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Migration research in Oceania has produced a problematic genre that continues to be dominated by conceptions of population movement occurring between two poles: the rural and urban, or village and metropolitan areas. Embedded in migration assumptions are notions of individualism, social disjuncture, and the primacy of economic motivations as understood in capitalist terms. Rather than construct movement and identity of people in places rural or urban, or framed by the bipolar model of settler and sojourner, this study goes beyond such polarities. Through an analysis of how culture, in this case fa‘a-Samoan, integrates movement, ‘aiga (household, family), and configurations of mobility, this dissertation argues that embodied experience is central to Samoan identities as exemplified in local metaphors of movement, identity, and place.

This research focuses on the experience of people from Salelologa village on Savai‘i, the big island of Samoa, and its social extensions abroad. Based on more than eighteen months fieldwork in Salelologa with members of ‘aiga in sites in Auckland, New Zealand and Santa Ana, California, this study tells of the transformations occurring in local society and the individuals within it. Fa‘a-Samoan (Samoan way of life/culture/knowing) is a conceptual tool with which to examine concepts of migration, diaspora, transnationalism, and place. Cultural metaphors of movement: malaga (moving back and forth), and of where: fafo (overseas) and i‘inei (here), most clearly expressed identity and conceptions of movement and place for Samoan social worlds.

Questions about movement led to how people think of personal and group relationships and how social connections express continuity in interactions with others who move, rather than around notions of cultural rupture and social dissipation. Samoans,
through personal narratives of identity and movement, evoke *va* (social space) or the space that relates rather than separates and which guides appropriate behavior, acts of reciprocity, and continued links and interactions between people and places. In this study, the emphasis is on the dialectical interaction between *fa'a-Samoa*, movement, polities, and intricate processes of westernization and globalization for local societies and economies.
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CHAPTER ONE
WEAVING TOGETHER BEGINNINGS

This study is an insider’s interpretation of population movements between a particular place Saleloga, on Savai’i, the big island of Samoa, and its social extensions overseas. It is an attempt to get at a deeper understanding of the interactive, two-way relationship between fa’a-Samoa (Samoan way of life/culture) and population movements. It is about the dynamics of fa’a-Samoa and mobility, social membership, and social attachment. In particular, it focuses on the cultural context in which population mobility takes place. Its concern is with the movement of individuals between Samoa, New Zealand, and the United States, and the forms of attachment that exist in an increasingly plural world (Figures 1.1, Figure 1.2).

In many ways, this research has its beginnings in my high school years. I remember it as a time of gradual changes in my village from a ‘traditional’ to a ‘modern’ life style. Attitudes to having things like running water, electricity, and flush toilets were also changing. One evening in 1978 as I was doing my homework at home in Foua, Saleloga Savai’i, my father, asked me, “Si ‘aula ‘o lea lau mea ‘e te mana ‘o ‘e fai pe’a ‘uma lau a’oga? “ (Hey, what do you want to do after high school?). I replied, “‘Ou te fia faia’oga ‘i se iunivesite ‘e tele ai ni a’u tupe” (I want to be a lecturer in a university so that I can earn lots of money). In a reflective mood, he nodded his head, and finished for me “...ma ‘e alofa ai i nai ou tei...” (…and also love your brothers and sisters). I only smiled and thought to myself, what’s new with my father?
Figure 1.1 Location Map of Samoa Islands

Source: University of Texas at Austin- Perry Castaneda Library Collection
Figure 1.2  Samoan Islands

Source: University of Texas at Austin- Perry Castaneda Library Collection
During this stage of my life, I had learned about life overseas in high school through the news transmitted via the 2AP, the local broadcasting radio station.

I was nurtured in an extended family which consisted of my parents, brothers and sisters, uncles and aunts, their children, and grandchildren. In addition, relatives from other parts of Samoa have stayed with us. Some stayed longer, while others stayed only temporarily. I believe the reason my father emphatically finished my reply was to remind me about the Samoan ‘self’ and one’s responsibility as a member of ‘aiga (family, household, kin group). In ‘aiga, individual members are socialized in strong family values associated with its collective welfare, and enhancement of its status. Embedded in this collectivity is the embodiment of the Samoan self and identity that is multi-sided and multi-aspected. In other words, “The Samoan self is a relational person” (Tamasese, Graves, and Peteru 1997, 28), primarily because of the complex yet clearly defined intermingling of one with their ‘aiga. This Samoan conception of the individual within the group and the group within the individual means neither are mutually exclusive.

My mother was a primary school teacher who retired in 1990. Both she and my father always made education a first priority. I was acutely aware of my parents’ dedication to our education, especially for the eight of us remaining at home who were still going to school. At the time, I also had three older siblings already in New Zealand and working in factories of Auckland. They, like other village Samoans, were part of a cohort who had gone overseas to help support their parents’ aspirations to develop the ‘aiga. For my part, not only did I want to do well for myself, but also worked hard in school to reciprocate my parents’ love and make them proud. My peers thought the same thing and there was intense rivalry to be the first in class at Salelologa Primary School.
and later in high school. There was a kind of ‘cool’ competition among us students, especially where family status was concerned.

This conversation with my father took place during my first year of major external examinations in the fifth form class, called the New Zealand School Certificate Examinations. I passed all five subjects and advanced to sixth form. Fifth form is equivalent to eleventh grade in the North American system. During the final year or sixth form students take the University Entrance Examinations (U.E.). It was every parent’s dream that their child do well in all five U.E. subjects because it more or less guaranteed a government scholarship. Even if a student’s grades are not quite high enough for a scholarship, decent local employment was still very much guaranteed. In my case, I had already applied to and been accepted for a job as a teller at the Bank of Western Samoa (as it was called then), but deferred accepting until the entrance exam results arrived from New Zealand. When my grades arrived in January 1980, I was ecstatic that they were high enough to send me to university. I really had not wanted to work in a bank. Such is the anxiety around this time for all students and parents in Samoa.

As it happened, I was the first student to be awarded a scholarship directly from Savai’i. I was also the first from Logo’ipulotu College, the first coeducational Catholic high school in Samoa. Built in 1972, it was comparatively a new school. My sixth form class, of which there were four of us, was only the second group to take the U.E. exams from Logo’ipulotu College. Prior to that, students from Savai’i had gone to high schools
in Apia, the capital, located on the island of ‘Upolu (Figure 1.2). My scholarship was thus a big lift for both my school and my family.¹

Increasingly, many Samoan parents view formal education as the avenue to better economic opportunities which will improve the material wealth and status of their families. Every chance counts, in a society where social esteem is intimately tied to the ‘aiga and becoming a socially well-located family is the universal goal. Many Samoan parents support their children’s education despite the fact that opportunities for scholarships are limited, and not every student has an ability for purely academic pursuits. The news of my father’s untimely death in April 1980 came two months after our group of nineteen Samoan students had arrived at the University of Newcastle, Australia. I was devastated, but I pressed ahead with studying and went home at Christmas. The Samoan government pays the fares of scholarship students to return home at the end of each academic year until graduation.

My experience mirrors that of other Samoans who have been fortunate to receive government scholarships to study abroad in New Zealand, Australia, Papua New Guinea, or Fiji. Most Samoans return to Samoa to work in the government upon completion of their studies. This has been part of the ongoing training and localization of the workforce since independence from New Zealand in 1962.

¹ I t was sad to find out that Logo’ipulotu was struggling to pay its bills to run the school. It closed down in 2001. I was the guest speaker at its Prize Giving ceremony in November 1999 when I was doing fieldwork. My girlfriend, who was the second to receive a scholarship two years after me, was the last guest speaker at their final Prize Giving in 2001. However, I was later happy to hear that the Catholic Church now uses the site as its administrative center in Savai’i.
A negative part of this scholarship system, however, is that it unintentionally makes the other eighty percent of the student population feel second best. They come to view working in the plantation and agriculture as degrading, or remaining at home a let down. This perception has changed, however, since the Samoan Polytechnical Institute was rebuilt in 1989 and its curriculum revised. It now encourages vocational skills and other talents amongst its students.

The years since I was in high school have been a period of rapid change in Samoa in terms of overseas movement, and the building of *fale palagi* (European style homes). Infrastructural improvements and better transportation links between ‘Upolu and Savai’I (Figure 1.2) were made possible with the introduction of a vehicular ferry in the mid-1970s. Although as a teenager I witnessed this momentum of development and saw people moving back and forth between the islands, and overseas, I did not begin thinking about it intellectually until many years later. Nevertheless, I mark this time as the beginning of my scholarly interest, which results in this dissertation. This brief account of my personal and intellectual journey shows that thoughts, actions, and beliefs do not exist in a vacuum.

Dominant scholarly approaches to population movement include the neoclassical-equilibrium, structural, dependency, and MIRAB (Migration, Remittances, Aid, Bureaucracy). Each of these conceptions of population movement are embedded in notions of individualism and the primacy of economic motivations, as understood in capitalist terms. As such, they all fail to explain fully what is happening in Third World and Pacific societies, where principles of obligation, reciprocity, collectivism, participation, and sharing remain strong even in the face of late capitalism,
westernization, and modernization. Although these theories have made some contribution to understanding population movement they are, as Quan-Bautista (2001, 33) writes, “only stepping stones to a more holistic view of mobility.”

*Migration* is a problematic term. However, its taken-for-granted meaning which was used to explain movements of people in Euro-American contexts has been automatically transferred to explain population movements in the Pacific Islands. This conventional understanding is found in Thomas-Hope (1993, 146) where she writes, “Migration is a permanent relocation that involves total displacements of persons.” Lee (1966, 176) also defines “migration as a permanent or semi-permanent change of residence which involves a discrete origin-destination affected by intervening obstacles.”

This study of Samoan population movement argues that the conventional understanding of ‘migration’, with its assumptions of uprooting, rupture or severing of ties is inappropriate to understand this complex process. Instead, I argue ‘migration’ is culturally defined and various cultural groups interpret ‘migration’ differently. Hence, ‘migration’ is an interpretive practice. Thus local contexts merit serious consideration in order to gain better understanding of Pacific Islander movements, as well as broadening intellectual perspectives. In this study, I argue that a *holistic* approach to the study of population mobility is central to a fuller understanding of the interactive relationship between culture, movement, place, and identity. Such an approach must include people’s indigenous knowledge and understanding of their movements, as well as the structural, economic, and political environments in which they are enmeshed.

More specifically this thesis seeks to provide an understanding and an interpretation of the way *fa’a-Samoa, ‘aiga, and malaga* (movement) impacts on the life
choices Samoans make and on their culture. The thesis is therefore underpinned by Samoan conceptual frameworks concerned with the intersection of culture, identity, mobility, and place. In the following, I lay out the conceptual framework and thesis outline, followed by a review of approaches to migration.

**Fa’a-Samoa as Concept and Meaning**

My conceptual framework starts with *fa’a-Samoa*, (Samoan way of knowing or way of life). *Fa’a-Samoa* is fundamental to Samoan culture but, like culture, it is not static. *Fa’a-Samoa* is an intellectual tool for apprehending the world, how Samoans interact with each other, the church, outsiders, and the environment. As with all such collectively held codes, there is no complete, homogeneous agreement on all tenets, but there exists a vast consensus.

When informed by postcolonial theory, culture is understood as negotiated rather than static and given meaning through symbols, places, and relationships (Gupta and Ferguson 1997). As recently argued by Silvey and Lawson (1999,124), “Cultural meanings are no longer assumed to be unproblematically shared among members of bounded communities, but rather are understood to be constantly negotiated and to be embedded in mobility processes, in that there is ongoing reworking of migrant identities as well as the places and social contexts among which they are moving.” In short, the meaning of movement for people is culturally situated and ‘migration’, as conventionally understood, needs to be seen as a particular set of interpretive practices. In this study, *fa’a-Samoa* is the conceptual tool which not only apprehends issues of movement, ‘aiga,
and land relationships separately and interactively, but also generates the themes and topics to be considered and analyzed.

_Fa’a-Samoa_ as a concept acknowledges the collective importance of the Samoan person as a member of the ‘_aiga_. The primary perception of the individual is that of a lifetime member linked to the ‘_aiga_ of _toto e tasi_ (one blood) and/or _tino e tasi_ (one body). _Toto e tasi_ exemplifies the blood links of an individual to the ‘_aiga_ through marriage, the _tino e tasi_ exemplifies the importance of affective and symbolic connections through adoptive or genealogical relations that are made vital through active cultural performance. These blood and relational links are internally related and functionally interdependent. They constitute a plethora of ties that are sacred and guarded with great reverence within each ‘_aiga_. Each ‘_aiga_ is headed by _matai_, whether _ali‘i_ (chief) or _tulafale_ (orator), and each village has particular salutations and attributes as prescribed in the _fa’alupega_ (honorific salutations). These _mamalu ma pa’ia_ (sacred attributes) remain with individuals wherever they travel.

Long before Europeans arrived in Samoa, there was considerable mutual influence between Samoa and other Pacific societies, particularly Fiji and Tonga. This contact aided in each the self-realization of their own identities known as _fa’a-Samoa_ (Samoan way), _vaka Viti_ (Fijian way), and _anga fakatonga_ (Tongan way). Later, when Samoans were also interacting with a diverse group of Europeans (_palagi_), _fa’a-Samoa_ began to be contrasted explicitly to _fa’a-palagi_ (foreign or western way). _Fa’a-Samoa_ is frequently invoked in everyday life in Samoa as both the defining element of Samoan identity and as the values and behaviors that comprise Samoan culture. _Fa’a-Samoa_ is also rendered as the way of the land, and of the people. _Fa’a-Samoa_ is used to identify
what is seen as uniquely or specifically a Samoan way of being and can be used in any context, from a statement of key Samoan values such as alofa (love, hospitality) to a description of a Samoan way of cooking taro. Samoans speak of fa’aa-Samoa as something timeless and essential, yet they are also aware of its multiple interpretations and historical transformations.

I will explore fa’aa-Samoa in its philosophical and socioeconomic dimensions to understand the linkages and networks of mobility, an important feature of the contemporary Samoan world. As mentioned, fa’aa-Samoa is constantly reworked to keep up with changing contexts. In this study, fa’aa-Samoa is a new frame to situate the movements of transnational families within a global economy. Moreover, it is also a frame that both counteracts western influences in a globalizing society and draws back Samoans to their ancestral values. In short, the emphasis is on the dialectical interaction between fa’aa-Samoa, movement, and processes of westernization and globalization.

**Synthesis, Themes, and Concepts**

There has been little attempt to synthesize the intellectual perspectives employed in different mobility studies which tend to remain fragmented and disparate. Rather than amplifying or enhancing our understanding of mobility, scholars are talking back and forth to each other within “self-contained intellectual domains” (Hayes 1992, 34). They remain overly concerned with fitting societies into their models and continue to ignore conceptual problems. This, according to (Chapman 1991, 263), has resulted in a “scholarly impasse.”
In this study, I take a more integrated approach, I begin with indigenous concepts and understandings of fa’ā-Samoa, which is primarily a humanist position. From the humanist tradition, I draw on Buttimer’s (1980) interconnected metaphor of ‘home’ and ‘reach’ to address the fluidity of mobility processes, people, and identities. Focus is provided by two frames of reference. One, the idea of circular mobility (Chapman and Prothero 1985), emphasizes territorial understandings of mobility; the other, transnationalism (Basch, Schiller, and Szanton 1991), points to how political economy provides the overall structure within which movement occurs. These frames of reference break the intellectual impasse on several levels by abandoning the use of rural-urban dichotomies and reorienting conceptual categories and understanding of movement beyond assumptions of unidirectionality and permanent mobility.

This intellectual position is pursued in the dissertation through five themes, each explored to examine their weaknesses and strengths from a Samoan perspective, then linked together to achieve a more holistic understanding.

1) The culture of population movement: Fa’a-Samoa is related to culture, identity, mobility, and place. Fa’a-Samoa is adopted as an epistemological stance conceived of as including tino e tasi (one body), toto e tasi (one blood), and va fealoa’i (the space in between, the space that nurtures). The dichotomies of rural/urban, traditional/modern, primitive/modern, body/mind, and culture/body have become increasingly problematic in light of the ‘globalization’ of the world economy, specifically with regard to population movements. In geography and anthropology, space has long served as a seemingly value-free idiom for defining clear and permanent divisions between cultures and regions (Appadurai 1997, Veck 1998). An examination of people’s views on culture, space, and
place in relation to themselves, their identities, and their movements can shed light on these complex issues.

2) Identity and place: Conventional understandings of identity and place treat them as static processes, simple ethnic selfhood, and regionalism. This study instead pays attention to the complicated self-perceptions of individuals and their unfolding identities over time. The linkages between fa’a-Samoa, identity, and place and the discourses on fanua (land, soil) ‘aiga, and identity will be discussed as they relate to mobility. It is true that macro processes of polity and economy play a part in the construction of identities and place, but these are filtered through processes from below. Local agency, local knowledge, and subjectivity interact in various ways to influence the manifestations of identities and mobilities.

3) Diaspora: In this study, the concept of diaspora is different from orthodox frameworks, which strongly tie diaspora to the nation state. It is important to understand processes which distinguish the Samoan mobility experience from other diaspora. Brah (1996) breaks down the notion of diaspora into three: (i) diaspora as a theoretical concept; (ii) diasporic discourse; and (iii) distinct historical experiences of diaspora. The different cartographies and specific histories of diaspora for the Pacific and the Caribbean as against Jewish or African diasporas must be explained, in order to both understand new articulations of diaspora in the Pacific and to bring greater clarity to some issues within diasporic literature (Clifford 1995; Cohen 1997; Safran 1994).

4) Transnationalism: The concept of transnationalism as the transport of ideas, activities, remittances, and contacts among ‘aiga will shed light on the ‘lived experience’ and how these processes affect mobility and identity. That is, transnationalism implies
the subjectivity of identity, a sense of belonging, the multiple centers of home that are still anchored in place, rather than a notion of people without roots or a place to call ‘home’. Transnationalism highlights the incessant dialectical interplay of desires, identities, and subjectivities in multiple sites in order to understand processes of belonging, exclusion, and affiliation that are produced through movement (Faist 2000; Lawson 2000; Mahler 1999; Smith and Guarnizo 1998; Vertovec 1999).

5) Malaga (movement): Malaga is conceived as a way of seeing the different places Samoans live, without inserting them in dichotomies such as rural/urban, Samoa/America, or Samoa/New Zealand. Malaga as a cultural metaphor helps situate individuals in the realm of ‘aiga, the unity-that-is-all (Wendt 1999). Irrespective of location, there is always a place to call home. Movers are not perceived as ‘people of two worlds’ or ‘people of no worlds’, but as being involved with both ‘home’ and ‘reach’ (Buttimer 1980, Subedi 1993). It is important to know that ‘home’ and ‘reach’ meet and overlap in various places in the diaspora. Neither ‘home’ nor ‘reach’ are static. While the global political economy is an indispensable framework for understanding Samoan diaspora, the main focus of this study is local: the ways people organize experience and create meaning. Meanings are not simply dictated by the ‘outside’, but instead are negotiated and recreated by people both in Salelologa and other points in population movement. The relationship between ‘home’ and ‘reach’ frame my wider inquiry into fa’a-Samoa and movement.

This thesis acknowledges both western and Samoan theoretical understandings, grounding them in a specific cultural, sociohistorical context illuminated by narrative discourse. Seminal works relevant to each theme outlined above are drawn upon, but are
also critically analyzed with reference to data collected during my field research, the scholarly literature, and personal experience. The dialectical interactions between macro processes of colonialism, Christianity, globalization, and between local knowledge are important points of reference. In this study, I try to emulate the works of the geographer Victoria Lawson (2000, 91), who conceived “migration and modernization as socially constructed discourses that have imposed western understandings and meanings on movement processes and theorizations.”

I foreground fa’a-Samoa as a way of life, a way of seeing, in the blood and in the body. Fa’a-Samoa is what Samoans do and value, and why they do what they do; it is a wealth of knowledge and resources people can access in different contexts and situations. Hence the situatedness and contextuality of fa’a-Samoa is emphasized. By inserting fa’a-Samoa and its concomitant understandings into movement, I explore ways in which a specific case can highlight the transnationality of identities, actions, and structures. As individuals blend their lives across borders, cultural knowledge and memories inevitably become the basis for interpreting and knowing new worlds and creating transnational cultural worlds.

This study also argues that issues of power are inherently part of any culture. Fa’a-Samoa is no exception; its hierarchical power relations and their manifestations were observed in the field. While everyone subscribes to fa’a-Samoa in Salelologa, Samoa, and other points of the Samoan diaspora, the extent and degree of fa’a-Samoa and its relation to identities and processes are inflected by differences of gender, age, social class, generation, ethnicity, and locality.
Language, Style, and Outline

Since my goal is to situate an indigenous epistemology against established western concepts, choice of language and style of writing similarly acts to counterbalance western convention. I allow Samoan voices telling of their lived experiences to pervade my study. Samoan words, phrases, and epigraphs are used to enhance understanding of results and concepts. I provide an English translation in brackets of each Samoan word or expression at first appearance. I also provide a comprehensive Glossary with translations of all Samoan words and expressions touched upon in the dissertation.

The Samoan language encompasses ‘everyday language’ and ‘polite language’. There is also the ‘t’ and ‘k’ form, which are used interchangeably by Samoans. There is also a difference between the spoken form and the orthography, in that the same words usually spoken using ‘k’ are written formally using ‘t’. For example, ‘Fa’atali atu’ and ‘Fa’akali aku’ (wait here) both mean exactly the same thing. In all of my interviews and discussions, the ‘k’ form was spoken most often. The use of ‘k’ also implies that a person knows the other people very well as friends, colleagues, or fellow Samoans. In the dissertation, however, I use the formal written ‘t’ form as is done in standard Samoan text. Lastly, the pronunciation of the written ‘g’ is a nasal consonant ‘ng’. So Salelologa for example is pronounced ‘Salelolonga’ and malaga is pronounced ‘malanga’.

I also had to make some decisions about whether or not to maintain the anonymity of those who constitute the ‘subjects’ of this study. Anonymity and confidentiality are issues that have long dominated discussions on research and representation. I have decided not to hide the identity of Samoans from Salelologa who assisted my field investigation. As a group, Samoans are intensely sensitive to public criticism or
embarrassment, yet they are equally proud of public recognition. I therefore decided
give individual names whenever the topic is a matter of pride or is at least not contested,
giving credit where credit is due. Where individual identification might cause
embarrassment, fictitious names are used. Finally, when several people agree on a point
and give similar responses, I gloss them as ‘members’. It is difficult to write about the
people and place one loves, knowing that their children and grandchildren will read what
is written and knowing I will be judged. Nevertheless, the exchanges that transpired as
the research was conducted were done with sincerity and great care. It is part of my
reciprocal obligation to acknowledge individual Samoans for their generous assistance,
and their role in ‘aiga and villages.

Finally, even though I am Samoan, I have not chosen to conceal some of the
difficulties faced by our local communities and their social extensions overseas. The
point of the dissertation was to understand how fa’ata-Samoa and movement interact and
are tied to globalization. Samoans ought to know that the concerns they talk about are
not always unique to themselves. In many ways, their concerns and dreams are part of a
universal human experience.

In the following chapters, I bridge the gap between the past and present by seeing
individuals in terms of their life histories. I place their experiences in the contexts of
broader regional, national, and global changes of economic history. Thus Chapter Two:
Contested Fields and Methods outlines the primary methods employed in the study and
my personal field experience. My goal to use overlapping field strategies and the success
and limitation of these instruments is considered. I also examine the often taken-for­
granted procedures of research and begin to isolate some of the problems with categories
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of field research. I discuss the rationale for using a multi-sited ethnographic approach and how it reinforces the concepts of household and ‘aiga in fa’a-Samoa. My intellectual journey, reflections, and thoughts on the research process especially as an insider doing research in my own community, are described in this chapter.

Chapter Three: Mapping the Study Communities describes the research sites at the national and village levels. The environmental and human settings are portrayed with concomitant socioeconomic changes, including the birth of Salelologa as a trade center. I describe the interactive relationships of change and continuity, and I argue that these changes simultaneously shape the contemporary scene as well as present challenges to the village and its matai council. Thus, maintaining equilibrium between both increased modernization or the ‘money economy’ and cultural continuity is a constant balancing act in the village. The second part of the chapter focuses on a socio-demographic profile of the population, its educational, agricultural, and economic activities and how these characteristics inform overseas movement and its origins.

Chapter Four: Fa’a-Samoa, Culture, Identity, and Mobility: Context, Critique and Dialogue outlines the literatures on fa’a-Samoa, culture, identity, and mobility as well as their applications to population movements. I argue that culture, identity, and mobility have been constructed in fixed and bounded positions leading to binarism and dualistic thinking about them and their applications to people’s movements. However, local knowledge and people’s understanding view these concepts as relatively flexible, permeable, and negotiable. Recent critical social theory has challenged spatial metaphors and created an awareness of the relationship between power and knowledge. In this context, questions about identity and mobility are increasingly framed within postcolonial
studies where migrant subjectivity, rather than an economistic approach, dominate the discussion (Lawson 2000; Young 1998).

*Chapter Five: Journeys: Samoan Understandings of Movement*, discusses the concept *malaga* (movement) to highlight its diverse meanings along with its cultural, economic, and sociopolitical dimensions. In *malaga*, dwelling and reaching are grounded in the social connections of kin by blood and/or adoption. *Paolo ma gafa* (shelter and protection, through marriage or adoption) is evoked constantly in interviews to explain people’s *faia* (kin connections). These *faia* compel people to do things for family members even though some of them are frivolous or unpredictable; it is also the reason why some do not follow suit. Thus, the possibilities for contestation and conflict are always present.

*Chapter Six: Diaspora, Remittances, and Development Reconsidered*, presents empirical evidence on how the relationship between ‘home’ and ‘reach’ is intricately intertwined in the discourse on the power of place, and how knowledge of these relationships is woven into understanding linkages of *faia*. Such *faia* are fundamental to the ways Samoans engage with kin and evoke connections that render being Samoan and of Salelologa complex. The meaning of remittances and ‘development’ are examined and their Samoan understanding exemplified. My analysis demonstrates both a sense of rootedness and the translocal nature of place.

*Chapter Seven: Multilocality ‘Home’ and ‘Reach’* provides both fact and overview of Salelologa mobility with connections between ‘reach’ and ‘home’ probed and their multilocality examined. The material and moral foundations of Samoan *aiga* are considered to help understand the regimes of kinship discourse, indicating ways in
which people know and use connections in new environments. The spaces of transnationalism are encoded in the links between ‘home’ and ‘reach’, or i’inei (local) and fafo (overseas), and vice versa. My focus on transnational space, or the “space between” (Small 1997, 193) those family members who move and those who stay, and the income and status earned in fafo (overseas) compared to i’inei (Samoa), demonstrates how the new social and economic structures of mobility, development, and tradition are being wrought. The procedures of matai conferment and tautua (service) are blurring boundaries of fafo and i’inei, illustrating the transnational dimension and impact of these processes. Thus issues of power, knowledge, and appropriation are legitimated through the interactions of ‘aiga members.

Chapter Eight: ‘Outou, Matou, Tatou: You, We, Us concludes and summarizes the study. In order to bring the interactions of fa’a-Samoa, culture, and mobility into clearer focus, the main argument of each chapter and their thematic links are evaluated. The chapter ends with my final thoughts on how this research contributes to the geographic literature on population mobility in the Pacific.

Approaches to Population Movement

Theoretical perspectives to population movements during the past forty years have tended to cluster around three conceptual frameworks: neoclassical, structural, and dependency. A concern with humanism is more recent, as is the focus on circular mobility. One scholarly approach applies specifically to Pacific Island environments and is summarized by the acronym MIRAB (Migration, Remittance, Aid, Bureaucracy). Thinking about transnationalism is also significant for its link to globalization and the
flow of capital, goods, ideas, technology, people, and services across the world. These theoretical perspectives, concepts, and concerns are the established conventions of migration study that frame my goal to focus on indigenous epistemologies of movement.

