua) and “Gods” (Akua) (Andrade 2001: 277). ‘Āina and its narrative significance, in terms of ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i, thus blurs the distinction the between “natural” and the “supernatural” central to the discourse of Geography of Hawai‘i; for in a sense “… in the Hawaiian worldview, there is no really distinct boundary” (Andrade 2001: 97). As Hawaiians are connected to ‘āina, ‘Aumakua, and Akua ultimately through relations of kinship (Andrade 2001: 46), Hawaiian bonds to ‘āina appear fundamentally different than the secular, detached, relationship a Geographer of Hawai‘i has to “land” in Hawai‘i.

The conflict between Chile and Rapa Nui regarding kāina, clearly a cognate of ‘āina (as with many Hawaiian words, one can obtain Rapa Nui lexical items by simply substituting Rapa Nui [ŋ] for Hawaiian [n] and Rapa Nui [k] for the Hawaiian okina [‘]), in terms of the philosophy of science, appears to share the “incommensurability” (Kuhn 1970, 1979, 2000a, 2000b, 2000c) between Hō‘ike Honua and the Geographers of Hawai‘i. In some of the last remarks before his death, Kuhn emphasized his notion of incommensurability as the most
important subject of his historical philosophy of science (Kuhn 2000c: 91). He developed the
concept to address problems he associated with interpreting terms of older scientific theories that
had a different meaning in the context of new theories (Kuhn 2000c: 91). The terms of primary
interest to Kuhn are of a limited sort; namely, those related to natural kinds denotable by mass or
counting nouns (Kuhn 2000c: 92). These terms have significance, for Kuhn, in part because of
their taxonomic relationships with other terms, such that modifications in their meanings
necessitate changes in the meanings of their taxonomic relatives (Kuhn 2000c: 92). Terms with
these features tend to be terms that are learned in the context of their taxonomic relatives (Kuhn
2000b: 44). Incommensurability develops when two or more language communities fail to share
a common taxonomy for interpreting natural kinds (Kuhn 2000c: 93). According to Kuhn,

Incommensurability thus becomes a sort of untranslatability, localized to one or another area in which two
lexical taxonomies differ. Violations of these sorts do not bar intercommunity understanding. Members of
one community can acquire the taxonomy employed by members of another, as the historian does to
understand old texts. But the process which permits understanding produces bilinguals, not translators, and
bilingualism has a cost, which will be particularly important to what follows. The bilingual must always
remember within which community discourse is occurring. The use of one taxonomy to make statements to
someone who uses the other places communication at risk (Kuhn 2000c: 93).

Incommensurability, thus while in part an issue of translation for Kuhn, can be understood by
learning another language, but not by translating the terms embedded in different taxonomies as
was proposed by Quine (1960). Kuhn notes incommensurability as an issue he is aware of most
in the case of astronomy and ethnology:

I’ve pointed out that the content of the Copernican statement “planets travel around the sun” cannot be
expressed in a statement that invokes the celestial taxonomy of the Ptolemaic statement “planets travel
around the earth”. The difference between the two statements is not simply one of fact. The term ‘planet’
appears as a kind term in both, and the two kinds overlap in membership without either containing all the
celestial bodies contained in the other. All of which is to say that there are episodes in scientific
development which involve fundamental taxonomic categories and which therefore confront later observers
with problems like the ethnologist encounters when trying to break into another culture (Kuhn 2000c: 94).

Yet, he also discusses cases in quantum physics, electrical engineering, and ancient philosophy
(Kuhn 2000a).
Kuhn primarily uses the notion of incommensurability to explain paradigm shifts in scientific understandings of natural kinds. The shifts involve radical, holistic changes in the understanding of a natural kind, rather than incremental, cumulative changes in understanding of a natural kind (Kuhn 2000a: 14). Shifts in understanding restructure a swath of taxonomic notions associated with a natural kind:

What characterizes revolutions is, thus, change in several of the taxonomic categories prerequisite to scientific descriptions and generalizations. That change, furthermore, is an adjustment not only of criteria relevant to categorization, but also of the way in which given objects and situations are distributed among preexisting categories. Since such redistribution always involves more than one category and since these categories are interdefined, the alternation is necessarily holistic. That holism, furthermore, is rooted in the nature of language, for the criteria for categorization are ipso facto the criteria that attach the names to the world. Language is a coinage with two faces, one looking outward to the world, the other inward to the world’s reflection in the referential structure of the language (Kuhn 2000a: 30).

Adopting the so-called candidate theory of truth of the philosopher Hacking, Kuhn proposes that language communities which do not share taxonomies have propositions which are not candidates for truth in the other communities:

In discussion between members of communities with different structured lexicons, assertability and evidence play the same role for both only in areas (there are always a great many) where the two lexicons are congruent. Where the lexicons of the parties differ, a great string of words will sometimes make different statements for each. A statement may be a candidate for truth/falsity with one lexicon without having that status in the others. And even when it does, the two statements will not be the same: though identically phrased, strong evidence for one need not be evidence for the other. Communication breakdowns are then inevitable, and it is to avoid them that the bilingual is forced to remember at all times which lexicon is in play, which community the discourse is occurring within (Kuhn 2000c: 100).

In other words, propositions that are not candidates for truth/falsity in one paradigm are not considered false in terms of another paradigm, but incommensurable. Interestingly, Kuhn does not think that communities with different taxonomies are in different unreal “invented worlds” (Kuhn 2000c: 103), but engaged in real discursive practices within alternative niches of an ultimately common world as framed within a ‘post-Darwinian and Kantian’ philosophy of reality’ (Kuhn 2000c: 104). While there is general agreement that Kuhn has revealed that there is no ahistorical metatheory available to establish the truth of incommensurable theses about
natural kinds, and restructured many of the major debates in the philosophy of science, the exact significance of Kuhnian theses continue to be debated (Rorty 1991b: 48).⁶⁶

Incommensurability between Rapa Nui and Chilean forms of life is implicitly recognized in many of the conversations analyzed in Chapter 7 and 8 as well as Rapa Nui narratives throughout the dissertation, and in the elder woman’s narrative in Chapter 6, as aforementioned, there is a fairly explicit sense of incommensurability discussed. The incommensurability between Rapa Nui kāiŋa and Chilean tierra is particularly pronounced. Assuming, for the sake of argument, Kuhn’s ultimately Kantian metaphysical discursive stance, one can consider both terms as names of a natural kind, which according to Frege’s partially neo-Kantian logic (Frege 1993a: 23), are names with a shared “reference” in Kuhn’s post-Darwinian Kantian philosophy of reality.⁶⁷ If Rapa Nui kāiŋa and Chilean tierra are incommensurable then to understand “land” in Rapa Nui as kāiŋa requires discursive practice with a taxonomic system significantly different than the taxonomic system a Chilean official would rely upon to interpret “land” on the island as tierra of Isla de Pascua, Chile. The preceding chapters do reveal Rapa Nui kinship discourse and Chilean discourse to operate in terms of relatively incommensurable taxonomies. As suggested in Chapter 2, the taxonomies are incommensurable in light of the philosophy of Bakhtin, Foucault, and Wittgenstein.

To understand kāiŋa one must “place” oneself within a niche circumscribed by Rapa Nui kinship discourse. In Bakhtinian terms, the Rapa Nui niche is dialogical with different discourse genres and voices, and addressed to different interlocutors than those constituting the Chilean

---

⁶⁶ One of the ongoing debates concerns the coherence of a Kantian reality grounding incommensurability; Rorty, among others, following a Davidsonian theory of truth rejects the Kantian component of the thesis (Rorty 1991b: 51). It follows that for Rorty, Ptolemy and Copernicus live in different worlds, not different niches, and that all human realities are socio-culturally constructed. Rorty (1991) provides a careful review of this and other debates that followed the Kuhnian paradigm shift in the philosophy of science.

⁶⁷ Frege’s logic is only partially Kantian because Frege replaces Kantian epistemology with semantics; thus initiating the so-called linguistic turn in philosophy (Dummett 1994: 185). A rather concise overview of this replacement can be found in a famous letter of Frege to fellow mathematician Jourdain (Frege 1993b).
dispositif. The voices one is supposed to address and dialogically engage in the Rapa Nui niche, in part, belong to entities not within the Chilean taxonomy. For example, in the case of Piru’s analysis of the kāiŋa supporting the sacred stone Pū ’Ōhiro represented in Chapter 5, she engaged with voices of three spiritual entities which have no clear translation or ontological status in Spanish: kuhane, tupuna, and varua.\textsuperscript{68} Important action within any kāiŋa presumably requires interaction with all three of these entities. I was not taught how to interact with kuhane and varua, but as noted in Chapters 3 and 5, I did learn how Rapa Nui consult with tupuna via the ritual performance of Umu Tahu. The voices one is supposed to address and dialogically engage in the Rapa Nui niche also belong to people often neglected within Chilean discourse, and conversely, people emphasized within Chilean discourse are ignored in Rapa Nui kinship discourse. Again, Piru’s comments regarding Pū ’Ōhiro are illustrative. Piru insisted that “G” consult hua’ai members with genealogies associated with the kāiŋa of Pū ’Ōhiro, she did not suggest any institution or person associated with the Chilean government need to be consulted. Further, she not only ignored stating anything about official Chilean discourse or its interlocutors, she used Rapa Nui kinship discourse to critique “G”. Though “G” has status within Chilean discourse given her job within the Chilean system of governance and production, for Piru, “G” is just a “child” (poki). For Piru, and Rapa Nui applying Rapa Nui kinship discourse, the important people to consult regarding kāiŋa are elders within kin groups associated with that particular kāiŋa, not officials within the Chilean government. Ancient Rapa Nui ancestors like Hotu Matu’a stressed in transcripts #3, #4, and #5 and more modern ancestors like King Atamu

\textsuperscript{68} While one might think this would entail a fundamentally different kind of case than that posed between Ptolemaic and Copernican planets, for Kuhn, part of the paradigm shift did involve these kinds of issues. The shift involved, among other things, reformulation of the narrative subject of Western language games named ‘God’ (Kuhn 1979: 132). Kuhn’s full explanation of the paradigm shift in planetary theory (Kuhn 1979) emphasizes that the shift was not simply about new calculations or observations, but broader cultural changes in theology and other discursive practices.
Tekena mentioned in transcripts #3 and #6 are significant within Rapa Nui kinship discourse, but the Chilean government, and its official history of laws are in a sense meaningless a sense strongly articulated by the elder woman of Chapter 6.

In Wittgensteinian terms, kinship forms of life constitute the regime of truth of Rapa Nui kinship discourse. Pū ʻOhiro and kāiŋa generally, according to Rapa Nui kinship discourse, are not things or natural kinds but socio-cultural kinds. In a sense, they, like Rapa Nui people, are inalienable huaʻai members, he meʻe here; that is, elements of Rapa Nui forms of life, I mentioned in Chapter 4, that tie living Rapa Nui to the tupuna and future poki with aroha. In terms of the values of Rapa Nui kinship discourse represented in Chapter 4, to move Pū ʻOhiro is to “cut into pieces” (horehore) the “land” (kāiŋa) of a huaʻai that is to be kept “together as one” (hokotahi nō). While Rapa Nui kinship discourse is influenced by the greater world and their political ecological place within it, it is a mistake to reduce Rapa Nui perspectives to those derived from the greater world. Like many Native American tribal members (Champagne 2007: 359-360), Rapa Nui experiences are not determined, only influenced by, the greater world. The meaning of kāiŋa is grounded in a regime of truth and forms of life articulated by Rapa Nui kinship discourse that has been insulated by a “compartmentalization” (Stella 2007: 168-169) of the influences of the greater world. The truth of narratives such as those of Blanka regarding her genealogy, and the accounts of traditional practices like that of Susana in Chapter 4, are primarily based in conversations with kin. Blanka’s genealogical knowledge and Susana’s knowledge of kaikai are derived principally from huaʻai enculturation processes. And like so much of her knowledge, Piru’s knowledge of Pū ʻOhiro no doubt also comes from talks within her huaʻai. Many of the narratives and conversations of Rapa Nui in the dissertation explicitly orient to this context of their ideas. Both men in transcript #3 explicitly frame the significance of
their talk about the Chilean land tenure system as members of particular *hua’ai*. They account for what they know, by articulating their “genealogies” (*hakaara*). The same is true of the elder woman’s narrative in Chapter 6, and the house builder of Chapter 4. The regime of truth for Rapa Nui kinship discourse of course not only establishes truth in terms of *hua’ai* enculturation, it disqualifies talk about Rapa Nui that is not similarly grounded. The state proposal of “G” discounted by Piru and the fisherman is discredited because it is not framed in *hua’ai* knowledge and forms of life. The elder woman of Chapter 6 refuses to register title within Chile because the title system has nothing to do with the forms of truth she acknowledges. The Rapa Nui leaders do not incorporate the Chilean flag into the Rapa Nui cultural festival discussed in Chapter 5 because they consider it to lack significance within Rapa Nui and Polynesian forms of life. As I suggested in Chapter 4, Rapa Nui epistemologically place propositions about the island by assessing a person’s genealogy. If one cannot answer the question ‘*A ai koe?* in terms of a *hakaara*, then from the discursive stance of Rapa Nui kinship discourse, one’s talk about land and anything else in Rapa Nui is fundamentally discredited. One’s talk lacks epistemological place.

To interpret “land” on the island as tierra of Isla de Pascua one does not so much “place” oneself within an ecological space, as position oneself within a dispositif. The dispositif is dialogical with “lieux de memoire” (archival memories) of government officials, archaeologists and developers not “milieux de memoire” (real environments of memory) (Nora 1989: 7) among Rapa Nui *hua’ai*. Archival memories, in a sense, “…have no referent in reality; or rather, they are their own referent: pure, exclusively self-referential signs. …a site of excess closed upon itself, concentrated in its own name” (Nora 1989: 23-24). States produce archival memories like maps, written laws, flags, and political ceremonies (Nora 1989: 21-22), to sever people from
their real environments of memory (Nora 1989: 14), and replace them with memories that serve particular interest groups (Nora 1989: 19). Positioning within the dispositif denoted ‘Isla de Pascua’ is less about walking the land and listening to people tell its remembered stories, as it is reading state documents and scrutinizing maps. Again the story of Pū 'Ohiro is telling. While Pū 'Ohiro, within its real environment of memory, has storied significance for fishermen, daughters of the ancestral Birdman ceremonies, and the hua’ai members who trace their descent to it, according to Chilean governmentality, it is just a thing to be moved within a cartographic space conserved for the benefit of tourism and archaeology, not Rapa Nui people. Rapa Nui are invited to participate in the construction of the cartography, but only as students, or protégés to use Rochona-Ramirez’s literal term, of plans for developing tierra according to modern discourses of archaeology, state planning, and tourism.

Fundamental taxonomic features of Rapa Nui place are clearly transmogrified within the dispositif. As is characteristic of governmentality within a dispositif, “the family becomes an instrument rather than a model” (Foucault 1991: 100); a tool for resolving problems of demography and security—the core interests of a governmentalized state (Foucault 1991: 104). In a sense Chilean governmentality substitutes a dispositif for the Rapa Nui kinship oikonomia. Rochona-Ramirez’s technocratic solution to “land conflict” between Rapa Nui and Chile dissolves the meaning of kāiŋa too. As kāiŋa is redefined into tierra, Rapa Nui “land” is severed from Hotu Matu’a, King Atamu Tekena, sacred objects like Pū ’Ohiro, and all the hua’ai and is re-contextualized as a natural kind rather than a socio-cultural kind. As a natural kind it is suitable for engaging in new forms of life; for example, conducting archaeological excavations, solving problems of demography, producing economic growth in a tourist economy, and maintaining Chilean security. Yet, as a natural kind, tierra seems to disconnect from such
spiritual phenomena as kuhane, tupuna, and varua. Perhaps Umu Tahu continue on tierra as symbolic rituals for Chile to appropriate in political arenas, and as curio cultural performances staged for tourists, but without tupuna how does one conduct a real Umu Tahu? In Kuhnian terms, there is nothing incremental about such taxonomic changes. Constructing Rapa Nui as tierra seems to radically redistribute and, or, restructure the categories associated with Rapa Nui kāiŋa in the sense Kuhn characterizes incommensurable taxonomies.

**CHILEAN SUBJECTS?**

Rochona-Ramirez, in a sense encourages Rapa Nui to cease engaging with their island land as kāiŋa of hua’ai and manage it as tierra. While the incommensurability between the broad semantic fields of kāiŋa and tierra is hopefully relatively clear in light of the above analysis, it remains to be shown precisely how the taxonomies construct meaning in talk-in-interaction (Bilmes 2008, 2009b); in other words, how the ‘semantic taxonomy is applied in real occasions of talk’ (Bilmes 2009b: 1609). Further analysis of some of the Rapa Nui talk-in-interaction represented in prior transcripts and a few new ones, reveals some the ways Rapa Nui use taxonomic features of their interpretative repertoire to reject the subject position the Chilean dispositif constructs for Rapa Nui. A core principle of rejection, as aforementioned, is in the distinction between “Chilean things” (me’e Tire) and “Rapa Nui things” (me’e Rapa Nui) introduced in Chapter 5. The distinction is broadly found across all of the recordings Rapa Nui recorded for me, and is present in all six of the transcripts examined in Chapters 7 and 8. It is the most constant taxonomic feature within the interpretative repertoire of Rapa Nui kinship discourse. Many of the recordings not included among the transcripts thus far examined consisted primarily of a brief negative assessment of the Chilean land tenure policy in terms of the distinction. In other words, they consisted of kind of a quick dismissal of it as “he me’e Tire”
like the cultural leader dismissed the Chilean election ceremony at the close of Chapter 5. This is evident in the conversational fragment I will refer to as ‘transcript #7’.

**Nua:** He aha te me’e Titulo Dominio ki a koe?

Int Int Art thing Title Dominion Prep Ps you?

What is the land title system to you?

**Matu’a Vahine:** Kai ‘'ite ho’i e vovo ’ēe

Neg know indeed Voc girl Voc

I don’t know girl.

**Nua:** Tā’aku kī, te henua nei o te Rapa Nui? O rāua?

My statement, Art island Dem Pos Art Rapa Nui? Pos they?

I am saying, the island belongs to Rapa Nui? Or them?

He aha te [me’e?]

Int Int Art thing?

What is this thing?

**Matu’a Vahine:** [No, nua, o te Rapa Nui tātou, o te Rapa Nui,

No, elder woman, Pos Art Rapa Nui we, Pos Art Rapa Nui,

No, elder woman, it belongs to all of us Rapa Nui, it belongs to Rapa Nui,

_ta’e o rāua. Ta’e o te Tire. O te Rapa Nui te henua nei.

Neg Pos they. Neg Pos Art Chile. Pos Art Rapa Nui Art island Dem

not them. It does not belong to Chile. This island belongs to Rapa Nui.

(o te me’e porekoreko ai . Tō’oku mama, Tō’oku papa…)

Pos Art thing born Dem. My mom, My dad

It belongs to those who are native born. My mother, my father…

---

69 The conversation is between a woman in her late fifties I denote ‘Nua’, and her “aunt” (*matu’a vahine*)—a woman in her late seventies. The recording was completed by *nua* under conditions she determined without me present. Unfortunately, the conditions she chose were plagued by wind noise, and I am unable to accurately transcribe the approximately two and a half minute conversation after her *matu’a vahine* appears to begin to give a “genealogy” (*hakaara*) to legitimate her discursive stance. The first question of the transcript by *nua* was preceded by about fifteen seconds of small talk that was similarly incoherent given the wind noise.
After her *matu’a vahine* modestly attempts to answer her question by feigning to not have knowledge to share about the Chilean land tenure system, *nua* inserts a qualification to her initial question (broadly question #1 of the questionnaire). She reformulates the question regarding the meaning of the Chilean land tenure system in terms of an opposition between “Chilean things” (*me’e Tire*) and “Rapa Nui things” (*me’e Rapa Nui*). She suggests, with the reformulation, that at the heart of the Chilean land tenure system is an assumption that the land of Rapa Nui is a Chilean thing, not a Rapa Nui thing. Like so many of the responses to the questionnaire, her *matu’a vahine* unequivocally rejects the proposition that the island is a Chilean thing. Chilean things within such talk appear to belong to a different taxonomic understanding of “land” broadly comparable to the way ‘vermin’ and ‘rodent’ are taxa of different taxonomic systems available for interpreting rats (Bilmes 2009b: 1602).