**Neoclassical and Structural approaches**

Neoclassical approaches emphasize the impact of the spatial distribution of labor markets on employment opportunities as a way to explain the shift of migrants from rural areas or developing countries to urban areas and developed countries (Chant and Radcliffe 1992). These approaches are loosely based on classical economics and have changed little since the end of the nineteenth century. Drawing on the arguments in Ravenstein’s (1885) *The Laws of Migration*, they use notions such as ‘push’ and ‘pull’ to explain choices migrants make and the reasons for their moves. Neoclassical economic and behavioral models take utility maximization as their premise, assuming that migrants seek better economic opportunities by moving. Consequently, migration is often described as different types of flow, that highlight demographic and economic features rather than social, political, or cultural meanings.

Moreover, neoclassical approaches stress the causes rather than the effects of migration. It is seen primarily as an individual affair and its wider structural implications are seldom considered (Gardner 1995). The positivist nature of much of this work, along with the assumption that migration is the result of rationalizing economic forces and so can be statistically modeled, means that it contributes little to our understanding of movement as a *social* or a *cultural* act.
Structural explanations of migration tend to emphasize factors such as colonialism, political instability, and inequality in the country of origin, differences in income and educational opportunities between origin and destination countries, dependency relationships, and incorporation of countries and societies into a capitalist world system. Among theories concerned with the origins of migrant flows, ‘push-pull’ formulations are still the most widely accepted. In these, economic, social, and political factors that compel people to leave their home village, region, or country are negatively evaluated and the destinations to which they go are viewed more positively. In studies of Samoan migration, many of these formulations attempt to assess the relative strength of the push or pull in migrant decision-making, and tend to emphasize the differences in wage incentives between origin and destination areas. Although nearly all these structural factors impact Samoan migration, Franco (1991, 6) notes that “there are many culturally distinctive features that are equally important in understanding Samoan migration.”

Portes (1984, 5) argues that push-pull constructs are particularly common in analyses of immigration to the United States and criticizes them on two grounds. First, most push-pull models are developed post facto: that is, they are successful in explaining existing flows but unsuccessful in predicting new ones. Secondly, they fail to explain why sizable emigration occurs from one particular country, while little or no emigration occurs from countries suffering from even worse social, economic, and political conditions.

Migration studies conducted throughout the Pacific (e.g., Connell 1984) often reflect push-pull thinking. First, the particular environmental and locational aspects of
small island nations are emphasized especially their narrow economic base, variable resource endowments, and fragmented shipping services. These combine to create a poor economic situation for people living in most Pacific countries of which Samoa is no exception. Second, discussions about people’s aspirations include a growing desire for more contemporary goods and services associated with urban lifestyle and the increasing attractiveness of perceived opportunities available in urban settings. These two contrasting situations are often seen as push and pull scenarios that inevitably lead to heavy out-migration. The impact of many people flowing away from the smaller or more remote islands is then seen in terms of loss of ‘talent’, ‘leadership’, and ‘manpower’ (Connell 1980; Graves and Graves 1976). Moreover, any changes in contextual factors, such as improved transportation, communication, and infrastructure or the growth of ethnic communities in metropolitan countries, merely encourage the flow of people away from their isolated home islands. Depopulation thus seems inevitable and is a negative result portrayed many times throughout the Pacific (Bedford 1984; Connell 1984; Shankman 1976; Ward 1989).

The structural approach comes in a variety of forms (e.g., Portes 1984). Its proponents are concerned with macro-level economic and political constraints on opportunities for movement and consequently favor ‘dual-economy’ models from the marginalist and rational choice tradition in economics. Structuralist understandings of migration interpret it in terms of global dependency and relationships between the core and periphery. Seen in this light, migration is just one experience of international inequality, with people being transported back and forth as the core pleases.
Even so, structuralist analysis provides useful insights into international politics and explains how economic trends have had multiple repercussions on the natal places of migrants. National and local economies, communities and family organizations, the individuals and their social networks are all implicated in structural analysis. But while the exploitative role of capitalism and colonialism forms the bedrock upon which structuralist accounts are founded, migrants should also be regarded as active agents. Their cultures, individual opportunisms, and collective enterprises interact in ways that affect the process and patterns of population movements. Migration cannot simply be reduced to a reactive response to the world capitalist order.

**Dependency model**

According to Hayes (1991), dependency is implicit in structuralist arguments, but the modern school of dependency theory did not come into existence until the mid-1960s. Since then, it has been extended to include labor movements, specifically between those areas categorized as the developing and developed worlds and come to dominate development studies. Central to the dependency framework are concepts such as labor migration, employment, markets, and the politico-economy. In local contexts, rural and urban areas are contrasted in terms of the level of development and concentration of services and infrastructure. In colonial regimes, poor areas were administered for the benefit of economic interests of colonizing countries. The lack of services in rural areas creates a dichotomy that encourages urbanization, whereby individuals leave their homes permanently to relocate in urban environs.
The dependency theory is closely tied into a 'world system' framework, in which economic inequalities are seen as inherent between core and periphery areas. The most popular version of this argument is associated with Frank's (1967) work in Latin America which sees a world dominated by a single economy such that all people are integrated into the sphere of capitalist production. They are linked by a series of metropolitan and satellite chains, which draw towards the center the surpluses evident at each stage of production. The result is that the periphery and the satellites become impoverished, the centers accumulate wealth and grow so that the effect of rural-urban migration in Latin America is creation of an urban proletariat.

Dependency theorists are unable to adequately understand the causes of underdevelopment. The essence of the dependency explanation is that the integration of the world system leads to a transfer of economic surplus from the colonized or underdeveloped regions to the colonizer or core regions. It is argued that this transfer of surplus is a necessary part of capitalist economic development at the core, which means that development and underdevelopment are two, necessarily integrated sides of one coin.

In other words, dependency theory has implied a “zero-sum process whereby the advances of one nation were and could only be made at the expense of another” (Forbes 1984, 71). The exchange relations which link countries are analyzed in terms of “how primitive accumulation and unequal exchange dominated the relations of production” (Frank 1978, 17-18).

Dependency theory has been challenged from several directions. For instance, it implies that dependent social entities are 'passive victims' of their place in a world capitalist economy, which in turn is the single main determinant of their internal social
structure. Dependency theory thus fails to recognize the significance of autonomous Third World histories, especially their own internal processes of class formation. It also neglects resistance to colonialism and therefore represents what Hayes (1991, 34) describes as “a venture into a Eurocentrism that utterly fails to understand the two-way nature of relationships between social formations.” Hayes elaborates this in terms of how the dependency model has been applied to Polynesian migration, as exemplified in the voluminous writing of the economic geographer, John Connell (1980, 1983, 1984, 1987). According to Hayes (1991, 24), “Polynesian migrants are usually characterized as discontent, over socialized victims of the global capitalist system wrenched from their islands and families by the destructive forces of monetization, individualism, and consumerism.” The migration process is writ-large as a destructive force that undermines the culture, social system, and demographic balance of the home society.

The failure of dependency theory to properly consider class formation is more than a mere omission. It is the result of an inability to adequately explain different "levels of development and underdevelopment or more appropriately levels of exploitation between nations" (Forbes 1984, 73). Dependency theory is mechanistic, because it assumes these processes inevitably produce underdevelopment while offering no socioeconomic alternative. In dependency theory, the primary cause of migration from peripheral areas is simple: it is the social and economic disintegration (underdevelopment) resulting from the penetration of global capitalism and the incorporation of the periphery into the international system.

Early studies in the Pacific, by Bedford in Tongoa, New Hebrides, now Vanuatu (1973), Brookfield in Chimbu, Papua New Guinea (1972), and Hayes in the Cook Islands
(1982), show the absence of an urban-proletariat in many Islands. This is largely attributed to their socio-cultural systems and the existence of subsistence agriculture. In short, local systems of production gives Pacific Islanders greater flexibility in the nature of movement and whether to go or to stay.

Other problems with structural and dependency perspectives reflect implicit assumptions about ‘development’ and ‘migration’. Shankman’s (1976) study, *Migration and Underdevelopment: The Case of Western Samoa*, is concerned with “The relationship between migration, remittances and underdevelopment, focusing on the kinds of economic ties that migrants maintain with people who are left behind.” Shankman warns about the dangers of excessive ‘migration’ and continuing dependence on remittances, arguing that the result could be an inordinate degree of dependency on external sources of finance, which would be exacerbated if receiving countries restrict ‘migration’. As (Va’a 2001) observes, it follows that more efforts should be directed towards internal sources of development because ‘migration’ over time will worsen ‘underdevelopment’.

Shankman’s version of ‘development’ assumes that economic behavior is universal and homogeneous. He also posits two economies, the ‘organized’ western economy and the ‘loosely organized’ non-western economy (Chant and Radcliffe 1992). Despite the addition of cultural details his ‘development’ analysis does not portray the complete picture for Samoa. Although quite impressed with the consistently high amount of remittances flowing through Samoa during the time he conducted research, it was predicted to decline once the Sa’asi villagers (a pseudonym) become established in new countries. In a more recent paper, “Samoan Exodus” (1993), Shankman seems enthralled by the levels of remittances to Samoa, still consistently high despite bad
economic recessions worldwide. Thus despite the obvious impact of economic processes on mobility behavior, less visible socio-cultural ones may be historically more durable than he and other structural/dependency theorists assume.

Equally problematic is the implicit assumption that ‘migrants’ always relocate permanently once they leave ‘home’, usually for urban or metropolitan environments. In a stinging critique, Young (1998, 10) observes that the “centrism of economics in the analysis of the ‘migrant’ perpetuates the disjunctive view of any durability and continuity that exist before movement; what existed prior to the term ‘migrant’ disappear in this kind of analysis.”

Early anthropological and geographical research in third world and tropical environments tended to understand ‘migration’ as an ‘external’ force, which would inevitably lead to the breakdown of local culture. This view was taken by researchers in pre-independence Africa who saw male labor ‘migration’ in negative terms, linking it with agricultural decay and ‘detribalization’ (Richards 1939; Shapera 1947). Similarly, in Samoa ‘migration’ has been linked with the breakdown of the extended family (Shankman 1976; Yusuf 1985). These studies evoke an image of cultural change following a linear trajectory and the inevitable transformation of traditional social institutions and culture into more modern forms. Similar assumptions appear in many contemporary studies of Island ‘emigration’, which portray sending communities as ‘dependent’ and ‘corrupted’ by ‘migration’ (Connell 1983a, 1983b, 1983c, 1983d, 1983e, 1983f, 1984; Ward 1989). Connell’s empirical corpus studies on population and ‘migration’ conclude that ‘migration’ inescapably and negatively impacts places of
origin. By its very title, Ward’s (1989) *Earth’s Empty Quarter* shares this pessimistic view of the impact of ‘migration’ and development in the Pacific region.

In a more recent paper, “Expanding Worlds of Oceania”, Ward (1997) finds such binary typologies untenable, especially when considering the lack of severe ‘underdevelopment’ in places such as Samoa, Tonga, and the Cook Islands compared to Africa, Asia, or Latin America. He suggests that the impelling social linkages of the Pacific diaspora necessitates rethinking the concept of ‘migration’ and perhaps *movement* is more appropriate. In short, economics is significant, but it is not the sole determinant of why people move. The persistence of cultural foundations of mobility behaviors across rural communities, urban, and international settings means that social and cultural factors cannot be easily ignored.

**MIRAB model**

MIRAB is a model that derives specifically from Pacific Island experience, is an acronym for Migration, Remittance, Aid, and Bureaucracy, and was developed by economist Geoffrey Bertram and geographer Ray Watters in the mid-1980s (Bertram and Watters 1985). They argue that migration (MI), remittances (R), aid (A) and bureaucracy (B) have changed Pacific Island micro-states to such an extent that they now constitute an entirely new model for development. Their thesis argues is that these four factors dominate the development process, are durable rather than temporary, and actually more desirable than conventional development strategies given the limited resource base of the Pacific islands. Of all factors in the model, perhaps migration is most important. Traditional emphasis on the importance of family motivates movement and the sending
back of remittances, so that transnational corporations of kin may be said to allocate their labor between countries. They are members of an integrated social community which transcends spatial boundaries, but which maintains a single socioeconomic system (Bertram and Watters 1985).

The MIRAB model as applied to Samoan population movement illuminates some of the factors missing from neoclassical, structuralist, and dependency thinking. The bedrock assumptions of economic rationality, remain intact, however, so that when there is an economic boom or bust in the United States, New Zealand, or Australia, remittances are assumed likely to be reduced or even curtailed. Furthermore, MIRAB thinking has been criticized for assuming dependency on the part of those receiving remittances and for giving the impression that flows are only in one direction from abroad toward island homes. More recent studies suggest there is also flow, even if in smaller amounts and different in kind, from island to overseas countries where family members live (Brown and Walker 1995; James 1993; Small 1997).

A product of “welfare state colonialism”, according to (Hayes 1991, 22), the MIRAB model reflects a concern that the unique features of Pacific Island states render inapplicable theoretical constructs based on other developing countries. Throughout the 1980s, socioeconomic growth in Samoa was strong and general improvement in village life, despite a low GNP of US$1000 per capita (Human Development Report 1996). Ward (1997) argues that although Pacific Island economies in the last decade are often described as growing slowly in some sectors, this poor performance may reflect the variable quality of statistical data and the statistical measures used to assess economic performance rather than the realities of people’s well-being. In Samoa, remittances sent
by relatives and children have contributed significantly to raising living standards, but
this process is not unique to Samoans. As Hayes writes,

The ability of modern Polynesians to maintain dual identities, one adapted
to the demands of metropolitan societies (in particular the labor markets),
the other rooted in the neo-traditional culture of the home society, has
facilitated “transnational communities” consisting of two or more
population “nodes” separated by large distances while apparently
maintaining similar social relations of rights and obligations as would be
operative in a previously geographically bounded system (1991, 9).

While the MIRAB model acknowledges the importance of cultural particularities,
such as close family networks and collective responsibility in studying Pacific Island
economies, it tends to valorize such difference by relegating them to some mystical
position without examining the cultural foundations for such social exchange. For
example, movers are not given the scholarly attention they deserve as dutiful members of
‘aiga, who in spite of bad economic times and financial difficulties often continue to
remit money. These outgoing flows include not only money orders and tele-transfers, but
also shipments of food, clothing, home appliances, and cash gifts which often go
unreported in national accounts, as unmeasured trade and currency flows through
transnational household economies. Without a complete examination of the ideologies
that underpin Pacific Island mobility, such explanations cannot be considered complete.

There is a subtle aspect in MIRAB thinking that remittance stifles agricultural
production, because it is a more efficient way to acquire hard currency than exporting
agricultural crops. There is truth to this, but along with remittance comes the oso (gifts to
take when traveling) usu, and alalafaga (gifts to distribute when traveler returns)— all of
which require agricultural production to occur properly. This dimension is not fully
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explored in MIRAB theory. Foodstuffs such as taro, bananas, kava, along with mats and fine mats, remain essential to fulfill obligations at local and international levels, and for trading and giving presents. Remittances are needed to provide capital to establish small businesses and try to generate local incomes while cash also has become a necessary ingredient of Samoan ceremonial occasions. As in Tonga (James 1991, 1993), remittance-receiving families have not entirely replaced agriculture as a source of local income, nor have villagers been able to purchase enough food remittances to give up subsistence activities. The timing of remittances is specific, sent when fa’alavelave (crucial life event) occurs, as gifts from children to their parents on birthdays, or for other special occasions.

Bertram (1986, 820) writes that links between the capitalist and non-capitalist sectors are provided not only by “bilateral transfers of funds between aid donor and recipient countries in the Pacific, but also by remittance transfers among various component parts of the 'transnational corporations of kin' which direct the allocation of each island family's labor around the regional economy.” This views the behavior among related kin as resembling the familiar transnational corporations of the modern global sector in how resources are allocated and how income is transferred between units within the group. Hayes (1992) notes this is a rather stretched analogy, even though it draws attention to the important role of kinship, which is virtually absent from structuralist dependency approaches.
Humanist approach

Deep concerns with logical positivism resulted in the humanist turn in geography and mounting criticism during the 1970s, of the limited reach of empiricism, the positivist underpinnings of location analysis, and the empirically exact ‘spatial science’, stimulated the search for alternative procedures and perspectives (Gregory 1978; Harvey 1969; King 1976). Since then shifts toward a more humanist conception of nature, space, and place have been a general trend in social science led in geography by Edward Relph (1976), Yi-Fu Tuan (1974), Anne Buttimer (1974), and David Ley (1978).

Buttimer’s work, *Values in Geography* (1974), argues for the need for geography to have a serious engagement with ‘values’. In “Grasping the Dynamism of the Lifeworld” (Buttimer 1976, 278) she suggests ways to make a concerted effort to “reconcile heart and mind, knowledge and action in our everyday worlds.” She argues for a more humanist philosophy that transcends the dualism between subjective and objective modes of understanding experience. When examining the human experience of space and place, Buttimer (1976) emphasizes the holistic nature of communities and the dynamic wholeness of individuals as they negotiate their lifeworlds—*lebenswelt* a concept that comes from Husserl’s phenomenology. Broadly speaking, “lifeworld can be defined as the all-encompassing horizon of individual and collective lives. In geography, it represents a disciplined but subjective investigation of the places constituting the lifeworld” (Peet 1998, 54). In other words, it is the moving historical field of lived existence.

For Buttimer, drawing upon the lifeworld of individuals can help explore the intricate meanings of life experiences that often are taken for granted. Scholarly
procedures which separate ‘subjects and objects’, ‘thought and action’, or ‘people and environment’ are inadequate for investigating lifeworlds, whereas metaphors of ‘home’ and ‘reach’ emphasize the rootedness of people in places despite their mobility. In this study, I draw insight from Buttimer’s (1980) metaphors of ‘home’ and ‘reach’.

Humanists consider movement an integral part of life rather than resulting solely from capitalist penetration or the stages of modernization or economic growth. Humanists favor looking at the real world and reject reducing participants to abstractions (Agnew, Johnston, and Rogers 1996). In one form or another, this approach is evident in specialized studies of Western Europe (Buttimer 1980, 1985), South-Central and West Africa (Mitchell 1961; Olofson 1976, 1985); the Pacific Islands (Bonnemaison 1981; Chapman 1985), Southeast Asia (Hugo 1978), and South Asia (Subedi 1993). Most humanists interpret movement as a continuing dialectic between the centripetal forces of social obligation and the centrifugal forces of economic opportunities located elsewhere (e.g., Mitchell 1961). Most often, inherent concepts and societal worldviews are traced through feelings, local expressions, and metaphors (Bonnemaison 1985; Buttimer 1980; Olofson 1976).

In the last three decades, indigenous scholars from the Pacific Islands have entered the academy, adding important insights and new dimensions to the abovethinking. Wendt’s (1976) *Towards a New Oceania* signals an emergence from a sense of closure, imprisonment within the spaces delimited by others, and pushes the boundaries of objective and detached analysis to a narrative of movement and place that recognizes the relationship between power and knowledge in the construction of identity. Thus he underscores the importance of alternative ways of seeing, whose origins are
rooted in a complex of experiences. Hau’ofa’s (1993) *Our Sea of Islands* expands on the vision of a ‘new’ Oceania, and advocates inclusion. Whereas the prevailing narratives of the Pacific had focused on small, resource poor, remote islands scattered ‘in the far seas’, Hau’ofa in ‘our sea of islands’ envisions a ‘world enlargement’ as people in Oceania move within and beyond its boundaries. He argues, “people were unnaturally confined and severed from many of their traditional sources of wealth, and it is in their blood to be mobile” (Hau’ofa 1993, 9). For Hau’ofa and Wendt, their challenge to prevailing academic and cultural paradigms in Oceania describe personal journeys through time and place as maps of movement. My perspective is similarly guided by indigenous Samoan ways of knowing and I tread a path laid down by the humanist thinkers and indigenous scholars who have gone before me.

Some of these humanist studies point to a particular brand of urbanization in the Pacific that characterize these processes, whereby moves are notably impermanent and circulatory (Pirie 1995). Some see migration as taking place within one international system. ‘Emigration’ can cause radical change and readjustment, but does not necessarily lead to greater structural change or the ‘breakdown’ of traditional forms of activity (Franco 1991). The balancing of the forces of modernity, with the maintenance of ancestral values is a continual theme in these accounts. O’Meara (1990) studies the reasons for agricultural stagnation and whether economic factors influence Samoan choices to continue in agriculture or making copra. He shows that Samoan farmers calculate the cultural benefits of fa’a-Samoa, the pain and gain of change relative to the advantages promised by a money economy or paid employment. O’Meara’s study is a refreshing account that gives a close description of the many decisions facing villagers.
In essence, it refutes the idea that fa’a-Samoa is inherently conservative and static or that Samoans are resistant to change. Instead, deliberate calculations are made with regard to the relative benefits of a mixed economy.

Various writers have described island ‘migration’ in terms of stages such as ‘sojourners’ or ‘settlers’ (Connell 1990; Kallen 1982; Macpherson 1984). Labels such as these cannot do justice to second or third generation Samoans born overseas and paying extended visits to Samoa, or even to the original pioneer migrants now in their fifties and sixties and returning to Samoa to establish houses, consolidate businesses, or receive matai titles. While notions of settling or sojourning is a useful starting point, in reality things are not so clear cut. People in Salelologa are often settled in both there and abroad. Households transcend geographical boundaries and people’s perceptions of where they belong have become increasingly complex.

Circular mobility

The circular mobility approach is closely identified with the work of Murray Chapman and Mansell Prothero (1985). They take a more micro view that emphasizes the constant ebb and flow of people in and out of village communities, the customary or traditional bases of mobility and, most importantly, the circular nature of movement. In other words, Chapman and Prothero argue that cultural and territorial interpretations of movements are as important in understanding population mobility behaviors as are economic factors. Initially based on internal migrants in Black Africa and Melanesia, the circular mobility approach has been applied by social scientists to other kinds of movement in other parts of the world.
In the late 1950s, extensive research on the labor mobility of wage workers in south-central Africa led the British social anthropologist J Clyde Mitchell (1961) to propose a theory of population movement which he called 'circulation'. This notion recognized the continual oscillation of villagers between their homes and plantations, mines, commercial centers, and seaports as an enduring feature of African life. Such constant movement or circulation reflects a people who hold strongly to their tribal heritage but who, to fulfill their desire for some of the material products of a money economy, must leave the village to engage in temporary employment. The wage laborer thus responds to two conflicting sets of forces: centrifugal ones that induce him to leave his tribal domicile and centripetal ones that draw him back again.

Mitchell's concept of tribal mobility as 'circulation' referred only to the ebb and flow of wage laborers. Inherent to Mitchell's level of abstraction was the assumption that "circulation is a transitory population movement linked to particular processes and phases of socioeconomic change—notably urbanization, modernization, and industrialization" (Chapman and Prothero 1985, 5). Again, for Mitchell "the circulation of labor between village and town would cease once a rising social commitment external to the rural areas converges with the town-based pull of ever-expanding economic needs" (Mitchell 1961, 278).

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, research in Melanesia and South East Asia (Bedford 1973; Chapman 1970; Hugo 1978) broadened Mitchell's position to include all reciprocal flows, irrespective of purpose or duration, while still emphasizing the "dialectic between the centrifugal attractions of wage employment, commercial and administrative forces and the centripetal power of village obligations, social relations and
kin ties” (Chapman and Prothero 1985, 4). Chapman and Prothero continue:

“Circulation, far from being transitional or ephemeral, is a time honed and enduring mode of behavior, deeply rooted in a great variety of cultures and found at all stages of socioeconomic change” (ibid., 6). Wide-scale sustained urbanization is one of the most significant geographical processes of the last two centuries. In Europe, the shift of population from rural areas to towns and cities was closely associated with the emergence of industrialization (Hobsbawn 1974). That did not make it less traumatic for agricultural workers displaced from the land, nor did the growth of industry guarantee a good life in the city. Many were forced into an informal labor market, working in domestic or petty trade, while factory conditions for the industrial workforce and housing standards in general were poor (Forbes 1986).

Urbanization in the Third World lagged behind Europe, but has grown rapidly over the last forty years. The incorporation of rural societies into the world economy precipitated a destabilization of village economies, redirected and amplified an innate restlessness in rural populations, and led to large-scale permanent and temporary shifts of population to towns and cities. Zelinsky (1971, 221-222) has termed this a process of 'mobility transition', arguing that “There are definite, patterned regularities in the growth of personal mobility through space-time during recent history, and these regularities comprise an essential component of the modernization process.” In other words, he posits a general shift in the nature of mobility as society evolves from pre-modern traditional society through transitional stages to an advanced, urban industrial society. While there are certain parallels between urbanization in Europe and in the contemporary Third World, they have occurred in different historical epochs and, therefore, can be
compared only with great caution. Nevertheless, persuaded by the impelling power of modernization, Zelinsky (1971, 223) argues that “A society always passes through four unilineal phases of mobility—premodern traditional, early transitional, late transitional, and advanced stage on its way from a traditional-subsistence to an urban-industrial state. As it moves through these stages there is a vigorous acceleration of circulation.”

Chapman and Prothero write that common in the thinking of both Mitchell and Zelinsky, is the assumption that circulation is a transitory form of population movement linked to processes and phases of socioeconomic change. They argue:

The paradox of Zelinsky’s ‘mobility transition’ is that, presented as a stage-type model, the discontinuities between each of its four cross-sectional phases are magnified. Such schema also reflect an analytic bias. Namely that, under any condition of socioeconomic change, the indigenous elements of a mobility system are seen to be of lesser importance and hence are examined more infrequently than whatever the external forces operating upon that system (1985, 5).

Thus Chapman and Prothero see this complex process differently and argue that “circulation as a form of mobility has not evolved from the impact of alien or western influences upon indigenous circumstances. Rather, these and other externally-generated changes have reinforced customary circuits of mobility and added new ones.” Crucial to their formulation is the notion that circulation like migration, is an integral part of population movement and not separate from it. Moreover, they view most previous migration research as overly concerned with the shape and structure of movement rather than articulating actual mobility processes and how they operate over time. The circular mobility approach attempts to address some of the problems raised earlier, especially in the kinds of mechanistic, aggregate, and macro level research so common in the literature.
Transnationalism

Transnationalism is an emerging concept in studies of population movement that has gained momentum since its inception in the early 1990s. Declaring the need to rethink conceptions of international migration, anthropologists Basch, Schiller, and Szanton-Blanc in an initial statement defined their understanding of transnationalism:

We define “transnationalism” as the processes by which immigrants build social fields that link together their country of origin and their country of settlement. Immigrants who build such social fields are designated “transmigrants.” Transmigrants develop and maintain multiple relations—familial, economic, social, organizational, religious, and political that span borders. Transmigrants take actions, make decisions, feel concerns, and develop identities within social networks that connect them to two or more societies simultaneously (1992, 1-2).

Issues which have dotted the field in recent years include arguments about the intensity and relevance of transnationalism in certain migrant communities, the significance of investigating the logic of transnationality, and the methodologies to be employed in transnational studies. Transnationalism has not come without its critics. Much transnational scholarship in geography has focused on economic globalization, particularly the growing international flows of commodities, services, money, and information of the last two or three decades. In analyzing the effects of political forces at both international and national scales, numerous geographers have focused in particular on the contemporary geopolitics of the nation-state (Vertovec 1999; Mitchell 1997). Advances in technology have facilitated globalization processes and further enabled the presence of global restructuring.
While this ‘new vision’ is welcome, analyzing the newly visible mobility of
goods and services and the general capitalist expansion worldwide often relies on a
homogeneous vision of global processes. As Mitchell points out:

Assumptions and hegemonic narratives of modernity are assumed as
standards—standards which are, of course, transformed in various ways
upon contact with local regions, but which nevertheless contain a form and
explanatory potential that is inviolate. The origin of these processes
recede from view, and their power and ability to expand and diffuse take

The most glaring assumption that dominates these narratives is of nationstates with
borders seen as places of containment. So far, research on transnationalism has focused
on documenting evidence of material exchanges between sending and receiving
communities (Gorges 1990; Grasmuck and Pessar 1997). Although earlier studies
collected data on the transfers of money, goods, and resources, scholars are beginning to
move beyond this more tangible traffic to uncover ties, links, and movements based on
ideas, beliefs, and values.

In part, ransnationalism began as a critique of globalization, much of which
discussion is theoretically rather opaque (Featherstone 1990). If ethnography there is
ethnography and rarely is, it usually involves occasional forays into secondary sources to
embellish a particular point. Without analyzing local responses to wider global processes
in far more detail, we are in danger of either recreating the generalizations of earlier,
homogenizing macro-theories, or simply substituting obsolete notions of modernization
with the more trendy ‘globalization’, thus simply reducing it to a code for westernization.
The mechanisms of globalization—and implicitly f transnationalism are usually
identified as world capitalism, so that in some versions ‘globalization’ becomes a modified version of world-system theory (Wallerstein 1990).

Reflecting on how globalization is conceived, Amin (1997) argues that the dualistic thinking pervasive in academic discourse misses the point of globalization. He writes against the bipolar boundaries of state and capitalism, emphasizing the meaning of globalization as an “intermingling of ‘in here’; and ‘out there’ processes resulting in heterogeneity, shifting identities and multipolarity consistent with contemporary urban reality” (Amin 1997, 123). Much of what Amin discusses is still framed in the context of ‘globalization from above’, emanating from a city, or a core in the west. By talking in terms of ‘in here’ (as the center) and ‘out there’ (backstage and invisible), his conception remains tied to the very structures he critiques.

So far, most literature on globalization has only touched upon local interpretations of the flows of people, goods, and meanings distilled in the idea of transnationalism. The ways in which diversity is created locally, or of how the homogenizing tendencies of late twentieth century capitalism are resisted, have yet to be integrated with these more general discussions of ‘global flows’ (Gardner 1995). Clearly, what is missing from these dominating macro-analyses are more grounded, cultural interpretations and a deeper understanding of the social, economic, and political processes involved.
CHAPTER TWO

CONTESTED FIELDS AND METHODS

‘I’ does not exist, I am not. My self belongs not to me because ‘I’ is always ‘we’, is a part of the ‘aiga...part of the Church, a part of the nu’u, a part of Samoa (Figiel 1996, 135).

Unlike some of my anthropological ancestors, I have no love affair or fascination with the bizarreness, strangeness or exoticness of other cultures, nor am I disenchanted, fed up or disillusioned with my own Samoan culture. The purpose of my work in looking at the identity of NZ-born Samoans, i.e. researching my own culture, is to continue the voyage of my Samoan ancestors across time and space, and to tell the story about the experiences of Samoan people across time and space (Anae 1998, 21).

In this chapter, I reflect on the research methods of approaches to population movement in the Pacific Islands. As already discussed, these include neoclassical, dependency, structural, and modernization theories. Neoclassical and modernization approaches favor methods that are based on logical positivism. The logical positivist stance which from the seventies assumed a dominant position in geographic research in the Pacific, prompted me to look for alternatives to mobility study. Anthropology has been at the forefront of the re-evaluation of methodological issues, while population geography has been relatively slow to follow.

My main goal is to understand population movements and fa’a-Samoa through the eyes of Samoans. This endeavor has given me the opportunity to constantly compare a lived reality to the various theories of population movements rooted in the western intellectual tradition. In particular, I reject the dualistic frameworks of rural-urban, village-metropolitan currently applied to readings of contemporary transmigrant communities. In the following, I evaluate the assumptions inherent in research protocols
and research design. Secondly, as a member of the community on which this research is based, I clarify what it means to be an ‘insider’ or ‘outsider’ or ‘indigenous’ researcher, reflecting on both the research process and some ethical issues that emerged in the field. Reciprocity, and establishing a common dialogue about issues important to the Samoan community at large, were also important. I describe my interactions with research groups and communities, and how interview sessions became a reciprocal sharing of information, and my role not so much an inquisitor but a sister, daughter, mother, advisor, and friend. Thirdly, the field instruments used in this study and my particular approach to collection of data are described and evaluated in terms of their theoretical underpinnings and changing empirical foci.

**Reflections on the Research Process**

In population geography, very few current works bring together the personal with the historical and the structural, advance theories and inform politics, and use multiple methods and data sources (Halfacre and Boyle 1993; Lie 1995). At the same time several bedrock assumptions, as exemplified by Handlin’s (1951) extremely influential *The Uprooted*, have guided the majority of international migration studies. For example, the sojourn of ‘immigrants’ usually entails a radical, and in many cases a singular break from the old country in the move to a new nation; ‘migration’ is perceived as *inter*-national across well-defined national boundaries. However, the geographer Lawson (2000) notes that some exceptions are found. In cultural migration studies in the third world, there is a long-standing interest in ethnographic approaches and indigenous epistemologies as exemplified by the works of the sociologist J. Clyde Mitchell (1961) and the geographer
Murray Chapman (1970). True, analyses of international ‘migration’ have expanded in
depth and breadth, ranging from immigration networks and gender to adaptation and
assimilation of distinct migrant streams. Yet, as Lie (1995, 303) argues, “Theoretical and
methodological concerns remain rooted in classic immigration narrative and statistical
analyses or survey and census data. The historical and the ethnographic impulse, and
most glaringly the place of personal narratives has largely sunk.” In pursuing scientific
rigor, social scientists have assigned individual voices to the academic periphery.

In addition, how we know what we know is couched in terms of ‘distance’, or
what Rosaldo (1993) has called the obsession with ‘objectivity’, a central theme in the
human sciences that is traced to Max Weber. The Weberian tradition has provided
legitimation to research programs that attempt, in the name of value-free inquiry, to both
clarify the world and change it. Weber’s successors “have transformed the original
demanding ethic of ‘disinterested’ into an orthodoxy widespread in the social sciences
that equates objectivity with an attitude of emotional disengagement, cognitive distance,
and moral indifference” (Rosaldo 1993, 170). ‘Distance’ implies neutrality and
objectivity on behalf of the researcher. The Maori scholar, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, in her
book Decolonizing Methodologies explores assumptions and the structural issues which
underpin conventional research methodologies. As Smith writes:

> The individual can be distanced, or separated from the physical
> environment and community… it was all so impersonal, rational and
> extremely effective. Distance is measurable. What it has come to stand for
> is objectivity, which is not measurable to quite the same extent (1999, 55-
> 56).

Inherent in the idea of ‘distance’ is the assumption that the ‘researcher’ (often
read as ‘outsider’) somehow gets it because they can ‘keep a distance’ and therefore be
‘objective’ about it. This justifies the notion in classic social science research that one has to do research outside of one’s own cultural group, since it is presumed the only way to do ‘real’ and ‘objective’ enquiry. A distinction is therefore drawn between outsider and insider researchers, with implications for our findings that involves issues of representation. Although this critique is aimed at much classic work, some semblance of these assumptions are still found in more contemporary studies.

‘Objectivity’, in the strict sense of the word, is a goal that is not fully attainable because no matter who we are, our backgrounds, biases, likes and dislikes cannot be entirely suppressed. But the impossibility of attaining perfect objectivity does not mean that it is not worth pursuing. I believe we have come far in developing a body of research procedures, techniques, and methodologies that overcome the observer’s limitations and biases as they arise from national affiliation, sex, cultural/social class, age, and positionalities. All accounts are partial (Clifford and Marcus 1986). It is equally important to admit the subjective nature of the geographical or anthropological project. We need to explicate our research methods, so that readers will be able to take account of them in evaluating the ethnography or case study we present.

I contend that the points at issue are made more complicated by equating ‘distance’ with ‘objectivity’ and by setting up a simplistic dichotomy between insider and outsider. It is important to distinguish the epistemological assumptions dominant in western-based paradigms in social sciences. The use of empirical method and the general principle of testing propositions should also be examined.

The idea of being in the ‘field’ implies an intimate involvement with a place that is ‘out there’, in the distance, chaotic, where people may or may not be present (Smith
The researcher's job is to put order to that chaos, so it can be studied and analyzed. This raises concerns for the insider researcher for whom ‘the field’ is her own community, defined more intimately as full of people with hopes, dreams, and plenty of aspirations. In the process of doing ‘fieldwork’, it was never easy to distinguish between the ‘field’ and the ‘community’. I was perplexed over the emphasis put on these protocols of research, the distinctions between ‘us’ and ‘them’ in ‘the field’ as the *raison d’être* of social science research. Furthermore, ‘subjects’ are often treated as passive compared to the researcher. Deeply embedded in these constructs are classification systems that easily lend themselves to binary oppositions, dualisms, and hierarchical orderings of the world (Smith 1999). The ‘research’ describes a distinction, a difference. Pierre Bourdieu (1977, 208) argues that such an understanding of difference is fundamentally binary and oppositional, but “so ingrained into our western culture that the same oppositions have continued to shape our theorizing about different cultures.”

Scrutinizing the ethnographic self, social scientists now argue that the longing for the primitive, exotic, and authentic ‘other’ prevalent in academic discourse reflect the western ‘self’ and binary thinking (Parkula 1997). Unlike the outside scholar who may have ‘gone native’ and even ‘quit method’, I did not abandon essential field procedures for gathering information. I only became aware of my different statuses during field enquiries and noted that all participants were doing the same, as they evaluated me and our interactions.

In reality, my intellectual persona as a geographer (‘researcher’) and my emotional persona as a Salelologa villager, Samoan, and Pacific Islander (‘researched’), were not easily distinguishable. I do not take a purely reflexive route, however. To
portray my experience at the center of this report would be to deny community members
the dignity of their stories. The more we share our stories, the more blurred the
distinction between ‘researcher’ and ‘researched’ becomes.

During my interview visits, I was often introduced as “O Sa’iliemanu, le afafine o
Lilomaiava Niko ma Fa’alenu’u” (It’s Sa’iliemanu, the daughter of Lilomaiava Niko and
Fa’alenu’u), prompting people’s memories, especially the elderly whose hearing and/or
vision were not quite sharp. As Figiel (1996, 136) has written, “The ‘I’ was always
identified through my parents, my ‘aiga. ‘I’ did not exist; I was always part of the group,
part of the aiga, flesh and blood, part of the community, part of the village.” This
inclusiveness has always been the way family members are identified in Samoa. Great
emphasis is placed on the ‘I’ being responsible and accountable for actions within the
collective system. This is another way of saying that my actions, feelings, and reflections
do not exist in a vacuum. At times my identity as ‘student researcher’ was considered
secondary to my affiliation with my ‘aiga. At other times, my status as ‘university
educated’ became more important. In Samoa, people thus experience social interactions
as a cluster of hierarchies that interweave, sometimes discordantly, and that determine
appropriate displays of respect as calculations of context shift. The members of the
communities are active agents; this refutes the simplistic assumption of
power/powerlessness in the researcher/researched relationship.

The story that I tell here takes the approach that those interviewed were active
participants and that my role was an active learner, rather than judgmental expert. We
all collaborated and contributed to the narrative. Therefore, what I write is partly based
on participant perspectives and partly on my interpretations, mindful of the fact that we
never escape putting our own personal stamp on a study (Cresswell 1997; McBeth 1993). My research experience underscores the personal nature of such an undertaking, something that is not always acknowledged in social science research. Whether insider or outsider, inter-subjective relationships are created with research groups. Research design and procedures are inextricably linked to these philosophical issues. Our epistemology determines “the very production of knowledge systems that sustain particular conceptions and preconceptions of the world” (Young 1998, 102).

My primary interest in the interactive relationship between fa’a-Samoa and population movements was not something that I consciously intended to pursue. Although traveling around is something that I know I and most Samoans do as part of our everyday lives, I had not put too much thought into it as a scholarly endeavor. While studying for my Master’s degree in Pacific Islands Studies, I encountered studies of population movements, several of which treated people either as statistics or laborers rather than human beings. The meaning and experience for the movers was lacking in these portrayals.

Writing on population movement in the villages of Duidui and Pichahila, in what was then known as the British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Chapman asserts:

> While numerous studies have shown the importance of economic incentives to explain the extent, frequency and direction of population movements within a given country, for many, this conclusion reflects their Euro-American context (1970, 2).

Thirty years later, not much has changed in population geography, particularly in the field of mobility studies. In addition, research tends to focus on the rural versus urban dichotomy, which exacerbates problems of comprehension. The research agenda in rural
areas is fixated on socioeconomic issues of class and poverty and their impacts on ‘traditional’ cultures. As White (1992, 16) has noted, this is mainly because “the vast majority of research is funded by development agencies.” Moreover, this view is also greatly influenced by the pervasiveness of developmentalist writing (Overton 1993). It follows that Samoa is usually presented by the outside world, to the outside world, as a set of problems which need solving and have immediate policy implications. The people I worked with in Salelologa do not see themselves in this way. Although rural development and ‘impoverishment’ issues are crucial to a comprehensive understanding of Samoa, there is more to Samoan society and more specifically to Samoan movements than is accounted in such presentations.

**Insider, Outsider, Indigenous Research**

The driving force behind my research was the goal to understand mobility experiences of Island peoples, particularly Samoans. The village of Salelologa, on the big island of Savai’i in Samoa (formerly Western Samoa), was used to examine the transnational nature of movement. In Chapter Three, I describe the study sites and their particular historical contexts, but for now I would like to explain why I chose the community of Salelologa, Savai’i.

In selecting this site, I was guided by both personal interests and professional criteria (National Science Foundation 1998). Personal and professional concerns are difficult to disentangle. I had no desire to adhere to the traditional anthropological or geographic journey of doing research in some exotic location, which from my point of view might have included Africa, Europe, Asia, or North America. At the same time I
knew insider research often carries less status professionally. As Anae (1998, 25), a New Zealand-born Samoan points out: “You’re not really an anthropologist until you study another culture, you know...”. However, I already knew that large numbers of Salelologa residents had left for New Zealand or the United States. Salelologa is also a local community that, in microcosm, comprises attributes and processes of Samoan population movement. I knew that Salelologa was an excellent site for conducting a longitudinal study and was supported in this choice by the authors of the National Science Foundation’s (1998, 32) who argue that “familiarity can be a valuable asset in research.”

In recent times, the contexts of research have changed. As researchers and practitioners, we now recognize that we must continuously assess our roles in relation to our immediate social and professional environments. Our roles must necessarily vary with the situation and the social structures within which we work. Rather than remaining overly concerned with whether we should study ‘inside our own’ or ‘outside of our own’, we should step outside the ‘comfort zone’ of our disciplinary orientations. That includes adjusting to the impossibility of “absolute objectivity “ (Lett 1990, 135) and pondering whether our research is meaningful and fulfilling to the lives of those geography has called its ‘subjects’. Human geography arose from a concern with the search for universals within the diversity of human experience. This aim remains valuable, despite the cultural biases and patronizing attitudes that were bundled into early research studies. Studying my own village people and culture does not mean I simply turned my gaze on myself. Rather, I worked from the assumption that we are all part of the world system and that our participation in a global geography is essential, but without
invalidating the importance of local systems of knowledge, especially in Oceania. As other insider researchers have done, I study my own community as a means of helping my people. I am committed to the application of geographical knowledge as “a means of not only alleviating problems and providing self-help among native groups but of also being mediator between two worlds” (Medecine 1987, 284).

As an insider, my involvement is ongoing, demanding, and sometimes emotionally, economically, and educationally debilitating. I went into geography to try and rectify some of the ways ‘knowledge’ has described, categorized, and sometimes demeaned us. But too much preoccupation with these can become dubious given the postcolonial world we live in. Samoa has been independent since 1962 and at the helm of its own destiny. This means we Samoans cannot keep on blaming ‘outsiders’ for our problems. Given this, ‘neutrality’, formerly one of the central ethics of research, does me no good. As insider researchers, we may need to report abuses of power that we find while observing our own communities. In short, there are dangers in both extreme relativism and extreme subjectivism.

I am very much part of the people that my research concerns. My parents are both Samoan from Savai’i island. My father is from Salelologa and Sataua and my mother from Sale’aula and Fasito’otai. I was born in Salelologa and lived there for the first eighteen years of my life, until I went on government scholarship to do my Bachelor of Arts degree in Australia. The scholarship was earned by passing the University Entrance Examinations (U.E) conducted by the New Zealand Examination Board (Tamati 1989), a system which was established in the early 1950s.
After three years of undergraduate studies in Australia, I returned to Samoa and taught for two years at Vaipouli College, the only government high school on Savai’i. I then taught for four years at Samoa College in Apia, the capital city on Upolu island (Figure 1.2). My first eighteen years had nurtured and instilled a strong sense of my Samoan ‘being’, a village identity, and a commitment to my country. As one Samoan from Salelologa, who has lived in Santa Ana California for over thirty years related “You can take away the boy from Samoa but you can never take away Samoa from the boy” (Fieldnotes, February 2000).

After six years of working and teaching at home, my desire to do postgraduate studies became an obsession. At the beginning of 1989, I applied to the Center for Pacific Island Studies at the University of Hawai’i at Manoa, and was awarded a Fulbright fellowship to do a Master’s degree. During my sojourn in Hawai’i, I have embarked on two new journeys: one an intellectual awakening and the other through marriage. In 1991, I married an American and had a daughter a year later. In a way, I feel I now have a life of my own, so to speak. But my intellectual interests have always grounded me to Samoa(ns). Did I ever leave?

With these transformations, I see myself not as foregoing one identity for another, but rather as adding layers of identity to already existing ones. My time in Hawai’i has also been very important because of the presence of a significant Samoan community, as

---

Footnote 2: The British system of university education which New Zealand and Australia follow is quite different from the American system. The undergraduate degree normally takes three years unless a student does an Honors course. Upon the successful completion of studies abroad, one is required to return home and work in Samoa in a department suitable to one’s area of expertise. The Samoan Scholarship Program still operates but the syllabus the U.E. is based on has been considerably revised since 1990, with greater emphasis on courses more suitable to the Pacific Island context.
well as of other Pacific Islanders. These communities need people like me not only as role models but also as ‘cultural brokers’, who help break the cycle of misunderstanding which often leads to social problems associated with new migrant groups (Medecine 1987). My time in Hawaii has been punctuated by travels to Samoa, New Zealand, and the United States mainland, where some of my family members live. When I do not go to Samoa, it comes to me, as when my mother, siblings, or friends visit for extended periods. Such movements are quite universal to most Samoans and undoubtedly other Island peoples. This is the nature of our travels, perceived or real.

To clarify my position regarding the issue of insider/outside, indigenous research, and how it relates to my study, enough has been said about the question of who may do research. Researching one’s own community has now passed into mainstream social science (Kuper 1992). The question of how geography, history, or anthropology should be done is now a more pertinent issue, as Samoans and other indigenous scholars like Maori, Hawaiians, Solomon Islanders, Fijians, Rotumans, Tongans, and Chamorro have joined the academy. For example, as insider and outsider researchers collaborate, all have become encouraged to pay equal attention to aspects of emotion, intuition, oral history, and verbal sources, and to have a greater sensitivity to the different cultural groups that they study (Hau‘ofa 1982). Our efforts to produce more eclectic methods and theories that are both universal and culturally sensitive may be more difficult, but is worth the perseverance.

Much of the intellectual critique of standard ethnography and foundationalist epistemologies come from ‘postmodernist’ and ‘postcolonial’ scholars. I embrace the postmodern perspective for its rejection of metatheory and metanarratives in favor of
multiple voices and multiple subjectivities. What I do not subscribe to is the tendency in postmodernism to do away with all cultural boundaries or erase cultural roots, as has been claimed for a diasporic phenomenon (Gupta and Ferguson 1997). From a fa'a-Samoa epistemology, my tulaga and tofi (place and role) unquestionably puts me in a position from which I may speak to important issues about Samoa/for Samoa/of Samoa and without being challenged as to identity or right, irrespective of my current location and place of residence. This manner of thinking about the Samoan ‘self’ is predicated on the idea that, indeed, geography matters. Remaining connected to a ‘natal place’ does not imply people must remain fixed within a precise location to legitimize their identity or have the inviolable right to speak about one’s community.

The preoccupation with bounded space of classic geography and anthropology has been the focus of recent critique (Gupta and Ferguson 1997; Martin 1994). Gegeo’s (2000) discusses understanding of place and space for Kwara’ae, a cultural/linguistic group in Malaita, Solomon Islands’. In Kwara’ae epistemology, the relationship between ‘space’ and ‘place’ is complementary. Place refers to genealogy: that is, one’s location in the kin group. From this standpoint, one has the unconditional right to access to land, which consequently means an unquestioned position from which a person may speak to important issues for and about Kwara’ae. A Kwara’ae person can be anywhere and still has a place in Kwara’ae society. Space is the location a person may be at any given time as necessitated by employment or pursuit of education. Because of the possibility of space, a person can be anywhere and still be inextricably tied to place” (Gegeo 2000, 5). This is much closer to how Samoans conceive of transnational mobility.
Within fa’a-Samoa, every individual has a role accompanied by duties and responsibilities. To be unable to live up to those expectations is to bring shame to the collective ‘aiga (Ai’ono Fanaafi1996; Iuli 1991). With fa’a-Samoa comes a position informed by indigenous knowledge.

**Field Strategies and Methods**

Some authors express a strong desire for the precise definition of movement based upon strictly specified criteria. Although unresolved, much of this genuine concern could be met if definitions were acknowledged to reflect the nature of the research problem and consequently to vary with level of investigation (Chapman 1985, 432).

The earlier over-emphasis on quantitative methods in mobility research has shifted, along with the reorientation in thinking about mobility implied by the work of geographers such as Chapman (1985), Underhill (1989), and Young (1998). This methodological reorientation favors a more integrated approach to fieldwork through obtaining overlapping sets of field data, as will be outlined below, or the autobiographical approach described by Chapman (1990). In either case, mobility research should be informed by the ethnographic experience of fieldwork, which often translates into the use of qualitative methods. Unfortunately, the ongoing insistence of the dichotomy between quantitative and qualitative techniques means that the call for integration has yet to have made a meaningful impact on methodological practices. This is strange, since both approaches have similar goals, as Borman, LeCompte, and Goetz summarize:

Statistical procedures use tools of mathematics to establish relationships and linkages among constructs across settings and groups. By contrast, qualitative researchers use tools of logic to establish the same relationships within a given setting (1986, 55).
The theoretical basis and significance of qualitative research is now well established (e.g., Cresswell 1997; Fetterman 1989; Fielding and Fielding 1986; Hammersley and Atkinson 1995; Yin 1994). Cresswell writes that qualitative inquiry represents a legitimate mode of exploration in social and human science without a need for apology or comparison to quantitative research. Good models of qualitative inquiry demonstrate the rigor, difficulty, and time-consuming nature of this approach. Qualitative inquiries emphasize a “complex and holistic perspective” (Cresswell 1997, 15) so that the success of a ‘good’ qualitative study lies in how it engages the reader, how believable and realistic it is, how well it reflects all the complexities of real life.

Most critics of qualitative field methods favor use of the ‘scientific’ method idealized from investigative methods borrowed from the natural sciences. They criticize qualitative research for not being something it was never intended to be, ignoring its strengths. Subedi (1993), who integrated quantitative and qualitative methods in his field study of territorial mobility within two rural Nepali villages, rightly argues that “In quantitative research, deciding what to use as a unit of analysis is fundamentally an interpretive issue requiring both judgement and choice” (ibid, 36). ‘Choice’ is at the core of qualitative methods, where meanings rather than frequencies assume paramount importance (Cresswell 1997; Fielding and Fielding 1986; Yin 1994). Given the shortcomings of customary methods in mobility studies, the choice I made is to refuse an either/or position. Rather, I combine both qualitative and quantitative research tools. For the most part, my research design has been exploratory and descriptive in nature.

Cresswell (1997) lists five different qualitative traditions, none of which are mutually exclusive: interpretive biography, grounded theory, phenomenology,
ethnography, and case study. Of these, the case study, ethnography, and biography have been most useful in my research. In particular, I followed a multi-sited ethnographic approach for understanding chains, pathways, links and/or juxtapositions of locations in the transnational social field. This multi-sited strategy was essential to get a better understanding of the relationships between fa’a-Samoa, mobility, and identity. Marcus (1995, 96) argues that the multi-sited ethnography, as research method, “moves out from the single site and local situations of conventional ethnographic research designs to examine circulation of cultural meanings, objects, and identities in diffuse time-space.”

My field instruments included a field census, in-depth personal interviews (both open and semi-structured), participant observation, ‘home’ and ‘reach’ surveys, life history, and oral histories of names and places. The great advantage of this synthetic approach is that it draws not only from historical explanations, but also directly from material gained from fieldwork among contemporary Samoans at ‘home’ and at ‘reach’. It thus provides “important insights as to why Samoan culture and lifeways have remained so vitally Samoan in the contemporary, increasingly globalizing world” (Anae 1998, 4).

My intellectual journey involved ‘unlearning’ years of heavy emphasis, often exclusive emphasis on western paradigms and their research methodologies. Decolonizing the mind is not as easy as often argued, for the alternatives are not already in place. My discipline did not give me my theories, I had to figure them out for myself. However, I was encouraged by a supportive dissertation committee to look beyond the ‘givens’ of research and examine new approaches. This gave me a certain degree of freedom in how I conducted interviews, conversations, and observations in the field.
Taking a flexible methodological approach allowed me to explore and relate to materials that would have been denied by more structured approach to field enquiries.

Field Instruments: Samoa, New Zealand, and the United States

I now turn to the field realities, what was accomplished and what achieved using each method. In doing so, I evaluate each field instrument for its success and limitations. In discussing these various techniques I am reminded that, in the ‘field’, the techniques and research approaches were mediated by the culture of the research setting, something that may not have been fully appreciated in more empirical or positivist studies.

Rather than construct conceptions of movement and identity around rural/urban or village/metropolitan places, which reduce them to physical entities, I used the ‘home and reach’ paradigm encouraged by Buttimer (1980). ‘Home’ and ‘reach’ forms a social web in the residence activity chain, rather than being conceived as mutually exclusive entities. They are also transposable concepts that change with a person’s point of reference, but without substantially reducing the essence of one’s identity. Compared to earlier anthropological and sociological studies of Samoa (e.g., Pitt 1971; Shankman 1976), this thinking implies that data should not be drawn exclusively from one place. Scholars who have done so have “relied on people in one place to relate the experiences of those who were ‘absent’—either ‘the migrant’ or those who remained behind” (Young 1998, 106). Instead of taking the ‘field’ to mean a single site of research, I went beyond a fixed case study of Foua, Salelologa, by following people within an ‘aiga to sites in Auckland, New Zealand and Santa Ana, California, U.S.A. This multi-sited ethnographic approach also
corrects the scant attention paid to the ‘urban Samoan’, which has remained outside the traditional scholarly domain of ‘the field’.

The primary information collected at these three sites is the foundation for this study and the basis for Chapters Three through Eight. These data were collected over eighteen months in the research settings of Salelologa, Samoa; Auckland, New Zealand; and Santa Ana, California (Figure 2.1). These occurred in two phases. The first was summer of 1998, at home in Salelologa. The second phase, was from 1999 to 2001, involved fieldwork in Salelologa; Auckland, New Zealand; and Santa Ana, California. During that time, I also updated the initial field census and conducted more interviews in Salelologa (Table 2.1).
Figure 2.1 Map of Field Sites: Salelologa, Auckland, and Santa Ana
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Information collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June-Aug 1998</td>
<td>Salelologa, Samoa</td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>\textit{de facto} population</td>
<td>Socio-cultural background of village, observe norms of \textit{fa’a-Samoa} and what is done (literal meaning of place)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{de facto} and \textit{de jure} population, obtained addresses of members in New Zealand and U.S.A.</td>
<td>All households of Foua (subvillage) Salelologa</td>
<td>Demographic information of ‘\textit{aiga}’ (household) members, information on ‘\textit{aiga}’ members at ‘reach’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August-December 1999</td>
<td>Salelologa, Samoa</td>
<td>Collection of oral stories</td>
<td>Elder members of village, both men and women</td>
<td>Origin of Salelologa, historical background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1999</td>
<td>Salelologa, Samoa</td>
<td>Update field census, ascertain information for ‘\textit{aiga}’ members in California</td>
<td>‘\textit{aiga}’ members obtained from field census of Foua, 1998</td>
<td>Demographic information, travels between ‘reach’ and ‘home’, remittances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1999</td>
<td>Salelologa, Samoa</td>
<td>Biographies</td>
<td>Household members</td>
<td>Mobility history of travels between ‘home’ and ‘reach’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>Information collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November-</td>
<td>Salelologa,</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Women's committee,</td>
<td>Perceptions of place, identity, home, and fa'a-Samoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1999</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td></td>
<td>matai (chiefs and orators),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>village meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1999</td>
<td>Salelologa,</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Household members</td>
<td>Mobility history, thoughts on those at 'reach', remittances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Views on 'home' and 'reach' and mobility, <em>malae</em> as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>identity literal and figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-Aug 2000</td>
<td>Salelologa</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Household members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-Dec 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'REACH'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1999</td>
<td>Auckland, New</td>
<td>‘Reach’ survey</td>
<td>Members of household, information</td>
<td>Mobility experiences, figurative and literal meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td>from 'home' kin</td>
<td>of place, home, and fa'a-Samoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1999 and</td>
<td>Auckland, New</td>
<td>Biographies</td>
<td>Members of households</td>
<td>Personal stories of moving and remittances, meaning of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2001</td>
<td>Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>malaga and development</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>Information collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2000</td>
<td>Santa Ana, California</td>
<td>‘Reach’ survey</td>
<td>Members of households,</td>
<td>Mobility/travel between ‘reach’ and ‘home’,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>information from ‘home’</td>
<td>remittances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2000</td>
<td>Santa Ana, California</td>
<td>Biographies</td>
<td>Members of households</td>
<td>Personal stories, meaning of movement, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fa’a-Samoa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork 1998-2001

Field census

In the preliminary field census of Foua, Salelologa conducted in June-August 1998, the population was enumerated both de facto and de jure. The de facto population of 471 came from forty households, an updated field census in December 1999 expanded that to 478 from the same forty households. It provided critical information about membership including demographic and personal characteristics of family members and their current places of residence. These households showed the de jure population to be 686. The aim of the de jure census was to count those who were considered to belong to a household, rather than only those who lived there.