This taxonomic feature is common in much of the discursive data included in the dissertation. Both narratives of the women in Chapter 6 also reject the idea that the island is a Chilean thing. In transcript #1 there is no explicit formulation of the island land as a Rapa Nui as opposed to a Chilean thing; however, there is a related, implicit opposition in lines 13-14. Therein the *taina* asserts that the Chilean system be removed so Rapa Nui can live like they did in the old times, and *nua* of transcript #1 is shown to agree with her *taina* that it should be removed and in effect replaced by a Rapa Nui policy. The women of transcript #2 are fairly explicit in their representation of the policy as a Chilean thing they reject. The *taina* of transcript #2 identifies the policy at line 6 negatively as a Chilean thing designed to take land from Rapa Nui, and explicitly states at line 54 that she refuses registering her land in terms of a Chilean title. She and *nua* of transcript #2 explicitly call for its removal at lines 68-69. The men of transcript #3 also explicitly reject the proposition the island is a Chilean thing. *Koro*, at lines 59-
60, strongly denounces the idea that the land belongs to Chile; he insists therein that the land is of the ancestors and their progeny. His brother of course does not challenge his assessment. His brother focuses on his own struggle to get land back from the Chilean government from lines 150-154. Therein he rejects the state claim to own his land and insists he will continue to fight their claim. The husband and wife of transcript 4 also reject the Chilean land tenure system in principle because it is a Chilean thing. The wife disassociates herself, and Rapa Nui people, from the idea that the land of Rapa Nui is a Chilean thing from lines 28-31. Her husband goes further; unlike his wife at lines 32-33, he cannot even continence the idea of Rapa Nui as a Chilean thing. Similarly, the husband and wife of transcript #5 do not seem able even to stomach the thought of Rapa Nui as a Chilean thing. Instead of assessing the Chilean land tenure system in any official terms, they discuss Rapa Nui genealogy. Transcript #6, the most complex of all of the transcripts, is punctuated by numerous formulations of the Chilean land tenure system as unacceptable simply because it is a Chilean thing. Their silence converges on this point at line 164. Rochona-Ramirez’s Pascuense proposal that Rapa Nui identify as subjects upon a Chilean land is clearly rejected by all of the Rapa Nui in my survey.

While the opposition can occur as a corrective contrast in talk-in-interaction, generally the opposition tends to be of the form of an “explicative contrast” (Depperman 2005: 309-311). While not all of the transcripts explicate the details of the contrast, and the explications vary, one aspect of the explication, I noted in Chapters 7 and 8 as well as in the narratives of the women of Chapter 6, concerns Rapa Nui ancestors and progeny. Rapa Nui also contest the subject position the Chilean land tenure system inscribes for them by identifying themselves and their island lands in terms of Rapa Nui ancestors and progeny. Transcript #8 below summarizes many of the core points of the transcripts analyzed previously The transcript is from a recording made
between a Rapa Nui “grandmother” (tupuna vahine) and one of her “grandsons” (hina). Transcript #8:

**Hina:** Pe he tu’u mana’u o te me’e nei Titulo Dominio?
Like Int your thought Art thing Dem Title Dominion?
What is your thought of this land title system?

**Tupuna:** O’oku te mana’u nei ko mātou he hua’ai.
My Art thought Dem Foc we Art extended family.
My thought is we are an extended family.

A au he poki a Hotu Matu’a.
Ps I Art child Pos Hotu Matu’a.
I am a child of Hotu Matu’a.

I avai mai te henua ki a mātou tā’ana poki.
Prf give Dir Art island Prep Ps we his child.
The island was given to us, his children.

He henua o’ona, tō’ona hua’ai, i avai mai.
Art island his, his extended family, Prf give Dir.
The island is his, his extended family, it was given [to them].

Kihaŋa Tire Sucesión de Derecho. I te hora nei, mātou te henua o X
Speaking Chile inheritance of right. Prep Art hour Dem, we art land Pos X
In Chilean words, it is a right of inheritance. Now we have this land X

---

70 The hina was in his twenties and the tupuna vahine in her sixties at the time of the recording. A questionnaire and recorder was given to the mother of the young man. Rather than complete the recording herself she encouraged her son to ask her mother. The recording was completed at the home of the tupuna vahine under conditions she and her hina determined without me present. There is no response from the hina after her answer as he simply turned off the recorder once she finished answering. He made three separate recordings with his tupuna vahine. Each recording consisted only of his questioning and her answering; there was no actual conversation about the subjects of the questionnaire.
Te henua o tō’oku matu’a. 'Ina he, 'ina he Titulo Dominio.  
Art land Pos my father. Neg Art, Neg, Art Title Dominion.  
The land is of my father. No, there is no Dominion Title.

Ki tō’ona mana’o, te mana’o o tō’oku matu’a te henua o te Rapa Nui.  
Mod his thought, Art thought Pos my father Art land Pos Art Rapa Nui.  
His thought, the thought of my father, it is a land of the Rapa Nui.

Tō’oku matu’a, ta’e haŋa he avai mai te Titulo Dominio.  
My father, Neg want Asp give Dir Art Title Dominion.  
My father, he did not want to be given Dominion Title.

I te mana’o o tō’oku matu’a, tō’ona hua’ai,  
Prep Art thought Pos my father, his extended family,  
The thought of my father, his extended family,

o’ona mo avai ki te ŋa poki.  
His Sub give Prep Art Pl child.  
[land X] is for him to give to the children.

Ta’e o pe nei hakaou mai a roto te Tire a roto te Titulo Dominio.  
Neg Pos like Dem again Dir Pos inside Art Chile Pos inside Art Title Dominion.  
It is not also to be registered within Chile, within Dominion Title.

Ki tā’ana poki. Te henua o Rapa Nui, o te Rapa Nui.  
Prep his child. Art land Pos Rapa Nui, Pos Art Rapa Nui.  
It’s for his children. The land of Rapa Nui belongs to the Rapa Nui.

Like transcript #7, and so many other narratives and conversations noted in this dissertation, transcript #8 rejects the land tenure system as a Chilean thing. The *tupuna vahine* formulates the Chilean land tenure system as a Chilean thing rather than a Rapa Nui thing as she closes her answer. Unlike transcript #7, there is an explicit indigenous epistemology given by the
tupuna vahine in order to legitimate the opposition.\textsuperscript{71} The epistemology involves the Wittgensteinian form I noted at work in Blanka’s genealogical narrative in Chapter 4. The tupuna vahine knows the island belongs to Rapa Nui, not Chile because her father taught her to oppose me’e Rapa Nui and me’e Tire as his child, and as a child of Hotu Matu’a. By teaching her to be member of his hua’ai and that of Chief Hotu Matu’a, he was able to teach her to not acquire a Titulo Dominio for land X (a named land in the actual recording, silenced to preserve anonymity). As land X belongs to Hotu Matu’a and all Rapa Nui, it is not to be registered by Chilean titles. For the tupuna vahine there thus appear to be at least two related “partonymic relations” (Bilmes 2009b) rules illuminating the incommensurability of Chilean and Rapa Nui taxonomies in her talk-in-interaction.\textsuperscript{72} First, part of land being a Rapa Nui thing, is the land being part of Chief Hotu Matu’a. Secondly, part of being a Rapa Nui thing is being part of a hua’ai. Alternatively, to be more consistent with the analyses of Chapters 7 and 8: part of land being a Rapa Nui thing, is that the land is part of Rapa Nui ancestors; and secondly, part of land being a Rapa Nui thing, is the land being part of Rapa Nui progeny. Both partonyms articulate in the narratives of the women of Chapter 6, though perhaps the first is expressed stronger than the second. In transcripts #1, #2, and #3, I have shown how Rapa Nui progeny are part of the discursive ground by which Rapa Nui figure the contextual significance or insignificance of the Chilean land tenure system. In transcripts #4, #5, and #6, I have shown how Rapa Nui ancestors are also part of the discursive ground by which Rapa Nui figure the contextual significance or insignificance of the Chilean land tenure system.

\textsuperscript{71} Actually, and as the reference to her mother and father portends in transcript #7, I think matu’a vahine also grounds her perspective in her genealogy from a particular hua’ai. The wind, unfortunately, simply is too strong in the recording to transcribe it further.

\textsuperscript{72} In terms of an analysis more in tune with the Rapa Nui kinship discourse value of “hokotahi nō” elaborated in Chapter 4, my suggestion of “partronymic relations” regrettably does what Rapa Nui elders explicitly suggest hua’ai not do: “cut into pieces” (horehore). I use the notion of “patronymic relations” only heuristically; I have no idea how to represent it in terms of the more accurate way Rapa Nui hua’ai things link as “me’e here”.
Interestingly, I have noted in a number of transcripts included in the dissertation a relative silence on Chilean frames for understanding Rapa Nui lands. This is most pronounced in the case of transcript #5 that circumvents any discussion of Rapa Nui lands in Chilean terms by focusing strictly on the way they recall Rapa Nui ancestors divided the island lands. While I have provided an analysis and representation of the Chilean land tenure system throughout the dissertation, the transcripts generally do not reveal the partonyms of the system in talk-in-interaction among Rapa Nui. Transcripts #4 and #6 are the clearest exceptions to this generalization. In transcript # 4, the husband ‘K’ elaborates some of the partonyms he sees associated with the Chilean land tenure system. Here is a fragment of his talk:

14. **K:** Pe ira `ēe nua `ēe?

Like that Voc mother/elder woman Voc

Like that mother?

15. **V:** E ho’i.

Indeed

Indeed.

16. **K:** Yeah, he toke e te Tire i te henua o te Rapa Nui,

Yeah, Asp steal Ag Art Chile Prep Art island Pos Art Rapa Nui,

Yeah, the island of Rapa Nui was stolen by Chile

17. he papa’i ki runa, ki runa ki te inoa o te (.5) te Tire Fiko

Asp write Prep upon, Prep upon Prep Art name Pos Art Art Chile Fiscal

Upon it was inscribed the name of the Chilean state.

18 He toke tako’a e te Tire i te tanata Rapa Nui

Asp stolen also Ag Art Chile Prep Art people Rapa Nui.

The Rapa Nui people were also stolen by Chile.
19. He papa’i (1.0) ki ruŋa ki te carnet nei ‘e ki ruŋa ki te pasaporte, he kī, he Tire.
Asp write Prep upon Prep identification Dem and Prep upon Prep Art passport, Asp say, Art Chile
It is written upon the identification card, and upon the passport, it says, Chile

20. ‘Ina kai ‘ui ki te mana’u o te taŋata Rapa Nui ‘o ‘o te vi’e Rapa Nui.
Neg Neg ask Prep Art thought of Art men Rapa Nui Dis Dis Art women Rapa Nui
[Chile] did not ask for the opinión of Rapa Nui men or women.

21. I toke ro ai i te taŋata i te rāua ta’e ‘ite.
Prf steal Eval Dem Prep Art person Rel Art they Neg know
The people were robbed because they lacked knowledge.

22. Hē aha te me’e karnet nei? He aha te me’e pasaporte?
Int Int Art thing identification Dem? Int Int Art thing passport?
What is the identification card? What is the passport?

23. ‘I aŋarina e aŋiaŋi ai pe nei ‘ēe. He toke ana ho’i te Tire i te
Prep today Ipf understand Dem Like Dem Voc. Asp steal Prog indeed Art Chile Prep Art
Today it is understood like this. Chile indeed robs the people

24. taŋata a ruŋa i te carnet nei, a ruŋa i te pasaporte. ‘E ko mau ‘ā.
person Pos above Prep identification Dem, Pos above Pre Art passport. Voc Prf complete Prog
with the identification card and upon the passport. Properly finished.

31.M: ‘Ēe::: (1.0) tō mātou mana’u (6.0), tō matou mana’u (1.0)
Yes Pos we thought, Pos we thought
Yes ahhh our thought, our thought is, we are native Rapa Nui
In this segment the husband ‘K’ is following up his wife’s initial assessment of the policy that emphasized issues of Hotu Matu’a and *hua‘ai* values. As noted in Chapter 8, his assessment stresses political issues he seems to in part criticize his wife for not mentioning. While his wife explicitly discusses the Chilean land tenure system, like the husband and wife of transcript #5, the husband of transcript #4 tends not to even want to discuss anything to do with Rapa Nui in Chilean terms. His closing comment in the conversation with his wife at lines 32-32 belies this aspect of his talk. After considering his wife’s direct assessment of the Chilean land tenure system as an obligatory system for Rapa Nui, he does not even comment on the Titulo Dominio. Importantly however, he does explicate some of the Chilean partonyms he appears to associate with the Chilean land tenure system; namely, Chilean identification cards and passports. The Chilean land tenure system, in terms of his talk, is part of a broader system of Chilean identification cards and passports. Importantly, the husband K stresses a kind of violence and erasure common to nation-state “geographic imaginaries” (Shapiro 1997: ix-xi) articulating within indigenous places. At lines 23-24, the husband emphasizes that the Chilean identification cards and passports erase Rapa Nui native identity. The husband K rejects the Chilean identification card and passport system not in this case by simply opposing them to Rapa Nui things, but by re-contextualizing them in terms of Chilean colonial history in Rapa Nui. Like the Rapa Nui narrator introduced in Chapter 2, the husband K sees this Chilean system as engaged in a kind of robbery. By disputing the Chilean identification cards and passports and asserting his identity in Rapa Nui and Polynesian terms at the close of his turn at talk, he appears to not only
reject the significance of the Chilean land tenure system, but the broader features of the colonial
governmentality Chile uses to erase its theft of Rapa Nui land and native identity. He refuses to
locate himself within a Chilean dispositif; he places himself within Polynesia and Rapa Nui. The
*hua'ai* members of transcript #6, at the close of their talk, speak in similar terms. Chilean things
in these cases stand in explicative contrast with Rapa Nui things in such talk-in-interaction as
things which steal Rapa Nui ancestral identity and land rather than as “*me’e here*”: things that tie
Rapa Nui with *aroha* to their ancestors and progeny.

**CONCLUSION**

Chile, in terms of Pascuense discourse, represents conflict between Rapa Nui and Chile
as primarily a conflict over land. Land, however, in this discourse is represented as tierra rather
than *kāiŋa* or *henua*; that is, as a thing to distribute in terms of Chilean governmentality. The
state tries to resolve “land conflict” with Rapa Nui by allotting a few select Rapa Nui a “space
of participation” in policy decisions for redistributing tierra in a manner consistent with
archaeologists interested in continued research and preservation of the “prehistory” of the island,
developers interested in utilizing the island for economic growth, and state officials interested in
the continued value of the island for national security and national aggrandizement as a “lord of
the Pacific” (to use Vegara’s terms noted in Chapter 9). 73 Tierra of Isla de Pascua, to return to the
language of Chapter 2, is produced and managed by such Pascuense discourse as a kind of global
ethnoscape to serve archaeologists, developers, state officials, and tourists, as well as Rapa Nui.

73 Interestingly, the emphasis on “participation” rather than self-determination, sovereignty, or autonomy is
historically a somewhat common tactic of colonial powers in the Pacific Islands. The first South Pacific Conference
in Fiji in 1950 that set the foundation for later organizations like the contemporary South Pacific Forum was created
by a cohort from the Western powers in the region. It was called the South Pacific Commission (Fry 1997). The goal
of the conference and regional development was explicitly formulated as Pacific Island “participation” rather than
self-determination and decolonization (Fry 1997: 195-199). Maintaining control, rather than decolonizing, was
considered fundamental in the context of the Cold War and the perceived threat of Communism to the region (Fry
Within the global ethnoscape Rapa Nui are to attentively listen to the teachings of technocrats and government officials with the hope that maybe one day “under the current education level of the younger generations, the Rapa Nui will be capable of assuming—in a not so distant future—the control of their own development as a people” (…con el actual nivel de escolaridad de las jóvenes generaciones, los rapanui estarán capacitados para asumir—en un futuro no tan lejano—el control de su propio desarrollo como pueblo (Rochona-Ramirez 1995: 82-83)).

While within its own geographic imaginary Chile is a kind of philanthropic educator of an indigenous people it provides participatory space for, from the vantage of Foucauldian philosophy, Chile can be made visible as a kind of colonial lord of a dispositif. Rochona-Ramirez’s development proposal ultimately promotes a colonial space in which Rapa Nui are asked to circulate, and Chile is authorized to police:

…police interventions in public spaces consist primarily not in interpolating demonstrators, but in breaking up demonstrations. …It consists, before all else, in recalling the obviousness of what there is, or rather of what there is not, and its slogan is: ‘Move along! There’s nothing to see here!’ The police is that which says that here, on this street, there’s nothing to see and so nothing to do but move along. It asserts that the space for circulating is nothing but the space of circulation. Politics, by contrast, consists in transforming this space of ‘moving-along’, of circulation, in a space for the appearance of a subject: the people, the workers, the citizens. It consists in re-figuring space, that is, in what is to be done, to be seen and to be named in it. It is the instituting of a dispute over the distribution of the sensible, over the nemeïn that founds every nomos of the community (Rancière 2010: 37).

By asking Rapa Nui to resolve their “land conflict” with Chile by acquiring new parcels of tierra rather than henua or kāiŋa, in a sense Rochona-Ramirez proposes that Rapa Nui “…trust in the power of the present moment as an origin” (De Man 1983: 149). However, reflection upon Rapa Nui kinship discourse suggests that Rapa Nui find that ‘to sever themselves from the past is at the same time to severe themselves from the present’ (De Man 1983: 149). In an attempt to refine an indigenous model of self-determination and decolonial futures, one indigenous Cherokee scholar asks, ‘To what degree are indigenous peoples asserting visions of self-determination on their own terms in order to remember the qualities of ancestors and act on those
remembrances to lead a self-determined process that is sustainable for the survival of future generations of indigenous peoples?‘(Corntassel 2008: 106). Examination of Rapa Nui discursive practices suggests many Rapa Nui hope to “unwrite” (Winduo 2000) the Chilean dispositif known popularly as “Easter Island”. “Easter Island” emerges from analysis of Rapa Nui discursive practice to be a “political lion’s skin” (Marx 1843: 34) many Rapa Nui clearly do not want to depoliticize and embrace within a Pascuense “space of participation” ultimately determined by Chile. The violent cartography that Chile hopes to maintain under the nomenclature “Easter Island” thus appears less a psychologically accepted “imagined community” (Anderson 1991) of Chile among Rapa Nui as a discursive ‘property enforced by contracts, rituals, and routines of institutions of official representation’ (Kelly and Kaplan 2001: 200) that a Chilean dispositif tactically manipulates and polices upon the island. Within this dissertation I have noted numerous conversations, discursive practices, and narratives of Rapa Nui which reveal the interpretative repertoire by which Rapa Nui resist this dispositif and remember their ancestors on behalf of a decolonial future they hope to attain for their children. Analysis of the interpretative repertoire reveals an “indigenous epistemology” (Gegeo 2001, Gegeo and Gegeo 2001, Meyer 2001) that Rapa Nui apply in an effort to unwrite “Easter Island” and place Rapa Nui within the “sea of islands” (Hau’ofa 2008: 31) of a decolonial “New Oceania” (Wendt 1983). The Rapa Nui I lived with, I hope to have shown, unwrite “Easter Island” often remembering their genealogy and cultural heritage, and usually imagining a future in which they can pass on their genealogy and culture to future progeny; however, perhaps almost universally, they unwrite “Easter Island” in their daily discursive practice of simply being Rapa Nui within their kinship form of life.
BREAKING NEWS RELEASE—12/3/10

RAPA NUI (EASTERN ISLAND) UNDER FIRE BY CHILEAN TROOPS

Early this morning armed Chilean troops opened fire on unarmed Rapa Nui civilians. The police started shooting and tear gassing as the Rapa Nui people started gathering in solidarity. NOW THERE IS BLOOD ON THE STREETS. Leviante Araki, the President of Rapa Nui Parliament was shot twice about his hip and rib cage and is being airlifted to Santiago for medical care. A young man, Richard Tepano, was shot at short range in his right eye and is in critical condition in the hospital. Maori Pakarati was shot above his right eye and in his arm, a rubber bullet remains encrusted in his arm. Zita Atan was shot in the head, Pia Vargas was shot in her right leg. Honu Tepano was shot in his shoulder. As the Chilean troops were charging towards the fleeing Rapa Nui Claudio Tuki was hit in the forehead. Enrique Tepano was shot in his face. Santi Hitorangi was shot in his right leg from behind, and as he attempted to continue to film the situation he was shot twice in his back. At 5:45 am Jose Rioroko who was on the premises of Rapa Nui land adjacent to the bank building was beaten by a baton in his head. At this site, Chilean troops violently routed out the unarmed family of Michael Tuko Tuki, Rapa Nui nationals. The unarmed Rapa Nui people are determined not to be removed from their lands. The Rapa Nui people defended themselves by throwing rocks amid the bullets flying toward them.

The judge and fiscal official who activated the order has disappeared. No officials can be found and the police say they are only following orders. Yesterday the Governor asked the Rapa Nui people to evacuate the premises, they refused. She has no control to stop the police as it is not within her power. After months of relatively peaceful reoccupation of their lands by the Rapa Nui people, the Chilean government attacked with force, brandishing automatic rifles and shotguns. The state of Chile has refused to hold meaningful discussions to resolve this situation, which could be resolved by issuing title to the Rapa Nui people of their lands as required under Chilean law. Instead of finding a peaceful solution the Chilean government has all that delayed and criminalized the Rapa Nui clans that are in re-occupation and has now violently attacked them. Regardless, the Rapa Nui commitment and steadfastness is unwavering and inspirational. The unfunded and unarmed Rapa Nui are fighting colossal well financed foreign and Chilean private interests to privatize the Rapa Nui Island and its archaeological treasures, the Moai.