In published census data, the de facto is presented as unproblematic. In my fieldwork, the field census proved far more complicated, as I confronted the complex reality of trying to find members in household arrangements dispersed throughout the village, or even those who shifted to more inland locations. Defining membership on the basis of a de jure concept of household embraced a much more complex body of
narratives about ‘who belonged’ to a family or to a village than is suggested by the fixed structure of a census schedule. As mentioned, what constituted a household had to remain flexible considering the many arrangements that people have from time to time (Young 1998). This field census also provided important information on family members living overseas. Most people from Foua who are abroad live in Auckland, New Zealand, or Santa Ana, California, U.S.A. In the end, I obtained the names and addresses of twenty six transfamilies in Auckland and four in Santa Ana.

The complexity of conducting something as apparently straightforward as the field census reveals how little consensus exists about the meaning of mobility. Previous studies are preoccupied with categories of mobility, time, and length of stay, as reflected in terms such as ‘internal migration’, ‘external migration’, ‘return migration’, or ‘permanent migration’. My own concern is not so much with length of stay, or whether movement falls into any of the above categories, but on indigenous conceptions and meanings of movement and identity. This approach allows for tensions, ambivalence, and ambiguities to emerge that may seem unable to be resolved, but underscores the fact that placing too much emphasis on neat bounded categories neglects “analyses that are contextual, contested and contingent” (Moss 2001, 15).

‘Home and ‘Reach’ Surveys

The surveys of those at ‘home’ and at ‘reach’ aimed at getting accurate demographic information on travels locally and overseas and they were far more personal than the census. Intimate information about individual experiences was collected, specifically about travel events, interactions, and personal reflections. This study
conceives as part of a web all places where members of an ‘aiga (household) live: Samoa, New Zealand, the United States. Questions focused on histories of movement, traveling around, ongoing interactions with ‘aiga members, and indigenous meanings of movement, place, and identity. In turn these were tied into narratives of member’s experiences within ‘new’ environmental contexts at ‘reach’. Linking up stories of those at ‘home’ with those at ‘reach’ helped make connections and to understand ruptures in the overall web. The ‘home’ and ‘reach’ surveys, personal interviews, and biographies of individuals at ‘reach’ were conducted during the second phase of field enquiries.

Participant observation

For a deeper understanding of the workings and meanings of movement and fa’ a-Samoan, participant observation was important. This strategy has been criticized as the main instrument that resulted in stereotyping Chicanos through cultural explanation (Leo Chavez, June 1999, personal communication). Clearly, this is a concern since what a researcher observes tends to be directly translated in writing about how people ‘behave’ or ‘think’, the privileging ‘eye’ of the researcher becomes a mimetic representation.

Participant observation can describe the heterogeneity and roundedness of a population when taken together with other field instruments, especially by considering the context and subject and topic of study. Stereotypes can be avoided and the value of participant observation heightened when combined with surveys, archival sources, and interviews to give a broader view of society, experience, and perception. Throughout my study, participant observation was ongoing, taking place in many fa’alavelave such as funerals, district nurse visits, court cases, and village fines. During such activities much
informal ‘talk story’ or *talanoa* took place; it is during these sessions that I learned of serious concerns and issues.

**Interviews**

In contrast to the field census, which was structured and at times involved precise but mundane questions, in-depth and personal interviews were more open. Interviews afforded both interviewer and the person being interviewed the opportunity to relax a little and talk at a slower pace. As mentioned, the village is the setting of my research. Village organizations are intact in each of the six *pitonu‘u* (hamlets) of Salelologa—Sapulu, Sakalafai, Falefia, Malaeta, Foua, and Saletagaloa (Figure 3.2). Rather than a random sample of the whole village, I decided to interview all forty households in Foua, one of the largest *pitonu‘u* and also my home place. I interviewed fifty-two *matai* (chiefs and orators); forty-eight women, including *faletua ma tausi* (wives of chiefs and orators) and *aualuma* or unmarried daughters and sisters of *matai*; twenty *taulele‘a* or untitled men; four clergy; and six public servants. The public servants were interviewed during times I was in Apia.

It is important to acknowledge the diversity of movement experience in any community. Everyone interviewed had traveled many times between islands in Samoa and almost all the adults interviewed had traveled overseas once or twice in their lifetime—mainly to New Zealand or the United States. Altogether, fifty-eight people altogether had traveled at ‘reach’, twenty-six of whom were interviewed in Auckland, New Zealand, and nine in Santa Ana, California. During interviews, I paid particular attention to the context of those at ‘reach’, previous movers, and those at ‘home’ and their narratives of
the subjective experience of *malaga* (movement) revealed a shared identity and meanings that have become part of common knowledge. As Lawson (2000, 174) argues, “Migrant stories can reveal the empirical disjuncture between expectations of migration, produced through dominant and pervasive discourses of modernization, and the actual experiences of migrants.”

Interviews and discussions involved both interacting and brainstorming about indigenous understandings of ‘culture’, *fa’a-Samoa*, and *malaga*. They often entailed questions about the personal experiences of a person’s movement within and beyond Samoa. People were encouraged to describe not only the many events of movement but also their contexts, their pivotal places and stages at ‘reach’. Individuals were also encouraged to discuss perceptions of movement: their feelings, emotions, and attitudes about ‘home’ and ‘reach’. Throughout the interview process in Foua, I attended and participated in other family and community activities, which allowed me to record the minutiae and mundane things of everyday life. Throughout I was really touched by the welcome I received from members of my village, both at ‘home’ and at ‘reach’. It was a very humbling experience.

**Life history**

Oral testimonies to events in a person’s life often reflect changes and significant processes in a society as well. Biographies inherently involve life histories and personal testimonies. The life history, life matrix, or mobility register are all synonyms for a similar research instrument. Patterned after work by Balan (1969), who developed the life matrix/history in Mexico, subsequently used by Perlman (1976) in Rio de Janeiro and
Lauro (1979) in central Thailand, the life history is a concisely-formatted instrument for stimulating, ordering, and cross checking an individual’s memory of life-cycle events. I adapted this instrument to focus on the comings, goings, or frequent visiting of family members. I asked about their travels: when, length, reasons, how afforded, and how often. During the second phase of fieldwork, I obtained life histories at the three sites: Salelologa, Auckland, and Santa Ana.

**Biography**

Biography is closely related to life history but is less precise and structured, since it “rests on the subjective and inter-subjectively gained knowledge and understandings of life experiences of individuals, including one’s own life” (Denzin 1989, 28). Halfacree and Boyle (1993) argue that movement studies would benefit if they tapped biography more often, as it is through individual stories that we gain insight to the subjective meaning of mobility, place, and identity, something that is currently rare in mobility research. This argument stems from the idea that such studies, without reference to real people acting in real time, are meaningless. In a review of anthropological work in the Polynesian Pacific, Howard (1993) reminds scholars that historical anthropology must rethink its methods and start focusing on the strength of the discipline—learning and writing about the humanity of world cultures. An important step is the inclusion of biographical stories for, without biography, historical analysis is cold and impersonal. Biography puts a face on research, making our knowledge about the people of whom we write more meaningful. It brings a sense of immediacy, and sometimes commonality, of the human experience.
In biography, issues are brought out in the open that relate to the lived experiences of interacting individuals. Personal relations and contextual links were equally significant in my analysis, as I attempted to connect and join biographically meaningful experiences to the immediate environment and the broader culture. Stories helped me appreciate not only the variability and uniqueness of personal experiences and behaviors, but also enhanced my conception of the social relationships reflected in individual behaviors. The life history and biographical methods provided important information, but I was aware that verbal accounts cannot be taken at face value. Usually I tried to confirm what people said by repeatedly asking for details of names, dates, and context. Often there were children or spouses present at the time of an interview, who would correct each other or mention people’s names or other events prompting yet more memories of an event. In this way, an internal cross-checking of events, names, and dates occurred throughout the interviews.

**Formality of Research: ‘Field’ Experience**

Scholars tend not to discuss the different cultural contexts of research and perceptions of their procedures. I did not want my research to become intrusive, a thing in and of itself. Negotiating my way around Samoan protocols, respecting the authority of male and female elders for their maturity of knowledge and using appropriate language was constantly on my mind. As an insider, inattention to such matters could have resulted in awkward situations, even had long-standing ramifications. Surprisingly, attitudes toward some of this formality was at times quite dismissive. Discussions with the *matai* (chiefs and orators), older *faletua ma tausi* (wives of *matai*) and *tama’ta’i*
(unmarried daughters and sisters of matai) whom I regarded as tama (fathers) and tina (mothers)—were very fulfilling. For many of them, my coming to do interviews was a welcome break from routine activities.

Despite some preference for informality, I continued with appropriate gestures of respect, this included the giving of small gifts called lafo. In old Samoa, a lafo would have been an ‘ietoga (fine mat), but today is mostly cash. As Mulitalo observes:

Researchers should take this cultural practice into account in their research budget. This fa’a Samoa custom of making a donation from $10 to $100 or more is known as lafo. Lafo should be considered an essential part of qualitative research techniques. Lafo is given only at the end of the interview. Thus it does not pose an ethical problem (as a form of payment for information) because of the timing, and the uncertainty of its happening (2000, 122).

At interviews, especially if it was the first time a family was visited, I usually gave the person interviewed $5 Tala at the end of the session. This was done discreetly, just as I was leaving the house, so that it did not seem like payment. Many times people rejected the gift, saying they had not done the interview expecting payment and were very happy to volunteer their time. I often replied that it was not payment, but just a little token of my appreciation for their participation.

Encounters and relationships made during the process of field enquiries tended to go beyond how the concept of research is viewed in the literature. Research itself is an interpretive practice. While giving money might pose some conflict with ‘ethical codes of conduct’, as we are cautioned in research proposals, nevertheless as it took place in the field it was culturally appropriate. Whether a researcher decides to reciprocate during fieldwork or after their career is firmly established does not deny the fact that this issue needs very careful thought. To simply state that gifts should not be made is to
assume that the researcher and the researched are ‘objects’ or ‘objective’ people, unthinking and unfeeling beings who remain unaffected by the encounter. It also fails to allow for the ‘inside researcher’, who is under tremendous pressure to perform such socially normative actions.

Even more important, such ‘research ethic’ assumes that only the ‘researcher’ offers gifts when often those who are ‘researched’ make invitations to partake of their meals or in celebrations. This is the personal nature of research mentioned earlier. Sometimes I was given ripe pineapple or papaya from a garden or fish from a family’s catch of the day. Are we to refrain from doing what is deemed culturally and humanly appropriate in a given situation or adhere to research protocols that supposedly leave our inquiries ‘uncompromised’? I do not have an unambiguous answer to this question, which is still in the process of personal experience for many indigenous researchers. Faced with these kinds of dilemma, I was forced to confront many issues that are often taken for granted in research protocols (see Smith 1999).

Formal or informal, field discussions often became animated recollections of past events, sometimes leading to unexpected linking of people and actions. From these narratives came a profound sense of social bonds and the legitimacy of people’s movements. As a relatively young Samoan, I learned from the elders their knowledge and reasoning of a Samoan way of life. I sometimes felt quite exhausted following deep philosophical discussions that, as a western-educated Samoan, raised fundamental questions about the ‘reliability’ of simplistic economic theories of why people move. Throughout this research project, I never felt I was studying down in cultural terms, rather I was always studying up and across.

72
Learning from the ‘Field’

In this chapter, I have drawn attention to the field methods used, theoretical considerations, successes and limitations, evaluated with the experience of hindsight. I have underscored the significance of taking a flexible and culturally sensitive approach to fieldwork, for what is considered ethical or unethical in western terms may not be considered such in Samoan protocols. Ethics of research are, to a large extent, culturally defined. I have also drawn attention to issues of representation and ethnographic authority, noting my position as an insider who placed myself in the research and showing how issues that emerged during fieldwork were handled. I explained the focus on my own community and the lessons learned from collaborative enquiries.

In arguing for the use of overlapping sets of data from qualitative and quantitative instruments, up and down the scale of inquiry, I have noted that the ‘aiga (household) is both a viable unit of analysis and reference point for understanding population movements. In the dissertation, I present subjective experiences of ‘aiga members through interviews and biographies, as well as provide some theoretical considerations on how to link these to academic discourses. This material engages in a “dialogue between practice and theory in anthropological fieldwork that allows the personal and the practical to become theoretical” (Small 1997, 211).

I make no claim to ‘objectivity’ in this research since I am Samoan, but neither would I change the methods if studying another cultural group. Whatever biases I have as insider or outsider may be balanced by having also drawn heavily from geographic theories and discourses considered ‘objective’. As Hereniko argues in his essay on “Indigenous Knowledge and Academic Imperialism”:
This is not a time for purely academic pursuits. Whenever those of us who teach or carry out research in the Pacific promote and foster academic practices that are imperialistic in design, we become agents of a power structure that is oppressive and lacking in a social conscience (2000, 91).

I end this chapter with some words from an interview at the home of one of the oldest members of Salelologa. These words express the wish for young Samoan people to be good men and women, doing constructive and fulfilling work to contribute to the collective welfare of everyone:

Talofa e, Alas! I did not know you are studying these things. That is admirable! You go and come back but you have not changed. You are still the same! As for me, yeah am pretty good and healthy, it’s because of God’s grace. Talofa e, your father would be so proud of you to see your work and effort. So, are these the things you are interested in your research? You know, our culture is so complicated, intricate, knotted...too many things, too much to do. You are so good you are keen on studying ja’a-Samoa. So how is your husband? Do you have children? Talofa e, I hope you take good care of him suga [girl]! Is he a good man? I heard Fa’alenu’u [my mother] goes to Hawai’i a lot, she will soon bait a Hawaiian millionaire with all her travels...(laughs).
CHAPTER THREE

MAPPING THE STUDY COMMUNITIES

The Samoan Islands have been constructed in the western imagination as forming an idyllic paradise, stable and unchanging. However, “far from embodying simple unchanging essences, all agents are relatively complex and shifting. They make and remake each other through a dialectic process in changing situations” (Liu 1991, 7). This suggests that Samoan culture is far from set, yet there are also social realities at local levels at which meanings are shared and fall into particular patterns. In the following, I shall attempt to trace some of the background information for Samoa in particular Salelologa village, which is located on the island of Savai'i. I do this not because I want to create essentialist categories but to provide a context for the discussion which follows.

Like a map, generalized ethnographic descriptions do not directly mirror reality, but instead help their readers locate themselves in an otherwise unfamiliar landscape. Samoa has already been a popular site of anthropological and geographical inquiry since the turn of the twentieth century, perhaps it is no longer an unfamiliar landscape. Formal studies of the village of Salelologa, the site of this study are non-existent, however. Furthermore, Salelologa village is strategically located at the crossroads of the socio-cultural change now taking place in Samoa, making it an ideal place for studying these processes.

In chapter one, we saw how structuralists interpret Samoa in terms of global dependency and relations between the core and periphery. This analysis provides vital
insights into how international politics and economic trends have had multiple repercussions on the ‘sending’ nations. But while the exploitative role of capitalism and colonialism is the bedrock upon which structuralist account is founded, those who move are also active agents. Understanding the cultures of which they are part and the local meanings they give to movement provide important counterbalance to structuralist theories of population movement.

In this chapter, I describe the study sites at the national and village levels. The environmental and human settings are described within the context of socioeconomic changes including the birth of Salelologa as a trade center. I also describe the interaction between change and continuity, and argue these changes simultaneously shape the present, and present challenges to the village. Maintaining a balance between increased modernization or the ‘money economy’ and continuity is constantly negotiated in the village. I also examine how global and local conditions along with the enterprise and opportunism of individuals have interrelated to produce Salelologa’s particular history of population movement. Part One presents the national context and a brief historic and geographic background of Samoa. Part Two presents the local village context, the results of the fieldwork: a sociodemographic profile of the population, educational and socioeconomic activities culminating in the beginning of overseas movements. In this, I argue that the dichotomies of village-town, rural-urban become problematic when applied to the study of Salelologa. Moreover, the conventional understanding of ‘village’ becomes complicated when the local understanding is probed.
National Context

Samoans understand history (both oral and written) as central to their relationships to place, movement, and identity. Before contact with Europeans, the Samoan islands constituted one of many groups of islands. Intensive interactions among the people of all the island groups characterized every day life. Our oral histories describe many of these social and cultural interactions. For example, our fables and oral histories tell of power struggles and marriage alliances between Tuimanu’a (king of Manu’a, a group of islands in what is now known as American Samoa), Tuitoga (king of Tonga), Tuifiti (king of Fiji), Tuia’ana, and Tuiatua (paramount chiefs from two of the three political districts on Upolu island) (Lambie 1958; Henry 1980). Our oral traditions, acknowledge the powerful Tuimanu’a, as a one time ruler of all Samoa. Samoans do not fight anymore but much of this history is captured in our islands fa’alupega (charter of honorifics), that constitute the mamalu ma pa’ia (sacred attributes) of families, villages, districts, and islands.

The origin of matai titles, place names, house sites, proverbs, and metaphors used in our oratorical speech and everyday language remind us of the significance of personal names, and place names. They tell important historical stories about our ancestors and institutions. They emphasize the close relationship we have with our physical environment. Names are added, adapted, or sometimes disappear, only to emerge again in later generations, but names and their meanings are never completely wiped out, for they are etched in memories and stories of our ‘aiga (families) and villages. Names are
the primary markers of complex relationships with persons, localities, and events; they only secondarily define discrete individuals.

Reconciling this way of knowing with the hegemony of western education and learning has been a struggle for many Samoans over the last two hundred years. In the academic environment, history begins in the post-contact period when Europeans discovered Samoa and introduced Christianity when colonialism and capitalism ensued. At school, memorizing the names of explorers, missionaries and others is a primary objective of the curriculum. Examinations are geared toward perpetuation and retention of the western version of Samoan history. This is in contrast to what we learn at home, in villages where performance and storytelling are the medium for imparting important information. Not surprisingly, many of our students have not made it to post-secondary schooling because of the misfit between classroom learning and home learning.

The history of Samoa from a Samoan perspective strongly emphasizes both the social connections with other islands in Oceania and the internal social connections and political and economic organization of villages at the local, district, and the national levels. In these histories our heroic figures, are always our own ancestors; their genealogies and histories are learned not in the white pages of a textbook but in *fagogo* (story telling), *talanoa* (talking sessions), or *faleaitu* (comedies) in everyday life in our ‘aiga and villages. Although as in the case in other Pacific societies, these oral traditions have been treated as unworthy of the label ‘literature’ (Hereniko 2000), they have a real profound influence on our worldview and epistemology.

I therefore begin this account of Samoan national history with a song written and performed by members of Fa’asalele’aga district to celebrate Samoa’s independence from
New Zealand in 1962. Salelologa comprises one of the twelve villages of this district.

This song gives a historical account of the different colonial powers and the mishaps of each administration, but ultimately portrays the gratitude and elation of the people on the eve of Independence. Following is the original Samoan and an English translation of the song.

**Song by Faasalele’aga District for Western Samoa’s first Independence in 1962**

1. Sa le mafai ona tasi Samoa atoa e amata mai i ona po anamua
   O le ala lea sa vatau ai Samoa aua lava le pa’ia o Tama-aiga
   O taua ese’ese i totonu o Samoa ona o le sa’iliga o se malo atoa
   Ua fai i lagi ona augatama ae lei tasi i ai lava o Samoa

2. 1889 le afa tele i Apia Siamani, Peretania fa’aapea ma Amerika
   Vaelua loa Samoa sasa’e o Amerika, ao sisifo o Samoa o Siamani lea
   E lei tasi ai lava sisifo Samoa talofa ua leai oni tupu fai mai nāo ka Kaiser
   Pule, Aiga i le Tai, tama ua fa’atupapa, fa’aaunu’ua lava loa i Mariana

3. 1914 taunu’u mai loa Niusila Siamani ua tulai Samoa ua pule e Niusilani
   Manaia lea pule’aga amata mai le amataga ao le 29 o le tausaga na tupu ai le malo.
   Tupua Tamasese Lealofi, tamali’i fia’alaga tu’umalo i le ala i le malie o Samoa
   O le fa’aiologa lena e lei tasi ato’atoa i le fa’amantete a Niusila ia Samoa

4. Ua lafo loa Samoa i le Malo Aufa’atasi tofia loa Niusilani na te ao fa’ataitai
   To mai nei le pule Samoa ia e tula’i tau lou ai o lou malo ua tuto’atasi
   Ua e silasila Sisifo Samoa o le nae ua fa’atasi i le pulega e tasi
   O lau fu’a lena e lo ua agiagia Samoa o lo ta fa’avae o le Atua

5. Ua tafa mai nei ata na alu ai le malaga Samoa e ala mai i lou manuia
   Ua leva ou tausaga oe puapuaga i le sa’iliga o le nae olata
   Fiapia loa ma alo ane ia Samoa i Sisifo sei tatou talisapaia
   O si o tatou malo ua te’a nei o le po ua sau le ao. Samoa e o mai tatou mua o

6. Tatou te fa’amalo le Malo Aufa’atasi ua e tatalaina le malo ia ita
   O tulaga eseese sa e maitauina e mamafa le avega o lea ou aveina.
   O lau toe fesili ia Samoa po ua e loto i le malo
   O le pelebesite lea, ua lauliloa le iaou u manumalo
   Ia fa’aaoina le Atua ia i tatou ia tumau pea lona maopopo
7. Fa’afetai Niusila i lou aoa’oina ma lau taita’iga le malo i ona faiga
O oe le matua moni ua maua nei lou tofi e le galo i le agaga seia oo i le otu
Niusila aua e te tiai mai aua ou te vaivai
la taulai pea lava o lau va’ai ia au ma e fafaga mai
Tumau fealofani Niusila i lou malo le ta sa ia fa’afualua pea

8. Amuia le fono sili ma le Palemia feagai tonu lava ma se nofoaga
O le nei malo i ana pule’aga o le mea fou lea i le foafoaga
Tautuana ma outou ulimasao si a tatu sa
Tautai o le malo fou ina ia malutia i afa outou fautua
Fesili pea i le Atua i le fa’afoeina o Samoa

9. Fa’afetai i le paia o le auvala’aulia i la outou fa’aaloalo, ona o le malo o Samoa
Afai o le a ta’ape o le fuamanusina i saogalemu ala uma ele’ele sami ma le ea.
Afai o lea ta tete’a le pa’ia o le aofia ia fa’amanuia le Atua i le aofia, soifua

**English Translation**

1. Samoa was not one in the beginning, we had lots of warfare. All these wars were to find a leader who could satisfy everyone. Auwe! our forefathers have passed on but we have not found one.

2. In 1889, the great hurricane hit Apia, also Germany, Britain, and America. Samoa was divided east to America and west to Germany. But it still did not make West Samoa one. Especially when we were told there was to be no more chiefs except for the Kaiser. Our fathers from Pule [i.e., Savai’i] and ‘Aiga ‘I le Tai [i.e., Manono and Apolima] protested and they were exiled to the Marianas.

3. In 1914, Germany shipped out when it was defeated and New Zealand arrived to rule us. Its rule was good but in 1929 something terribly wrong took place. Tupua Tamasese Lealofi, our paramount chief was shot on the road during one of the protest march. No clash ensued between us because Tamasese before he died, beseeched us to remain calm so that we would have a peaceful outcome. But this was a sign that the mandate that Samoa would be ruled by New Zealand through the League of Nations was not completely satisfactory.

4. Samoa was given to the United Nations which instructed New Zealand to help us with our efforts toward self-determination. Now Samoa you have your independence; we have come together as one under the guidance of our leaders. That is your crown, your flag is blowing brightly and we are founded on God.
5. A new dawn, Samoa, is here thanks to your journey and effort. So many years you have struggled. We finally have our own government, let us rejoice. The dark cloud has passed and a new morning has begun.

6. We thank the United Nations for its confidence in us. You conducted the final test, the plebiscite where we were asked if we really wanted this. There was an overwhelming yes. May God enlighten us and keep us from harm.

7. Thank you New Zealand for guiding us and grooming us. You were like parents, with true love we will never forget. New Zealand don’t forget us, we still need your guidance, keep an eye on us. Let our two vessels [our governments] work together in friendship.

8. Blessed are the Advisory Council [Head of State and Deputy], the Prime Minister and Cabinet. May God bless the new government. We ask you to navigate our vessel well with wisdom. May the good Lord guide and watch over you, our new leaders; always ask God for spiritual guidance in the governing of Samoa.

9. Thank you very much; we appreciate all the dignitaries and guests for your graceful attendance on behalf of Samoa’s independence. When we depart, may God’s speed be with you as you leave by air, sea, and ground. May God bless this glorious gathering. Goodbye, and good tidings.

Both written sources and oral sources as recorded in songs, or poems, share similar elements, for both describe historical and sociopolitical change in Samoa. Both make valuable contributions to knowledge and both arrive at similar conclusion about Samoa’s independence. However, witnessing the performance and hearing the voices of the people singing this song imparts more of the essence and meaning of independence to Samoans than reading about it in a textbook. The first time I heard this song I was more emotionally moved and felt more immediate connection to Samoan history than all my literary attempts to capture history from texts. I came to deeply appreciate how our leaders and many ordinary Samoans negotiated historical events on their own terms despite the tenuous and often dangerous situations they have found themselves in. I am convinced, as others have suggested (e.g., Anae 1998; Hanlon 1998; Hau’ofa 1982;
Hereniko 2000; Meleisea 1987; Wendt 1976), that oral histories, and oral sources must be fully integrated into our researches if we intend to present meaningful accounts about Oceanic societies. The power of the written word should not preclude oral traditions from being acknowledged as acceptable forms of knowledge. These historical records held in songs and story constitute for the subjects of this study an important point of reference and manner of thinking about place, movement, identity, and connections to the world beyond Samoa.

As this song makes clear, local demographic and socioeconomic relations in Samoa have been drastically affected by colonial and postcolonial history. For over a century, Samoa was the object of international rivalries and deliberations. At the turn of the twentieth century, three major world powers, namely Great Britain, Germany, and the United States, vied for control of the islands. A territorial division of the islands called the ‘Tripartite Agreement’ peacefully resolved the hostilities in 1899. Germany retained control of the western larger islands of ‘Upolu and Savai’i, and the islets of Manono and ‘Apolima. The United States took control of the eastern smaller islands of Tutuila and Aunu’u, and the tiny Manu’a group made up of Ta’u, ‘Ofu, and Olosega (recall Figure 1.2). Great Britain gave up its claim on Samoa in favor of Germany, which then gave up its claim to Tonga, Niue, and most of the Solomon Islands in favor of Great Britain. New Zealand, as the song notes then administered Samoa after Germany was defeated at the end of the First World War.