Santi HitoRanji
The events of December 3, 2010, though shocking and disturbing to me at the moment I heard them, really came as no surprise. Indeed, I to some extent predicted them in a Radio New Zealand International interview on August 23, 2010. In a context in which Chile had deployed additional troops and warships to remove the estimated 1,000 of the 2,500 Rapa Nui (PIR Aug) occupying Chilean government offices and various lands officially claimed by the state and the new corporate hotel developed and owned on the island I was asked whether to expect violence. I responded that while I did not know all of the details of the current situation, during my residence on the island I regularly witnessed that

Police patrol the areas, taunting Rapa Nui that are known to not agree with their policies, on horseback, in their cars, in their full military regalia, armed where Rapa Nui are not. I have seen Chileans abusive of Rapa Nui when I was there. It would not surprise me at all if Chilean military acted violently towards Rapa Nui (RNZI: Aug, 2010)

My response surprised my interviewer. I suspect the “alarming report” (Arno 2009) he was concerned with producing targeted the 1,000 Rapa Nui “protestors” and the danger they posed to tourists and the larger world of settler societies. It was Polynesian “protesters” that threatened him. What he wanted to know was whether to alarm Pākeha (New Zealanders) about Maori siblings resisting another instantiation of the Western ethnoscape. Rapa Nui were the target of white settler moral questioning; it did not occur to him that the armed Chilean police, military troops, and circulating warships he comfortably referred to as “security” should be the target of moral questioning. The more complex moral and political questions were grammatically removed from the ‘violent Western settler cartography he assumed and naturalized’ (Shapiro 1997: 16). What was potentially alarming to New Zealand was that Polynesians were protesting and had not “moved along” when Rancier’s police commanded them to.

While Santi HitoRaŋi, a Rapa Nui man, emphasized to Associated Press reporters following the state violence that Rapa Nui were under increasing “psychological duress” as still
“more police and armed swat teams” were arriving to Rapa Nui on December 4 (New York Times, Dec 2010), Chilean Interior Minister Rodrigo Hinzpeter clearly assessed the situation differently. He said,

There is a limit to these things and it was reached when there are illegal takeovers that cause damage to the island. The police forces acted in compliance with a court order. That’s how institutions function, and we all must follow them (New York Times, Dec. 2010).

How is one to place the significance of the utterances of Santi HitoRaŋi and Minister Hinzpeter? On the one hand, one might ultimately argue that their contextual significance ‘cannot be absolutely determined, for their contextual significance cannot be exhaustively determined or saturated’ (Derrida 1982: 310). On the other hand, one might pragmatically argue that, fuzzy boundaries aside, they exhibit relatively clear significance in terms of the history of particular forms of life and geopolitical economic structures. Minister Hinzpeter’s utterance, from the standpoint of the Chilean dispositif adumbrated above, appears to have coherence. Clearly, Rapa Nui occupied buildings and lands in violation of Chilean laws. No doubt the occupations were disrupting the tourist political economy and the global ethnoscape of “Easter Island”; if archaeologists were there at the time, I suspect they had to stop digging. As the Minister of Interior, Hinzpeter is presumably supposed to utilize Chilean court orders, government institutions, and security forces to enforce and maintain Chilean law and order upon the island. I suspect his speech is broadly authoritative; that it satisfies the “felicity conditions” (Austin 1999) requisite for a state official to speak.

Yet, as Derrida would advise,74 the meaning of Minister Hizpeter’s utterance is not saturated by the local speech acts it performs; it ‘communicates meaning only within a broader

---

74 Because Derrida deconstructs the very foundations of Western philosophy, some argue that he cannot be said to be coherently arguing for any particular position because that would in effect demand the foundations he has deconstructed (Rorty 1992). I am not sure this discursive stance is the best among alternatives, but if Rorty’s stance is coherent, then maybe an apt word for what Derrida is doing is “advising”.
hermeneutic field of writing located beyond the utterance’ (Derrida 1982: 311). If one places Minister Hizpeter’s speech act in terms of Rapa Nui kinship discourse or the broader geopolitical economic “structure of the long dureé” (Braudel 1980: 210) or “world time” (Braudel 1992: 71) of capitalism, its contextual significance shifts. From the vantage of Rapa Nui kinship discourse the “illegal takeovers” he targets are incommensurable with the ones Rapa Nui target. For the Rapa Nui who speak of Chileans as thieves of their land, as so many do throughout my dissertation, Rapa Nui deny that Chile has title to their island. As the hua’ai members note in transcripts #3 and #6 explicitly, Rapa Nui stress that at annexation, King Atamu Tekena did not give Chile title to their land—only the “grass” (mauku) on the surface for the ranch animals to eat. Hence, Rapa Nui contest the legality of Chilean and corporate takeover of Rapa Nui land by Enrique Merlet in 1895, and then the Easter Island Exploitation Company in 1903, as the island was transformed into a sheep ranch and Rapa Nui people were imprisoned in Hanga Roa without sufficient food, water, and health care. Rapa Nui also contest that Chile legally acquired title in 1933. Chile, as is evident in the complexity of the legal process it concocted to obtain title (numerous debates with the Easter Island Exploitation Company and the various French authorities Chilean officials initially feared might also want to claim title), invented its title in 1933 through its own procedures of legitimation. This title is considered illegitimate because it violated the two-party form of agreement established at annexation between Rapa Nui and Chile. Such violations are common for indigenous peoples, but normal violation of indigenous communities does not constitute legality (King 2003: 138). Chile never consulted with Rapa Nui about their desire to establish state title to the island; indeed, as noted in Chapter 2, Rapa Nui never learned of this “title” until approximately thirty years after the fact. To such Rapa Nui,
there is thus nothing illegal in their occupations; Rapa Nui are simply occupying what, as the woman of transcript #8 asserts, is their natural birth right.

Minister Rodrigo Hinzpeter’s concern with “damage to the island” also would have a different meaning with the interpretative repertoire of Rapa Nui kinship discourse. Even more than I noted Di Castri emphasized in Chapter 10, Rapa Nui would argue that Chile has damaged the island for over a hundred years. In the words of the narrator of Chapter 2, “Not one righteous thing has been given by Chile to this land” (‘Ina ‘ā katahi me’e tano i va'ai mai e te Tire ki te henua nei.). As I noted in Chapter 2, historical analysis broadly confirms the narrator’s claims: Chile’s contributions to Rapa Nui life and island ecological preservation are indeed meek. As Di Castri proposes, Chile has wrought tremendous violence upon the ecology of Rapa Nui. There is thus no historical evidence that the Chilean bureaucracy which Minister Hinzpeter wants to restore on the island will cease to do “damage to the island”. As Di Castri noted, the Chilean officials in charge continue to have little knowledge and training in the specifics of Polynesian geography and ecology. From a scientific standpoint, restoring them perpetuates further damage, not less. Chilean bureaucracy, however, in light of Chapter 10, also perpetuates a different kind of damage. Kāiŋa cannot, from the vantage of Rapa Nui kinship discourse, be analyzed independently of the Rapa Nui themselves, their ancestors, and imagined progeny. Restoring the social order the minister has in mind transmogrifies kāiŋa into tierra that does tremendous damage to the indigenous “sacred geography” (Deloria 2003: 121) where Rapa Nui find their “real environments of memory” (Nora 1989: 7), and storied place; a place Agamben and Foucault would say Rapa Nui desire organized by an oikonomia, rather than a Chilean governmentalized dispositif.
Minister Hinzpeter appeals to recent court orders to legitimate Chile’s recent participation in the Western genocidal tradition of attempting to “exterminate all the brutes” (Lindqvist 1992). But it is unclear that he can “…trust in the power of the present moment as an origin” (De Man 1983: 149) to define Chilean legality. Chile signed the 2007 United Nations of the Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples which stipulates that Rapa Nui, like any indigenous people, has a right to self-determination. The court orders he references not only appears to be in conflict with international orders, but some of Chile’s own “Indigenous Law” (Ley 19253) introduced in Chapter 2. According to this law, foreigners and ethnic Chileans cannot own land in Rapa Nui. Yet, part of the conflict since August 2010 has been Rapa Nui protest of the new 50 million dollar development of the Haŋa Roa Eco Hotel and Spa on the island that the ethnic Chilean Schiess family claims to own (Warren 2010). Rapa Nui, particularly the HitoRaŋi hua’ai of which Santi is a member, contest this ownership as illegal in light of Ley 19253. Though any legal analysis involves the selective use of a legal system (Moore 2000, Nader 2002: 169-170), the Chilean “nomos” that Minister Hinzpeter claims legitimates that Rapa Nui “move along!” ironically may not even be stable within the Chilean dispositif.

Historically, Minister Hinzpeter’s words are similar to those of the British Lords of the Realm in 1607 against British commoner protests of the great sheep enclosures in Great Britain at the time. The lords commented in a formal statement, “The poor man shall be satisfied in his end: Habitation; and the gentleman not hindered in his desire: Improvement” (Polanyi 2001: 36). The December 3 state violence and Minister Hinzpeter’s assessment have a somewhat different significance in the context of the long durée of historical world time. Since gaining Western visibility in 1722, Rapa Nui has had a minimal role in the “self-valorization” of capital, the “sole
value” (Marx 1990: 342) and “immanent driving force” (Marx 1990: 437) of capitalism; the island political economy has functioned in ways characteristic of “external areas” and “peripheries” (Wallerstein 1974: 349-350) of the global political economy. As is common in the self-valorization of capital (Hopkins and Wallerstein 1982, Krishna 2009: 20-22, Marx 1990: 926), recent periods of historical violence are strongly associated with restructuring by the world political economy. Rapa Nui became visible in the world political economy through significant violence: the entrepreneurs of the Dutch West Indies Company looking to find and exploit the riches Terra Australis Incognita who instead found Rapa Nui betrayed their aloha for trade and shot at least twelve Rapa Nui dead upon landing—history I detail more fully in Chapter 2. Under the Western name “Paasch Eyland” (Easter Island) given by the Dutch, Rapa Nui was targeted for provisions in the increasingly detailed world cartography. As Rapa Nui became more integrated into the world political economy it became a producer of an important commodity in the 1860s: people. As the world political economy restructured as more and more states prohibited African slaves and the United States became embroiled in civil war, Pacific Islanders were acquired as substitute slaves (Maude 1981: 2). The violent effects of slavery and subsequent diseases brought to the island as a result of the Pacific Islands slave trade on Rapa Nui were profound: as detailed in Chapter 2, the population was reduced from an estimated 4,000 in the 1850s to 110 people in 1877. As Rapa Nui acquired a new name in the late nineteenth century, “Isla de Pascua” or simply “Chile”, and the Rapa Nui political economy shifted towards the production of a raw material of significant value to the world political economy—wool—for a British based transnational corporation, the Easter Island Exploitation Company of the Williamson and Balfour Corporation the island was again plagued by violence. Rapa Nui land was violently enclosed and transformed into a sheep pasture as it was in Great
Britain during the Tudor and Stuart periods of the 1490s-1640s in Great Britain (Polanyi 2001: 37). Rapa Nui resistance to the prison the corporation enclosed them in was constant and they successfully dissolved the formal reality of the prison in the 1960s. While there was no explicit violence as Rapa Nui was restructured from a wool based political economy into a tourist political economy, the 1960s revolution was circumscribed by a threat of state violence. Many think it was only the coincidental presence of a Canadian medical team on the island that prevented the military that surrounded the Rapa Nui civil resistance in the 1960s from attacking and perhaps slaughtering large numbers of Rapa Nui.

Santi’s concern that the state violence is based upon “well financed foreign and Chilean private interests to privatize the Rapa Nui Island and its archaeological treasures, the Moai” makes significant sense when placed in the historical context of past capitalist violence on the island. If Marx is right that the expansion of capital tends to be bloody, then recent blood on the streets in Rapa Nui may indeed be a sign of a process of further restructuring of Rapa Nui within the global political economy. Minister Hinzpeter’s utterance, in such a context, increasing loses its humanistic locutionary and illocutionary sense as a speech act towards the restoration and protection of social order. The laws and court orders he uses his utterance to uphold would appear to be more or less ‘coercive ideology backed by the state’ (Marx 1990: 412) for the expansion of capital into Rapa Nui. To return to the language of Chapter 2, the privatized $800 a day Haña Roa Eco Hotel and Spa could be a sign that the U.S. tourist fantasizing about making the island a real, or at least metaphorical, golf course is not such a fantasy at all. As I noted in Chapter 2, her complete fantasy was to have a pedicure and spa after rounds of golf—just like she does in Hawai’i. She only has half of her fantasy now unfulfilled. Perhaps if enough
additional troops and ships arrive she will eventually get her “improvement” of golf as Rapa Nui continue to be bloodied and forced by Rancier’s police to “move along!”

The “archival memory” articulated in Minister Hinzpeter’s utterance, and the Chilean dispositif which gives it discursive ground, appears to destabilize as they are played against the “real environment” of Rapa Nui memory and the history of world time. Chapter 10 concludes suggesting that Rapa Nui resistance to the Chilean dispositif is at very fundamental level of being Rapa Nui. In other words, by not resisting, they cease to be. The large scale, and tremendous tenacity of Rapa Nui resistance since August 2010, suggests Rapa Nui do see themselves involved in a struggle to be Rapa Nui. I think however, it would be a mistake to ultimately see the fight to be Rapa Nui as only a fight against Chile. For the prison that is “Easter Island” was constructed and has been managed by a form of colonial governmentality which as noted in Chapter 10 does not reduce to the state. Foucault saw prison revolts as revolts of the entire system of punishment:

[Prison revolts] They were revolts against an entire state of physical misery that is over a century old: against cold, suffocation and overcrowding, against decrepit walls, hunger, physical maltreatment. But they were also revolts against model prisons, tranquillizers, isolation, and the medical or educational services. Were they revolts whose aims were merely material? Or contradictory revolts; against the obsolete, but also against comfort; against the wardens, but also against the psychiatrists? ...they were revolts at the level of the body, against the body of the prison. What was at issue was not whether the prison environment was too harsh or too aseptic, too primitive or too efficient but its very materiality as an instrument and vector of power; it is this whole technology of the ‘soul’—that of educationalists, psychologists and psychiatrists—fails either to consider or to compensate, for the simple reason that it is one of its tools (Foucault 1995: 30).

I suspect Rapa Nui resist not simply Chile, but the broader subject position constructed by the archaeologists, tourists, developers, and everyone else with a hand in the dispositif. Like Hawaiians (Silva 2004), Rapa Nui have never passively accepted colonial subjectivity, but have a history of resistance. The recent forms of resistance are part of a century of human struggles against Chilean colonialism that began with King Atamu Tekena’s qualification of the terms of
annexation, and King Riro’s attempt to challenge the sudden end of those terms at the close of the nineteenth century. Rapa Nui resistance continued in the early twentieth century with Catechist Aŋata’s attempt to overthrow the corporate-state (Porteous 1981, 66-68); Alfonso Rapu Haoa’s overthrow of Military rule in the 1960s; and numerous occupations and confrontations in both the 1980s and 1990s (Rochona-Ramirez 1996), as well as marches and protests in the twenty-first century (Fisher 2005). As the elder of Chapter 2 notes herein, Rapa Nui resist the Chilean government in part because “They arrived here, they stole all the land of the Rapa Nui” (He tu’u mai, he toke tahi i te henua o te Rapa Nui). Yet, the elder notes that the problems are not simply about land but also about the colonization of Rapa Nui minds and spirit. The elder complains the Chile has “stolen their mind and spiritual power” (Toke te mana‘u; toke te mana…). Rapa Nui resist Chile and its complex dispositif not only to regain their island land, but to restore their mind and spirituality as a people. The voices of Rapa Nui throughout this dissertation place themselves within the history and present material and discursive prisons Chile has managed and enforced upon their island, prisons they have incessantly struggled against and hope one day to place Rapa Nui progeny outside. At the time of writing, Chilean special forces had removed the last of the Rapa Nui involved in the occupations at gun point from the Haŋa Roa Eco Hotel and Spa. Interestingly, those removed were brought to the police station not in police cars, but within hotel minivans (HitoRaŋi 2011).

The results of the latest Rapa Nui human struggle to be a people are unknown and it is unclear whether there will continue to be “blood on the banner” (Robie 1989) Chile increasingly forces upon Rapa Nui people. After the December violence I made a statement to the Pacific Islands Report of the Center for Pacific Islands Studies at the University of Hawai’i Māoa that Rapa Nui needed the world’s help (Young 2010). No doubt hearing other requests for help,
largely the voice of “Saverapanui.org”, the world has begun to listen to the struggles of Rapa Nui against Chilean colonialism. Rapa Nui are no longer alone in their fight to be themselves—to be Rapa Nui, not Chilean or Pascuense. The United Nations has recently appointed a special rapporteur, Law Professor James Anaya of the University of Arizona, to conduct a three year investigation of the conflict. U.S. Senator Daniel Akaka and Congressman Eni Faleomavaega of America Samoa have written letters to Chilean President Pinera condemning its recent violent treatment of Rapa Nui. Amnesty International and the Indian Law Resource Center for Justice for Indigenous Peoples have also written letters against Chile’s actions and begun further investigations. I am excited that the world is listening and trying to see how to help Rapa Nui. Perhaps in the future the dispositif of “Easter Island” will cease to be; in its place will be Rapa Nui: a place not only of an important world heritage site, but of an important Polynesian people determining their future as they deem fit.
APPENDIX

PREVERBAL ASPECT MARKERS

Ipf: Imperfect Preverbal Aspect Marker: ‘E’
Asp: Generic Preverbal Aspect Marker: ‘He’
Ctg: Temporal Contiguity Preverbal Aspect Marker: ‘Ka’

MODAL PARTICLES

Mod: Preverbal Modal Particle ‘Ana’: expresses possibility mood.
Mod: Preverbal Modal Particle ‘Ka’: expresses imperative mood.
Mod: Preverbal Modal Particle ‘E’: expresses exhortative mood.
Mod: Preverbal Modal Particle ‘Ki’: expresses hortative mood.

Demonstratives
Dem: nei: expresses closeness in space and time.
Dem: ena: expresses nearness in space and time.
Dem: era: expresses distance in space and time.
Dem: ’ai: word initial demonstrative particle (Du Feu 1996: 93)
Dem: tū: used to mention something or someone already mentioned in a text.

Post-Verbal Progressive Aspect Particles

Prog: ‘ā: signifies a situation or action is incomplete, continuing, developing
Prog: ‘ana: signifies a situation or action is incomplete, continuing, developing

Locatives

Loc: na: locates something near in space and/or time
Loc: ra: locates something distant in space and/or time
Loc: ira: locates something distant in space and/or time
Loc: ni

Directional
Dir: atu
Dir: mai

Subordinators:

Sub: mo: introduces purposive clauses, complements, and sometimes conditionals
Sub: ki: introduces purposes clauses, and sometimes adverbial “when” clauses.
Sub: ’o: a negative similar to English “lest”
Evaluative
Eval: rō: a postverbal particle that expresses speaker affirmation
Eval: nō:

Prepositions:
Prep: ’i:
Prep: ki:
Prep: i:

Benefactives:
Ben: mo:
Ben: ma:

Relational Particles
Rel: i: expresses a kind of causal sense

Focal Particles
Foc: Ko

Articles
Art: He
Art: Te

Interrogatives:
Int: Hē
Int: Ai
Int: aha
Int: He

Negatives:
Neg: ’Ō: expresses negation in a double negative structure

Disjunctive Coordinators:
Dis: ‘O: expresses disjunction like English “or”

Possessives:
Pos: ’a:
Pos: o:
Pos:  a:  Tō:  used in possessive pronouns
Pos:  Tā:  used in possessive pronouns
Pos:  Te:  used in possessive pronouns

Agent Marker

Ag:  e:

Person Marker

Ps:  a:  the person marker ‘a’ occurs before pronouns and personal names

Plurals

Pl:  ūa

Degree Adverbs

Deg:  Ata

Deg:  Apa

Vocative Particles

Voc:  E
Voc:  ‘ēē

Counting Particles

Num:  Ka
SYMBOLS OF CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

1. A left bracket ‘[‘ is used to symbolize conversational overlap.
2. Numbers within parentheses indicate second or micro-seconds of pause in speech.
3. A micro-pause is indicated by the use of ‘(.)’ for example.
4. A micro-pause of half a second is indicated by use of ‘(.5)’ for example.
5. Expressions found between parentheses are estimated words that are not certain.
6. Use of a ‘:’ after a letter indicates prolonged sound of the sound preceding it.
7. Use of a ‘=’ indicates conversational “latching”.
TRANSCRIPT #1

1. T: Hai vānaŋa Rapa Nui?
   With speech Rapa Nui
   With Rapa Nui speech?

   Speech Rapa Nui indeed.
   Indeed, Rapa Nui speech.

3. T: Ko ai te iŋoa o te taŋata?
   Foc Int Art name of Art man?
   What is the name of the man?

4. N: No, Kī koe, a koe ko mai ‘ā a koe he Rapa Nui.
   No, say you, Ps you Foc Dir Prog Ps you Art Rapa Nui.
   No, you say, you, you are a Rapa Nui.

5. [Ko aŋiaŋi nei a koe te me’e tā’atoa?
   Foc understand Dem Ps you Art thing all?
   Have you understood everything?