Discontent with the New Zealand administration resulted in a nationalist movement called the Mau (Our Witness) in the 1920s-30s, sowing the seeds of nationalism. Beginning in 1953, preparations started for the transition to independence,
which was obtained in January 1962, making Samoa the first South Pacific Island nation to attain such a status. This began the process of decolonization in the Pacific Islands, with Fiji following in 1970. In 1997, the Samoan Parliament passed an Act to delete the ‘Western’ portion from the old Western Samoa. Now, it is called simply Samoa.

In spite of many profound changes, outside commentators have observed how much Samoans have maintained a reputation for cultural conservatism and pride in fa’a-Samoan (Lockwood 1971; O’Meara 1990; Paulson 1992; Pitt 1970). Most of Samoa’s approximately three hundred fifty villages are still governed by village fono (matai councils). Although two hundred years of contact has allowed the genes of foreigners to mix in, the population remains almost entirely Samoan. About ninety percent of the population is 100 percent Samoan while the remaining population is mixed Caucasian, Chinese, Solomon Islanders, Tokelauans, Niueans, Tuvaluans or Tongan genes (Liu 1991). Fox and Cumberland (1962, 112) report that, “In September 1956, Western Samoa’s population of 97,327 people consisted of 88,036 (90.4 percent) Samoans while the part-Samoans numbered 7,900 (8.1 percent), and Europeans 662 (0.7 percent).” Table 3.1 below summarizes population censuses conducted under the auspices of the German and New Zealand authorities until 1962, when Samoa became independent.
Table 3.1: Population of Western Samoa (1902-1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Census</th>
<th>Samoan Population</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Samoans as a percent of total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>32,815</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>32,612</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>33,478</td>
<td>37,320</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>33,554</td>
<td>38,084</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>35,404</td>
<td>37,331</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>32,601</td>
<td>36,422</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>36,688</td>
<td>40,231</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>52,232</td>
<td>55,946</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>62,422</td>
<td>68,197</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>88,153</td>
<td>84,909</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>91,883</td>
<td>97,327</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>113,101</td>
<td>114,427</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>130,110</td>
<td>131,377</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>144,111</td>
<td>146,267</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>150,089</td>
<td>151,983</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>153,920</td>
<td>156,349</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>157,158</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>158,121</td>
<td>161,298</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Population of Western Samoa, Pirie 1960; Report of the Census of Population and Housing, Department of Statistics, Western Samoa 1991

Missionary censuses in 1853 and 1869 were perhaps the first attempts to scientifically measure the population. Both of these censuses estimated a population of only 30,000, probably an undercount due to a limited capability to conduct an accurate census (Department of Statistics, Samoa 1991). In the beginning of the twentieth century, several epidemics reversed what was an increasing trend toward population growth. German authorities made population counts in 1900, 1902, 1906, and 1911. The first census after the seizure of Western Samoa from Germany in 1914 was taken in 1917 by the New Zealand administration (Pirie 1960). From 1921 onwards, the New Zealand authorities conducted a census survey every five years. A 1918 epidemic wiped out
almost 30 percent of the population during New Zealand’s administration, consequently, great emphasis was placed on improving health and sanitation conditions.

At the time of the 1956 census, 70,429, or nearly three-quarters of the population, lived on Upolu, in an area of 430 square miles (Fig. 3.1) the smaller of the two major islands. On Savai’i, 26,898 people lived in an area of 700 square miles. In 1986 the population had increased to 157,158 people, but the same distribution remained with 112,228 (71.5 percent) on Upolu and 44,930 (28.5 percent) on Savai’i. In the 1991 census, the population was 161,298 with 72.1 percent on Upolu island and 27.9% on Savai’i. Thus, while Savai’i is physically the larger of the two main islands, almost three quarters of the population live on Upolu, where the country’s capital city of Apia is located. The growth rate for Samoa is at 2.2 percent, but if international movement is taken into account, the rate of increase falls to 0.5 percent, the total fertility rate is 4.7, and life expectancy at birth is 68.5 years (Department of Statistics, Samoa 1991).

Very little is known about the population of the Samoan Islands before the arrival of the missionaries. Tradition prescribes that Namulau’ulu is the title of one of the senior orators for Pule, the traditional political name for Savai’i. Pule has six districts, each with a political center thus, Fa’asaleleaga is Safotulafai, Gaga’emauga is Fagamalo, Gagaifomauga is Safotu, Vaisigano is Asau, Satupa’itea is Vaega, and Palauli is Vailoa. For ‘Upolu island, its three orator districts consist of A’ana, Tuamasaga, and Atua. In cultural exchange and speeches the fa’alupega (honorific names) for the islands are Pule (for Savai’i) Tumua (for ‘Upolu), and ‘Aiga le Tai, ma le Va’a o Fonoti (for Apolima and Manono islands) (Figure 3.1).
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Figure 3.1 Political and Physical Map of Samoa

Source: University of Hawaii Map Collection
Environmental Setting

Samoa’s two main islands, Savai’i and ‘Upolu, are tropical and mountainous. With a total area of about 1150 square miles, the big island of Savai’i is the western-most island and comprises about 700 square miles. The second largest island, Upolu is about 430 square miles. The rest of the land is made up of the smaller islands of Apolima and Manono. Apia, the capital, is located about halfway up the north coast of Upolu island. Samoa is today only a five-hour flight from Honolulu or Sydney Australia, about four hours from Auckland, New Zealand, or thirty minutes from PagoPago, American Samoa (Figure 3.1). Considered a ‘backwater’ in the colonial days the psychological distance from the rest of the world has rapidly changed for Samoans.

All of the islands are of recent volcanic origin; beneath the lush vegetation lies more lava rock than soil. Although no volcanic activities have occurred recently, a series of volcanic eruptions from Mauga Mu and Matavanu in 1905 and 1910-1911 respectively wiped out entire villages such as Salesaula and Samalae’ulu on the northeast coast of Savai’i island (Fox and Cumberland 1962). Many people and villages were relocated to villages in northwest ‘Upolu, calling the area Le’auva’a (boat crew) to commemorate their flight from the lava flow to sea. Undulating lava still blankets the island for miles where it flowed down from the top of Matavanu and spilled into the sea (Fig. 3.1).

In Salelologa on the southeast coast, much of the land around the wharf consists of basalt rock and lava, the result of volcanic eruptions more than two hundred years ago, circa 1760 (Fox and Cumberland 1962). Much of this land is unusable although some coconut and hardwood trees in the midst of a thick, low altitude rainforest dominate this peninsula. Apart from this area, Salelologa has relatively productive soils and climate,
which allow a fair degree of agricultural diversity. The southeast coast is also on the receiving side of southeastern trade winds and rainfall.

The daily temperature range is 23°C to 30°C at the coast. Average monthly temperatures vary little from the annual average of 26.6°C degrees. Mean temperatures decline with elevation to an average of 21°C at 800 m and 17°C at 1700 m, near the top of the highest peak, Mt. Silisili (Wright 1963). Rainfall varies both seasonally and spatially over Samoa. The wet season throughout the islands is during the summer months, around November to April. This is also the hurricane season. The dry season is during the winter months from May to October. During this time, the southeast trade winds predominate.

**Early Savai’i and ‘Upolu**

Like the big island of Hawai’i, Savai’i, is Samoa’s youngest island in geological terms, with a hugely impenetrable inland forest. It is much smaller though; its 700 square miles is about the size of O’ahu. Internal movement from Savai’i to the outlying areas of Upolu and its capital, Apia, has always been characteristic. The majority of Savai’i’s villages and settlements are located on the coastal plains. In the last few years, along with better access to roads, settlements have become established inland. One main road runs the perimeter, connecting all the villages around the island (Fig. 3.1).

The pattern of distribution of the villages is irregular. Tracts of the coastline have remained unsettled because of physical disadvantages. Villages are concentrated in the Fa’asalele’aga district, from Salelologa to Pu’apu’a, and in the Gaga’emauga and Gagaifomauga districts from Samalae’ulu to Asau on the northwest tip of the island. From Salelologa west to
the other side of the island are the Palauli and Satupa'itea villages, after which vast tracts of forestland dominate, until the villages of Taga, Sala’ilua, Samata, and Neiafu connecting back to Asau (Fig. 3.1).

One could argue that Savai’i has been economically handicapped in terms of its location, and by its young rocky soil, which made it less attractive for business, especially during the colonial period. As Cumberland and Fox write:

Germany’s major plantations were concentrated on Upolu at Mulifanua in the west and Vailele in the east. These had become the ends of a ‘plantation belt’ in which production was conspicuously centered, while in Savai’i a scattering of smaller properties was localized in the hinterland of Matautu in the north, and at Palauli and Lata in the south (1962, 159).

Traditionally, however, Savai’i was no ‘backwater’ in terms of political authority and organizing capability, Savai’i had a great impact on Samoan affairs during its colonial history. By most accounts, one of the first resistance movements against the Germans between 1898-1904 germinated in Savai’i under the leadership of Namulau’ulu Lauaki, a tulatoa (senior and courageous orator) from Safotulafai in the district of Fa’asalele’aga. The village structure and fa’a-Samoa were crucial to the attempt at resistance to the German administration.

The fa’alupega (charter of honorifics) of Samoa had been abolished by Governor Solf and replaced by a new regime featuring the German Kaiser, the colonial bureaucracy, and a Samoan administration appointed by Solf. This virtually omitted the traditional authority of Pule (traditional name for Savai’i) and Tumua (traditional name for Upolu) and ‘Aiga ma latou Tama (paramount families, chiefs and orators of all of Samoa). Pule and Tumua are the protectors of ‘Aiga (Sunia 1997; Va’ai 1998). Hempenstall and Rutherford (1984, 27) wrote that, Namulau’ulu Lauaki and his
supporters resisted Solf’s “Kaisalika o Faipule (Kaiserlike council) selected from loyal and indispensable chiefs.” The central purpose of Lauaki’s opposition was to reassert the eminence and power of Tumua and Pule over what was perceived as insult to traditional Samoan protocols. However, Lauaki and their supporters were exiled to the German Mariana Islands in 1898. Lauaki never saw Samoa again, he died from dysentery on the way back in 1915, when his islands were already in the hands of another foreign power, New Zealand.

There is much more than meets the eye in this brief history, but as in other histories of native struggles and their colonial encounters ‘gunboat diplomacy’ was often deployed to settle disputes. Although Namulau’ulu Lauaki defied the German authorities, he lacked the military capability to back it up. When his people were exhausted, he surrendered. With Namulau’ulu Lauaki banished to Marianas, Solf had effectively eliminated any active opposition to his administration.

In the decade that followed, relative calm was achieved by a policy in which Solf declared himself “father of the Samoan people” (Hempenstall and Rutherford 1984, 29). Va’ai (1998, 95) writes, “Matai, leaders and elders in Samoan society, are referred to symbolically as ‘father’ and ‘mother’ out of respect.” As governor and leader of government, the Samoans called him ‘father’. Solf was therefore not seen by the Samoans as a master to be obeyed and bowed to, but a leader to be respected. In turn, like other Samoan ‘fathers’ and ‘mothers’ he was expected to reciprocate with mutual respect. Solf did not respond according to Samoan protocol however, but treated Samoans like children. He also refused to associate with Samoans apart from official activities as he believed that to “achieve anything in the colonies, Germany must maintain strict standards of racial pride and purity” (Hempenstall 1978, 55).
Prior to Namulau’ulu Lauaki’s exile, Paramount Chief Mata’afa Iosefo and his supporters were already banished in 1893 to the Marshall Islands spending five years in Jaluit meanwhile, Solf learned about Samoan culture by reading the works of German ethnologist, Dr. Kramer. Solf brought Mata’afa back in 1898 and made him ali’i sili (highest chief). While the German Kaiser represented by Solf was made the tupu sili (highest king). Va’ai (1998) writes, that Mata’afa’s position had been heavily compromised by being isolated in the Marshall Islands. Before he was brought back, he was persuaded to sign a pledge of allegiance to the German government and support the installation of Tanumafili to succeed his recently deceased father, Malietoa Laupepa. This was also not acceptable to the majority of Samoans since Tanumafili was only eighteen years old. Namulau’ulu Lauaki believed authority should be shared or rotated among the Tama’a’aiga (Paramount Chief) titles of Malietoa, Tupua Tamasese, Mata’afa, and Tuimaleali’ifano in line with Samoan understanding of these institutions. Tama’a’aiga literally means (Children of the ‘Aiga) the political lines of Malietoa, Tupua Tamasese, Mata’afa, and Tuimaleali’ifano. In other words, the Samoans refused to comply with the installation of kings as advocated by colonial rules attempting to maintain governmental authority (Meleisea 1987; Vaai 1998).

On the eve of Independence, all the holders of the Tama’a’aiga titles shared in the stewardship of Samoa. Many Samoan families trace their genealogy to these lines. If the Samoans had not persisted in their resistance to colonial forces, extensive land alienation would have resulted. Traditional district divisions were used with some modification in subdividing villages into political and electoral constituencies when Samoa became independent in 1962 (Figure 3.1).
So far, I have discussed Samoa’s contact with the outside world, particularly, in its encounters with colonialism, and the struggle for political independence. I do this to cast attention on larger processes that have informed Samoan culture and fa’a-Samoa, especially the making of modern Samoa. In Part Two, I turn to the study site to present an inside look at Salelologa as a village and community with ever expanding boundaries, in particular to New Zealand and the United States. I begin with oral traditions that show why the dichotomies of village/town and rural/urban are inadequate in describing understanding of mobility, place, and identity. I demonstrate how Samoans view mobility and identity, particularly through the cultural institutions of fa’alupega (charters of honorifics) and genealogy as important markers of individual and village identity.

**Origin of the Name Salelologa**

Growing up, I often heard stories during our fagogo (story telling) or talanoa (talking sessions) with the older generation about the origin of the name of my village, Salelologa. I never really paid attention to these stories but I knew a famous or rather notorious warrior was responsible for the name of the village. The stories were never given specific dates; they were put in the time frame of “A long time ago…”

The origin of Salelologa and its fa’alupega will be considered and an explanation offered in the hope that historians and indeed all researchers concerned with Pacific Island communities, traditional and contemporary, are encouraged to view myth and oral tradition as an important means of organizing and interpreting history rather than chronicling it. Cultural ideology always remains embedded in historic information and should be considered along with, not apart from the historical process (Anae 1998).
As a central, spiritual, cultural, and secular focus of village identity, it is not surprising that there are several versions of the origin of Salelologa. Two oral accounts are given below. Both orators give almost the same story differing only in the names of the paramount chiefs of Tuiatua and Tuia’ana. These versions were gathered during my interviews in Samoa and have been carefully assembled based on my understanding of them. The only written information is a paragraph in Kramer’s (1902) two volume *The Samoan Islands*. Kramer collected the greetings of each village and published them along with descriptions of house building, cooking techniques, and genealogies of political families. Meleisea (1999) praised Kramer’s work for its detailed documentation. However, Kramer has been criticized by Shore (1982, 72) for assuming that “the fa’alupega or greeting of a village is a determinate thing and one, moreover, that has a form and structure standardized for each district.”

Fa’alupega are defined as charters of honorifics which tends to portray a static character. They are much more complex than this since they include an accounting of major events in village history as reflected in titles and names. For example, a *ali’i* (chiefly titles) may have been appointed (*tofiga*) or acquired through marriage between chiefly lines (*‘aiga ali’i*) or combine with orator (*tulafale ali’i*). In short, the fa’alupega spell out a village’s major accomplishments past and present. The fa’alupega represents village pride and honor. As early as 1884, Turner (1884,18) wrote that, “fa’aalupega for Samoans constitute honor and dignity of which they are very proud”

The oral account of the origin of Salelologa is told by the orator Pipi Sa (a.k.a. Fiu Sa) now in his late fifties, eldest son of senior orator Pipi Esmer. The account by Pipi Sa goes like this.
Salelologa is unique among all the other six *pule* (main political districts) of Savai’i because of the warrior Lologa. Lologa was famous for his courage and mightiness, but he was also cruel during his time. But he was given high esteem when he saved the Tuiatua just before the chief warrior was going to be killed by the forces of Savai’i. This was in retribution for Lafai’s blood, a famous warrior of Savai’i who had been killed by Tuia’ana and Tuiatua forces during a famous war. In return, Tuiatua and Tuia’ana bestowed Lologa with the honorifics, *Lologapule ma le Faito’aga* [to govern well, to save]. The paramount chief giving it was Tuiatua whom Lologa saved just before he was about to be killed. In the old days, Tuia’ana and Tuiatua were both paramount chiefs. Their names derived from the districts of Aa’na, thus Tuia’ana, and Atua, thus Tuiatua, on Upolu island. This history is before the arrival of the missionaries in the 1830s.

The second account is told by the orator, Aufale‘Eti, now in his sixties. He is the grandson of Matamua Leatevalu of Salelologa, a *tu’ua* (senior orator) in the 1960s. The oral account by ‘Aufale ‘Eti runs like this.

Lologa was a famous warrior. Word of his might and courage spread throughout Samoa. He had “Sa” [taboos] near his *malaefono* [sacred site]. One of these taboos is that there is absolutely no noise or sound near his sacred site. People on a *malaga* from Fa’asalele’aga to Palauli or vice versa would invariably pass through where Lologa lived. The people were vigilant not to make any noise, not even a sound when they passed through Lologa’s place, in case they would be harmed or killed. One day Lologa heard that the people of Savai’i had gone to war with Upolu island in retribution for Lafai’s blood a warrior who had been killed in the village of Falelatai on Upolu. Lologa went there. When he got there, he saw that the Savai’i people had found chief Tuia’ana Tiasiutele at the house of Nu’ua’uta o Afolau. The Savai’i people were about to kill chief Tuia’ana Tiasiutele in exchange of Lafai’s blood. But Lologa intercepted and said, “No, please spare this man.” Lologa then took chief Tuia’ana Tiasiutele to Leulumoega, the district where he was from. Because of this great deed the chief of Leulumoega honored Lologa with the following words, *O le’a ‘e Lologapule ma le Faito’aga ia Tuia’ana,* translated You govern well and savior of Tuia’ana.

These honors accorded Lologa are called ‘Sa’. The prefix ‘Sa’ in front of a name also denotes groups of ‘aiga or villages who identify with that name, title, or honors. The *fa’alupega* of Salelologa has the above honorifics as evidence. While these ‘Sa’ refer
specifically to Lologa as the one who governed well and saved the life of the Tuia’ana (a powerful and well-known paramount chief) of Upolu in old Samoa, the honors do not refer only to Lologa but to all his fale’upolu (retinue of orators), chiefs, and descendants who make up the settlement or village. Implied in the saying is the fact that Lologa exercised great wisdom and pule (authority) in saving the life of Tuia’ana particularly given Lologa’s notoriety as a cruel warrior. ‘Le-lologa’ means ‘not a sound or drop’, it is also the name of the warrior combined with ‘Sa’ the group of titles and families that make up the village comes the village name Salelologa.

Thus the honors accorded a leader serve to remind the living descendants of the village to exercise their will and authority with wisdom. Other village names have similar origins. Sale’aula is also named after a warrior, Le’aula, known for his temper and strength. These Samoan oral traditions, deeply rooted in history, lie at the root of genealogical connections and relationships not only among families but also between villages, districts, and the islands of Samoa. The quote below is reported in Kramer:

The name Salelologa is derived from a Lelologa who was probably the Tuimanu’a (king of Manu’a) Lelologa who wanted to conquer Savai’i and fought against Lafai (well-known warrior) of Savai’i. Moreover, the father of the infamous Tamafaiga, another warrior --Leia’tau Lesa of Manono island who lived a hundred years ago had this epithet. Safotulafai (the traditional seat of government in Fa’asalele’aga district) caught a man of Salelologa but Lologa succeeded to get him back and thus given the name Faito’aga that is, to govern well, to save. To me the history of Salelologa seems to offer many interesting points not alone in this regard but also concerning the cannibal Pulusau, and because here the south was in frequent touch with the north (Salemuli’aga, Tagaloa, Lilomaia, Malietoa etc.). Also stone walls extending over long distances still awaits detailed research. They are called Mata’aga (1902, 61).
Regardless of debates on the validity of oral history over written history, those in Salelologa have a deep respect for their ancient history, what scholars call myths and legends. As a Samoan and an insider, I do not view this situation as frustrating or problematic. All versions of the history can be accommodated.

Samoans usually hold a theory of history in a broad sense, beginning with a time when humans were half man half demon and extending to biblical times and to the present. History extends into the future, most concretely in terms of problems of national independence and Salelologa’s role in regional politics. Poyer (1993) reports similar insights in her account of the Ngatik Massacre in Sapwuahfik atoll in Micronesia. In Salelologa, a great sense of pride and shared history exudes when the people discuss their history reminding me of what Raymond Williams (1977) refers to as a ‘structure of feeling’ similar to the ‘sense of place’ one gets, only by living in a place. This history is central to the notions of place as history and identity. When people talk of Salelologa, it is not just an entity, but it is used as people, as place. In other words, place is personified. ‘Village’ is conceived differently from a formal abstraction or from an abstract idea.

**Village Context–Salelologa**

Just as Samoan affairs cannot be understood independently of the global context, Salelologa can not be isolated from the national context of Samoa. Salelologa’s story is captured in its *fa’alupega* (charter of honorifics) and its relation to the district of Fa’asalele’aga. Such oral traditions help explain the organizational structures of the village and the relationships and tensions between neighboring tight knit communities.
Such stories reflect the reality of village life and some of the most important concerns of
the people who constitute the subjects of the study.

In the academic literature on Samoa, the concept of village translated (nu’u in
Samoan) treats all of the three hundred and fifty villages throughout Samoa as the same.
This taken for granted way of thinking about ‘village’ is reflected in ordinary language,
in development discourse, and in scholarly studies of third world societies (Gardner
1995). The category of the village is portrayed as an absolute and physically bounded
entity, isolated, rural, developmentally backward and often lacking infrastructure. Once
major structural buildings and commercial activities dominate the village scene, its status
as a village somehow evaporates. This textualizing of Samoan villages, rooted in
evolutionary structural terms, leads one to believe that there is a typical Samoa village. If
a village strays from this image or definition, it is no longer a village.

In the Samoan context, however, organizational units such as matai council and
associated organizations make up the core structure of villages, irrespective of size or
location. People define the village, not infrastructure. While most villages remain
nominally the same, social contexts and historical circumstances shape a village social
identities.

Fox and Cumberland (1962), who studied ten villages in Upolu and nine in
Savai’i, observe:

All the villages chosen were distinguished by some peculiarity or
combination of peculiarities, by some problem or combination of
problems. They were each representative of wider groups and none was a
typical village of Western Samoa, for there is no such phenomenon. No
two villages in the territory are precisely alike, although all in their way of
life conform in some way or another to the general social customs and
traditions. Thus, this geographical study contributes to the understanding
of Western Samoa and its problems in that it recognizes nuances which
do not be readily apparent to the sociologist and the anthropologist
(1962, 25).

The village as a separate and bounded unit remains problematic in Samoan
ethnography. *Nu‘u* the generic western Polynesian term for settlement (Shore 1982), is
often translated to refer to a segment of some population such as are suggested by the
terms village or district. This misconstrues the significance of the term and the logic that
underlies its usage. When the morpheme *pito* (part) is prefixed to *nu‘u*, the resulting
term, *pitonu‘u*, signifies a subsection of a *nu‘u*. *Pitonu‘u* is frequently translated as sub
village, this definition appears to define an absolute rather than a relational unit. A *nu‘u*
(village) is made up of *pitonu‘u* which includes more than one group of ‘aiga or matai
titles. *Pitonu‘u* are embedded within larger territorial organizations, *nu‘u*. All the
villagers have families in other *pitonu‘u*. Labor and economic arrangements are made
between *pitonu‘u*. Physically, there are many links between local villages.

As *nu‘u* are comprised of groups of ‘aiga, so groups of *nu‘u* form districts,
When the morpheme *itu* (side) is prefixed to *malo* (government) the resulting term is
*itumalo* (governing side). This comes from a traditional understanding of Samoan history
in which Samoans used to combine forces or villages to go to war with districts or
islands. *Itumalo* is not an absolute administrative unit as it is conventionally understood
(Meleisea 1987). The Fa’salele’a’aga district includes the villages from Salelologa in the
south, to Safotulafai to Pu’apu’a, on the southeast coast of Savai’i island (see Figure 3.1).
Although my study pays particular attention to Foua, one of the six *pitonu‘u* of
Salelologa, my description of the general processes of socioeconomic development and
village structure includes all of Salelologa as a territorial unit. This is because when a
social process affects a part of the village, it concerns the whole village. In addition, the
people of Foua reside in different *pitonu‘u* of Salelologa and are not necessarily restricted
to the bounds of Foua. Village identity remains to the village as a whole.

The six *pitonu‘u* of Salelologa, from south to north are: Sapulu, Sakalafai, Falefia,
Malaeta, Foua, and Saletagaloa. Malaeta and Falefia sometimes went under one name in
the old days (Old Map of Salelologa Figure 3.2). Complicating matters again, sometimes
Papaloa, Fataloa, and Maota have appeared on recent census or survey maps, but these
lands lie within the six major *pitonu‘u* (e.g., 1990 Aerial Map, Figure 3.3). The use of
these names does not constitute a major shift or change in information. Rather, as a result
of population growth and the building of access roads and electricity, some ‘*aiga* have
moved onto plantation land of Salelologa (see Salelologa Topographical Map).
Nevertheless, they remain part of the six *pitonu‘u* outlined above.

*Matai system*

Romantic images of villages in ‘paradise’ dominate much of the literature of the
South Pacific, encouraged by the celluloid world. Those who have never been in the
Pacific, imagine basking in the sun and sheltering under ubiquitous coconut trees.
However, as Shore observes:

Far from a carefree existence geared only to the requirements of the
moment, a well run village defines for its residents an intricate system of
long-term social and economic obligations, strictly enforced by the chiefs
and their power to levy fines for noncompliance. These obligations are, in
turn, linked to memberships in corporate groups whose activities
constitute much of the active lives of the villagers (1982, 98).
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Figure 3.2 Saleologa Village circa 1920s
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Figure 3.3  Salelologa New Township and Subvillages

1. Taylor Shop
2. Le Laos Bar
3. Savaii Ocean View Motel
4. Water Authority Department
5. Luamanu Yu Hoi
6. Development Bank Fale
7. Masoe Niko Shop
8. Fish Market
9. Market
10. ANZ Bank
11. Kalini Shop
12. Vili Shop
13. Tomasi Ieu Fale
14. Amataga Shop
15. Morris Hedstrom Company
16. Carruthers Shop
17. Post Office
18. Development Bank
19. Coconut Products
20. Electric Power Corporation
21. Andrew & Makerita Shop
22. Tia Tila Fale
23. Salelologa Primary School
24. Public Works Department

Source: Aerial Photo, Samoa Lands and Survey 1990
A Samoan *nu‘u* is not just a geographical entity, but has a prescriptive and descriptive identity which goes beyond the physical setting, the clustering of houses around village greens, and the house sites of the *matai* as declared by the *fa‘alupega* (Va‘ai 1998). The *nu‘u* encompass all cultural values and practices (‘Aiono 1986). *Nu‘u* are comprised of several *pitonu‘u* each associated with its own *matai* titles. Representatives of all six *pitonu‘u* meet to consult on matters that concern the whole village. But when issues arise internally to a *pitonu‘u* there is no need for the whole *nu‘u* to be involved.

Within a *nu‘u*, five basic societal groups constitute the sociometric wheel of the *fa‘amatai* (*matai* system) to perform economic, political, and social functions (see Figure 3.4). The groups are: the *tama‘ita‘i* or *aualuma* (daughters and sisters of *matai*); *faletua ma tausi* (wives of *matai*); *‘aumaga* (untitled sons or brothers of *matai*); *tamaiti* (young children); and *fa‘afeagaiga* (clergy). All five are integrated with the *matai* (chiefs and orators). These groups function as interdependent organs of the village, each with designated tasks, in the process of government and the provision of goods and services.

**Figure 3.4 Sociometric Wheel**
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The *tama'ita'i* or *auaiuma* group includes the daughters of *matai* who reside locally and are no longer at school, unmarried, or widowed. They are the *fai'oa*, or producers and manufacturers of traditional wealth like mats, finemats, and tapa cloth. Other roles of *tama'ita'i* include being peacemakers and mediators over disputes, not only within families but also in the village. The *auaiuma* teach young women these activities and groom them for their future roles. More and more young women also work at some form of paid employment. In Salelologa, unmarried *tama'itai* both weave mats in their spare time and look for paid work outside of the home.

As the wives of *matai*, *faletua ma tausi* are mainly foreigners in the village, as custom discourages endogamous marriages (although village elders are not always successful in preventing this). Since they are married into the village, direct participation in village affairs is lessened. However, as wives and mothers of *tama'ita'i*, *'aumaga* and *tamaiti* they play an important advisory role. The institutional structure of *faletua ma tausi* (wives of *matai*) basically follows that of the village as declared in *fa'alupega* (charter of honorifics). In old Samoa, the two groups of *tama'ita'i* or *auaiuma* and *faletua ma tausi* had separate and clearly defined roles. Over time these two groups have begun to operate jointly as a women’s committee, performing health and instructive functions.

The *'aumaga*, sons of *matai* are also called the *malosi o le nu'u* (the strength of the village). They are the untitled men who are no longer attending school. This group also includes untitled male spouses who have married in from other villages. The *'aumaga* is the labor force. They produce agricultural and other foodstuffs required by
the village. The ‘military’ power of a village is invariably determined by the capacity and courage of this group. The ‘aumaga join the matai to police the village during evening curfew and monitor obedience to bans stipulated by matai council. Like the tama’ita’i, and faletua ma tausi, the ‘aumaga hierarchy is determined by that of the matai, as laid out in the village fa’alupega.

The tamaiti or infants and children who are too young to be in the tama’ita’i or ‘aumaga groups comprises the fourth section of village population. The bulk of its membership are at school. This category does not operate as a group, but is recognized as a group with rights and responsibilities. As descendants of matai, they will inherit rights to utilize family land and hold matai titles. They also run errands. In some villages, however, members of this group have lodged complaints with the Land and Titles court, asserting their “rights to be consulted in matters of title succession” (Le Tagaloa 1992, 119).

A fifth group has become integrated into this social organization. This is the faife’au (missionary servant) or the clergy people. This group is referred to politely as fa’afeagaiga (covenant) a term originally reserved for the brother-sister relationship, as discussed in length in anthropological studies of Samoa (Schoeffel 1978). This special relationship prescribes that brothers have an obligation to consider the interests of their sisters and their sisters’ children. Culturally, sisters are expected to maintain peace and harmony in ‘aiga through their advisory role. Ai’ono (1992) argues that the ability of the matai to incorporate the faife’au missionaries of the early nineteenth century into their system is a testimony to the malleability of fa’a-matai. The new group was not treated as faife’au implying (servant) but as fa’afeagaiga, resembling the tama’ita’i (sisters) of the
family and village. The missionary was thus given the protection, privileges, and rights of sisters in the matai system.

The leading group in village government is the matai council, also called the fono. The matai council is the governing authority which regulates the daily lives of village inhabitants according to established practices and conventions. The matai council is the village legislature. It makes executive decisions which are carried out in accordance with its instructions. Villagers who act in contravention of village law are dealt with by the assembly. These legislative, executive, and judicial functions are carried out by the village council as an undifferentiated process (Va'ai 1998). In carrying out the various functions of government however, authority is expected to be balanced with tofa ma le fa'autaga (profound wisdom and fairness). Procedures vary, but the essential requirement is a discussion of issues before decisions are made.

Previous studies on Samoan villages describe the matai structure as a ‘fixed’ set of essentials, suggesting a tension free system. For example, Kallen (1982, 36) writes that, “The matai system fell into two classes, chiefs and talking chiefs. Together, these matai constituted an hereditary ruling class or nobility. The category of untitled Samoans constituted the commoner class.” Her nobility/commoner dichotomy is an oversimplification of a system that is far more complex. Shore’s (1982) study of the village of Sala’ilua explores the notion of a Samoan theory of action in which fa’alupega are used to analyze the connections between action, role, and context in Samoa identity and personhood. He analyzes the organizational structures that make up the village, but his structuralist orientation leads him to emphasize dual units such as the ali’i tulafale or
brother/sister relationship. He neglects the ambiguities and tensions involved within these organizational dynamics of the *matai* system.

Merely describing different structures runs the risk of overstating structure. It does not help us understand the relationships, dynamics, ambiguities, power relations, and tensions involved. Culturally grounded concepts of ‘identity’ and ‘place’ are entangled in constructs such as the *matai* system. An intricate meaning of *nu’u* is manifested in *fa’alupega* but this has not been given serious academic consideration despite its impact on the relationship between individuals, families, and villages.

As in all Samoan interactions, the dignity of the person is first and foremost emphasized, as ramified in the language used to address the person. *Matai* titles are divided into two kinds. The most important are the *ali’i* or chiefly titles. The second are the *tulafale* titles. *Tulafale*, act as spokesperson for their high chiefs; in English they are referred to as ‘talking chiefs’ or orators. Some *ali’i* or *tulafale* have the *pule* (authority) to make new *matai* as they see fit, following consultation with ‘*aiga* members who have direct genealogical links to a title. The *ali’i* are the guardians of the honor and dignity of a family. They are the peacemakers and mediators of family friction, repositories of wisdom (*tofa mamao*). The *tulafale* are the custodians of family history. Deploying oratorical skills in debate and speaking on behalf of the *ali’i* in social and cultural interactions are the primary functions of the *tulafale*. The *ali’i* reciprocate by providing the *tulafale* with material goods such as cash, meat, and fine mats which are the most valued property in Samoan cultural exchange (*Ai’ono* 1992; *Va’ai* 1998).

Orators, especially those knowledgeable in the intricacies of Samoan lore, genealogy, and oratory, are called upon by their ‘*aiga* to take a trip to *fa’alavelave* such
as funerals, matai investitures, weddings or church dedications. This is because when an ‘aiga pays respect to another at a fa’alavelave, it always because there is a faia (connection) or ‘auala (pathway) between them. People from the host ‘aiga eagerly await the arrival of the orator from another ‘aiga who is usually considered someone knowledgeable and competent as well. When the orator arrives, he will normally be greeted respectfully and then asked to make public the ‘auala (pathway) by which he comes. The visitor defines a connection through descent, marriage, political alliance, or village association. At these occasions, relatives catch up on family news, learn of new ‘aiga members, and attempt to gain some social or political advantage through the activation of relationships that may have been dormant. It is also an opportunity to acquire fine mats in the gift exchanges that are the highlight of all such gatherings.

Although physical prowess and production capacity, are important qualities for Samoans, oratorical skills are most highly valued, irrespective of gender and status. Samoans traveling to other villages invariably ask for the fa’alupega of the village, anticipating a traditional exchange of honorifics. Village orators well versed in Samoan traditional lore are solicited to accompany a group on important trips between villages, for they are possessed of knowledge which allows them to participate effectively and efficiently in traditional exchanges and dialogue. Oratorical skills include knowledge of gafa and faia (genealogy and connections). As Va’ai observes:
Genealogy is history for Samoans and lineages are the blood arteries of Samoan society. Samoan traditions relate that all lineages are ultimately connected. While orators and matai are the official custodians of family genealogies, heirs ought to know their genealogical connections—which can be acquired not only by knowledge and continued referrals to family genealogies but through active participation in traditional activities. With the emphasis on oral tradition, acquiring knowledge of genealogical connections is a difficult and slow process hindered further by taboo on talagafa or public discussion of genealogies. Village constitutive laws often impose heavy penalties on those who transgress village prohibitions on discussion of genealogies, including presentation as evidence in a court case; and might even involve banishment of offenders from village affairs (1998, 37).

Although it has been argued that there is an implicit assumption that all lineages are ultimately connected to the ‘ramified lineages’ of Malietoa and other Paramount Chiefs of Samoa, Samoans are sensitive to the delicate nature of their relationships at any given level. Even though, the fa’alupega clearly defines the relative rank of ali’i (chief) and tulafale (orator), it is not equivalent to a ‘lord and commoner’ or ‘upper class and working class’ relationship, as (Turner 1884) implied. The western understanding of this relationship emphasizes antagonistic attitudes and the sovereignty of an individual. Instead, the ali’i and tulafale groups which both comprise the matai, are interdependent and complementary, not only in the family setting but in the village and beyond (Va’ai 1998). The same is said of the relations between the other groups on the sociometric wheel (Figure 3.4).

Individual qualities of a titleholder may also influence the actual power of a village matai. Fa’alupega sometimes change to reflect these shifts in power. In other words, the rank of a title may become gradually elevated over time as a result of the achievements of the one who holds it. Titles can also decline in importance. The origins of the rank and status of matai titles thus cannot be explained by simple generalizations.
Certain *tulafale* titles can outrank certain *ali‘i* titles in some contexts (Meleisea 1987). The rank of each title can be understood only in the context of the village and district to which it is attached by its genealogical origins.

*Fa‘alupega of Salelologa*

As I have described, *fa‘alupega* are the source of a great deal of information on villages, including origins, titles, status, rank, lineage, and location. *Fa‘alupega* provide essential insight into *fa‘amatai* (*matai* system) relationships and the network of authority at the village, district, and national levels (‘Ai’ono 1986; Va‘ai 1998).

The *fa‘alupega* of Salelologa is given below. It shows how *fa‘alupega* presents individual, family, and village identities not only within Samoa but also overseas Samoa. They constitute the *mamalu ma pa‘ia* (sacred attributes and honors) that are inherent to *fa‘a-Samoa*. The version below is drawn from Kramer’s (1902) *The Samoa Islands Volume I*, The Samoan Church’s (1958) *O le Tusi Fa‘alupega o Samoa*, and Fepuleai Seuao F Taeao Salua’s (1995) *O le Taeao o Au Measina Samoa*. This is the most updated version, incorporating recent additions. *Fa‘alupega* change with the ebb and flow of Samoa’s social and political life.
Fa’alupega o Salelologa

Tulouna a ‘oe le Lologapule ma le Faito’aga\(^1\)  \(\begin{array}{c}
\text{Greetings Lologapule, and Faito’aga} \\
\text{[all the orators of Salelologa]} \\
\text{Your good government}
\end{array}\)

Lave ‘i manino lave ‘i a’ava  \(\begin{array}{c}
\text{Respectfully welcome your highness} \\
\text{Luamanuvae}
\end{array}\)

Afio mai lau afioga Luamanuvae  \(\begin{array}{c}
\text{Respectfully welcome your highness} \\
\text{Muagututi’a}
\end{array}\)

Afio mai lau afioga Tinousi o le Ma’upu\(^3\)  \(\begin{array}{c}
\text{Respectfully welcome the} \\
\text{house of your highness Tinousi}
\end{array}\)

Susu mai lau susuga Su’a  \(\begin{array}{c}
\text{Respectfully welcome your} \\
\text{mightiness Su’a}
\end{array}\)

ma le malelega a Malietoa\(^4\)  \(\begin{array}{c}
\text{Greeting your chiefs [matai title of} \\
\text{Seiuli, Papali’i]}
\end{array}\)

Tulouna a lo outou To’afia ma le Falesalafai\(^5\)  \(\begin{array}{c}
\text{Greeting special orators of the} \\
\text{Falefia and Falesalafai}
\end{array}\)

---

1 Refers to all the orators of Salelologa, originates from the warrior Lologa’s feat at war, founder of Salelologa.

2 Luamanuvae and Muagututi’a are ali’i titles of Salelologa. In recent fa’alupega text, Muagututi’a is the name used, but in Kramer (1902) it was Ti’a reflecting everyday usage in addressing matai mentioned in Wesleyan song (1931). People use Ti’a or Muagututi’a interchangeably.

3 Ali’i title of Salelologa, whom Muagututi’a and Luamanuvae referred to as their tama signifying a feagaiga relationship that ma’upu (chiefly honors received through a founding female line) prescribes. Tinousi was also given the title Lilomaiava, the latter Ao (honorific high title) through tofiga or marital alliances from the village of Palauli.

4 Although knowledge of this group existed in the village, their formal incorporation into Salelologa’s fa’alupega has only recently been recorded in the 1995 fa’alupega text. These matai titles came to Salelologa through his highness Malietoa’s arrangement with local chiefs.

5 Emphasize the specific orators from the six subvillages of Salelologa.
It should be noted that fa’alupega are now published in a handbook. To highlight the currency and importance of fa’alupega today, these honorifics are mentioned in a song composed by the Methodist Theological College at Piula to commemorate its first national annual synod held in Salelologa in 1931. In the original, I have italicized the main honors also mentioned in Salelologa’s fa’alupega. The relationship between Malaefatu, Salelologa’s malae (meeting place) with Fuifatu, the malae in Safotulafai, the traditional political center of the district of Fa’asalele’aga is also highlighted.

Commemoration Song for Salelologa (1931)

1. Le Uesiliana e, le Uelesiana e
Fiafia ua tatala lo ta manuia ua aofia mai le ‘ekalesia
‘Ua maua le tua o Fuifatu e, ua ifo manu i le fogatia

2. ‘Ua malo le fale ua malo le folau.
‘Ua ou tiu i le vasaloloa ‘ae talitalia ‘i peau
‘Ua ifo le galu e ‘ua moe manu i ulu la’au
‘Ua manumanu le tua o Fuifatu e ‘ua ali’itia le tia vavau

3. Le Lologapule, ma le Faito’aga ma le Falesalafai
Malo le uto malo le va’ai ua nofo i muli o va’a
‘Ua ‘atoa’atoa to’oto’o ‘o le fono ua mae’a le Uesiliana
‘O lenei ua potopoto Malaefatu o le malaefono

4. ‘O lou finagalo malie ‘ua alai ona usu le fono
Sa ‘alaga nei le manu pei i ai se nu’u e ofo
Lenei ua lagona le leo ‘o le lupe ‘ua olo
Ti’a e, ma Luamanuvae ma le latou tama, fa’asao

5. Ua malie le Falefia i lau pule ua ou sapaia
‘Ae fai pea ma le fiafia ‘o lau taulaga ‘ua ‘ausia
‘Ae tu’u pea ‘i le lagi na te totogi lou milosia
‘Aumai le lagi se fa’amatafi ‘ia liligi mai se manuia
‘O lenei ‘ua ‘ou folalima leai se mea ou te mafai. Mu o mu a he...
English Translation

1. O! Wesleyan, Wesleyan are happy, we are very fortunate
   Our church is gathered here at the tua o Fuifatu [back of Fuifatu, which is Malaefatu].

2. Thank you. We have been sailing the land, sailing the seas, we have been voyaging
   the deep ocean and supported by the waves. Now the waves have reached the snare
   and the birds rest on trees. Our treasured tua o Fuifatu (back of Fuifatu) is honored
   let there be no disturbance.

3. To the orators of Falefia and Falesalafai, thank you to your great vision and wisdom.
   The meeting is held and Wesleyan is gathered here at Malaefatu the meeting place.

4. It was your kind and loving gesture that let us hold this meeting here. We have
   sought and looked for an offer to take us in. It was the people of Salelologa, who
   responded. The chiefs of Ti’a, Luamanuvae and Tinousi. Thank you so much, we
   appreciate it.

5. We are saturated by your sacrifice Falefia [chiefs and orators]. May your sacrifice
   burn gloriously. We do not have anything good to return for your kindness, but we pray
   to the Almighty to shower you all with bountiful blessings.

   The song demonstrates a complementary relationship, illustrative of the historical
   alliances between villages and district. These complementary functions are often
   expressed through reciting genealogies and fa’alupega as well as in the activities of
   regional politics. In the song, events are remembered and the hospitality and kindness of
   the host village are acknowledged. They exemplify the va fealoa’i (social
   space/relations).

Salelologa Then and Now: Communication and Settlement

Salelologa is today only ten minutes flight by a single engine plane from Faleolo
or fifteen minutes from Fagali’i airport on Upolu island or an hour by ferry from
Mulifanua wharf on Upolu island (see Figure 3.1). Modern technology has considerably
shortened travel time between the islands. But it was not always that easy to get to or
from Salelologa. Some of the older members interviewed recollect the difficulties.

Below are Silia Luamanuvae’s recollections, from an interview in September, 1999.

In the late 1940s, our village people were still traveling between Savai'i and Upolu using va’a (big outrigger canoes). Strong men from the village formed the crew members. Some of the men were also very good orators who invariably accompanied Lilomaiva Lafaele (my grandfather) and other matai when we went on a trip. These trips from Salelologa usually landed at Mulifanua or Lalovi [villages on northwest Upolu]. Those days were so hard, because there was always the danger of rough seas. A simple mistake by the captain about the direction of waves and wind and all of us would be in peril, especially in the Apolima Strait. In those days we usually landed at Lalovi, where this particular lady Ta’ase, was her name lived. Her family always looked forward to our coming. She was like family to us. Once we landed at Lalovi we got so tired we slept the night at her house before we continued to Apia. We had one trip eh? My god! You know the weather all of a sudden got really bad and our canoe almost sank because of the big waves, but Lilomaiva Lafaele was very quick and kept good control of it especially keeping the men focused, and ordering the women to bail out the water fast, as well as calming down the women.

**Did Foua have its own outrigger canoe?**

O! Yes, in those days each pitonu’u of Salelologa had a canoe with its own launching pad at their shore. For example, Falefia’s launch area is called Lautala. Sakalafai launching place is called Vaie’e. Sapulu’s launching place is called Silai’a heading toward the wharf. Saletagaloa had its own canoe too. For us in Foua, our launch area is called Tautai, right near a freshwater pool also called Tautai. The women’s committee house is currently located next to it, so we can monitor the freshwater pool. Well, you know in those days while we were doing chores around the house all of a sudden we would hear this singing from the sea and we would run to check. We could see it was the canoe of the subvillage of Saletagaloa. We would yell out to them, hey where are you going? You know, but they were gone!

**So how big were these outrigger canoes?**

O! Big it carries twenty to fifty people. We wouldn’t go if we had less than twenty men because we need at least twenty men to paddle the canoe.
The historical map of Samoa (Figure 3.5) shows many boat passages between Savai‘i and ‘Upolu. On Savai‘i the main harbor was at Matautu near Fagamalo village. These stories are corroborated by Leiataua Vaiao Ala’ilima, now a great grandfather, who has traveled since he was a child and continues to traverse between homes in the United States, New Zealand, and Samoa. His parents were Methodist ministers in Salelologa from 1925 to 1932. He remembers traveling by outrigger canoe from Salelologa to Upolu or to other parts of Savai‘i, especially to Satupa‘itea where the central Methodist church on Savai‘i is located. In an interview conducted in April, 2001 in Hawai‘i, Leiataua Vaiao Ala’ilima recalls the following:

People were always traveling in those days by outrigger canoe. About forty men were needed, two on each seat, to paddle it. That gives you an idea of how big the outrigger was. The names of some of the big outrigger of Salelologa were Filemu (Peace) and Koneferenisi (Conference). You know it was also at Salelologa in 1928 that I saw perhaps the last double-hulled canoes built in Samoa. I estimated them to be forty feet long and twelve feet wide.

The villagers explained why the outrigger canoes were still used although diesel engined boats owned by merchant stores in the colonial period were around. These diesel-engined boats were called, va’a la’u popo (copra boat) because they were specifically chartered to freight sacks of copra and cocoa. The boat would take people only after all the copra had been taken. Moreover, the copra boat did not come regularly and always had the lingering smell of copra. It was also difficult to trek all the way to Faga’s copra trading station, a few miles from Safotulafai (Figure 3.1) where the old wharf was since only Baker owned a car.
Figure 3.5 Historical Map: Boat Passages
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All the four companies: Nelesoni (Nelson and Co. Ltd.), Eveni (I.H. Carruthers and Co. Ltd.), Molesi (Morris Hedstrom and Co. Ltd.), and B.P. (Burns Philp Co. Ltd.) had parent copra stations in Faga. Another smaller company Coxon came later. But later on each company had a copra station spread out amongst several *pitonu 'u* in Salelologa (Old Map circa 1920s, Figure 3.2). From these stores, copra and cocoa were transported to Faga for the boats to take to Apia.

During interviews about life in Salelologa, the older people, now in their late 60s or late 70s, describe simple surroundings and dusty roads. They also talked about the trail to the promontory now called Salelologa Wharf. It was part of Sapulu. The wharf was a place for fishing and where women dug up rock oysters or fish for sea cucumbers in the early 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. Fishing for sea cucumber, rock oyster, and sea urchins is still done today but fewer women dig up oysters either because it is unsafe since the ferry route crosses the passage to the rocks, or because oysters have become scarce from over-fishing. Nowadays, one has to order in advance to guarantee delivery of a bottle of oyster. Salelologa is so well known for its delicious sea cucumbers that it has gained a nickname ‘ai-sea-elo, which means ‘people who eat day old sea cucumber’. Adjacent to the rocks where the oysters are fished is the *soata*, a low land bushy forest that is a popular place for hunting wild pigeons.

In the old days, there was no electricity, no paved roads, and no running water, but there was good supply of wells water for drinking, cooking, and washing dishes and freshwater pools for bathing and washing clothes. Most families had a thatched roof guest house (*faletalimalo*) and then a smaller hut behind it for sleeping. Many families in Salelologa had simple *fale* and the houses were bare. Even my grandparents’s sleeping
house was a simple hut with a food box in which food was kept, although they had a
guesthouse with mats like other 'aiga, but hardly anything else. When I interviewed
others outside of my family about life in Salelologa, a grandparent said that, “life was
basically good, but that they were poor or that it was not easy to get money. “

Since these times, Samoans have aspired to improve their lot. Just as these
changes were described to me more than fifty years before I was born, things have
changed again by the time I had grown up and, even as I write. The changing landscape
is not only a result of natural conditions, but of the growth, fluidity, and decisions of the
local population. Salelologa was like the other villages of Samoa in its quest to
modernize.

As in all of the other villages of Samoa, church is an integral part of village life in
Salelologa. Three of the six pitonu‘u of Salelologa have a Methodist church. Saletagaloa
has two churches, a Mormon and Methodist, Foua has the Catholic and Congregational
Christian Church (formerly L.M.S.). In 1977, a new church, Assembly of God, was
added in Malaeta. A Baptist church followed soon after. Since then, the matai council
has regulated against the introduction of new religions or churches of any kind in
Salelologa.

Primary education throughout the country was formerly in the hands of the
churches, with little financial assistance from the central government. Before the
government took over responsibility for education, the Methodist church (the dominant
denomination in Salelologa) administered primary education. From the 1930s to the
late 1950s, classes went from Primer One to Standard Four or seven years of primary
education. Students traveled to Apia to finish intermediate and high school. The
Methodist school in Salelologa was housed in six Samoan *fale*. Samoan *fale* come in three kinds: *faletalimalo* (guest/meeting house) and *faletofa* (sleeping house) and *faleo’o* (smaller hut). These kinds of *fale* are substantial. A good house could last twenty to thirty years without major hurricanes provided the thatched roof was maintained. The less substantial though well-sheltered *faleo’o*, are usually placed behind the main houses. This layout has been applied to modern Samoan houses in villages, in which you have a square house in the front and enclosed European living quarters behind.

Salelologa was the location of the first village school my mother taught in after she graduated from the Teachers Training College in Apia in 1952. There she met my father, whom she married in 1955. During my interviews in New Zealand and Santa Ana people described their experiences at Salelologa primary school and remembered my mother as their teacher. In those days, school buildings were Samoan houses, and they sat on mats spread on a pebble floor. They had no desks and only one book and a pencil for the entire school term. Holmes’ (1957) study in Ta’u, American Samoa, describes similar situation for schools.

By the 1950s, the primary school had been relocated six hundred yards on the mountainside of the mainroad. This coincided with Samoa’s effort to become more self-governing. Education was a major way to achieve this goal. Together with government leaders, village leaders worked to improve the schools. Below is a report on the proceedings and the construction of this school by Tinousi Lilomaiava Niko, (Translation mine).
It was in November 1958 that the Honorable Minister LuamanuvaʻEti came to me and we called a meeting with Sa LuamanuvaʻEti, Tiʻa ma Tinousi in Foua about a school for the future of our children. A messenger was sent to inform Falefia and Falesalafai about a meeting with the entire village. After a discussion with our member of parliament, LuamanuvaʻEti [a.k.a. Tofilau ʻEti] it was agreed that to improve the lives and future of our village, building a better school was a first priority. It would ensure that future generations of Salelologa would be armed with knowledge and better prepared to engage in the development of the village. After deliberations and more discussion, an agreement was reached and the school was built in the subvillage of Falefia, about six hundred yards from the main road on the mountainside. This land was donated by matai. Concern about the safety of children had been voiced in previous discussions regarding the first school run by the Methodists. The first school was located right near the main road at Falefia. The new location was safer and also had more space for the playground. Negotiations were made by Tinousi Lilomaiava Niko, LuamanuvaʻEti,3 and other matai with Dick Carruthers, the manager of the Carruthers company in Apia, for a loan to buy timber, cement, nails, and a tin roof. The village would pay back the loan with pounds of copra. The very next morning, the member of parliament came and picked us up: myself, Pauli Taetafe, Fiu Siʻa, and Leuamuli Olona to go to Apia to negotiate the contract with Dick Carruthers. We went for a second meeting and those who signed the contract were LuamanuvaʻEti, Lilomaiava Niko, Suʻa Toe, Pauli Kolise, Fiu Siʻa and Leuamuli Olona, to represent the village [see attached copy of the contract]. At the village council meeting, it was decided five of the six subvillages (Saletagaloa, Foua, Falefia, Sakalafai, and Sapulu) were to produce 15,000 pounds of copra, except for Malaeta which was asked to give 7,000 pounds because it was a smaller subvillage. This allocation was calculated according to the number of matai per subvillage. During this period, Salelologa matai council held sa [a ban which prohibits the making of copra at certain times] to ensure a good supply of coconut...Our member of Parliament, LuamanuvaʻEti was the guarantor for the loan. I, on the other hand, with the other matai from Salelologa were the members of the committee for the project. The committee members were Tautua Talatala, Pauli Kolise, Pauli Taetafe, Fiu Ioane [a.k.a Fiu Siʻa], Tiʻotala Ului, Seumanu Sile, Tuilimu Matofa, Tiumalu Letane, Atioʻo Fegasavaiʻi, and myself Tinousi Lilomaiava

3 LuamanuvaʻEti is the first matai title ʻEti had and it is from Salelologa. My grandfather Tinousi Lilomaiava Lafaele bestowed him with the LuamanuvaʻEti title in 1955. He was later bestowed two other matai titles: Vaʻaelua and Tofilau. Vaʻaelua comes from the village of Lalomalava and Tofilau comes from the village of Iva where he has run as a candidate for our electoral constituency of Faasaleleʻaga No. 1. Tofilau ʻEti remained our Prime Minister from 1983 until he passed away in March, 1999.
Niko. Despite some difficulties encountered during the project, it was successfully finished. It took three years to build the school. The building’s measurements were 120 feet in length and 32 feet in width. There were five classrooms and each classroom had its own steps. The total and final cost of the school building was 3,250 pounds, 16 shillings and 8 pennies. In March 1962, the school building was finished, the dedication followed soon after.

I went to this school. I did all of my primary education there until I graduated in 1974. In 1974, the village renovated and extended the school, as the student population had grown. Twenty years later, the school underwent another major expansion and relocation. This time, the matai of the adjacent subvillage donated a bigger piece of land. The burden of financing was offset by a deal the village of Salelologa made with a private organization, the Environmental Conservation Agency from Sweden. This agreement involved an exchange of part of the forestland behind the wharf for financial help. The land was set aside to preserve wild life, especially an endangered species of lupe (wild pigeon) and pe’a (flying fox) (Pauli Taetafe, Personal communication August, 1998).

In 1970, water pipes were installed to provide the water supply following the building of a dam south of Salelologa. Soon after, roads were widened and paved. It was government policy to pave roads in densely populated areas first. In 1998, the last section of the northcoast road of Savai’i was paved, greatly improving accessibility to all the villages around the island.