6. T: [Yeah
   Yes
   Yes.

7. N: Yeah, he kī pa’i koe pe nei ‘e me’e pe nei ‘ē. He aha tātou mana’u pa’i
   Yes, Asp say indeed you like Dem and thing like Dem, Int Int us thought indeed
   Yes, you talk indeed like this. What is our thought indeed

8. o te Titulo Domino? He aha tu’u mana’u o ’ou?
   of Art Title Dominion? Int Int your thought of you?
   upon the land title system? What is your thought?
9. T: ‘Ēe, 'Iorana, a au he Rapa Nui au. Yeah, Te mana’u o’oku te me’e nei me’e
Yes, Greetings, Ps I Art Rapa Nui I. Yes, Art thought of me Art thing Dem thing
Yes, Greetings, I am a Rapa Nui. Yes, my thought of this thing is that it is

10. rakerake pa’i ko te hia o te henua tako’a.
bad indeed Foc Art Num of Art island also
a bad thing indeed. And for a number of others on the island also

11. Me’e nei Titulo Dominio me’e ta’e rivariva.
Thing Dem Land Titles thing Neg good.
This land title system is not good.

12. ’Ina etahi sirve ‘e mo nei he oti tahi.
Neg one serve and Sub Dem Asp end all.
It does not serve a purpose, and for now it should end entirely.

13. ’Oira pa’i o ka ra mai mo hakakore o te me’e nei
Thus indeed Num Dem Dir Sub remove of Art thing Dem
Thus indeed remove this thing.

14. mo noho haka’ou pe he hora [tuai era
Sub reside again like Art hour ancestral Dem
in order to live again like old times.

15. N: [E ho’i.
Indeed.
Indeed

16. T: Porque mo oho nō pa’i pe nei he oti teki ki te ŋa pokī
Because Ben go Eval indeed like Dem Asp end Art Pl children
Because to go on indeed like this the children are finished. Giving to
17. ka avai nei ki te ŋa poki he ho’o mai.
   Ctg give Dem Prep Art Pl children Asp buy Dir
   the children is finished, it will be a manner of buying.

18. N: ’Ina etahi kona toe pa’i mo ka te minima o te hinarere.
   Neg one land area remaining indeed Ben Ctg Art cemetery of Art great grandchildren
   There is no area left indeed for the cemetery of the great grandchildren.

   Neg one land area remaining. Hour truly Dem Prog, Neg Art cementary remaining
   There is no area left. In our time now, there is no cemetery left.

20. ’Ina he kona mo te minima. Oti ‘ā te te henua o te minima.
   Neg Art land area Ben Art cemetary. End Prog Art Art land of Art cemetary
   There is not area for the cemetery. The land of cemeteries is over

   Imp bury Prog Prep Loc Prep Art hour Dem
   Bury above now.

22. N: tanu [laughter]
   bury
   bury

23. T: Yeah, tanu ‘ā eruā o te papa ku rē au.
   Yes, bury Prog two of Art father Prf earn I
   Yes, the two are burried, of the father I remain

24. He oho ki ruŋa tō’oku mama ki ruŋa tō’oku papa ki te taina.
   Asp go Prep top my mother Prep top my father Prep Art sibling.
   I will go on top of my mother, my father, and siblings.
25. 'Ina he henua toe. Porque ko oti ai e avai mai te Titulo Dominio.
Neg Art land remain. Because Prf end Dem Impf Dir Art Land Title
There is no land left. Because the Land Titles have been given.

26. Ko oti tahi te te ho’o tā’ato’a ana kī mau rō te me’e hope’a o ta’e au
Prf end all Art Art buying all Mod say truly EVAL Art thing best of Neg suitable
All of the selling is finished, it will truly be said to not be the most suitable thing

27. Ta’e pe ora ra era. 'Ina he pue mo aŋa, etahi aŋa
Neg like life Dem Dem. Neg Asp Sub work, one work.
It is not like life in the past. It is not possible to work, (not) one job.

28. eko pue ko mamoe. Ko ai?
Neg can Foc sheep. Foc Int?
It is not possibile to (work) sheep. Who?

29. 'I te hora nei e aŋa mai tā’a poki ki a koe,
Prep Art hour Dem Impf work Dir your child Prep Ps you,
Now, when your child comes to you

30. hakatapa te pe ia ‘ai o te tapa.
Clarify Art like it Dem of Art side.
[you] clarify thus, there is the boundary [of the land].

31. Ka oho koe ’i hē? Horou tāua ki oti.
Mod go you Prep Int? Quickly we Mod end.
Go! Where? We are quickly ending.

32. N: Yeah, te rua ‘ui haka’ou nei tātou hauha’a pa’i he aha pa’i
Yes, Art two question also Dem we value indeed Int Int indeed
Yea, the second question also our value indeed, what indeed…
The two *taina* continue discussing issues for additional minutes. The talk shifts back to a discussion of difficult working conditions on the island. *Nua* subsequently records an additional monologue in which she reviews her genealogy and details of her ancestral lands.
TRANSCRIPT #2

1. **N:** Yeah, ‘ui ra’e o te titulo nei.
   Yes, question one of the Title Dem
   Yeah, the first question of the land title system

2. **He aha te tāua te te haura’a ko te me’e,**
   Asp Int Pos we Art Art meaning Foc Art thing
   What is our interpretation of the thing

3. **he aha te tāua mana’u i te me’e Titulo Dominio o (. ) he parau o**
   Int Int Pos we thought Prep Art thing Title Dominion of Art paper of
   What is our thought of the land title system of the paper of

4. **te hau Tire ‘i ruŋa i te tāua henua?**
   Art government Chile Prep top Prep Pos we island?
   the Chilean government upon our island?

5. **T:** Yeah, te mana’u o’oku o te o te parau ‘o te Titulo Dominio (1.0)
   Yes, Art thought my of Art of Art paper or Art Title Dominion
   Yes, my thought of the paper or the Land Title system

6. **Me’e ta’e tano. He aha? He manera etahi (.5) o te hau era he Tire e nei.**
   Thing Neg moral. Int Int? Art manner one of Art government Dem Art Chile Ag Dem
   is that it is unjust. Why? It is a way of the Chilean government here.

7. **He Tire (1.5) mo, mo hiko i te henua (.) mai te Rapa Nui.**
   Art Chile Sub, Sub expropriating Prep Art land Dir Art Rapa Nui.
   It is a Chilean thing for, for taking the land from the Rapa Nui.

8. **He mana’o o’oku. Yeah, Ko ko kimi ‘ā te manera (.) mo: (1.5) a roto**
   Art though mine. Yes Prf Prf search Prog Art manner Sub Pos inside
   That is an idea of mine. Yeah, I have investigated the
9. i te vānaŋa he Titulo Dominio. He to’o haka’ou i i te henua mai
Prep Art talk Art Title Dominion. Asp take again Prep Prep Art land Dir
discourse of the land title system. It takes again the island from

10. te Rapa Nui. Yeah oira o te haŋa nei ki te me’e he: (.5) Titulo Dominio. (3.0)
Art Rapa Nui. Yes, thus of Art want Dem Prep Art thing Art Title Dominion.
Rapa Nui. Yeah, thus the land title system is wanted here.

11. He aha a koe te ‘ui?
Int Int Ps you Art question?
What is your question?

12. N: Eh: te Titulo Dominio ho’i (1.0) Eh ’Ina te nu’u haŋa ki te Titulo Dominio o
Eh Art Title Dominion indeed Neg Art people want Prep Art Title Dominion of
The land title system, the people do not want the land titles of

13. Rapa Nui [chuckles] He aha tātou e: e: e e avai nei ki tātou haŋa nei i te me’e?
Rapa Nui Int Int we Impf Impf Impf Impf give Prep we want Dem Prep Art thing?
Rapa Nui [chuckles] What is given to us that we want that thing?

14. ’Ina, ’ina he moni, he veve. ’Ina he hare.
Neg, Neg Art money, Art poverty. Neg Art house.
We don’t have money, we are poor. We lack houses

15. ‘E ‘e, ’I a era tu’u hare i nu’u era ki a koe ki te hau Tire ki
And and, Prep Ps Dem your house Rel people Dem Prep Ps you Prep Art government Chile Prep
And your house because of those people, to you, to the Chilean Government,

16. Te te hare he avai rō te ko i te Titulo Dominio
Art Art house Asp give Eval Art Foc Prep Title Dominion
the house given by the land title system
17. Kai haŋa koe. Ta’e haŋa. Kai a’aru Titulo Dominio
Neg want you. Neg want. Neg grab Title Dominion
You do not want it. Do not want. Don’t take the land title.

18. ana haŋa ko ki te hare. Peira o te veve tātou e nei Titulo Dominio.
Mod want Foc Prep Art house. Thus of Art poverty we Ag Dem Title Dominion
when wanting a house. Our poverty results from the land title system.

19. Ta’e o pe nei ‘ēe o haŋa a tātou. Yeah, katahi.
Neg of Like Dem yes of want Ps we. Yeah, one.
It is not like this yes, that we all want it. Yeah, that is first point.

20. Te rua me’e te ra ve’a mo ta’e haŋa o’oku ki te Titulo Dominio,
Art two thing Art Dem heat Sub Neg want mine Prep Art Title Dominion,
The second thing heating my not wanting the land title

21. ’ina ’ō ’ina henua derecho te mātou henua.
Neg Neg Neg land rights Pos we island.
There are no land rights/laws on our island.

22. T: E ho’i, porque i te Tire te te henua. ’I rote rima o te Tire tātou.
Indeed, because Prep Art Chile Art Art island. Prep inside hand of Art Chile we.
Indeed, because it is Chile’s, the island. We are within the hand of Chile.

23. Yeah, oira, ’i te hora nei: ko aŋa ‘ā i te pacifico (.)
Yes, thus, Prep Art hour Dem Prf work Prog Prep Art Pacific
Yeah, thus, now there has been work in the Pacific

24. o te taina o te **** Organization Name*** ko aŋa ‘ā mo mo hoki o te henua.
of Art siblings of Art ******** Orgnaization that has worked Sub Sub return of Art island
of the siblings/cousins of the *****Orgnanization for for returning the island
25. ki te ki te mā’ohi ’o ki te māori. E kimi pa’i i te kaokao.
Prep Art Prep Art natives or Prep Art natives. Ipf search indeed Prep Art sides
to the natives. Indeed searching to the sides

Prep Art Rapa Nui.
to the Rapa Nui.

27. T: ’O ki te Rapa Nui. Me’e o Rapa Nui. Yeah, oira te te aha
Or Prep Art Rapa Nui. Thing of Rapa Nui. Yes, thus Prep Art Int
To the Rapa Nui. Things of Rapa Nui, yeah, thus this is why

28. E ai rō ‘ā te nu’u ko aŋa ‘ā (.5) mo hakakore te i te me’e he Titulo Dominio.
Ipf exist Eval Prep Art people Prep work Prep Sub remove Prep Prep Art thing Prep Art Title Dominion
there are people working to remove the land title system.

29. Pero i te me’e nei, he veve o te henua. Automatica.
But because of this thing, there is poverty on the island. It’s automatic.

30. ’o si ’ā e aŋa pa’i pe nei ‘e e e ai te Titulo Dominio mo avai i [te: (.5)
Or yes Prep work indeed like Dem and Ipf Ipf exist Prep Art Title Dominion Sub give Prep Art
or if indeed work like this continues the land title system for giving

31. N: ki te hare
Prep Art house
Houses

32. T: ki te hare. Ki te (1.0) ki te etahi huru pa’i o te o te me’e ’i runa o te henua nei.
Prep Art house. Mod Prep Art Mod one kind ideed of Prep of Prep Art thing Prep top of Prep Art island Dem.
Houses. This will be the one way of life upon the island.
33. N: Bueno. Hai ma, hai ra, he oti ma ho’i te rave’a mo o tātou henua
   Good. With Sub, with Dem, Asp end Sub indeed Art taken Sub of we island.
   Well, with that we will be finished indeed our island will be taken

34. i te me’e pa’i i te rima o te Tire te henua
   Rel Art thing indeed Prep art hand of Art Chile Art island.
   This thing places the island indeed in the hand of Chile

35. E e avai haka’ou ki te te titu Titulo Domino.
   Ipf Ipf give again Prep Art Art title tile Dominion.
   by giving the land titles.

36. Ta’e haŋa rō ki te Titulo Dominio
   Neg want Eval Prep Art Title Dominion.
   The land titles are not wanted.

37. ’Ina henua. ko ai?
   Neg land. Foc Int?
   There is no land. Who?

38. Una momento. He avai ki tetahi nu’u.
   One momento. Asp give Prep some people.
   One moment. Give to the people.

39. T: E ho’i.
   Indeed.
   Indeed.

40. N: Yeah o te o casa o te Titulo Dominio katahi:: katahi ah punto.
   Ye of Art of house of Art Title Dominion one, one ah point.
   Yeah, the house of the land title system is one point.
41. Yeah, he oho mai i te kona era ‘e ‘ui mai era pe nei ē. He hoki?
   Yes, Asp go Dir Prep Art area Dem and question Dir Dem like Dem Voc. Asp return?
   Yeah come to that land there and question it this way: Will it return?

42. E ai rō ‘ā te Titulo Dominio te tāua henua nei ‘ī?
   Imp exist Eval Prog Titl e Dominion Pos we island Dem Dem?
   Is there land title for our entire island now?

43. Yeah a koe ho’i ‘ina koe kai to’o i tu’u Titulo Dominio porque
   Yes Ps you indeed Neg you Neg take Prep your Title Dominion because
   Yeah, indeed do not acquire your individual land titles because

44. A au nō atu hare nei i aŋa [ē
   Ps I Eval Dir house Dem Prf build Voc
   The house built is to no purpose yes.

45. T: [bueno
   good
   good

46. N: Ahh hare tu’u hare nei ahhh i aŋa i to’o mai e koe mai
   Ahh house your house Dem ahh Prf build Prf take Dir Ag you Dir Ps you Dir
   Houses made and acquired from the government

47. a koe mai a hau tiene que to’o koe te Titulo Dominio.
   Ps you Dir Ps government has that take you art Title Dominion
   require acquisition of the individual land title.

   Good Ps I know, Ipf exist Eval Prog my land but Neg Art Title Dominion
   Well, I know I have land but I did not take a land title.
49. 'Ina a au kai to’o. Yeah etahi henua i avai i tā’aku pokī ki aŋarina
Neg Ps I Neg take. Yes one land Prf given Prep my child Prep today
I did not take it. Yes, a land that I have given to my child to this day

50. kai to’o ai eh Titulo Dominio. Yeah, Henua nei o:: tō’oku mama era
Neg take Dem eh Title Dominion. Yes, land Dem of my mother Dem
did not get the individual land title. Yes, this land my mother

51. pe avai mai ki a au 'ina a au kai to’o te Titulo Dominio. Yeah (.5)
like give Dir Prep Ps I Neg Ps I Neg take Art Title Dominion. Yes
gave to me I did not acquire a land title. Yes,

52. he mana’o o’oku ‘ina a au kai haŋa ki te Titulo Dominio.
Art thought mine Neg Ps I Neg want Prep Art Title Dominion.
my thought is I do not want land title.

53. Pero i te vānaŋa nei i kī mai nei (. ) e te nu’u nei o ruŋa eh o te Tire.
But Prep Art discourse Dem Prf say Dir Dem Ag Art people Dem of top eh of Art Chile
But in the discourse of today it is said by people of Chile

54. He to’o i te Titulo Dominio (. ) pero ta’e to’o (. ) He haka a au ki te ara.
Asp take Prep Art Title Dominion but Neg take Asp make Ps I Pre Art road.
to take land title, but I do not take it. I make [them] go away!

55. N: =E ho’i.
Indeed
Indeed.

56. T: Yeah, tiene que to’o porque (. ) ‘ina he mana’u toe.
Yes, have to take because Neg Asp thought remain
Yeah, it is necessary to take because there is no thought left.
57. N: =Que tu’u henua? (Bueno ko te mo ou)  
What your island (Good Foc Art Ben you)  
What about your island? (Well for you)

58. T: [Ta’e o te henua pa’i. [oia pa’i  
Neg of Art island indeed really indeed  
It is not the island [really

59. N: Yeah i etahi [kona hakaou  
Yes, Prep one area again  
Yes, one land also.

60. T: [Pero me’e ta’e rivariva pa’i mo te mo te Rapa Nui (1.0)  
But thing Neg good indeed Ben Art Ben Art Rapa Nui.  
But, it is not a good thing indeed for the Rapa Nui

61. mo te Rapa Nui tā’atoa.  
Sub Art Rapa Nui all  
for all the Rapa Nui.

62. N: Bueno me’e nei ho’i e e vovo e. Bueno ’ina etahi pura  
Good thing Dem ideed Voc Voc young woman Voc. Good Neg one pure  
Good, this thing indeed young woman. Good, not any one purely,

63. ’ina kai haŋa ki te me’e nei porque tātou moana tātou henua araraua ia  
Neg Neg want Prep Art thing Dem because we ocean we island together Prep  
no one wants this thing because our ocean, our island,

64. i hau demande i tu’u henua nō i hau i te te i te ka katahi parauti’a nei  
Prep nation demand Prep your island Eval Prep nation Prep Art Art Prep Art one truth Dem  
The nation demands your land indeed as the nation is the one truth here.
65. T: Yeah (.5) te mana’o haka’ou ko te me’e he Titulo Dominio
Yes Art thought also Foc Art thing Art Title Dominion
Yeah, another thought about the Titulo Dominio is

66. pe mu’a (.5) ka oho ena (.5) tetahi dueño a mu’a pa’i (2.0)
like front Ctg go Dem Art property of front indeed,
in the future to get a property in the future

67. ki te tāua makapuna o ki te tāua hinarere (1.0)
Prep Pos we grandchildren or Prep Pos we great grandchildren.
to our grandchildren or to our great grandchildren.

68. mo kore o te o te me’e he Titulo Dominio
Sub remove of Art of Art thing Art Title Dominion
Consequently, remove the Titulo Dominio.

69. N: Hakakore.
Make remove
Make it removed.

70. T: Hakakore, mo mo a mo aŋa e te e te ŋa poki ena ka oho ena
Make removed, Sub Sub sub worke Age Art Ag Art Pl children Dem Ctg go Dem
Make it removed, so that it is productive for the children to continue

71. pe mu’a (.5) mo hakakore te me’e he Titulo Dominio. He mana’u o’oku.
Like front Sub remove Art thing Art Title Dominion. Art though mine
in the future, remove the land title system. This is my thought.

72. N: Ahh te te ahh ra te te me’e ka oho hope’a pa’i
Ahh Art Art ahh Dem Art Art thing Ctg go end indeed
Ahh the thing to ultimately to go indeed
73. ‘i te hora nei ana ana tā (.) .hhh ana hakatano tano ro ro
Prep Art hour Dem Mod Mod Pos hhh Mod make moral moral Eval Eval
now to make things just,

74. tātou ana mo mo tu’u mo ha’amata mo mo
we Mod Sub Sub arrive Sub begin Sub Sub
we are going to establish, start

75. Hakatitika mo ana ki te ra hora (.) ana ana tu’u pa’i
Make straight Sub Mod Prep Art Dem hour Mod Mod arive
to straighten things according to that time. Going to establish indeed

76. ki te hora ko me’e ‘ā (.) ana ki te tāua ŋaro.
Prep Art hour Foc thing Prog Mod Prep Pos we lost
at that time this thing that is leading to our disappearance.

77. Ka hakare atu te ŋa pokī.
Mod leave Dir Art Pl children.
We must leave it for the children.

78. T: =ʻĒe (1.0) bueno me’e tako’ a era (.) i aŋa ho’i eee o te
Yes, good thing also Dem Prf work indded eee of Art
Yes, well, another thing has indeed been done in

79. national uninia hakakore mo hakahoki ki te henua
National Union remove Sub return Pre Art island.
United Nations to remove it and return the island.

80. ki te Rapa Nui. Ka nohonoho mai rāua rāua
Prep Art Rapa Nui. Ctg reside Dir they they
to the Rapa Nui So they can live.
81. 'Ina 'ina he problema (.5) yeah pero hakahoki mai te henua
Neg Neg Art proble. Yes but cause return Dir Art island
It is not a problem, yeah but make the island return

82. ki te Rapa Nui. I aŋa era (.) he to’o mai e te Tire
Prep Art Rapa Nui. Prf work Dem Asp take Dir Ag Art Chile
to the Rapa Nui. There was work done regarding what was taken by Chile

83. he kī, bueno, o ŋa te henua na (.) ka horehore ka avai ki te Rapa Nui
Asp sa, good, of Pl Art island Dem Ctg cut into pieces Ctg give Prep Art Rapa Nui
[Chile] will say, well, the island is theirs to divide and give to the Rapa Nui.

84. N: Pero e ai Titulo Dominio
But Ipf exists Title Dominion.
But that is the land title policy

85. T: ‘Ēe, e Titulo Domino (.) pero mo mou o ra vānaŋa era ki te
Yes, Voc Title Dominion but Sub silence of Dem talk Dem Prep Art
Yes, it is the land title system but to silence that discourse for

86. Ka avai te mātou (1.0) henua, he horehore he avai te henua, pero
Ctg give Pos we island, Asp cut into pieces, Asp give Art land, but
Giving us our island; dividing it; and giving us land, but

87. ta’e he manera era o te Rapa Nui. He manera era o rāua.
Neg Art manner Dem of Art Rapa Nui. Art manner Dem of them.
That is not a custom of the Rapa Nui. It’s a custom of them.

88. N Yeah, e ai rō ‘ā te me’e (1.0). Ko tu’u mai ‘ā te nu’u mai haho…
Yes, Ipf exist Prog Art thing. Prf arrive Dir Prog Art people Dir outside
Yes, [we two] have this thing. Outsiders arrived...
1. **K:** Pe he tā’a ‘ui e?
   Like Int your question Voc?
   What is your question?

2. **T:** He aha te kōrua mana’u o ruŋa o o te kaiŋa o Rapa Nui
   Int Int Pos you thought of upon Pos Pos Art land Pos Rapa Nui
   What is your thought upon the land of Rapa Nui

3. ‘e te parau henua o te hau Tire?
   And Art paper land Pos Art government Chile?
   and the land title system of the Chilean government?

4. **K:** Ee::h tō’oku matahiti i aŋarina i te hora nei ka pae ahuru ma maha.
   Ee::h my years Prep today Prep Art hour Dem Num five ten and four
   I am today fifty four years old today.

5. Ee::h I poreko ai a au i te matahiti ho’e tautini eiva hanere e pae ahuru ma maha.
   Ee::h Prf born Dem Ps I Prep Art year one thousand nine hundred and five ten and four
   I was born in 1954.

6. Te me’e a au take’a, tō’oku hora i oho mai ai, he take’a e au
   Art thing Ps I see, my hour Prf go Dir Dem, Asp see Ag I
   The things I see, from my our of birth, I see

7. he ‘apapa atu e au etoru haŋa. Eeee I ooo. Ko poreko mai ‘ā,
   Asp exhibit Dir Ag I three work. Eeee Pf v ooo. Pf v born Dir Prog
   three developments. I was born,

8. ko nuinui mai ‘ā, ko oho mai ‘ā a au,
   Prf big Dir Prog. Prf go Dir Prog Ps I
   I grew, I came
9. a au i poreko ai ’i runja i te pute tarake i roto te hare [Place Name omitted].
Ps I Prf born Dem Prep upon Prep Art bag corn Prep inside Art house
I was born upon a maize bag within the house at ****.

10. ’I ira i poreko ai ’i roto te piti hora i eh ah i te kona nei e vānaŋa atu ena [Place Name omitted].
Prep Loc Prfv born Dem Prep two hour Prep eh ah Prep Art area Dem Ipf Dir Dem
There I was born within the second hour at this area here called ****.

11. He parehe henua hore ‘ā mai i tō’oku mau tupuna mai te rau henua mai te rau
Art piece land cut Prog Dir Prep my Pl ancestor Dir Art hundred island Dir Art hundred
It is a piece of land cut from my ancestors from the hundreds of lands left by the

12. kaiŋa hakare te te ariki nui e Hotu Matu’a. ‘I atu tere ra’e era mo hakaiti atu
land make remain Art Art chief big Ag Hotu Matu’a. Prep Dir direct75 first Dem Sub Reduce Dir
founding chief Hotu Matu’a. In the first era of control [the land] was reduced;

13. pe nei, katahi. I tu’u mai era te nu’u mai haho, i tu’u mai ki nei mo haŋa
like Dem, one. Prf arrive Dir Dem Art people Dir outside, Prf arrve Dir Prep Dem Sub want
it was like this first. Outsiders arrived, arrived here and wanted

14. i te animara mo haŋa i te pua’a mo haŋa i te hoi.
Prep Art animals Sub want Prep Art cow Sub want Prep Art horse
animals, they wanted cattle and horses.

15. I to’o mai te henua e te hau ena he Tire o hau kakaka.
Prf take Dir Art island Ag Art government Dem Art Chile or government paper
The island was taken by the Chilean government or the paper government.

75 The Rapa Nui verb ‘tere’ is sometimes used metaphorically to mention political leaders, Chilean or Rapa Nui, on the island. From time to time I would hear Rapa Nui call Rapa Nui leaders “taŋata hakatere i te henua”. The causative verb ‘hakatere’ is often used to mention driving a car. Thus, the Rapa Nui leaders characterized by use of the causative verb in a sense are represented as “people driving the island”. I believe koro is herein using tere metaphorically similar in this utterance.
16. To‘o tetahi me‘e te tupuna. He aha tahi mai, mai kampō
Take some thing Art ancestor. Int Int all Dir, Dir country
Ancestral things were taken. What all was taken, was from the country

17. e ma‘u mai ki Haŋa Roa, he puru. Yeah, ‘i roto a au i poreko mai ai
Ipf bring Dir Prep Haŋa Roa, Asp shut. Yes, Prep inside Ps I Prf born Dir Dem
and brought to Haŋa Roa and imprisoned there. Yeah, I was born

18. ‘i roto o te hare ma‘auri ma‘u mai a tō’oku tupuna
Prep inside of Art house iron bring Dir Ps
within a prison they brought my ancestors,

19. tō’oku matu’a tane tō’oku matu’a vahine. Ko oho mai ‘ā ki roto te hare ma auri
my father my mother. Prf go Dir Prog Prep inside Art house iron
father/uncles, and mother/aunts. I arrived within the prison;

20. ‘i roto te hare ma ‘auri i poreko ai. ‘I aŋarina i a au ‘i roto i te hare ma ‘auri ri’a.
Prep inside Art house iron Prf born Dem. Prep today Prep Ps I Prep Art house iron ???
within the prison I was born. Today I remain within the prison.

21. Eeee hora era tu‘u mai o te o te compania ki nei (.5) Ki ‘ati pa‘i o u‘i .
Eeee hour Dem arrive Dir of Art of Art company Prep Dem. Mod problem indeed Pos see
That hour the company arrived here. It was difficult for the

22. ko te poki. Eeeː etahi nō parehe itiiti o te taŋata e noho era. Etoru parehe o te
Foc Art children Eee one Eval piece small of A Art people Ipf reside Dem. Three pieces of Art
children to see. On this little piece of land people lived. Three sections of

23. o te henua i te pua’a ‘e te mamoe. He noho ki kampō mo
Pos Art island Prep Prep Art cow and Art sheep. Asp reside Prep country Sub
the island to the cattle and sheep. One resided or went to the country in order to
24. mo hī ‘e vari koe e u’i. (1.0) Ana ai ha’atika te rāua te parautī’a
Sub fish and shee you Ipf look. Mod exist follow Pos they Art truth
fish and sheer and look. One would follow their truth

25. mo uru o ki roto o te henua o tu’u hui tupuna.
Sub enter of Prep inside of Art island of your group ancestor
enter within the island of your ancestors.

26. I oho mai ki te tupuna ki te matu’a he kī a au. Eeee
Prf go Dir Prep Art ancestor Prep Art elder Asp say Ps I. Eeee
One went to the ancestors, to your elders, I would say.

27. Mo i ‘ai roto eee: e kimi a koe kimi tu’u pute kimi te aha te me’e au
Sub Prep Dem inside eee Ipf search Ps you search your bag search Art Int Art thing valuable
For inside there, you search, search with your bag search for valuable things

28. e ma’u mai mai ira. Tu’u ‘ā pe he me’e ena i oho mai i e rāua e ai rō ‘ā
Ipf bring Dir Dir Loc. Arive Prog Like Int thing Dem Prf go Dir Prep Ag them Ipf exist Eval Prog
to bring back. You arrive with things of them, you had

29. te rāua ma’ea ‘o e ai rō ‘ā te rāua me’e. Irā hora, ’ina kai hapā’o ki te ono
Pos they Stone or Ipf exist Eval Prog Pos they thing. Loc hour Neg Neg care Prep Art wealth
their stones, you had their things. At that time there is no care of the wealth

30. e hakare mai (. ) e te tupuna (. ) mō’oku. Eee mo
Ipf make remain Dir Ag Art ancestor my. Eeee Sub
left by the ancestors for me. For

31. Te ta’u ‘e te ta’u ‘e ki ajarina. He aha te ono i hakare mai ai? Pipi horeko, he ana,
Art era and Art era and Prep today. Int Int Art valuable Prf make remain Dir Dem? Pipi horeko, ca
To these eras until today what are the valuables left? Boundry stones, cave
32. he ahu, he moai. Yeah he to’o mai e aŋa me’e ko hakaŋaro ‘ā. Art ahu, Art moai. Yes Asp take Dir Ipf work thing Foc make disappear Prog ceremonial centers, sculpture. Yeah things were taken and disappeared.

33. Eee hakare mai ai te rāua: me’e. Hakatikea mai i te mamoe. Eee make remain Dir Dem Pos they: thing. Make see Dir Pos Art sheep There things remained. They were seen by us as [we cared for] the sheep.

34. Hakatikea. I haŋai ai te pua’a i te hoi. Yeah i nei i hauha’a tupuna era Make see. Prf feed Dem Art cow Prep Art horse. Yes, Prep Loc Prf valuable ancestor Dem [As we] fed for the cattle and horses. Yeah the ancestral valuables

35. hakare mai tō’oku mau hui tupuna ki a au. Kai hapā’o i ra hora. Make remain Dir my Pl group ancestor Prep Ps I. Neg car Prep Loc hour. my ancestors left to me. They were not cared for at that time.

36. I oho mai katahi i ahh (. ) te rua o te ‘apapa (2.0 ) he tu’u mai Prf go Dir one Prep ahh Art two Pos Art order, Asp arrived Dir The second organization [of the island] arrived upon

37. te aha te: (2.0) tu’u mai te me’e te:: (2.5) Policarpo Toro Art Int Artt arrive Dir Art thing Art Policarpo Toro the arrival of Policarpo Toro.

38. i te matahiti tautini va’u (. ) va’u hanere e va’u ahuru ma va’u ki nei Prep Art year thousand eight eight hundred and eight ten and eight Prep Dem in the year 1888

39. i te eiva o te ava’e nei o (.5) o me’e o Anakena. Tu’u mai ki nei (.5) Prep Art nine Pos Art month Dem Pos thing Pos July. Arrive Dir Prep Dem the ninth of July. He arrived here.
40. He aŋa etahi mana’u (1.0) a ruŋa ko te ariki o ra: mātou.  
Asp work one thought Pos upon For Art chief Pos Loc we  
One thought occurred to our chief.

41. He aha te me’e i ta’e: (.) ta’e titika? He aŋa mana’u era i ra hora  
Int Int Art thing Prep Neg Neg straight? Int work thought dem Prep Loc hour  
What is not straight? The thought at that time,

42. I ra matahiti tautini e va’u hanere e va’u ahuru ma va’u. Te kī o te ariki  
Prep Loc year thousand and eight hundred and eight ten and eight. Art statement Pos Art chief  
in the year 1888, the statement of the chief

43. o ra hora (..) he avai atu i te mauku (2.0) mo tā’a pua’a tā’a mamoe mo  
Pos Loc hour Asp give Dir Prep Art grass Ben your cattle your sheep Ben your  
at this time was to give [Policarpo Toro] grass for your cattle and sheep for

44. tā’a mo tā’a au tā’a aha mo haŋai (.) eee: (.) me’e ra’au mo avai mai eee  
your Ben your valuables your Int Ben care ee thing medicine Ben give Dir eee  
your goods, to feed them [the animals], medicine to give [them]

45. He hapo’o mai koe ki a maŋtou. E avai mai koe i te hāpī  
Asp protext Dir you Prep Ps we Ipf give Dir you Rel Art study  
You protect us. You give for study

46. e avai mai koe ki te me’e rivariva mo maŋtou. Peira te me’e  
Ipf give Dir you Prep art thing good Ben we. Thus Art thing  
you give good things to us. Thus things

47. i noho ai i ra i ra anatau ki aŋarina. I to’o mai era i aŋarina to’o mai  
Prf reside Dem Prep Loc Prep Loc era Prep today. Prf take Dir Dem Prep today take Dir  
were established at that era to this day. What was taken from us then until today,
48. toʻo mai, he hakahape. Hakahape te meʻe. I oho atu eehh tuʻu mai te ha te::
taken Dir, Asp make wrong. Make wrong Art thing. Prf go Dir eehh arrive Dir Art ha Art
is falsified. It is falsified. [Toro] then left and there arrived

49. te [hatu] mau (.). taŋata o te henua nei he hāpī. ’I ra ŋa hora o tuʻu mai
Art Pl people Pos Art island Dem Asp study. Prep Loc Pl hour Pos arrive Dir
people of the island to study. At that time the catholic

50. te misión catolic. Tuʻu mai mai Tahiti ki nei, hakamau rō
Art mission Catholic. Arrive Dir Dir Tahiti Prep Dem, to make correct Eval
mission arrived. It arrived from Tahiti to here to make everything proper:

51. mai te mamoe mo mātou mo te Rapa Nui. Tuʻu mai ki nei he toʻo tahi
Dir Art sheep Ben we Ben Art Rapa Nui. Arrrive Dir Prep Dem Asp take all
for the sheep and for us Rapa Nui. They arrived here and took everything

52. tū ŋa repa ena ko rāua te ‘ono te hauhaʻa henua
Dem Pl person Foc they Art wealth Art valuables island
as theirs; the wealth, the island valuables;

53. mai te henua ki te taŋata ki te maʻea
Dir Art land Prep Art people Prep Art stones
from the land to the people to the stones,

54. ki te meʻe tāʻatoa i to ki aŋarina He aŋarina, mahana nei ko aŋarina eiva o Ruti.
Prep Art thing all Prep Pos Prep today. Art today, day Dem For today nineth Pos November
To everything to this day. Today, the ninth of November.

55. Mahana nei ko aŋarina aue e vānaʻa atu ena ki roto o te paepae nei ‘oʻoku
Day Dem Foc today wow IpF talk Dir Dem Prep inside Pos Art house Dem mine
Today this talk within my small home here
56. ko [place name] ki aŋarina. (1.0) Yeah o rāua te henua. Kī a rāua i kōrua
Foc Prep today. Yes Pos them Art island. Speak Ps them Prep you
to this day. Yeah of them the island. They say to you,

57. I kī ai he avai etahi parahe henua mo ou. He kī [hua’ai name] i a rāua
Prf speak Dem Asp give one piece island Ben you. Asp speak Prep Ps they
it is said they will give one piece of land for you. This family will say to them

58. He avai atu a te rāua etahi parau hakamana? Pe nei?
Asp give Dir Ps Pos they one paper make empowered? Like Dem?
They will give you a paper to empower? Is this the case? It is for them to give

59. O rāua i avai ai te henua ki a koe? Te henua o te tupuna te henua.
Pos they Prf give Dem Art island Prep Ps you. Art island Pos Art ancestors Art islnad
land to you? The island is the island of the ancestors.

60. Hakare mo tō’ona hinarere mo te makupuna mo te hina.
Make remain Ben his great grandchildren Ben Art grandchildren Ben Art grandchildren
It is left for its great grandchildren for the grandchildren for the grandchildren

61. mo te Hinarere. Ko te me’e nei i aŋarina. (1.0)
Ben Art great grandchildren. Foc Art thing Dem Prep today.
For the great grandchildren. Today the thing is

62. Te rahi o te taŋata o te henua nei.
Art big Pos Art people Pos art island Dem.
for the majority of the people of this island

63. (1.0) ko me’e ‘ā, ko ha’a ko hakateka ‘ā i te pū’oko
Foc thing Prog. Foc Cau Foc make gather Prog Prep Art head
The thing is, their minds have been collected
64. e tū ŋa nu’u ena o haho e te Tire.
Ag Dem Pl people Dem Pos outside Ag Art Chileans.
by the foreign people, by the Chileans.

65. To’o mai ‘ā. Tata i te pū’oko. He aha te ha’aura’a o
Take Dir Prog. Wash Prep Art head. Int Int Art meaning Pos
The minds are taken, and washed. What is the meaning of

66. te vānaŋa ena i tata o te pū’oko? He to’o mai, ‘ai ture
Art talk Dem Prep wash Pos Art head. Asp take Dir, Dem conflict
the phrase ‘washing the mind’? The minds are taken within conflicts

67. o rāua hakatere mai nei ‘i ruŋa o te henua, ‘ai ture o te Tire.
Pos they direct Dir Dem Prep upon Pos Art island, Dem conflict Pos Art Chileans.
they have directed upon the island, conflicts of the Chileans.

68. Ko te me’e nei te me’e o te Tire i ma’u mai ki ruŋa
Foc Art thing Dem Art thing Pos Art Chile Prf bring Dir Prep upon
This thing, the thing Chile brought upon this island

69. o te henua nei etoru o te apapahaŋa o te nohohana o te henua.
Pos Art island Dem three Pos Art arrangement Pos Art lifestyle Pos Art island.
the third arrangement of life on the island.

70. Eee: i aŋarina oti (¿) a mātou i Te Mahana O Te Re’o (1.0)
Eee Prep today end Ps we Prep Art day Pos Art language
Today concluded the Day of the Language

71. o te tupuna (1.0) o te pou tupuna o te pini etoru (.) i te hitu o Ruti.
Pos Art ancestors Pos art pole ancestor Pos Art corner three Prep Art seven Pos November.
of the ancestors, of the three ancestral poles or corners on this seventh of November.
72. Ee:: i oti mau ‘ā te me’e he toe nei i te mahana
Ee Prep end completely Prog Art thing Asp remaing Dem Prep Art day
The remaining things of this day are completely finished

73. tō mātou re’o, he me’e i a ‘a’aku e haŋa nei mo ma’u
Pos we language, Art thing Prep ps my Ipfs want Dem Ben bring
Our language, it is a thing I want to bring

74. te mata ‘api o te mahana nei mo hapa’o i te me’e nei he re’o
Art eye new Pos Art day Dem Sub protect Prep art thing Dem Art language
to the youth this day to care for them; it is a language

75. mo mana’u hai re’o moe varua i tō’ona re’o mo haŋa ki tō’ona re’o
Sub think with language sleep spirit Prep its language Sub want Prep its language
for thinking and dreaming, its language, I want its language,

76. e haere ai a au te ‘ao nui e ma’u i tō’ona re’o mo ‘ite pe nei ‘ē.
Ipfs go Dem Ps I Art world big Ipfs bring its language Sub knowledge like Dem Voc
I am going to bring the language to the world for knowledge.

77. Ahh he kī o te repa etahi e ai rō ‘ā i tō’ona re’o ahhh he kī,
Ahh Asp speak Pos Art person one Ipfs exist Eval Prog his language ahh Asp speak
Ahhhh one man said, he has his language, he says

78. ‘Ēe repa, he aha tā’a re’o o ‘ou ka vānaŋa mai ena? ‘O ko ai tu’u henua
Voc person, Int Int your language Pos you Ctg speak Dir Dem? Disj Foc Int your island?
Hey man, what language are you speaking to me? Or, your island is whose?

79. Ahh mō’oku mo ko au pa’i te ra me’e ko ‘ui mai hakakauŋu mai i a au
Ahh for me Sub Foc I indeed Art Loc thing Foc ask Dir order Dir Prep Ps I
For me I am indeed the one to ask to order that I
80. Ahh pahono pa’i pahono te repa mo ‘ui mai. Tō’oku henua ko Rapa Nui
     Ahh answer indeed answer Art person Sub ask Dir. My island Foc Rapa Nui
     Ahh I answer indeed, answer the man questioning me. My island is Rapa Nui.

81. ‘E tō’oku re’o he re’o Rapa Nui ‘o he re’o mā’ori Rapa Nui.
And my language Ar language Rapa Nui Disj Art language native Polynesian Rapa Nui
And my language is Rapa Nui or the Rapa Nui Polynesian language.

82. Eee Eko pau te me’e mo aha mo (.) o te mana’u eko pau te mana’u
     Eee Neg complete Art thing Sub Int Sub Pos Art thought Neg complete Art thought
     The thoughts are not finished. The thoughts are not finished for.

83. mo aha yeah, I tu’u mai ki nei ’i roto te kona tā’atoa o Rapa Nui
     Sub Int yes, Prf arrive Dir Prep Dem Prep inside Art area all Pos Rapa Nui
     Yes, within all areas of Rapa Nui there has arrived

84. Ko uru mai ‘ā tū re’o ena he re’o Tire ’i roto. He oho ki roto
     Prf enter Dir Prog Dem language Dem Art language Chile Prep inside. Asp go Prep inside
     The Chilean language has entered. One goes inside

85. te hare monī he re’o Tire: he oho koe ki roto te municipalidad
     Art house money Art language Chile Asp go you Prep inside Art municipality
     the bank, Chilean language. You go within the municipality

86. ki te aro era, tū re’o ena he re’o Tire.
     Prep Art area Dem, Dem language Dem Art language Chilean
     to that area there, the language there is Chilean language.