---

4 I knew most of these older matai in the village growing up. Most of them passed away while I was still in high school. As of this writing, only Tuilimu Matofa and Pauli Taetafe, now in their 80s, are still alive.

5 A Peace Corp civil engineer, Daniel Lutz lived with us for two years (1970-72) during this road project.
RECEIVED AS FOLLOWS
LENTORIAT OF CONTRACT

LENTORS-
Llassromi Nkame, Oa Joe, Littanumbe Dtd., Min Mba.,
Lokcompeto, Dswiri, Makoba - representing the
Ama M. N. Makumbu of Salembio Village, Gwemelo, Gwemelo.

Lassromi, J. H. Carruthers, Limited, Apia,

AMOUNT OF DEBT-
One Thousand Five Hundred & Two Pounds, Thirteen
Shillings & Eight Pence (£1,502/13/8),

PURPOSE FOR WHICH
DEBT INCURRED-
School Building,

DATE OF PAYMENT-
31st March, 1953.

NOTICE OF CONTRACT-

Should the Debtor fail in complying with the Terms
of this debt agreement, the same (the Debtor) understands
that he will be liable to legal action taken
against him by the Creditor, and that the Creditor
will take a Bill of Sale over the Building for
which this Contract was signed, such Bill of Sale to
be cancelled only when Debt complete with interest
have been fully paid up.

Dated at Apia this 10th day of December, 1952,

Signed by the Debtor
MIN. 10BH, DAY OF DECEMBER 1952 IN THE PRESENCE

APOSTLE BEYOMA (P.A.)

Signed by the Creditor
J.H.CARRUTHERS, LIMITED.

H. N. U. MUKUMBA.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the above Memorandum was read over and
explained to the above-named parties in Apia and that they
thoroughly understand the same before affixing their signatures.

[Signature]
Electricity came to Salelologa in December 1978, following the same pattern as for the roads. Fa’asalele’aga district got electricity first, then the northwest side of the island near Asau, followed by Fagamalo and Sala’ilua, until finally the rest of the island was hooked up. As modernization has gone, forward, so have the aspirations of the people and village, and government leaders. The pace of development has had to keep up with rising expectations.

The point here is that rather than being passive in the face of changes in international economics, local people have been very ‘resourceful’ consumers of the new opportunities. This has been demonstrated to me at each of my visits in 1990, 1991, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1998, 1999 and 2000. Villagers continually talk about ways to increase investment in Salelologa. Business in New Zealand, everyone agrees has been terrible. Australia is now the new destination, where profits are larger. The United States is another new destination, where profits are much larger.

**Establishment of the Wharf at Salelologa**

The building of a wharf turned Salelologa into the trading center of Savai’i. Although Salelologa already had boat passages, it was not a historic trading post probably because of the endemic warfare between Tuamasaga and A’ana districts of Upolu and the Fa’asalele’aga district in Savai’i. In the early nineteenth century, Fagamalo, Sala’ilua, and Asau were more attractive commercial sites for European traders.

In the colonial period, the Germans made Tuasivi the commercial and government administrative center of the district of Fa’asalele’aga on the southeast coast, much like the villages of Vailoa in the Palauli district, Vaega in the Satupa’itea district, ‘Auala and
Asau in the Vaisigano district, and Fagamalo in the Gaga’emauga district (see Figure 3.1). In Fa’asalele’aga, a trading post was established at Faga, a village near Tuasivi (Davidson 1967). Possessing the best reef passage on the southeast coast, Faga afforded relatively easy access by sea, despite its remoteness from Apia. The merchant trading stores owned by the Carruthers, Nelson, Burns Philp, and Morris Hedstrom were all located adjacent to each other in Faga. As Fox and Cumberland report:

The trader, often of part-Samoan stock, is likely to be the representative of one of the large merchant firms whose head offices are in Apia. The store sells all the necessities and luxuries likely to be demanded by the villagers: bush knives, cotton fabric, tinned meat and fish, sugar, flour, salt, rice, biscuits, soap, matches, tobacco, sweets, kerosene, nails, mosquito netting, goggles, hair oil, and numerous other commodities. The trader buys copra and cacao beans from the villagers and arranges for the produce to be taken into Apia by road or sea (1962, 185).

Another possible reason why Salelologa was overlooked was that it was not a seat of colonial authority. Tuasivi, within Safotulafai was where the government offices, the courthouse, hospital, police headquarters, and the post office were located. The colonial seat of authority upset a traditional complementarity between the two villages, however. Salelologa’s malaefono (meeting place), called Malaefatu was traditionally known as the tua o Fuifatu. Fuifatu is the name of Safotulafai’s malaefono. The saying, “Malaefatu ‘o le tua ‘o Fuifatu” means that Salelologa’s Malaefatu was the backbone of Fuifatu, signifying their complementary relationship. In other words, Malaefatu (literally, center of hearts) and Fuifatu (literally, cluster of hearts), and by extension Salelologa and Safotulafai, were closely aligned politically.

The momentum, however, of development between Savai’i and ‘Upolu had started to pick up. Later, the U.S. Marines joined with the New Zealand administration to
build Mulifanua wharf on the northwest coast of ‘Upolu island during World War II
(Davidson 1967). Previously, Apia harbor had been the only port. This greatly reduced
travel time to Asau, Fagamalo, Sala’ilua, and Faga. With the establishment of Mulifanua
wharf, building a wharf at Salelologa was inevitable since Salelologa is much closer to
Mulifanua than any other ports on Savai’i.

Elders such as Tuilimu Matofa remember the decision to build the wharf and the
work involved in its construction. Tuilimu Matofa, who then was in his early 80s,
describes his recollections in an interview in November, 1999.

You know it was in the 1950s that the whole district of Fa’asalele’aga had
a meeting here in Salelologa. It was genuinely felt that we in Savai’i
wanted to improve and develop the island and the whole of Samoa. One
major way to do this was to accelerate and facilitate travel and
transportation for our people and goods to Apia. It was suggested that the
wharf be built at Safotulafai. The matai agreed to it you know because of
its traditional role as center of the district... We began with bringing rocks
for a pier but the waves washed away the pier. Another meeting was called
and several people including members of parliament came such as
Gatoloai Peseta Sio and I’iga Kalapu from Pua’pu’a.6 I’iga Kalapu, was
really the one who adamantly argued, to have the wharf built at Salelologa
since it has a natural harbor and quite a sheltered bay. I’iga Kalapu
became a member of parliament for his constituency. The other people
there were Luamanuvae ‘Eti and Magele ‘Ate.
Salelologa could not agree more and we also wanted to help the
government with its plans. Salelologa had its own meeting and the matai
council decided that to avoid any conflict it would be better to subdivide
the land at the wharf among all six subvillages instead of just the
subvillage of Sapulu where the wharf was located. Hence all the matai
and their families in the six subvillages who were present in 1951 when
the wharf was subdivided now have a piece of land adjacent to the road
going to the wharf. The government also helped, they brought two
engineers and two trucks, but most of the work was done by sheer

---

6 During the interview, Tuilimu Matofa asked me, If I remember Samoa’s colonial history when the
Germans ruled Samoa and that I’iga Kalapu and later his sister I’iga Suafole both became members of
parliament from Fa’asalele’aga No. 4. are children of I’iga Pisa who was one of the matai exiled in the
Mariana Islands and Saipan with Namulau’ulu Lauaki of Safotulafai.
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manpower. Men from all the villages of our district alternated and worked
shifts to reclaim some of the land and build the road to the wharf to make
the dock. Our village billeted the workers, eh? Each family helped with
food. Palauli district also contributed. It was difficult work. We cried
tears and sweat blood with our own hands. People got tired and at times,
it came to a standstill. It was not easy. It took about five years before the
wharf was ready for a boat, because we had to level and fill the path to the
point where we board the boats now...it was all jungle and rock before. In
the initial period, the project was more of a larger district project, but
eventually, it fell on the people of Salelologa, who did most of the work
and became responsible for security on the wharf.

Another elder, Pauli Taetafe gives a similar story. Tinousi Lilomaiava Niko’s
notes verify that the dates of construction were between 1951 and 1956 and that the land
around the wharf had been subdivided among the matai. The wharf at Salelologa was
dedicated in 1956. Below is the description of the Official Opening of the Wharf, as
reported in the Samoa Bulletin Friday, March 9, 1956:

The opening of the wharf at Salelologa was a major event last week. It
was held on Friday March 2, 1956 at 10:00 a.m. The boat Malcolm
arrived at the wharf carrying many dignitaries and government officials
from the government of Western Samoa. These included the New Zealand
High Commissioner, Mr. Guy Powles and his wife, the Fono Council
Advisor Tupua Tamasese Mea'ole, and Tapa'au Fa'asisina Malietoa,
members of Parliament and the Legislative Assembly. At Salelologa
wharf the receiving party had a guard of honor made up of the boys of
Tuasivi High School, all the chiefs and orators of Fa'asalele'aga district
and Salelologa village, as well as all the important officials and matai of
the villages of Satupa'itea and Palauli. Also attending were the pastors of
all of Fa'asalele'aga and the primary and junior high schools of
Fa'asalele'aga. The trip from Apia was welcomed by the commissioner of
Savai'i, Mr. Robson and Gatoloa'i Peseta Sio, a member of parliament.
The beautiful band of Lelepa sang the anthem of her Majesty the Queen
and the Samoan national anthem. The officiating ministers were Fai'ai
(senior minister of the London Missionay Society), and a minister of the
(Methodist church) Vae'aou L.M. The prayer was followed with the official
opening of the wharf when Mrs. Guy Powles cut the white ribbon draped
around the posts of the new building. The dignitaries went to Salelologa's
malae, Malaefatu where all the entertainment and cultural exchanges took
place for the visiting dignitaries. After the morning tea, it was followed
by a royal 'ava ceremony.
The 2,800 acres of conservation land behind the land that was subdivided during the building of the wharf was not subdivided, but remained under the jurisdiction of chiefs and orators of Salelologa. This tract of land was then sold by chief and orators in 1994 to the government to build a township for Savai’i. At that time Tofilau ‘Eti, (a.k.a. Luamanuva ‘Eti) who is from our constituency was Prime Minister of Samoa. This *foa’i* (giving away) has become a contentious issue. Several subvillages argued, they had not agreed to giving away the land. They wanted better compensation. The government and Salelologa village held several court hearings to resolve the matter. According to the government, Salelologa has received about $4.0 Million Tala, paid out in installments between 1994 and 2002. The *matai*, on the other hand, feel that they were rushed into the deal before considering all the implications and rights of the subvillages.

Salelologa wharf has since undergone many structural changes. The simple hangar-like structure of 1956 was bulldozed down in the early 1970s. A more substantial building was built with seats where passengers can wait sheltered from rain and wind. Dredging machines were brought in to deepen the harbor. Most of these capital improvements have been the product of gifts or low interest loans from foreign donors including New Zealand, Australia, Germany, Japan, and China.

In 1975, the first vehicular ferry, *Limulimutau* held its first inaugural trip between Upolu and Savai’i. Local demand was so great that trips were increased to three times a day, with a once a week trip between Apia and American Samoa (Savali Bulletin 1976). An additional vehicular ferry called the *Puleono* was added soon after. As a young girl, I was at the inauguration of the ferries *Limulimutau* (1975) and *Puleono* (1976) in
Salelologa. The celebrations were held at Foua. The women’s committee of Foua and Sapulu provided the lunch for the guests. My father then was the Minister of Justice. In the beginning, trips were twice a day, at 6:00 a.m. from Salelologa and at 4:00 p.m. from Mulifanua. The Salafai and Queen Salamasina ferries were added several years later. All these ferries have since outlived their use. At present, Lady Samoa and Lady Naomi currently service the Upolu-Savai’i route three times a day, as well as the once a week trip between American Samoa and Apia.

Air transportation

Communication with Apia was further enhanced with the establishment of an airstrip at Maota, Salelologa in 1969. The Faleolo international airport, about an hour’s drive from Apia had been the only airport in Samoa. The Faleolo to Maota service, inaugurated in December 1970 with a four-seater Cessna, at first carried mainly European (tourists and expatriates) and government employees. Local people began to use it on an emergency basis, but otherwise continue to favor the boats, which are cheaper and can accommodate more weight. An eight seater plane, was added a few years later and the Fagali’i airstrip, fifteen minutes ride from Apia, was also built. Domestic flights are now scheduled between Faleolo or Fagali’i and Maota. The air service saves many lives of patients who cannot be operated upon in Savai’i and have to be sent to Apia for treatment. In the mid-1980s, the government expanded the Maota runway and improved airport building facilities.

In 1996, a bigger plane, the nineteen-seater Twin Otter was added to the local Polynesian Airline fleet. The first direct international flights between Savai’i and
American Samoa began in May 1997 (Samoa Observer, June 1997). Samoa Air from American Samoa came on the scene and provided much needed competition. In the beginning, international scheduled flights were twice a week (Samoan Observer, December 1997), but local demand was so great that there is now a daily scheduled flight every day of the week (Solomua Personal communication, July 2000). In addition to passengers, airfreight carries registered packages, letters, care packages, cargo of taro, and bundles of mats and fine mats. Special cargo flights are added on demand, during the holidays. The Customs Office has opened in Salelologa after international flights began in 1997. More convenient air and sea transport means that Salelologa has become a nodal point to Apia as well as being directly involved in the international economy.

Technological progress in transportation and telecommunication made possible frequent contact over relatively long distances through the mail, and air services. Modern technology permits the dispersal of Samoans and at same time it is used to reinforce fa'a-Samoa agendas, by allowing those both at ‘home’ and at ‘reach’ to interact more quickly and easily. For instance, in the old days, money orders were sent through the post office, letters took weeks to arrive, telegrams were used more often in emergency, compared to phone calls so common today. In 1995, the Western union opened and has become very popular for transferring money in a moment’s notice, although money orders sent through the post office is used occasionally. Overseas movement has engendered rapid transformation as globalization is appropriated into the villages. Today, the maintenance of the links has important results, socially, economically, and politically.
The first difficulty in describing the structure of a Samoan village is to define the household unit. Because of the ambiguous and shifting character of group boundaries in Samoa, including those defining residence groups, I asked household members what they considered to be the most appropriate unit to frame census questions. Their answers were identical, the matai and his ‘au’āiga. Matai in this usage refers to the titled head of a household and au’āiga means ‘a bunch, or family cluster’. The ‘au’āiga is comprised of all people who are directly under a matai’s supervision, who serve him, and contribute to the regular affairs of the ‘aiga. Throughout this study, the term ‘aiga is used generically to refer to an ‘extended family’. However, for the household census ‘au’āiga was used to get a base population, by identifying those said to related de facto or de jure to each other. In other words, I attempted to identify all those persons with whom a household interacts consistently on a regular basis irrespective of geographic location, in contrast to members of an ‘aiga (extended family) who may participate only in certain fa’alavelave (cultural events).

This is in keeping with Wilk and Netting’s (1984, 37) argument that residence refers to how a group of people function “and that a household may have a bi-local or multi-local structure.” The people involved in an ‘au’āiga need not share the same kitchen, eat together or live in the same compound as the matai, but they form activity groups of varying density and share a commitment as a common socioeconomic entity, irrespective of geographic location. ‘Au’āiga therefore can include members of ‘aiga who live overseas.
During fieldwork, I saw visitors dropping in on the village for a couple of hours, days, weeks to months, even years. When relatives stay for long periods, they often become part of the ‘aiga and participate as family members by helping with every day chores. When I asked about these people, I was told “O! they are ‘aiga.” Distant relatives may come on an errand or just appear to stay for indefinite periods of time, exercising their rights as kin to hospitality and shelter with any of their family members. This is an everyday feature of life in Foua. The fluidity of this population makes it impossible to track and enumerate. Because of the frequency of such visitors, and the absence of those normally resident whom have gone temporarily to live in other houses, both household composition and overall census figures are very unstable. Some ‘aiga may not have a living matai holder for a time. In such a situation, the family continues to participate in village and church affairs under the guidance of the eldest member of the family, male or female, until a matai is selected.

In 1991, the national census reported data on individual villages and subvillages for the first time in 1991 and also initiated the system of enumeration being taken every ten years. This census reported total \textit{de facto} population for Salelologa nu’u as 2,401 fifty two percent of whom were male (Table 3.2). The six pitonu’u comprising Salelologa ranged in size from 190 to 977, with Sapulu and Foua the largest.
Table 3.2: Fa’asalele’aga District No.1, Salelologa Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subvillage</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maota</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapulu</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakalafai</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falefia</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foua</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saletagaloa</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1252</strong></td>
<td><strong>1149</strong></td>
<td><strong>2401</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Statistics, Western Samoa 1991

The field count of the *de facto* population of Foua conducted in August 1999 found 471 people in residence distributed over forty matai ‘au’aiga. By December, this resident population had increased to 478 within the same forty households. The largest of these ‘au’aiga had thirty-four residents, and the smallest only four, a married couple living with two younger brothers of the wife. The number of elderly is growing. While most senior household members report that they never knew their grandparents, 60 percent of today’s households contain three generations. The forty household units of 478 people in residence acknowledge another 208 people living *de jure* elsewhere.

Average size of households in Foua is 11.9 people *de facto* count. Usually, a married son or daughter lives in a separate dwelling behind the main parental house within the village *malae* (village green). Others live on plantation land, but provide food for their elders in the central village. Building rural roads has facilitated access to ‘aiga land, where small subsistence plots are cultivated so that many newer and smaller households are located at the plantation end of the village and somewhat remote from its center. Residents of these households are young matai or untitled adult members of ‘aiga, who have chosen to establish households on or near family gardens or on...
previously uncleared family land. In doing this and consequently establishing their own households, these young members create ‘new’ *au’āiga* but retain frequent and intimate contact with their parental households.

About 46.6 percent of the *de facto* population of Foua is under the age of twenty (Table 3.3) and (Figure 3.6), higher than the national figure that is closer to forty percent. If the 20-24 cohort is added to the 0-19 age group, then 53.3 percent of Foua’s population is aged less than 25. This holds true for the Samoan population at large.

Demographically, Foua is therefore a youthful *pitonu’u* with a substantial representation of adolescents and young adults who normally constitute the bulk of the work force in any Samoan community. According to preliminary results from the 2001 census, life expectancy has risen to 69.5 years, a year longer than the average in 1991. At the same time, national total fertility rates have been declining over the past decade from 4.7 in 1991 to 3.5 in 2001. However, the statistician is cautious about these numbers, because reliable measures of fertility remain incomplete in Samoa.

If the low total fertility rate for the country is probably an undercount, then this is reflected in Foua where women had given birth in excess of five children by the time they reach 50. Older women generally favored larger families and had lived through periods of high fertility. Those aged less than 30 have relatively fewer babies, partly due to their younger age but spacing between children suggests the total number borne over their lifetime will be a little different than for the older cohorts. For Foua, the average number of children for every childbearing woman was six, higher than national census estimates. In addition, the number of generations in a household indicate people to be living longer, with three generation households prevalent and not one of a single generation (Table 3.4).
This indicates that fertility rates remain high, conforming to cultural tradition favoring large families.

Table 3.3: Age and Sex Structure of De Facto Population of Foua 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Census 1999
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Figure 3.6: Age and Sex Structure of De Facto Population, 1999

Table 3.4: Number of Generations per Household, Foua 1999 (de facto)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations in Household</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total households</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Household Survey 1999

Of the total of 208 household members living elsewhere, more than half were in Apia, the urban center of Samoa (Table 3.5). Some of these were students attending high schools while others are married to Samoans and live in different villages. Still others
elsewhere were in a range of countries—mainly New Zealand, Australia, and the United States. The large numbers found in New Zealand reflects the relative ease of gaining entry to New Zealand, part of Samoa’s postcolonial arrangement. Those living overseas play a critical role in household development through donations of money and food for fa’alavelave, such as funerals, weddings, and church dedications.

Table 3.5: Foua Population, Present or Absent, at time of Census 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members present</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members away</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>686</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Distribution of de jure population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apia and other areas</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Canada, Singapore, Turkey</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>208</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Household Census, 1999
Education and agriculture as ways of life

Education is immensely important to Samoan parents. Most children attend school starting at age five and complete a high school education. In Fa’asalele’aga district, most villages have their own primary schools. Four high schools (called ‘colleges’) serve the district within driving distance by bus. Tuasivi College located in Tuasivi is the oldest, run by the Congregational Christian Church of Samoa. Logo’ipulotu College was established in 1972 by the Catholic Church and Vaiola College in 1975 by the Mormon Church. These three high schools are located in Safotulafai (Figure 3.1), the traditional center of Fa’asalele’aga district. The fourth Mata’aevave Junior High School, is a public school in the village of Iva, about fifteen minutes ride from Salelologa.

Most students go to Apia if they wish to complete tertiary education. There, they may attend the Polytechnical Institute, the Teachers Training College, the Nursing School, or the National University of Samoa (NUS). The last opened in 1984, as a university preparatory school, but moved to a new and permanent campus in 1997 built largely with aid from Japan. It now offers limited degree programs.

The education system in Samoa has been modified since the early 1990s. Although the classification levels remain, names have changed from Primer and Standard to Year 1 to Year 13, similar to Grades 1 to 12 in the North American system of education. Primary education is almost universal, with a literacy rate of 98.2 percent (Department of Statistics, Samoa 1991). Primary education has been the experience of 96.2 percent of Foua’s de facto population and 56.3 percent have completed secondary
education (Table 3.6). A small percentage, about 6.4, have obtained tertiary and university education.

Table 3.6: Education Attained by Foua People, Age and Sex:
(In/Completed, 1999)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Pastor school</th>
<th>Primary Year 1-8</th>
<th>Secondary Year 9-13</th>
<th>Tertiary</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent by sex</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of both sexes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Household Survey, 1999

* Education status is categorized in levels of education in or completed at time of census. Thus total column far left, represents people enumerated in these age groups; columns on right with different education levels, indicate people who have completed or are in these education categories.
Although education is compulsory, it is not free, and the government does not enforce attendance. Since parents must pay school fees, to help maintain school buildings, the high percentage completing primary and secondary education indicates its importance to most Foua parents. Both male and female children are encouraged to attend school but the community seems to follow the trend, as reported in the 1986 census, that overall females are more represented than males (Department of Statistics, Samoa 1991). Most older people (aged 65-89) have had no schooling beyond intermediate level, due to the absence of secondary education at the time they were growing up and most attended the pastor’s school in the village.

The continuing improvement in formal education among the Foua population mirroring national trend (Figure 3.7). For those aged 60 years and above about 2.2 percent attained secondary level. At each younger age cohort, the percentage reaching this level increased so that among those now aged between 40 and 60 years, the experience of most was better than their elders. Among those aged less than 40, the majority had achieved secondary level, a further four percent achieved tertiary and university education. One notable feature is that, for each five-year age group between 15 and 40, the percentage achieving secondary education has remained stable at around 44 percent.
Figure 3.7: Education Attained in Foua by Age and Sex 1999
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Very few people in Foua work at regular wage employment five days a week, from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Of the forty household heads, only eleven (27.5 percent) are regularly employed. Six own small village stores. About four of every five of the able-bodied population earns money from the sale of surplus crops, such as banana, taro, or *ta’amu* (giant taro), vegetables or copra, and from fishing. The women also sell bottles of sea cucumber, oysters, or handicrafts. In general, there is no uniform source of income, revenue comes from multiple sources. Those without a regular job often say they are *tausi ‘aiga* (home employed), which includes taking care of the family, working on plantation land, making copra, fishing, and attending to family welfare, including key roles in arranging *fa’alavelave*. This is so for the vast majority of Foua population. Copra was once the main source of local revenue, but with recently depressed prices it is only cut in cases of emergency. Of forty households, thirty-four or 85 percent reported receiving some significant and regular monetary contributions from *‘aiga* members living overseas.

Fresh coconut is cut everyday for pigs and chicken feed. Just about every household has domesticated poultry and pigs for local consumption and the occasional *fa’alavelave*. Since pigs also have ritual importance, each household raises from two to eight large ones. Despite a village rule about fencing pigs, most animals roam free and sometimes cause great damage to crops and vegetable gardens around houses. Two related households each owned a cow, received as as gifts which they were raising in anticipation of the funeral of an elderly grandparent. Common food staples include taro, breadfruit, *ta’amu* (giant taro), yam, banana, chicken, and fish. Imported food includes canned meat, mackerel, frozen mutton, chicken, and turkey tails while local stores sell
biscuits, flour, sugar, salt, soap, and shampoo. Households reported spending most of their income on imported food and clothing.

Twelve households were headed by widows. In this kind of household, adult children are the main income earners and family providers. In some cases, the adult son becomes matai of the 'aiga and hence represents the family in village and church affairs.

**Overseas Movement and Modernity: Auckland, New Zealand and Santa Ana, California, U.S.A.**

As argued earlier, local affairs cannot be separated from national context. Just as population movement overseas has affected Samoa, so too has it been influential in Salelologa. Following Samoa’s independence from New Zealand in 1962, relations between the two countries have been cordial and have worked to sustain the autonomous efforts of a struggling nation. As part of this relationship, the New Zealand government signed a Memorandum of Mutual Friendship allowing easy access to New Zealand through a quota system. Each year, one thousand Samoans were allowed to enter New Zealand, later raised to 1,100. At independence, government leaders thought Samoa’s economy future was in agriculture and the focus of the first, five-year economic plans was to increase production of copra, cocoa, taro, and banana. Devastating hurricanes in 1966 and 1968 ruined many agricultural crops with the taro, copra, and banana industries heavily hit exacerbated by competition from other countries. These took a heavy toll on Samoa’s export crops. Although government made efforts to diversify the economy and later began tourism promotion, Samoan families did not consider that it provided adequate economic security and began looking for opportunities overseas.
Temporary work permits to New Zealand ranged from three months to a year, renewable provided there was still employment. The economic boom in the industrial and manufacturing sectors of New Zealand’s economy in the late 1960s led to an increased demand for unskilled labor, since the local labor force rejected such work in an expanding postwar economy (Anae 1998; Macpherson 1991). This prompted the flow of many village Samoans to New Zealand to seek new sources of income to supplement the economic efforts of ‘aiga. Macpherson (1991) argues that the concentration on young adult cohort, reflects a New Zealand government policy that favored single independent migrants whose presence cost the state the least in the short term.

Fairbairn (1961) describes early trends in Samoan movement to New Zealand, the most significant of which commenced in the period immediately after the end of World War II. It has been said that these migrants were disproportionately ‘afakasi Samoans with European surnames, who had access to a western way of life through contacts with merchant shipping or the Armed Forces. Macpherson (1991) argues that these people may have been motivated to move through ‘afakasi experiences of a European lifestyle in Samoa, working at the Bank of Western Samoa or at commercial enterprises such as Morris Hedstrom or Burns Philp that had given them firsthand knowledge of New Zealand.

The pre-1960s phase of movement was characterized by individual and chain migration, usually small in scale and almost exclusively afakasi. Conversely, the post-1960s saw a significant increase in movement by Samoans from throughout the country. The 1970s to 1980s showed a doubling of the Samoan immigrant population, coincident
with New Zealand’s drive for imported labor. Eventhough the eighties was a period of worldwide economic recession, immigration continued to increase as reflected in more departures from Foua (Table 3.7). In my view, recession may disrupt economic activity in developed countries but would have greater impact for countries like Samoa. Despite the immigration policies of overseas governments, Samoan families were motivated to assist relatives through sponsorship and other available visa categories.

The first wave of people who left Salelologa in the early to mid-1960s, including those from Foua, were mainly young men and women in their twenties, with two barely eighteen years old (Table 3.7). Most of these young men and women had just finished high school and knew some English, enough to enable them to work in factories. Two had an aunt married to a New Zealander, who sponsored them to help with children. They saw their move to New Zealand as a way of securing a better life for themselves and their ‘aiga in Samoa. In turn, these pioneering men and women helped bring over younger siblings and other relatives once they had secured stable jobs and accommodation.

Overseas movement for both Samoa, and the Foua community, has tapered off since the 1990s (Figure 3.8). During the ten-year period 1990 to 2,000, only four individuals of working age (20-39 years old) from Foua were reported to have left permanently to work in New Zealand or the United States (Table 3.7). During conversations, one young mother said: “One reason families haven’t been sending people overseas was because they have enough people overseas to sustain economic integrity, families also need people to stay in Samoa.” Conversely, this marked decline could reflect the stricter immigration requirements of overseas countries. Parents in older age
group (50-60) years old, however, noted having gone several times to visit families on a short-term basis.