87. He oho koe ki roto te hare ma’i ‘o ki roto te opitara, he re’o Tire. Yeah,
     Asp go you Prep inside Art house sick Disj Prep inside Art hospital, Art language Chile. Yes
     You go within the hospital You go within the hospital, it is Chilean language. Yes
88. Ko ʻuru mai ʻā ko te meʻe ena te meʻe ʻaʻaku ko mauui nei aue he haʻuru nei
   Prf enter Dir Prog Foc Art thing Dem Art thing mine Prf sick Dem wow Asp sleep Dem
   That thing has entered me and I am sick. Wow, I sleep and

89. He ʻara nei i te meʻe nei. He reʻo tumu o te henua ʻe he reʻo oʻoku.
   Asp wake Dem Prep Art thing Dem Art language tree Pos Art island and Art language mine
   awaken to this thing. The root language of the island is my language.

90. Eee na te pahono o tū meʻe raʻe ena ē repa ē.
   Eee Loc Art answer Pos Dem thing one Dem Voc person Voc.
   That is the answer of the first thing there man.

91. Yeah, kai ʻite hoʻi i te hora nei, huri atu huri atu
   Yes, Neg know indeed Prep Art hour Dem, turn Dir turn Dir
   Yeah, I do not truly know, there are different approaches

92. te ʻui a koe. Ko te ʻuiʻui mai ʻā a koe paʻi.
   Art question Ps you. Foc Art questions Dir Prog Ps you indeed.
   to your question. There are indeed many questions for you to ask.

93. Taŋata ke koe; taŋata ke au.
   Person different you; person different I.
   You are a different person; I am a differen person.

94. Manaʻu ke au; manaʻu ke koe.
   Thought different I; thought different you.
   My thoughts are different; your thoughts are different.

95. He aha tuʻu manaʻu i tū ʻui raʻe ena ʻui mai ena a koe?
   Int Int your thought Prep Dem question one Dem question Dir Dem Ps you?
   What are your thoughts regarding the first question you asked me?
96. T: Bueno, He haŋa potupotu nō tā’aku kī. He hoki mai ki te rāua potupotu era.
   Well, I want to only make a short statement. Return to their brief statement.

97. I tu’u mai ai e te Tire o tū vānaŋa kī ena a koe.
   Prf arrive Dir Dem Ag Art Chile Pos Dem discourse speak Dem Ps you.
   The arrrival by Chile that you mentioned.

98. Tu’u mai a Policarpo Toro ko ararua ko Atamu Tekena. Tātauro.
   Arrive Dir Ps Policarpo Toro Foc togther Foc Atamu Tekena. Sign.
   Policarpo Toro arrived together with Atamu Tekena. Signed.

99. ‘Ai kī era tātauro, hai tātauro.
   Dem speak Dem signiture, with crosses.
   The signitures mentioned, were signed with crosses.

100. I kī era ra nu’u i tuki tā era ’i ruŋa te parau.
    Prf speak Dem Loc people Prep point drawn Loc Prep upon Art paper.
    People stated points that were inscribed upon paper.

101. Tā’ana kī o Atamu Tekena, tātauro.
    His statement Pos Atamu Tekena Signed
    Atamu Tekena’s statement is signed

102. Paurō te nu’u era ’i ruŋa tātauro tahi. ‘E te Rapa Nui, i tā rō ‘ā
    Everyone Art people Dem Prep upon signed all. And Art Rapa Nui Prf draw Eval
    All of the people signed. And the Rapa Nui signed

103. i te ronoroŋo o rāua [te me’e. I tā rō ‘ā i te puka ’i ruŋa o te roŋo.
    Prog Prep Art message Pos they Art thing. Prf draw Eval Prog Prep upon Pos Art message
the document of them. Upon the book they signed.

104. K:  

[E pa’i  
Indeed  
Indeed

105. T:  
I tā ro ‘ā i te puka ‘i ruŋa o te Makemake. Kai e’a etahi manu ’i ruŋa.  
Prf draw Eval Prog Prep Art book Prep upon Pos Art God. Neg leave one man Prep upon  
It was signed upon the Bible. Not one signature was left out.

106. ’Ina etahi kona era ’i ruŋa. Tuki tahi hai tātauro.  
Neg one land Dem Prep upon. Point all with signature.  
There was not one land upon [the document]. All signed.

107. Pe ira tō’oku mana’u e kī nei aŋarina Atamu tātauro.  
Like Dem my thought Ipf speak Dem today Atamu signed  
Thus my thought, that I speak today, is that Atamu signed.

Elders signed. Hito signed of those people.

109. Tuki ‘i ruŋa i te parau. O tū ana kī ena a au (.5)  
Point Prep upon Prep Art paper. Pos Dem Mod speak Dem Ps I  
Signed upon the paper. Of him it was said, I

110. Pe nei kī ai a koe, he hoa kōrua. Hahini mai mo mātou.  
Like Dem speak Dem Ps you, Art friend you. Bring together Dir Ben we.  
You, you all are friends. Come join us.
111. I avai atu te kaiŋa mo, mo hapa’o kōrua i te mātou kaiŋa
Prf give Dir Art land Ben, Ben care for you Prep Art we land
Land is given to care for you upon our land

112. porque he hoa tātou o te pikipo era o Tahiti i kī mai pe nei.
Because Art friend we Pos Art bishop Dem Pos Tahiti Prf speak Dir like Dem
because we are all friends to the bishop of Tahiti it was said.

113. ‘e a kōrua he rivariva mo hapa’o ia [mātou. E ai rō ‘ā
And Ps you Asp good Ben care for Prep we Ipf exist eval Prog
It is good for you all to care for us. There exists

114. K: [Ko Tepano Jaussen era
Foc Tepano Jaussen Dem
[It was Tepano Jaussen

115. T: tō’ona here ’i ruŋa o kōrua hai a ara era o te hakatere o te
his bond Prep upon Pos you with a way Dem Pos art direct Pos Art
his bond upon you all, with the way of the

116. te atua Catolica ra hau eee he aŋa i ruŋa o te parau ki ruŋa.
Art God Catholic Loc government Asp work Prep upon Pos Art paper Prep upon
the Catholic God  government is built upon the document.

117. He ra’au kōrua i te nu’u nei kōrua i te nu’u nei.
Art medicine you Prep Art people Dem you Prep Art people Dem
There is medicine for you because of these people here.

118. He aha te me’e aŋa? Hai ka tuki ’i ruŋa i te parau ko etoru mahana. He aha
Int Int Art thing work? With ka point Prep upon Prep Art paper Foc three day. Int Int
What is the consequence? With the signitures upon the paper three days
119. He aha tahi mai te tupuna he puru.
   Int int all Dir Art acestor Asp close.
   Everything of the ancestors was imprisoned.

120. Ko tū vānaŋa ena e koe. I puru ai Haŋa Roa
   Foc Dem speech Dem Ag you. Prf close Dem Haŋa Roa
   As you said. Haŋa Roa was imprisoned.

121. Ahh ehhh ‘ina kai tano ki te puru.
   Ahh ehhh Neg Neg moral prep Art close.
   Ahh ehh It is not moral the imprisonment.

122. Ko haŋa ri’ari’a te puru eee. He aha?
   Prf want frighten Art close eee. Int Int
   Imprisonment was wanted to frighten. Why?

123. Ko te pua’a hakahoki mai ena he to’o tahi e rāua (.) o rāua ahh
   Prf Art cattle make return Dir Dem Asp take all Ag they Pos they ahh
   The cattle returned, all were taken by them, of them

124. He aha haka’ou ki tetahi me’e? Nu’u tuai ko tuai a nei.
   Int Int again Prep some thing? People old Foc old Pos Dem
   What is another thing? Old folks, old folks here

125. To’o mai te nu’u he hoa ki te hare ma’i. Kai ma’i.
   Take Dir Art people Asp friend Prep Art house sick. Neg sick.
   are taken and thrown in to the hospital. They are not sick.

126. ‘E he tu’u ki te (. ) ho’e tautini iva hanere toru ahuru ma toru.
   And Asp arrive Prep Art one thousand nine hundred three ten and three.
   And upon the arrival of the year 1933.
He kī ‘ā te hora nei to’o mai tātou he pāpa‘i te henua nei
Asp speak Prog Art hour Dem take Dir we Asp write Art island Dem
It is now said that we are all taken; the land is registered

'i rote hare pāpa‘i o te kai nga i te ao
Prep inside house write Pos Art land Prep art world.

Within the Office of Registering lands of the world

Viene Riesen te iŋoa. To’o mai he pāpa‘i ’i roto
Viene Riesen Art name. Take Dir Asp write Prep inside
Viene Riesen is the name. [The island] is registered within.

‘e ka ono ahuru ma toru matahiti o te anja
And Num six ten and three years Pos Art work
Sixty three years since the making

o te tratado Atamu Tekena (1.0) tātauro ararua Policrpo Toro
Pos Art treaty Atamu Tekena signed together Policarpo Toro
of the treaty Atamu Tekena signed together with Policarpo Toro

‘I te Tire ka mana’u iho to’o ho’i i oho mai
Prep Art Chile Ctg thought Dir take indeed Prf go Dir
It is thought Chile indeed came and took [the island]

Ka ha’a iho i ra hora he toke te henua kī haŋa te hora.
Ctg Caus Dir Prep Loc hour Asp steal Art island speak manner Art hour.
At that time the island is taken it is said at that era.
Pos Int Speak Sub steal? Eeee Pos Art Bishop Chile one. Foc Eduarto his name  
Of whom is it said took it? The Chilean Bishop. Eduarto is his name.

135. He kī ‘ā to’o mai te pāpa’i porque  
Asp state Prog take Dir Art write because  
It is said he took and signed [the document] because

136. e ai ro ‘ā etahi huru o te nu’u i te kaokao e haŋa ‘ā ki Rapa Nui.  
Ipr exist Eval Prog one kind Pos Art people Prep Art side Ipf want Prog Prep Rapa Nui  
there was another group of people that wanted Rapa Nui.

137. He to’o mai he toke he pāpa’i te henua  
Asp take Dir Asp steal Asp write Art island.  
The island is is acquired, stolen, and registered.

138. Ehhh aŋarina kī tahi ‘ā pa’i e koe i te vānaŋa, pura hokotahi era,  
Ehhh today speak all Prog indeed Ag you Prep Art talk. Pure one Dem  
Today it is always said indeed to you because of the talk of one person,

139. ’I hē te parau? Mo ai te henua?  
Prep Int Art paper? Bep Int Art land?  
Where is the paper? For whom is the land?

140. I iho ‘ā mo tō’oku me’e mō’oku ko au, kī au, I piri mai ai,  
Prf recent Prog Ben my thing mine Foc I, speak I, Prf join  
Recently, for my thing for me, I say I encountered

141. ‘e mahana toru i turu au ki te turu tō’oku henua tupuna.  
And day three Prf descend I Prep Art descend my land ancestor  
Wednesday I went down, down to my ancestral land.
142. ‘E na “M” au i noho ai ka ono ahuru matahiti o’oku piti ahuru ma piti

And Loc “M” I Prf reside Dem Num six ten year mine two ten and two.
at “M.” I am Sixty years old on the twenty-second

143. o te ava’e nei ‘ā tātou ko Ruti. Te me’e ra’e ira kona

Pos Art month Dem Prog we Foc November. Art thing first Loc area
of this month of us November. The first person at that land

144. i noho ai he tupuna etahi ko “H.”

Prf reside Dem Art ancestor one Foc “H”
that lived there is an ancestor named “H”.

145. Ehhh “H.” he noho ararua ko te taŋata ko “E”

Ehhh “H” Asp reside together Foc Art man Foc “E”
Ehhh “H” lived with the man named “E”

146. Mai roto i poreko ai a “R”. I poreko mai a “R”

Dir inside Prf born Dem Ps “R”. Prf born Dir Dir Ps “R”
From them was born “R”. From “R”

147. he poreko mai a “N” ko au “N”

Asp born Dir Ps “N” Foc I “N”
“N” was born. I am “N”

148. Ehh ra ŋa nu’u [?]

Ehh Loc Pl people
Ehh those people

149. He titi te henua. I aŋa i te hare ‘i roto i ma’u mai nei

Asp fence Art land. Prf work Prep Art house Prep inside bring Dir Dem
The land is fenced. A house was built inside I brought here
mo tā’aku poki. ‘E tu’u mai i tū űna nu’u Tire era
Ben my child. And arrive Dir Prep Dem Pl people Chile Dem
For my child. That Chilean I spoke of to you arrived

he kī atu ki a koe, ‘ina o te fisco te henua e haŋu (1.0).
Asp speak Dir Prep Ps you, Neg Pos Art state Art land Voc boy
and said, no, the land belongs to the Chilean state boy.

Oirá me’e nei kī atu ena tā’a kī testimonio o me’e u’i mata mo
Thus thing Dem speak Dir Dem your speak testimony Pos thing look eye Sub
Thus, this thing is stated, your stated testimony of the thing to look at, for

u’i kōrua a mu’a ka oho ena ta’e ho’i aŋarina o te ture ‘apo.
look you Pos before Ctg go Dem Neg indeed today or Art fight tomorrow
you all to look at until today or the fight tomorrow.

I te me’e a’aku mo hakahoki atu ko tū vānaŋa a tāua
Prep Art hing my Sub cause to return Dir Foc Dem talk Ps we
My thing for returning to our conversation

‘Ina hakaroŋoroŋo potopoto nō
Neg make message short Eval
I am not making a short answer indeed.

I hoki mai te rua me’e. Ma au i te vānaŋa
Prf return Dir Art second thing. Ben I Prep Art talk.
To return to the second thing. For me to talk.
1. F: E koro, pō nui koro. (5.0) He ‘a‘amu tāua ‘i roto o te mātou (background noise)
Voc father, night big father. Art discussion we Prep within Pos our
Father, good evening father. We are to discuss our

2. te ‘a’amu o te kāiŋa o Rapa Nui. (.5) Te ‘ui he tai’o etahi. Pahono.(1.0)
Art discussion of Art land of Rapa Nui. Art question Asp read one. Answer.
Story of the land of Rapa Nui. The first question to read. Answer.

3. Mahana toru (.5) he ono Hora Iti (.5) matahiti (.5) piti tautini va’u.(1.0)
Day three Art sixth August year two thousand eight
Answer. Wednesday, the sixth of August, 2008

4. Te me’e nei ko kī atu ena he vānaŋa parauti’a. (3.0) ‘Ua ra’e. (3.0) Te henua
Art thing Dem Prf say Dir Dem Art talk true. Question one. Art island
This that is to have been said is the truth. The first question. The island

5. nei (.5) ko Rapa Nui o tō mātou ariki (.5) mātou ariki era ko Hotu Matu’a (.5)
Dem Foc Rapa Nui of Pos our chief our chief Dem Foc Hotu Matu’a
Here, Rapa Nui, is of our chief our chief Hotu Matu’a

6. ‘e ko Ava Rei Pua. (.5) He poreko te ŋa pokii o te ariki a Hotu Matu’a (.5)
And Foc Ava Rei Pua. Asp born Art Pl child Pos Art chief Ps Hotu Matu’a
and Ava Rei Pua. Children were born of the chief Hotu Matu’a

7. tā’ana vi’e ko Vakai o Hiva.
his wife Foc Vakai of Hiva.
and his wife Vakai of Hiva.

8. He poreko tako’a te pokii a te ariki vahine ko Ava Rei Pua. Tā’ana kenu
Asp born also Art child of Art chief woman Foc Ava Rei Pua. Her husband
Children were also born by the chiefess Ava Rei Pua, and her
9. ko Tu’u Ko Iho. He vahi te ariki o Hotu Matu’a i te henua a te vaeŋa. Etahi Foc Tu’u Ko Iho. Art divide Art chief Pos Hotu Matu’a Prep Art island of Art half. One husband Tu’u Ko Iho. Hotu Matu’a divided the island in half. One

10. paeŋa o te henua ki te ariki o Hotu Matu’a. Etahi paeŋa ki a Ava Rei Pua ki side Pos Art island Prep Art chief Pos Hotu Matu’a. One side Prep Ps Ava Rei Pua Prep half of the island to the chief Hotu Matu’a. One half to Ava Rei Pua

11. tō’ona taina vahine he ariki tako’a. He porekoreko he oho mai te ηa poki ki his sibling female Art chief also. Asp born Asp go Dir Art Pl children Sub his female sibling is a chief also. Children are born and arrive to

12. aŋarina (.5) piti tautini va’u. ‘I a mātou e ora nō ana na today two thousand eight. Dem Ps we Imp live Eval Prog Loc today 2008. We will continue to live

13. ‘e i porekoreko nō ana te poki o te Rapa Nui. Ko mau ‘ana. (2.0) and Prf born Eval Prog Art children Pos Art Rapa Nui. Prf finished properly Prog and give birth to the children of Rapa Nui. Properly finished.

14. M: Pe ira ‘ēe nua ‘ēe?
Like that Voc mother Voc
Like that mother?

15. F: E ho’i.
Indeed
Indeed.

16. M: Yeah, he toke e te Tire i te henua o te Rapa Nui,
Yeah, Asp steal Ag Art Chile Prep Art island Pos Art Rapa Nui,
Yeah, the island of Rapa Nui was stolen by Chile
17. he papa’i ki ruŋa, ki ruŋa ki te iŋoa o te (.5) te Tire Fiko
Asp write Prep upon, Prep upon Prep Art name Pos Art Art Chile Fiscal
Upon it was inscribed the name of the Chilean state.

18. He toke tako’a e te Tire i te taŋata Rapa Nui
Asp stolen also Ag Art Chile Prep Art people Rapa Nui.
The Rapa Nui people were also stolen by Chile.

19. He papa’i (1.0) ki ruŋa ki te carnet nei ‗e ki ruŋa ki te pasaporte, he kī, he Tire.
Asp write Prep upon Prep identification Dem and Prep upon Prep Art passport, Asp say, Art Chile
It is written upon the identification card, and upon the passport, it says, Chile

20. ‘Ina kai ‘ui ki te mana’u o te taŋata Rapa Nui ‘o ‘o te vi’e Rapa Nui.
Neg Neg ask Prep Art thought of Art men Rapa Nui Dis Dis Art women Rapa Nui
[Chile] did not ask for the opinión of Rapa Nui men or women.

21. I toke ro ai i te taŋata i te rāua ta’e ‘ite.
Prf steal Eval Dem Prep Art person Rel Art they Neg know
The people were robbed because they lacked knowledge.

22. Hē aha te me’e karnet nei? He aha te me’e pasaporte?
Int Int Art thing identification Dem? Int Int Art thing passport?
What is the identification card? What is the passport?

23. ’I aŋarina e aŋiaŋi ai pe nei ‘ēe. He toke ana ho’i te Tire i te
Prep today Ipf understand Dem Like Dem Voc. Asp steal Prog indeed Art Chile Prep Art
Today it is understood like this. Chile indeed robs the people

24. taŋata a ruŋa i te carnet nei, a ruŋa i te pasaporte. ‘E ko mau ‗ā.
person Pos above Prep identification Dem, Pos above Pre Art passport. Voc Prf complete Prog
with the identification card and upon the passport. Properly finished.
25. F: Te toru. (5.0) He parau o te Tire ’i roto o te hua’ai.
Art third. Art paper Pos Art Chile Prep inside Pos Art extended family.
The third. The paper of Chile within the family.

26. Ka noho ra. (3.0) ‘O te Tire (.5) he obliga ki te taŋata Rapa Nui (1.0)
Mod reside Loc Pos Art Chile Asp obligates Prep Art person Rapa Nui
Wait. Chile obligates the Rapa Nui people

27. mo to’o i te parau nei e kī nei i rote re’o Tire Te Titulo Domino. (2.0)
Sub take Prep Art paper Dem Ipf say Dem Prep inside language Chille Art Titulo Dominio
to acquire this paper called in Chilean the Titulo Dominio.

28. ’Ina he tano ki te taŋata Rapa Nui (.5) te parau nei (.5)
Neg Asp moral Prep Art person Rapa Nui Art paper Dem
It is not just to the Rapa Nui people this paper

29. e avai mai nei e te Tire (.5) ki te hua’ai. A mātou te Rapa Nui (2.0)
Ipf give Dir Dem Ag Art Chile Prep Art family. Ps us Art Rapa Nui
given by Chile to the families. We Rapa Nui

30. mai a Hotu Matu’a ki aŋarina, he ŋa poki te ariki.
Dir Ps Hotu Matu’a Prep today, Art Pl children Art chief
from Hotu Matu’a until today, children of the chief.

Foc us Art island Dem Foc Rapa Nui. Foc complete Prog.
Rapa Nui is our land. Properly finished.

32. M: ‘Ēe::: (1.0) tō mātou mana’u (6.0), tō matou mana’u (1.0)
Yes Pos we thought, Pos we thought
Yes ahhh our thought, our thought is, we are native Rapa Nui

33. he mā’ori Rapa Nui mātou o te moana nui o Hiva. Ko mau ‘ā.
Art native Rapa Nui we Pos Art ocean great Pos Hiva. Foc complete Prog.
we are Rapa Nui of Polynesia. Properly finished.

34. F: Eha. ‘Ēe, e aŋiaŋi nō ‘ana mātou tō mātou kāiŋa ’i te hora nei.
Four. Yes, Imp understand Eval Prog we Pos we land Prep Art hour Dem.
Four. Yes, we are understanding our lands now.

In the second half of the ten minute recording the couple proceeds to discuss details of
each of their genealogies and the ancestral lands they claim given their respective
genealogies. The recording concludes as the couple sings parts of traditional songs
about the land and life of Rapa Nui.
TRANSCRIPT #5

1. F: Tō’oku mana’u ra’e pa’i o te hau ki Hiva (1.5)
   My thought first indeed of the government to Hiva
   My first thought indeed of the government to Hiva

2. M: Hmmm
   Hmmm
   Hmmm

3. F: Omoaŋa. (1.5) Yeah, (5.0) ho’e ahuru pa’i e:: ahhh ariki ma’ahu
   Omoaŋa. Yeah, one ten indeed e:: ahhh chiefs ma’ahu
   Omoaŋa. Yeah, indeed ten eeeahhh high chiefs

4. M: Ho’e ahuru arkiki ma ‘ahu
   One ten chiefs ma’ahu
   Ten high chiefs.

5. F: Ariki Matuŋi te (?)
   Chief Matuŋi Art
   Chief Matuŋi

6. M: Matuŋi
   Matuŋi
   Matuŋi

7. F: ‘Ēe Ariki Matuŋi te ŋa nu’u nei. Yeah, he oho mai. (2.0) Me’e
   Yes Chief Matuŋi Art Pl people dem. Yeah, Asp go Dir. Thing Art expert five
   Yes, Chief Matuŋi is of these people. Yeah, [he] came. There are five native leaders

8. he: mā’ori (1.0) hokorima. Erima mā’ori. ‘E ŋa mā’ori he kohu tohu.
   Five experts. And Pl expert Art kohu tohu
Five native leaders. And the native leaders are of the Kohu Tohu class.

   Kohu Tohu
   Kohu Tohu

10. F: Hmmm. Te ēa nu’u he mā’ori ‘e ēa mā’ori he kohu tohu.
    Hmmm. Art Pl people Art expert and Dem expert Art kohu tohu.
    Hmmm. These people are native experts, native experts of the Kohu Tohu class.

11. Profesion. Ata superior. Yeah, ‘e:: he mā’ori kohu tohu
    Profesional, Deg superior. And Art chief ma’ahu
    Professional, of the highest class. And they are Kohu Tohu

12. ‘E he ariki:: (1.5) ma’ahu.
    Profesional, Deg superior. And Art chief ma’ahu
    Professional, of the highest class. And they are high chiefs

    Ma’ahu
    Ma’ahu

14. F: Ariki ma’ahu ananake. Yeah, (1.0) ko: Dēraŋi (3.0) ko Pō
    High chiefs together. Yeah, Foc Dēraŋi, Foc Pō
    They too are high chiefs. Yes, Dēraŋi, Pō

15. M: Ko Pō, he aha te [apellido ko Pō?
    Pō, Art Int Art surname Foc Pō?
    Pō, What is the surname Pō?
16. F: [ko Heŋa iŋoa ho’i ‘ana ko Pō.]
   Foc Heŋa Name indeed Prog Foc Pō
   Heŋa, indeed the name is going to be Pō.

   Pō indeed egg.
   Indeed Pō, idiot.

18. F: ‘Ēe, ko Heŋa, (2.0) yeah te principal o te rāua ko Moe Hiva.
   Yes, Foc Heŋa, yeah Art first Pos Art Pro Foc Moe Hiva.
   Yes, Heŋa, yeah the first of them is Moe Hiva.

19. M: (?) Ara o te ehhh
    (?) Path Pos Art ehhh
    Descendent of … ehh

20. F: Da nu’u nei.
    Pl people Dem.
    Of these people.

    Pl people Dem
    Of these people.

22. F: Moe Hiva. (1.0) Ko Moe Hiva, ko Ďeraŋi, ko Pō, ko Heŋa.
    Moe Hiva. Moe Hiva, Ďeraŋi, Pō, Heŋa,

23. E ai ro ‘ā etahi kape hakaou. Yeah o te kape nei pa’i eeeh (1.0) ’i ’i ruŋa
    Imp exist Eval one person also. Yeah Pos Art person Dem indeed eeeh Prep upon
    There exists one person more. Of this person indeed upon
24. M: ‘E i ruŋa pa’i ŋa; i ŋa: nu’u.
   And Prep upon indeed Pl, Prep Pl people
   And indeed upon them, these people

25. F: ‘A’ana ‘i ruŋa te tohu tako’a ki a ‘Otu ‘Uta pe nei pe mu’a te kaiŋa.
   Pos Pro Prep upon Art tohu also Prep Pos ‘Out ‘Uta like Dem like before Art land
   He is high class also until ‘Otu ‘Uta is upon the land

26. ka oho ena he eke te pari. He (?) te kaiŋa he eke e pīera te tāŋata.
   Ctg go Dem Asp rise upon Art surf. Asp (?) Art land Asp rise upon Num thousand Art people
   Then the surf rose. (?) the land, rose upon a thousand people.

27. ‘I nei a e te kope nei (.5) e kī ro ai i tu’u era ki te roa era i ai
   Prep Dem Ps Ag Art person Dem Ipf say Eval exist Prf Dem Prep Art long Dem Ipf exist
   Thereupon this person here, it is said arrived long ago

28. E e ha’amata era me’e profesia pa’i e ha’amata era ra me’e
   Ipf Ipf begin Dem thing prophecy indeed Ipf begin Dem Loc thing
   The prophecy started, indeed began, that person

29. ‘e tu’u a Hotu Matu’a ‘i nei (1.0)
   And arrived Ps Hotu Matu’a Prep Dem
   Hotu Matu’a arrived here.

30. M: Hotu Matu’a na
   Hotu Matu’a Loc
   Hotu Matu’a is there.

   Yes Pos Matu’a Prep Dem. Two also remain
   Yes Matu’a is here. Two are left
32. Yeah A Aroi pe kī pe nei tu’u he kī pe nei
   Yea Ps Aroi like said like Dem arrived Asp say like Dem
   Yeah Roroi as said here arrived [it] is said here

33. ko Roroi o Roroi te hakaere pēera o te kuma.
   Foc Roroi Pos Roroi Art left thousands Pos Art sweet potato
   Roroi it is said arrived and left thousands of sweet potato

34. Taŋaroa, Ata Raŋa (3.0) Ko Ta’ana (3.0) Ko Ta’ana
   Taŋaroa, Ata Raŋa Foc Ta’ana Foc Ta’ana
   Taŋaroa, Ata Raŋa, Ta’ana, Ta’ana

35. pa’i te matu’a o:: o Matu’a ko Matu’a Ata Raŋa
   indeed Art father of of Matu’a Foc Matu’a Ata Raŋa
   indeed is the father of Matu’a, Matu’a Ata Raŋa

36. ko Hotu ma a Matu’a eehh (2.0) [ta
   Foc Hotu Sub Ps Matu’a ehh [ta
   Hotu Matu’a eehh.

37. M:                         [Bueno, te me’e tā’atou ena
                               [Good, Art thing all Dem
                               [Well, all theses things

38. Ņa me’e tā’atou ena ehhh me’e he oho Ņa mo tū ‘ui mai ‘ā Forrest?
   Pl thing all Dem ehh thing Asp go Pl Sub Dem question Dem Ps Forrest?
   these things, all these things are going to that question of Forrrest?

       Yes.
       Yes.
40. M: ‘Ēe
   Yes.
   Yes.

41. F: Yeah, ʻa hoʻi te nuʻu pahono rurutu qualquiera te meʻe ena.
   Yeah, Pl indeed Art people answer recitied sort Art thing Dem
   Yes, indeed these people recited are part of the answer to that thing there.

42. M: E paʻi.
   Indeed
   Indeed.

43. F: Te haʻa aʻoʻoku ki te tāua meʻe nei, ka oho rivariva mai, mai he te tumu?
   Art desire Pro Prep Asp our thing Dem, Ctg go good Dir, Dir Int Art source?
   The thing I desire [regarding] our thing, to go well, from what source?

44. Pe he tuʻu mai ai ki Rapa Nui te ariki mo vahi ʻi te kaiʻa?
   How arrived Dir Dem Prep Rapa Nui Art chief Sub divide
   Upon arrival to Rapa Nui how did the chief divide the land?

45. O te ariki pe te kaiʻa e vahi (1.0)
   Pos Art chief like Art land Imp divide
   Of the chief the land to divide.

46. M: E hoʻi.
   Indeed.
   Indeed.

47. F: Yeah, 'i roto o te parautiʻa taʻe o te ariki ehhh e vahi raʻe.
   Yeah, Prep inside Pos Ar truth not Pos Art chief ehhh Imp divide first
   Yeah, the truth is it is not the chief who divides the island first.
48. 'A ai e vahi ra’e mo te mata o te aŋata hokorua taŋata
   Pos Int Imp divide first Sub Art Tribe of Art people two groups people
   Who was responsible for first dividing the tribes of the two groups of people

49. to’o mai ararua? He vahi kaiŋa pe e Tu’u Aro Ko te Mata Nui
   take Dir together, Asp divide territory as Tu’u Aro Foc Art Mata Nui
   taken together? The island was divided as Tu’u Aro of the greater tribe

50. ko tu’u Hotu Iti, Ko Mata iti he aŋata ra ŋa a Ko Roroi.
   Foc arrived Hotu Iti, Foc Mata iti Asp people loc Pl Ps Foc Roroi
   And Tu’u Hotu Iti of the smaller tribe, the people of Roroi.

51. Oira te aŋata tā’atoa nō kona Rapa Nui
   Thus Art people all Eval area Rapa Nui.
   Consequently, there was Rapa Nui land for all of the people.

52. ‘E bueno mo ariki ’e bueno mo dueño ’e bueno mo
   And good Sub chief and good for dominion and good sub
   And this is good for the chief and good for dominion and good for

53. M: E pa’i
   Indeed.
   Indeed.

54. F: mo moe. ‘Eko piri etahi problema, itiiti hupehupe ha’uru mai era
   Sub sleep neg meet one problem, small lazy sleep Dir Dem
   for sleep. There was not one problem; few lazy people resided there.

55. i tū ŋa aŋata era ararua ko ai ata ka mita te henua
   Prf Dem Pl people Dem together Foc exists Deg Ctg divide Art island
   Together those people divided the island.
56. ka uno. (1.0) Hai ra vahiŋa era o ra ŋa aŋata ararua, (. ) i tu’u mai era
Num one With Loc Division Dem Pos Dem Pl people together, Ipf arrive Dir Dem
First point. With that division, the people and

57. i:: noho era te ariki. I tano era te hora te historia pa’i hakapotupotu nō
Prf reside Dem Art chief Prf proper Dem Art hour Art history indeed make pieces Eval
the chief resided. In this historic era the sections [of land] were divided justly

58. mai ‘ā e tano era te hora noho e te ariki observa,
Dir Prog Imp proper Dem Art hour reside Ag Art chief observed,
The chief observed the way of life at this time as just,

59. e observa era he oho he u’i pe nei ravaiŋa era
Imp observe Dem Asp go Asp look like Dem manner Dem
[He] observed, [he] went and looked at the manner [of the sections]

60. o ra ŋa ararua he peti etahi. Ah ra to’o mai te ariki,
or Loc Pl together Art peach one. Ah Loc acquire Dir Art chief,
collectively as a great thing. The chief acquired things

61. He vahivahi hakaou i te kaiŋa ’i rote ra ŋa mata ararua nunui era. Kai etahi
Asp divide again Prep Art territory Prep within Dir Pl tribe together big Dem. Neg one
He also divided again the land within the large tribes together. Not one

62. M: Bue, bue, bue pa’i
Goo[d], goo[d], goo[d] indeed.
Goo[d], goo[d], goo[d] indeed.

63. F: Haka, hakarikiriki
Make, make smaller.
Make, make smaller.
64. M: Hakarikiriki
   Make smaller.
   Make smaller.

65. F: E ho‘i. Yeah, oira ho‘i i kī era he Mata Nuinui, he ra te meʻe Mata Itiiti. A au
   Indeed. Yeah, thus indeed Prf say Dem Art Mata Nuinui, Asp Loc Asp thing Mata Itiiti. Ps I
   Indeed. Yeah, thus indeed it is said there Mata Nuinui, that thing Mata Iti-iti. I

66. ho‘i kata ʻā au hermano “J” i niuniu hakaroŋo ataiŋa aŋarina o “X” e kī era
   Indeed laughing Eval Prog Ps I brother call make heard Deg today Pos “X” Imp say Dem
   Indeed I am laughing at brother “J” who called today to hear more of what X is saying

67. pe nei a rāua he Mata Raʻā. Eko piri mai ai puna ariki.
   Like Dem Ps them Art Mata Raʻā Neg meet Dir Dem stream chief.
   like this that they are Mata Raʻā. [They] are not within the line of chiefs.

68. Pero mo oho, mo hāpī rivariva te rāua papatupuna,
   But sub go, Sub study well Art they “great uncle” Neg Art Mata Raʻā Eval Prog Ps “J”
   But [he] should go and study this well with his “great uncle”,

69. taʻe he Mata Raʻā no ʻā a “J”. He aŋi hoʻi Mata Raʻā eh aŋarina.
   Neg Art Mata Raʻā Eval Prog Ps “J”. Asp understand indeed Mata Raʻā eh today.
   “J” is not Mata Raʻā. Mata Raʻā is indeed understood today.

70. M: Bueno
   Good.
   Good.

71. F: Pero tō‘ona mata mau hoʻi Tupa Hotu i oho mai ena
   But his tribe true indeed Tupa Hotu Prf go Dir Dem.
   But his true clan is indeed Tupa Hotu that he came from.
72. M: Tetahi nunui he te me’e a
Some big Art Art thing of
Some very big thing of

73. F: Tetahi ŋa nu’u tā’atoa nei taŋata nei ‘ā, ‘a ‘ana e te haito i te vaikava
Some Pl people al Dem people Dem Prog, Pos Pro Ag Art measure Prep Art ocean
Something of all of these people, of him the navigation of the ocean.

74. M: Ko ai ŋa me’e?
Foc Int Pl thing?
Who is the one?

75. F: Ko Moe Hiva.
Foc Moe Hiva.
Moe Hiva.

76. M: Ko Moe Hiva, yeah
Foc Moe Hiva, yeah
Moe Hiva, yeah.

77. F: Yeah, a ia he ma’ori he Kohu Tohu, a ia he ariki ma ‘ahu
Yeah, Ps him Art expert Art Kohu Tohu, Ps him Art chief ma’ahu
Yeah, he is an expert of the Kohu Tohu class. He is a high chief.

78. M: Ko ia yeah te me’e tā’atoa ena
Foc him yeah Art thing all Dem
He is the one of all them.

79. F: ‘Ēe, Superior o te superior ho’i o te ŋa nu’u nei ‘ā.
Yes, Superior Pos Art superior indeed Pos Art Pl people Dem Prog
Yes, the superior of the superior indeed of the people here.
80. M: E ho‘i.
   Indeed
   Indeed.

81. F: Yeah, a ‘ana nei i ruŋa pe nei, ka oho ena pe mu’a.
   Yeah, Pos him Dem Prep Loc like Dem, Ctg go Dem like before
   Yeah, of him here upon this, went before.

82. M: Pe mu’a pa‘i.
   Like before indeed.
   Like before indeed.

83. F: E ho‘i. He pari. He eke te vai, he eke mai.
   Indeed. Art wave. Asp rise upon Art water. Asp rise upon Dir

84. M: He eke mai te vai.
   Asp rise upon Dir Art water.
   Brought forth the water here.

85. F: Te vai ki ruŋa i te kaiŋa. (4.0) He oko i te pīera te taŋata.
   Art water Prep Dir Prep Art territory. Asp seize Prep Art thousands Art people.
   The water came upon the land. It seized thousands of people.

86. M: Pīera te taŋata
   Thousands Art people
   Thousands of people.

87. F: Ummhmm pīera eh te taŋata.
   Ummhmm thousands eh Art people.
   Ummmmhmm thousands of people.
Discussion continues approximately two minutes more, along the same theme with no further discussion of my questions explicitly. Another recording shortly followed was provided that is a monologue of the wife which further elaborates the role of Hotu Matu’a in the land divisions. The wife also details her own genealogy and provides accounts of her own genealogical relationship to ancestral lands.
TRANSCRIPT #6

1. **V:** No, primero ‘a’amu he aha te kōrua mana’u ’i ruŋa te, No, first discussion Int Int Art your thought Prep upon Art, No, the first discussion is what is your thought regarding


3. He aha te kōrua mana’u o te Titulo Dominio i avai mai ai e te hau? Int Int Art your thought Pos Art Titulo Dominio Prf given Dir Dem Ag Art government? What is your thought of the Title system given by the government?

4. [Porque he he Because Asp Asp Because

5. **T:** [Bueno mau ho’i, Titulo Dominio, ‘ina etahi valor Good truly indeed, Titulo Dominio, Neg one value Well truly, the Title System, lacks value.

6. **K:** Dominio o rāua te rāua dominio Dominio Pos them Art their dominio The Title System is of them, it’s their Title System.

7. **T:** No: Ka mou e [X] ē, ‘ina etahi tit valor o te Titulo Dominio, No Mod silent Voc [X] Voc Neg one tit value Pos Titulo Dominio No Be quiet, there is no value of the Title System,

8. hakakore ‘ā tātou (.) i te (.) hakatere Rapa Nui me’e te ha’amata ki remove Prog we Rel Art to govern Rapa Nui thing Art to begin Sub we should remove it in order for Rapa Nui to begin to govern
9. te hope’a. O sea, te significa ka topa ‘ā te henua o te Tire mo ira ra me’e.
Art best. That is, Art meaning Ctg fall Prog Art island Pos Art Chile Sub Dem thing.
best. If the land of Chileans collapsed, then that would be the significance.

10. V: ’Oira ho’i ki hē? Dominion ‘ā i te henua Rapa Nui, i te taŋata
Thus indeed Prep Int? Dominion Prog Prep Art island Rapa Nui, Prep Art people
Thus indeed to where? Island dominion to Rapa Nui, to the

11. Rapa Nui, i te me’e ta’atoa, ahh ha’a (.) cultura Rapa Nui i te
Rapa Nui, Prep Art thing all, ahh Caus culture Rapa Nui Prep Art
Rapa Nui people, to everything, ahh Rapa Nui culture

12. T: [Yeah, ka rua ka rua te me’e mo vānaŋa (3.0) He pahi!  
Yeah, the second the second thing to discuss (3.0) A ship!
Yeah, the second thing to discuss: a ship!

13. ’Ina he pahi o te o te estado.
Neg Asp ship Pos Art Pos Art state
There is no ship of the state.

14. V: ‘Oira I hē tū pahi i oho mai?
Thus, Prep Int Dem ship Prf go Dir?
Thus Where is that ship coming from?

15. T: ‘O te muni, o te muni te pahi
Pos Art municipality, Pos Art municipality Art ship
Of the municipality, the ship is of the municipality

16. K: [particular
particular
particular
17. T: Te estado, (1.0) 'ī na he manera o Rapa Nui. (2.5) 'Ī te vānaŋa importante
   The state is not a manner of Rapa Nui people. This is important to say.

18. [slaps table] ha'amata o te o te hau era mo te Tire mo kī atu ena
   To begin the government for Chile, for saying

19. Ta: No, e ai ro 'ā te me'e 'e ko ai haka'ou te henua o te Rapa Nui
   No the thing exists and the thing is to exist again on Rapa Nui.

20. (mo ? ) o rāua necesita te Rapa Nui
   (For) them, the Rapa Nui, it is necessary.

21. T: Hey, ka mou koe i te vānaŋa ki tā’aku vānaŋa pe ira tātou ta’e titika
   Hey, you quiet the speech until my speech is [finished]. Like that and we are not straight.

22. te vānaŋa o te vānaŋa ena vānaŋa no etahi kamiare haka’ou kamiare
   The speech of, the speech, speak only one at a time change and change again

23. He oho e marere i te reunión i te () 'ī na he titika.
   At the meeting [speech] was scattered, it was not straight.
24. V: E pa’i
   Indeed
   Indeed

25. N: [ ? ]

26. V: E ho’i ē nua ‘ē
   Indeed Voc elder woman Voc
   Indeed elder woman yes.

27. N: [?]

28. V: No, ka vānaŋa tātou, ’ina he problema
   No, Mod speek togeher, Neg Art problem.
   No, we can speak together, it is not a problem.

29. T: Pe ira
   Like Dem
   Like that.

30. V: Importante nō he responde i te vānaŋa. He aha te significa
   Importante Eval Asp respond Prep Art speech. Int Int Art meaning
   No, it is important that [we] respond to speech. What is the meaning

31. To te Titulo Dominio mo tātou. Mo te Rapa Nui?
    o te Titulo Dominio mo tātou. Mo te Rapa Nui?
    of Art titulo Dominio for us for Art Rapa Nui?
    Of the Land Title system for us. For the Rapa Nui?

32. T: To’o ’ana ho’i te henua e te Tire
    Take Prog indeed Art island Ag Art Chile
    The island continues indeed to be taken by Chile
33. V: No me’e
No thing
No thing

34. T: [ka turu ra koe i te hora ‘ina (?)]
Mod descend Loc you Prep Art hour Neg
You come down at that time and no (?)

35. te hare tō’oku ‘ina he parau era ko rava’a
Art house my Neg Asp paper Dem Pfv caught
At my house no title has been obtained.

36. N: E ho’i
Indeed
Indeed

37. T: Me’e Titulo Dominio ki te aha? He aha te parau mo te Titulo Dominio?
Thing Titulo Dominio Prep Art Int? Int Int Art paper for Art Titulo Dominio
For what is the Land Title system? Why the paper for the Land title?

38. V: [He aha te me’e haka’ou i te hora nei?]
Int Int Art thing again Prep Art hour Dem
Why is this thing [discussed] again now?

39. T: Kamiare ‘ā
Change Prog
It’s continuing to change

40. V: He sistema i oho mai?
Art system Prf go Dir
From where is the system?
41. T: No Pehe systema?
   No how system?
   No how is the system?

42. Porque (1.0) te sistema o te te Titulo Dominio () To’o mai te henua
   Because Art system Pos Art Art Titulo Dominio take Dir Art island.
   Because through the system of the Land Titles the island was taken.

43. V: E ho’i
   Indeed
   Indeed

44. T: e te Tire
    Ag Art Chile
    By Chile

45. V: Dominio pa’i i te bienes o te Rapa Nui
    Dominion indeed Rel Prep Art goods Pos Art Rapa Nui.
    The dominions indeed are the goods of the Rapa Nui.

46. T: Sipo, Dominio
    Yes, Dominio
    Yes, Dominion

47. V: Te hauha’a o te Rapa Nui
    Art valuable Pos Art Rapa Nui
    The valuables of the Rapa Nui.

48. T: O sea Dominio ‘ā
    That is, Dominion Prog
    That is, dominion continues
49. V: Dominio ‘ā, I aŋa he te Titulo Dominio i oho mai ki nei?
   Dominion Prog, Prf work Art Art Titulo Dominio Prf Prep Dem?
   Dominion continues, when did the Land Title system arrive?

50. I matahiti ena, ka toru ka rima matahiti a tu’a o aŋa te aha?
    Prf year Dem Num three Num five years before or work Art Int?
    In what year, three, five years ago or when?

51. T: No:, o era a Kete he ha’amata oira te me’e
    No, or Dem Ps Kete Asp begin thus Art thing.
    No, Kete started that thing.

52. V: Mai a mai a mai a Pinochet?
    Dir Pos Dir Pos Dir Ps Pinochet?
    From, from, from Pinochet?

53. K: [E ho’i
        Indeed
        Indeed

54. Ta: [E ho’i
        Indeed
        Indeed.

55. K: Pinochet
    Pinochet
    Pinochet
    Pinochet

56. V: Yeah, Pinochet
    Yeah, Pinochet
    Yeah, Pinochet
57. **T:** Pinochet, a a aquí yeah nu’u era nu’u era
Pinochet, a a here yeah people Dem people Dem
It is Pinochet here, yeah those people, those people.

"~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~15minutes"

58. **V:** no, te me’e nei o te titulo dominio tā’a ui nei ‘ā (1.0)
No, Art thing Dem Pos Art Titulo Dominio your question Dem Prog
No, the issue of the Land title system is your question

59. **V:** Titulo Dominio (. ) Pe he te mana’o o te Rapa Nui i ruŋa i te
Titulo Dominio, Like Int Art thought Pos Art Rapa Nui Prep atop Prep Art
Land Title System. What are the thoughts of the Rapa Nui regarding

60. **V:** Titulo Dominio i avai mai ai e te ( .) e te Tire pa’i?
Titulo Dominio Prf give Dir Dem Ag Art Ag Art Chile indeed.
Titulo Dominio given by the, by Chile indeed?

61. **T:** muy facile ho’i te me’e ena
Very simple indeed Art thing Dem
That is indeed a very simple thing.

62. **N:** muy facile te me’e ena
Very simple Art thing Dem
That is a very simple thing.

63. **T:** Ko te me’e nei he kī atu ena
Foc Art thing Dem Asp say Dir Dem
This thing is said
64. V: Kī mau acepta tahi te Rapa Nui ehh ah tiempo ’ina kai acepta
Say truly accept all Rapa Nui ehh ah time Neg Neg accept
It is truly stated that all Rapa Nui accept at this time [or] don’t accept

65. He aha? Ta’e acepta te Rapa [Nui]
Int Int? Neg accept Art Rapa Nui
Why? Rapa Nui don’t accept?

66. Ta: [obliga mai ‘ā
Obligated Dir Prog
[We] are obligated

67. N: Ko te obliga ‘ā
Prf Art obligation Prog
It has been an ongoing obligation.

68. V: [Obliga ‘ā [Obligacion etahi
Obligation Prog Obligation one
It is an obligation, one obligation

69. N: [Ko te [te repa
Foc Art Art friend.
The friend

70. K: Ėe:::
Yes
Yes

71. V: Oti Mau ‘ā
Finished truly Prog
[We are] Truly finished
72. Ta: amenaza ‘ā te kīiŋa
Threaten Prog Art way of speaking
The discourse is threatening.

73. V: amenaza ‘ā te taŋata
Threaten Prog Art people
Threatening the people.

74. T: Shh::: ( ) tātou erua nō taŋata te me’e ki oti koe ka vānaŋ
Shh we two Eval people Art thing Mod finish you Mod speak
Shh only two of us, when finished speak

75. “K” vānaŋa o miramira te vānaŋa te reo importante
“K” speak or confuse Art speech Art voice important
“K” speak or the speech is confused, [this is] important speech

76. N: E hoʻi (1.0)
Indeed
Indeed

77. K: Te parauti’a o te me’e nei obliga mai ai mātou ’i te Titulo Dominio
Art truth Pos Art thing Dem obligated Dir Dem us Dem Art Titulo Dominio
The truth of this is that we are obligated to acquire land titles.

78. ’I na ‘ā he cuenta te taŋata (2.0)
Neg Prog Asp account Art people
The people do not take account of it.
79. N: ’Ina he anjiangi te cuenta (1.0)
Neg Asp understand
[They] do not understand.

80. K: ’Ina he anjiangi (5.0)
Neg Asp understand.
[They] do not understand.

81. T: He oho tū vānaa, i more tahi (2.0) ŋa poki Rapa Nui
Asp go Dem speech, Prf cut all Pl child Rapa Nui
As discussed, the Rapa Nui children are all cut out

82. estudio ko enginero ‘ā tā’atoa pue tū nunui pue rava’a pero
study Foc engineering Prog all can Dem big can find but Art
I have studied engineering that can it is possible but

83. Te problema ’ina he avai e te Tire i ra pue poki Rapa Nui era
Art problema Neg Asp give Ag Art Chile Prep loc can child Rapa Nui Dem
The problem is that it is not given by Chile to the Rapa Nui children

84. He to’o mai te rāua henua.
Asp take Dir Art their land
[Chile] took their land.

85. V: Segundo, i tō’ona es, i tō’ona hare ‘api ‘ina kai avai
Second, Prf his is, Prf his house new Neg Neg given
Second, his, his new house, is not given

86. T: No
No
No
87. V: Hakatapa ‘ā
Make clear Prog
Clearly

88. T: Importante, (tearing sound) me’e teatea pa’i
Important, thing white indeed
It’s important this white thing indeed (be torn?).

89. Rapa Nui ra [?] tono ‘ā kona era
Rapa Nui Loc [?] entering area Dem
Rapa Nui are entering that area.

90. Hakatopa ’i te problema era [etahi nunui i oho mai
Make fall Prep Art problem Dem one big Ipf go Dir
That great problem that has come must be ended

91. V: [O sea discriminación etahi
That is discrimination one
That is discrimination.

92. T: Peira te significa o te me’e he Titulo Dominio
Thus Art meaning Pos art thing Art Titulo Dominio
Thus, the meaning of the Title System,

93. Titulo Dominio he to’o ena (1.0) dominio o te Tire katahi
Titulo Dominio Asp take Dem dominion Pos Art Chile one
in the Title System dominion is taken within Chile

94. carnet to’o ka topa nei
identification card Mod fall Dem
Chilean identification is taken until [the system] falls here.
95. N: Si po
   Yes can
   It can

96. T: Que pasa?
    What happening?
    What is wrong?

97. V: Te Tire tātou
    Art Chile us
    All of us are Chilean

98. T: Que pasa te hora nei? Que pasa te hora nei? (?) Titulo Dominio na
    What passes Art hour Dem? What passes Art hour Dem? Titulo Dominio Loc
    What is wrong now? What is wrong now? That Titulo Dominio.

99. O te Tire te henua. (1.0) Es muy corto te vānaŋa nei pero amenaza mai ‘ā
    Pos Art Chile Art island, is very short Art speech Dem but threaten Dir Prog
    Of Chile the island, it is very short this speech, but threatening.

100. ‘E te Tire mo to’o i te Titulo Dominio, he manera o te Tire. (3.0)
     And Art Chile Sub take Prep Art Titulo Dominio, Art manner Pos Art Chile
     And Chile, taking of land titles, it is a manner of Chile.

101. (cough) Ka topa te me’e ena [Ko te X
     Mod fall Art thing Dem Foc Art (“clan” name)
     That thing must be ended. That is the way of X

102. V: [pe nei e kī nei
     Like Dem Imp say Dem
     Like it is here said
Te Titulo Dominio to’o mai o tu’u henua o’ou,
Art Titulo Dominio take Dir Pos your island of you
The Land Title system takes your island

He ino o’ou, he avai te Titulo Dominio. Ni te Presidente ni
Art bad of you, Asp give Art Titulo Dominio. Neither Art President nor
It is a bad thing for you, the giving of land title. The President is

Ninguna autoridad mo to’o haka’ou, tu’u hiko mai a koe tu’u
Not any authority for take again your remove Dir Ps you your
without authority continues to take titles, remove your

Titulo Dominio tu’u henua. O sea personalmente pa’i.
Titulo Dominio your island. That is personally indeed
land title from your island. That is my [thought] personally indeed

T: No, tano ‘ā
No, morally correct Prog
No, that is morally correct.

V: Te problema (2.0) na tō’oku henua na, ‘Ēe: ko ai me’e tō’oku (.)
Art problem Loc my island Loc, yes, Foc Int thing my
The problem of my island, yes, Who for me is the one is

Tū Petero, Petero e ai, he o’one ta’e ki a koe perenecio
Dem Petero, Petero Imp exist say Pos Int soil Neg Prep Ps you harmful
Petero (the mayor). For Petero, the soil, harmfully, is not for you

He hare a koe pero he o’one o te Tire.
Art house Ps you but Art soil Pos Art Chile.
You have a house but the soil is of Chile.
Ta’e pe tū hakateka ’ā tū vānaŋa era ‘ā a Atamu Tekena,
That is not like the speech of Atamu Tekena

pe nei he mauku o ‘ou he o’one hapa’o ki a ia
Grass for you, the soil he was to care for.

henua pa’i o te Rapa Nui te henua pero o ou te mauku.
The island indeed, the island belongs to Rapa Nui, but grass for you.

Ta’e te me’e haŋa pa’i, Ta’e pe ira i te hora nei.
Now, that is not what is wanted, it is not hence like that now.

ko (?) Titulo Dominio ahh oirá
The land title system ahh thus,

’Ina kai tano te Titulo Dominio mo te Rapa Nui, obligación etahi
The land title system is not moral to the Rapa Nui, it is an obligation.

Ki te mate.
Until we die.

N: Obligacion o [te
Obligation of the
119. T: [Casa o te o te super i oho mai te haura’a (2.0)]

House of Art of Art super Prf go Dir Art example/meaning

The office of the superior that came for example

120. amenaza ’ā [pe ira

threaten Prog like that

Hence is threatening

121. V: [he (?)

Art

A

122. T: amenaza mai ena (3.0)

Threaten Dir Dem

Is threatening

123. V: He tano mau he u’i mau ‘ā, he nuna’a Rapa Nui,

Asp moral truly Asp look truly Prog, Asp people Rapa Nui

It is truly moral, to truly see, Rapa Nui as a people

124. he ha’aura’a, he cercado Rapa territorio Rapa Nui

Art example, Art enclosed Rapa territory Rapa Nui

for example, an enclosed Rapa, Rapa Nui territory

125. carnet Rapa Nui, he reva Rapa Nui, he ra’e.

Identification Rapa Nui, Art flag Rapa Nui, Art one.

Rapa Nui identification, and a Rapa Nui flag firstly.

126. Me’e tā’ato’a Rapa Nui

Thing all Rapa Nui

Everything Rapa Nui
409

127. T: Ko te parau [nei
Prf Art paper Dem
The paper here

128. V: [Teritorio Rapa Nui mau ‘ā
Territory Rapa Nui truly Prog
A true Rapa Nui territory

129. O te Rapa Nui [o te Rapa Nui nnnann nannna nanaaaanaaaaa
Pos Art Rapa Nui Pos Art
Of the Rapa Nui, of the

130. T: [Hora ena o te (?)
Hour Dem Pos Art
At the time that

tehenua nei, he carnet mo te Rapa Nui,
Art island DEM, Art identification Sub Art Rapa Nui,
this island, an identification card for the Rapa Nui,

to’o mai ra hora mau a au mai nei mo “Ta” ka hakarē (?)
take Dir Dem hour Truly Ps I Dir Dem Sub “Ta” Imp bequeath
when that hour is acquired I am truly for bequeathing to “Ta”

132. V: [Mo “Ta” (laughter)
Sub “Ta”
For “Ta”

134. T: No, vā vānaŋa nei ’ī eso te (?)
No, va speech Dem Dem this Art
No this discourse here, this is

135. Ka oho ena ka mate au ka siguente ta’a pokì nei ’o
Ctg go Dem Ctg die I Ctg follow your child Dem or
Thereupon when I die your child can follow or
Te makapuna ena o ta’a makapuna ena yeah mo rāua si po
Art grandchild Dem or your grandchild Dem yeah Sub them it can
The grandchildren or your grandchild yeah for them it is possible

V: umhm te futuro peira
umhm Art future thus
umhm for the future

Ka kī nō ka oho ena ehia generación hakaou toe?
Imp say Eval go Dem how many generations more remain?
One must indeed ask though, how many generations more?

Ana (?)
Mod
If

[Nua ’iorana tā’aku vānaŋa completo miramira
Nua greetings my speech complete confusion
Elder woman, you are confusing my speech

No, peira te titika i oho mai ena
No, thus Art straight Prf go Dir Dem
No, I am correcting it

Ki oti koe vānaŋa
Mod finish you speak
When I am finished you speak.

(The conversation breaks down for approximately one minute as hua’ai members argue about the proper way to talk. No substantive content seems to be added in during this breakdown of communication. As there is extensive overlap it is too difficult to transcribe.)
143. K: Te rua me’e necesita mātou ki te mātou:: passporte (?)
Art two thing necessary we Prep Pos we passport
The second thing we need is our passport

144. Porque
Because
Because

145. V: recognoce i te [mundo
To be recognized Prep Art world
To be recognized in the world.

146. K: [mo pue ki haho he recognoce
Sub able Prep outside Asp recognize
So that one can be recognized outside

147. he Rapa Nui koe porque ‘ai ‘ai passporte o te Tire mātou
Art Rapa Nui you because Dem Dem passport Pos Art Chile we
as a Rapa Nui because on this passport we are Chilean

148. Aŋarina i nei i Rapa Nui ki te henua papa‘ā. I tu‘u mai
Today Prep Dem Prep Rapa Nui Prep Art foreign. Prf arrive Dir
today here in Rapa Nui and in foreign lands. Upon arrival

149. i kī era he ‘ui mai mātou he Tire mātou ’ina pe nei he ʻaŋiaŋi
Prf say Dem ask Dir we Art Chile we Neg like Dem Asp understand
it is said, it is asked of us if we are Chilean, but it is not understood

150. Pe nei a mātou he Rapa Nui.
Like Dem Ps we Art Rapa Nui.
Thus that we are Rapa Nui.
151. V: origine Polinesia pa’i
Origins Polynesian indeed.
Indeed of Polynesian origins

152. T: [Te ha’amata o te passporte o Chileana tu’u o ou
Art beginning Pos Art passport Pos Chile arrive Pos you
Your Chilean passport is the beginning

153. A koe toketoke te te Tire
Ps you stolen Art Art Chile
You are stolen by Chile

154. K Yeah i te rahī pa’i o te Tire i te henua papa’ā he aŋa
Yes, Prep Art large indeed Pos Art Chile Prep Art land foreign Asp work
Yes, many Chileans work in foreign lands

155. Te rāua me’e rakerake yeah i tu’u o ou pue pue ma
Art they thing bad yeah Prf arrive Pos you can can Sub
Their things are wrong, one can arrive by

156. roto i te passporte Tire. Ko au, ’i roto tako’a au
inside Prep Art Passport Chile Foc I Prep inside also I
Chilean passport. I am, I am also inside [the passport]

157. Pero te problema ta’e ko au ’i roto ko au he Rapa Nui.
But Art problema Neg Foc I Prep inside Foc I Asp Rapa Nui
But the problem is I am not inside, I am Rapa Nui.

158. Yeah ‘e tō’oku carnet, tō’oku passaporte he me’e Tire.
Yeah and my identification, my passport Art thing Chile
Yes, and my identification card, my passport is Chilean.
159. Peira te me’e rave’a o te me’e nei. (4.0)
Thus Art thing manner Pos Art thing Dem.
Thus is the way of this thing.

160. T: Hakamaun ho’i te vānaŋa o te estudio o te Tire i Rapa Nui. (1.0)
Completed indeed Art discourse of Art study of Art Chile in Rapa Nui
This indeed completes the discussion of Chile in Rapa Nui.

161. Peira te sistema o te Tire.
Thus Art system of Art Chile.
Thus, is the system of Chile.

162. Ta: He haŋa ‘ā mātou ki te derecho a mātou. ’I hē?
Asp want Prog we Prep Art rights of we. Where?
We continue to want our rights. Where are they?

163. T: Hey Ka mou. Te vānaŋa a “K”. Miramira te vānaŋa
Hey Imp silence. Art speech of “K”. Confusing Art discourse.
Hey, be quiet. “K” is speaking. You are confusing the discourse.

164. V: hmmm (5.0)
Hmmm
Hummm

The hua’ai members again have a kind of break down in discussion. For about a minute they mumble about different topics, but not in a coherent way. After a few minutes some of the same issues return to discussion in similar terms.
QUESTIONNAIRE DOCUMENT

E nono‘i ʻā a au ki te ŋa huaʻai Rapa Nui mo ʻaʻamu mai:

Estoy estudiando la cultura y lengua de Rapanui para mi tesis de doctorado en antropología en la Universidad de Hawai. Quiero aprender como las familias de Rapanui ven la tierra a través de la lengua Rapanui. Quiero registrar conversaciones con familias Rapanui sobre la tierra de Rapa Nui. Las grabaciones se mantendrán en el anonimato, sin individualizar a los participantes. Si después de la grabación, decide no participar del proyecto, la información entregada será borrada. Si lo desea, se podrá dar copia de la grabación.

Ka nono‘i koe ki te tetahi taina, poki, matuʻa, koro, nua, tupuna o tuʻu huaʻai mo ʻaʻamu mai i te ŋa ʻui i roto o te makini haka roŋo (karava). Ana ai hokorua o atarahi mo ʻaʻamu mai, he ata riva riva mo te hapi nei.

(1) He aha te kōrua manaʻu i ruŋa o te kaiŋa o Rapanui ʻe te parau henua o te Hau Tire (te Titulo Dominio)?

(2) E aŋiaŋi nei kōrua i te kaiŋa o te kōrua huaʻai e te parau Tire o te ite i roto o te kōrua huaʻai? He aha te kōrua manaʻu?

(3) E aŋiaŋi nei kōrua i tetahi kaiŋa o te kōrua Mata tahito he kaiŋa o te kōrua huaʻai i te hora nei? He aha te kōrua manaʻu?

Tōʻoku pohe he ʻaʻamu mai i te ʻarero māʻohi Rapanui. Tōʻoku pohe he ʻaʻamu huaʻai.

Mauru-uru,

Forrest Young
I am asking Rapa Nui families to “discuss/narrate” back to me:

I am studying the culture and language of Rapa Nui for my doctoral thesis in anthropology at the University of Hawai’i. I want to learn how Rapa Nui families understand their land within Rapa Nui language. I want to record conversations with Rapa Nui families about the land of Rapa Nui. The recordings are maintained anonymously; without individualization of names. If, after the recording you decide not to participate, the information will be erased. If you want, I can give you a copy of the recording.

Ask a sibling/cousin, child, parent/aunt or uncle, grandparent or elder man or woman of your family to discuss the questions in the recorder. If there are two or more to discuss my study is improved.

(1) What are your thoughts about the lands of Rapa Nui and the land title system of the Chilean government?

(2) Do you understand/recognize the lands of your family by the land title system of the Chilean government or the knowledge of your family? What are your thoughts?

(3) Do you understand/recognize the ancestral lands of your family clan as lands of your family today? What are your thoughts?

My desire is that you respond in the native Rapa Nui tongue. My desire is a family conversation.

Thanks,

Forrest Young
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