### Table 3.7: Year of Departure of Salelologa-born Residents to New Zealand and United States (1963-2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New Zealand (n=40)</th>
<th>United States (n=14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average size per Samoan households in Auckland was seven. Three households had a grandparent, while the other twenty households consisted of parents and their young children. In Auckland, most families were located in suburbs well-known for the concentration of Polynesian peoples: Manukau, Onehunga, Otara, Mangere, Manurewa, Otahuhu, Grey Lynn, Mt. Roskill, Mt. Albert, Papakura, and Papatoetoe (Figure 3.9). Initially, Samoans attended existing *palagi* (European) churches but gradually began to build their own which as in Samoa, became an integral part of their lives as Samoan communities overseas.
Figure 3.9 Map of Central-South Auckland, New Zealand

Source: Auckland District Maps, New Zealand 1988
Fewer Salelologa people went to the United States (Table 3.7), reflecting the difficulty of obtaining a visa. Some went first to American Samoa and thus facilitated entry into America. I interviewed nine people from Salelologa who live in Santa Ana, California. Like their compatriots in New Zealand, most of the first pioneers to the United States had only a secondary education which limited them to factory jobs and the service industry. In California, most people from Salelologa live in the suburbs of Santa Ana, Long Beach, and Carson, and average household size in Santa Ana was 6.2. All households had both parents still living and most people worked in entry-level jobs—except Iese, who was a manager for the Phillips Tire Company. In both the Auckland and Santa Ana communities, ‘aiga members were visiting some families from Samoa during interviews.

Linkages and alliances between people and places remain rooted in customary lifeways. While some scholars claim that Samoa’s dependence on migration is unhealthy and leads to ‘underdevelopment’ (Shankman 1976), loss of ‘culture’ or loss of manpower, my research discovered that context of time and of place are integral features to the changing dynamic of people’s movement and identity. Not only have villages undergone major change, but also Samoan communities overseas have flourished. The links between these communities at home and abroad remain extraordinarily strong. Instead of severing ties with the home place or dissipating the social unit, overseas movement has afforded Samoans new opportunities and allowed fa’a-Samoa to grow in vibrant ways.
I belong to Oceania...it nourishes my spirit, helps define me and feeds my imagination. A detached objective analysis I will leave to the sociologist and all the other 'ologists. Objectivity is for such uncommitted gods. My commitment won't allow me to confine myself to so narrow a vision (Wendt 1976, 49).

A radically different approach to the scholarly study of movement is needed. Such an approach demands more than a survey of forms of movement—rural-urban, urban-urban or transnational—it demands more than an alternative perspective on the flow of resources, remittances and people between different places; it demands an orientation in thinking about people in movement (Young 1998, 27).

In this chapter, I explore the categories of thought that underlie concepts of culture, place, and identity and their relationships to mobility. I first discuss dominant social science discourses on culture, drawn mainly from anthropology, geography, and sociology. For a more interpretive understanding of culture and identity, I draw mostly on the ethnographic work of Anae (1998). I make connections made between views of fa'a-Samoa expressed by Samoa-born and New Zealand-born Samoans in her focus groups and mine. In this, I argue that 'culture' is a human construction. Its ascendancy in the social sciences has resulted in the neglect of other concepts, what Chapman (1995, 254) calls “alternative manners of thinking.”

I then proceed to discuss how Samoans see 'culture' and the historical transformation of fa'a-Samoa countering the prevalent view in the literature that fa'a-Samoa has remained essentially intact in a conservative sense. I explore the philosophical, ideological, and socioeconomic aspects of fa'a-Samoa as they relate to
mobility, an important feature of contemporary Samoa. In elaborating on views of fa’a-
Samoa and mobility I draw on data from ‘home’ and ‘reach’ interviews.

Although, fa’a-Samoa plays a central role in the relationships between Samoan
culture, identity, and mobility, few studies have made fa’a-Samoa explicit. The current
works of indigenous scholars such as Wendt and Hau’ofa have provided a deepening
appreciation of an Oceanian perception of cultural identity and movement, however.
These studies also highlight the shortcomings of past definitions of culture and identity
that were based on bounded notions of community.

Extensive studies have been conducted on the history of Samoan population
movements and the political, social, economical, and cultural issues that have developed
between those who move and those who stay. I focus on analyses of the effects of
‘migration’ on Samoan cultural development and identity (e.g. Franco 1985, 1991; Kallen
migration as a ‘kinship bridge’. Macpherson (1984) shows how migration affects the
persistence of cultural values and institutions in the non-Samoan environments. Franco
(1985) accounts for the cultural perceptions of work and the strategies used by Samoans
to adapt to new work environments. He emphasizes the cultural competency (after
Howard and Scott 1981) of Samoans, rather than the cultural deficiency often suggested
in analyses of migrant adaptation (cf. Lewis 1966).

Issues of Samoan culture and ethnic identity are more often found in
anthropological analyses than in geography. Human geographers such as Chapman
(1970) in the Solomon Islands and Bonnemaison (1979) in Vanuatu brought the
intersection of cultural identity and mobility to the attention of geography, however.
Their fieldwork was grounded in local community epistemologies allowing them to gain insight to multiple reasons for mobility and multifaceted aspects of place and identity. These studies made a significant contribution to rethinking conventional approaches to geography, which formerly relied on push and pull models of individual behavior (cf. Underhill-Sem 2004).

Geographic studies on mobility, culture, and identity in Samoa remain scant. One of the first studies was by Pirie and Barrett (1962) it examined ways in which traditional Samoan village life has been modified and the extent to which Samoans are motivated by individual and economic considerations rather than traditions and customs. Subsequent work by Pirie (1976) examines the demographic effects and socioeconomic changes in Samoa’s population. His other studies focus on the fertility and mortality dynamics of Pacific Island populations (Pirie 1995). Lyon (1980) later argues that people from American Samoa have made a bicultural assimilation using both Samoan and American ways, values, and languages interchangeably.

These early commentators on Samoan culture tend to focus on specific topics such as kinship, social structure, ritual, or agriculture. I will instead argue that power is intimately involved with the concept of ‘culture’ and that some societies have greater power to produce their ‘cultures’ no matter where people move. This occurs ideologically in constituting culture and actions between people and places. It is not an innocent process. As I will show, the development of the concept of ‘culture’ becomes fraught with all manners of power relations, as individuals and national governments struggle to harness ‘culture’ to their own ends.
‘Power’ as used in this study, is influenced by Foucault’s conception, especially of its ‘doubleness’. To Foucault (1978, 94), “Power is not something that is acquired, seized or shared, something that one holds on to or allows to slip away, power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of non-egalitarian and mobile relations.” Power can come in variety of discursive forms and through economic, political, and cultural practices.

Population movement cannot be fully understood without reference to power relations, both between places and between people. Structural and dependency theorists interpret migration as an expression of unequal power between the core and the periphery. Relations between core and periphery may be ultimately hierarchical, but there are various local forms of ideological resistance to this power structure. As argued in previous chapters, a complete understanding of the relationship between population movements and culture must center on the dialectic between global and local contexts. This implies that we need to examine the material and psycho-cultural aspects of these processes.

That meanings are hierarchically arranged and controlled by particular groups has been recognized in the work of many social scientists, but it is Pierre Bourdieu (1977, 1984) who best exemplifies this in his work. According to Bourdieu, economic class channels cultural flow, rather than culture creating social structure. While this study does not prioritize class as much as Bourdieu does, culture is treated as unequal and uneven. As will be shown, cultural meanings are endlessly renegotiated and contested between groups. Rather than a ‘fixed set of essentials’ which are either changed by or resistant to
outside forces, culture is thus a dynamic “web of shared meanings” (Geertz 1988, 38). It is used in different ways at different times by different people.

I now examine the development of the concept of ‘culture’. I begin by tracing the genealogy of ‘culture’ in anthropology and how it became integrated into modern geography.

Culture as Concept

Culture has been defined in many ways. In the English language, the basic meaning of culture derives from the original Latin *cultura* meaning the cultivation of soil (Oxford dictionary). As the word developed in French and passed into English by the fifteenth century, it was used to describe tending natural growth. Over time, the metaphor of tending was extended from plants and animals to tending human development, particularly the human mind. By the sixteenth century the concept had expanded from the physical into the spiritual sphere so that “culture has another meaning that sometimes leads to some confusion, as in the training and refining of the mind, manners and taste or the result of this” (Hofstede 1980, 4). ‘Culture’ began to be used to differentiate the good from the bad, the cultivated from the unruly. In the eighteenth century, variations on ‘culture’ were closely associated with ‘civilization’, reinforcing the class aspect of the meaning of culture.

In the late eighteenth to the early nineteenth century the German term *Kultur* came to be applied to the whole complex of beliefs and customs of particular societies. Edward Tylor brought this use into English in a book significantly entitled *Primitive Cultures* (1871). By the time his book was published, evolutionism had become a
dominant force in the developing field of anthropology. Tylor describes culture in a wide sense, “as that complex whole, which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” (Tylor 1871, 21). In other words, culture had come to refer to all the skills and characteristics, human beings acquire as members of a society. Tylor’s definition assumes a coherent and homogeneous people, equally deriving meanings and subscribing to the same values.

Veck (1998, 2-3) in her introduction to the edited volume Common Worlds and Single Lives, criticizes this classical definition of culture as a continuation of an older concept of race derived from Herder’s (1784) notion of the Volksgeist. She writes, “Culture, like race, is perceived as defying definition for the emphasis on the we stands for differentiating us and our different cultural forms from others that are incommensurable, and renders this view attractive for the political and cultural New Right” (ibid, 3). Livingstone (1994) argues that Herder’s vision of culture was quite teleological. Despite his interest in the particular and the variable, he saw history as having direction that leads toward a particular end. Furthermore, Herder argued for a culture organically rooted in the topography, customs, and communities of the local native tradition, which supported German nation and empire building.

In Veck’s (1998) edited volume, the traditional concept of culture is called into question. The essays argue for a narrowed, more specialized and theoretically more powerful concept of culture to replace E.B. Tylor’s famous “complete whole”. Although Tylor’s originative power is not denied, his definition seems to have reached the point where it obscures a good deal more than it reveals.
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Morris-Suzuki (1998) delineates how culture later came to be seen like an organism in western cultural anthropology. All phenomena were divided into three basic levels. She writes,

At the most basic level was the inorganic world—the realm of the physicist and the chemist; above this came the organic world—the field of study of the biologist or natural historian; and at the highest and most complex level lay the superorganic—the world of human culture which was the special concern of the anthropologist (Morris-Suzuki 1998, 74).

Most of this vision derived directly from the writings of Alfred Kroeber. Kroeber’s main concern was the relationship between history, science, and anthropology. For Kroeber, all human thought required some combination of two forms of analysis: the historical (unique and changing phenomenon) and the scientific (dealing with constant regularities and laws). Morris-Suzuki (1998, 73) writes that, “This is an apt reminder of the fact that cultural anthropology was born in an age when science (particularly Newtonian physics) was king, and when the respectability of any new discipline depended largely on its ability to dress itself in the costume of the scientist.” The analogy of a culture’s religious practices, myths, language, and material technology was equated analogically to a bird in flight. In a bird, the parts—wings, head, legs, eyes, and tail are all integrated to provide perfect functioning and balance (Kroeber 1952). So too, “Human cultures seem to be organically integrated: not random collections of parts but unified structures” (Kroeber 1952, 77). In this analysis, what gives a bird its particular form is genetics, evolution, and ultimately the force of life itself, but what endows each society or ethnic group with an organically integrated culture is less clear. Kroeber was inspired by genetics and biological sciences generally. As he wrote:
Anthropology might not aspire to the elegant simplicity of physics, but it should aim to strengthen the element of science in cultural research by following the model of biology or (natural history) where the study of the irregular and particular was firmly grounded in orderly laws of behavior. Thus, the small cultures of primitive people could be accurately and dispassionately analyzed much as a biologist dissects a worm or a crayfish (1952, 76).

Howard later chastises anthropologists for taking this organic approach to cultural studies in Oceania. As he writes:

During the 1920s and 1930s, the Bishop Museum sponsored a series of studies aimed at collecting systematic data that would bear on the issues of origin and migration. Anthropologists were recruited to spend from a few weeks to several months on the various islands, documenting language, artifacts, customs, myths, and religious beliefs, as well as social and political organization. The basic premise of the museum’s project was that by systematically comparing ‘traits’, the historical relationships between Oceanic societies could be unraveled. It was assumed that traits had diffused along with migrating populations; hence cultures that shared traits were historically related as donors or recipients. The theoretical task was to determine directions of diffusion. Diffusionism thus focused on language forms, artifacts, customs and the like—presumed residues of an inferred history. In this context, ‘history’ was synonymous with sailing expeditions from one island base to another. Humans were largely omitted, except as conveyors of traits (1992, 647).

This yearning for scientific method meant that anthropology became a search for order and pattern. The “study of culture is the study of regularities” (Kroeber and Kluckhohn 1963, 330). The study of culture, in short, requires the ability to perceive patterns within apparent confusion and to extract these patterns from the messy bits of human behaviors that threaten to blur its edges. The search for a ‘science of culture’ also meant a search for the single unifying force underpinning the regularity of observable patterns.

The concept of ‘culture’ as organically integrated became the cornerstone of a whole genre of 1960s and 1970s ethnographic writing. The organic image was appealing
because it counteracted fears of social disintegration and provided a coherent and respectably *scientific* way of analyzing society. At the same time, it was problematic in terms of both ideology and methodology. Ideologically, it imposed a particular vision of integration and harmony on the fluid forms of social existence. Methodologically, it subjected those same forms to a biological model of interpretation the appropriateness of which was later questioned.

Clifford Geertz later espoused a semiotic approach to culture. For him, culture consists of “webs of meaning” and its analysis should not be an experimental science in search of law, but an interpretive one in search of meaning” (Geertz 1988, 38). He called this methodology ‘thick description’. Recent developments are somewhat misleadingly lumped together under the label ‘poststructuralism’. These generally suggest more complicated conceptions of culture. Specifically, social scientists have borrowed Foucault’s (1978) idea that power relations permeate all levels of society, and individuals are active social agents who never simply reenact culture, but interpret it in their own ways.

**Culture in geography**

The word ‘culture’ also implies the realm of spatial difference, a world divided by the differing social mores of distinct communities, operationalized as either national, ethnic, or regional groups. In geography, culture becomes equivalent to *region*, where different parts of the world are associated with distinct communities studied in terms of their location and distribution.
Geographer Carl Sauer (1963, 320), considered the founder of cultural geography argued in the 1920s that a “transposition of divine law into omnipresent natural law had produced in geography a rigorous dogma of naturalistic cosmology.” But as Sauer later adds, “natural law does not apply to social groups” (ibid., 343). Livingstone (1994) writes that Sauer was very much influenced by a line of anthropological thinking handed down from Boas to Kroeber. Franz Boas (1858-1942), a German trained scholar who dominated the anthropology department at Columbia from 1896 until his death nearly half a century later, played a role in making fieldwork the central part of the anthropological enterprise. His intellectual journey started with physics, then move to ethnology via geography. Boas’s anthropological historicism was later mediated through his students including Robert Lowie, Alfred Kroeber, Margaret Mead, and Ruth Benedict. From Kroeber, Sauer learned an antipathy to environmental determinism the paradigm that dominated geography in the late nineteenth to early twentieth century.

At that time, climate was seen as a significant determinant of sociocultural development. The belief that cold climate drove people to greater technological innovation legitimated supposed European superiority. Environmental determinism therefore buttressed imperialism and racism (Peet 1985). Livingstone (1994) argues that this determinist view so ingrained in geography was what prompted Boas to move towards a more historicist mode of conceptualizing the environment. As Boas (1928, 240) put it, “Advocates of the theory failed to take with sufficient seriousness culture’s historicity (the overlaying of geographical with historical factors) which meant that the environment never created a culture de novo, and that in any case many different types of cultures are found adjusted to similar types of environment.”
With Carl Sauer at the helm, the Berkeley school of cultural geography became established. Borrowing from Boasian anthropology and German *Kulturlandschaft*, Sauer came to conceive of geography as culture history in its regional articulation (Livingstone 1994). Regionalism takes the form of the study of culture areas and cultural landscapes. According to Sauer (1925, 52), “It was not because of an environmental conditioning of the works of man, but because man himself not the object of geographic investigation has given physical expression to the area by habitations, workshops, markets, and fields.” Cultural geography is therefore concerned with those works of humanity that are inscribed on the earth’s surface and give it characteristic expression. Sauer’s cultural landscape also retained an ‘organic quality’. As (Entrikin 1984) reminds us, the naturalistic approach within Sauer’s project must not be underestimated. He was strongly influenced by the “geology of Rollin Salisbury and the plant ecology of H.C. Cowles” (Entrikin 1984, 399). In his methodological publication *The Morphology of Landscape* (1925), Sauer focused on the *material* aspects of culture, particularly the landscape, since the landscape is a manifestation of the culture that makes it. Reading the landscape was expected to provide geographers with insight to particular cultures. One criticism of Sauer’s intellectual innovations however, is that culture is under-theorized (Wagner and Mikesell 1962). His central concern was with the *effects* or *shape* of landscapes, rather than *shaping* processes.

**Culture as superorganic**

Some cultural geographers in America did grapple with theorizing ‘culture’. Wilbur Zelinsky, one of Sauer’s students took pains to define culture as ‘superorganic’,
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in his influential *Cultural Geography of the United States* (1973). ‘Superorganic culture’ refers to an ontological assumption that culture is a life force that exists above and independent of human will or intention. Although a culture cannot exist without bodies and minds to make it manifest, “culture is also something both of and beyond the participating members. Its totality is palpably greater than the sum of its parts, for it is superorganic and supraindividual in nature, an entity with a structure, set of processes, and momentum of its own, though clearly not untouched by historical events and socio-economic conditions” (Zelinsky 1973, 40-41).

Zelinsky also asserted an image of essential unity within any given culture. He assumed that the processes of modernization would inevitably assimilate all the diverse cultural minorities together within the national ‘American culture’. The social upheavals of the 1960s and 1970s led British geographers to question the ‘superorganicism’ of American cultural geography. As (Peter Jackson 1989, 19) put it that, “American cultural geography’s reliance on ‘superorganicism’ or more accurately its unwillingness to think hard about the ‘inner workings of culture’ led to an almost obsessional interest in the physical or material elements of culture rather than its more obviously social dimensions.”

A more recent battle over the concept of ‘culture’ is found in an ambitious book by Don Mitchell (2000) *Cultural Geography: A Critical Introduction*. Mitchell (2000, 63) observes that, “If there is any consensus in the new work in cultural geography, it is simply that, no matter how it is approached, ‘culture’ is spatial and that the (re) production of culture is not as simple and straight forward anymore.” Mitchell then declares that, “culture is an empty meaningless abstraction” and therefore should be
abandoned. He exhorts geographers to focus instead on the idea of culture which will engage them “in the task of determining not what culture is, since it is nothing, but rather how the idea of culture works in society” (ibid., 77). He advocates Jackson’s idea of culture where Jackson conceives of culture as “maps of meaning through which the world is made intelligible” (Jackson’s 1989, 7).

Mitchell favors a political economy approach, focusing on the way power is deployed in society. Spatial politics becomes a particular concern of geographers and space a crucial dimension in understanding cultural processes. He draws most of his examples from social experiences of culture wars or “Battles over meaning and the structure of social relationships, the institutions, and the spaces that govern them” (Mitchell 2000, xvi).

What I find intriguing in this critical cultural geography is the focus on how the products of cultural industries are assimilated or contested in everyday life. However, most of his examples are drawn from the context of North American and European cultural wars over urban landscapes that is, the controlled spaces of malls or television studios far removed from Pacific Island contexts. In Western geographies, the tendency is to equate spatial awakening with ‘urban spatiality’ and capitalist development (Harvey 1989; Soja 1989). Furthermore, while Mitchell is correct in pointing out the political nature of the concept of ‘culture’, he does not clearly identify how the concept of “politics” resolves the problem in the culture concept (Goheen 2001, 573).

The concern of recent geographic literature is with an increased awareness of the spatial in everyday life, but more often than not, this has been synonymous with the politicization of everyday spaces. Much of this ‘new spatial language’ draws
geographers back to the familiar dichotomies and the preference for the macro-spatial. The ideas of culture and of ideology as orderly remain intact, even as order is politicized.

The history of the pursuit for a unified theory of ‘culture’ has over-burdened not only anthropologists but geographers who have found themselves wanting a definition that holds. The inability to define culture does not mean that culture is unknowable, however. It means that culture is never static, and is not the same thing to all participants. In reviewing the history of the culture concept, whether treated as an objective ‘self-contained’ reality within a bounded spatiality or more interpretively and reflexively, I find no definition that applies to Salelologa. Despite current predictions of the death of ‘culture’ in anthropology or the regression of ‘culture’ in geography, some concepts of culture certainly remains alive for Samoans in Samoa, New Zealand, and the United States. Samoans readily use terms such as culture, tradition, and identity in our interviews and conversations, most often in relation to the concept fa’u-Samoa.

In Salelologa, Samoan culture continues to exist as some kind of essential, stable, bounded entity. This is confirmed in the way Samoans measure themselves and each other against this Samoan cultural norm. However, they also discuss culture in more postmodern ways, suggesting strategies, construction, fragmentation, improvisation, and contestation. The extent of fa’u-Samoa’s influence on individuals is evaluated according to a person’s exposure to it not only as a result of family ties. In her study of Tongan migrants in Australia, Morton found similar conceptions of culture in relation to anga fakatonga (Tongan way). She describes Tongans as holding both views of culture and invoking them according to context and in their construction of their cultural identities. Morton writes:
If anthropology has a lesson to learn from the ‘natives’ point of view it is
that these two conceptions of culture are not mutually exclusive and
indeed that they are essential characteristics of the same phenomenon.
That people hold both views simultaneously makes the constructions of
cultural identities more confusing and complex than either modernist or
postmodernist accounts sometimes suggest (1998, 23).

Identity...Is it Ethnic or Cultural or Both

Identity is closely related to the culture concept and the significance of fa’a-
Samoa. Although the two concepts are often inseparable, identity is not necessarily
derived from all aspects of culture. It tends to be based on mutual images and stereotypes
and on emotions linked to symbols, heroes, and rituals. It is not always linked to values.

Identity and ethnicity are both problematic terms, yet they remain over
determined and overused, as if they were unambiguous. Much of the literature uses
ethnic identity to refer exclusively to a common biological origin that differentiates one
group of people from another (Kallen 1982). This conventional understanding makes a
distinction between ethnic and cultural identities (Linnekin and Poyer 1990).

The French cultural geographer Joel Bonnemaison (1981, 8) notes that,
geographers avoid the concept “ethnicity” probably because it was born in an ideological
context linked to a colonial past and confined by a narrow definition. However,
Bonnemaison observes that, “The concept of ethnicity is essential because it is basically
linked to the notion of cultural area; without a ‘carrying’ ethnicity, there can be neither
culture nor cultural vision. Ethnicity elaborates culture and vice versa, the existence of
culture identifies ethnicity” (ibid., 11). Whether an ethnic group has common ancestors
(real or perceived) is a secondary issue. An ethnic group exists foremost through the
consciousness it has of itself and through the culture it creates.
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Following Bonneimason’s conception of the relationship between ethnicity and culture minimizes the conflating of ethnicity, culture, and identity, but identity can have complementary ‘ethnic’ and ‘cultural’ dimensions. As Morton (1998) points out, ethnic identity is used to refer to the same people even when they move overseas (most often as migrants or refugees). Thus, ethnicity implies an identity imposed by outsiders as much as by insiders. Cultural identities are used to describe both variations within a group and the multiplicity of identities within an individual, including ‘nonethnic’ distinctions between rural and urban people, different islands or village origins, social rank, church membership, and so on. Individuals may also have disparate identities that defy clear-cut ethnic labeling, such as Polynesian, Pacific Islander, Kiwi-Samoan, or simply Samoan.

**Approaches to ethnicity and identity**

According to Anae (1998), ethnicity has only recently concerned anthropologists and many sociologists because previously they assumed acculturation and assimilation to be the end result of cultural and social subordination of minority ethnic groups. Much criticism of anthropology lies in its emphasis on describing cultural phenomena and traditions as the critical elements of ethnic groups. As Kallen (1982, 29) writes, “Ethnicity was viewed as an attribute of an organized and cohesive ethnic group, whose members shared distinctive ways of viewing and doing things. The old ethnicity then could be objectively measured in terms of the distinctive characteristics (e.g. language, religion, rules of etiquette) of ethnic groups.” Barth (1969, 10) notes that, most anthropologist defined “ethnic groups as largely biologically self-perpetuating.” This definition is not so far removed from the traditional proposition that race equals culture.
equals language, and that a society is a unit which rejects or discriminates against others (ibid., 11).

Much of the work on ethnicity has been carried out by sociologists overwhelmingly using quantitative rather than ethnographically qualitative methods. Despite diverse theoretical perspectives, sociological work tends to see individuals or even whole ethnic groups as having bundles of attributes that can be measured to determine, for example, their ability to assimilate or the degree to which they will maintain an ethnic identity. Similarly, relations between ethnic groups and their host societies are examined in search of determinants of “ethnic loyalty” (Morton 1998, 23). Furthermore, large-scale migrations and resettlements of people are commonly studied in the context of urban ethnicity articulating economic motives and emphasizing individual competition. This leads to the neglect of “sociocultural influences, and also reduces the importance of studying migration from a more culturally, emic perspective” (Quan-Bautista 2001, 67).

Quan-Bautista’s critique of studies of Micronesia is directed at classical anthropology but this tradition remains fixed in the literature of Micronesia and much of the Pacific Islands. Quan-Bautista (2001) further notes that as societies become more modernized and urbanized, we begin to see a shift from a nativist sentiment to an analysis of the cognitive nature of ethnic phenomena in anthropological writing. With the increasing mobilization of people, it is generally agreed that ethnic identity has become “more salient, ethnic self-assertion stronger, and ethnic conflict more marked” (Glazer and Moynihan 1975, 25).
Most anthropologists who have worked in Micronesia credit Fredrik Barth as the most sophisticated analyst of the ethnic cognitive dimension. He defines ethnicity as the product of social ascriptions, a kind of labeling process engaged in by oneself and others (Barth 1969). However, as the individual or group moves through daily life, ethnicity can change according to variations in the situations and audiences encountered. Barth (1969, 32-33) argues that “even a drastic reduction of cultural difference between cultural groups in culture contact situations does not correlate in any simple way with reduced relevance of ethnic identity.”

Following Barth’s initiative, Howard and Howard (1977) examine the development of ‘ethnic consciousness’ in ethnic Rotuman enclaves, particularly in the mining town of Vatukoula, Fiji. The authors highlight the development of a distinct Rotuman identity focused on the unity of Rotuma itself. They argue for the salience of an ethnic awareness fostering Rotuman cultural identity. They also point out that the absolute and relative size of an ethnic enclave has a significant effect on how communities organize along ethnic lines. A generation later, Howard and Rensel (1994) noted that Rotuman identity has become muted and opaque as a result of intermarriages with non-Rotumans. Descendants of mixed marriages may no longer claim themselves to be of just a single ethnic group, thus, ‘ethnic consciousness’ for them may mean being conscious of not one but a number of ethnic identities. They also point out the subjective nature of ethnicity and the highly permeable social boundaries in which these ethnic identities are viewed.

As Quan-Bautista (2001) notes, many studies of relocated communities and ethnic enclaves in Micronesia reflect Barth’s writings including Lieber (1977) on the
Kapingamarangi on Pohnpei, Emerick (1960) on the Pis-Losapese on Pohnpei, Alkire (1993) on the outer islanders of Yap on Madrich, and Flinn (1990) on the Pulapese on Weno. For many Pacific societies, discussion of the self, the ethnic self, and the social self involve identities that are shaped by environmental forces such as other groups, land, food, and spirits. Patterns of ethnic relations seem to be determined both by notions of personhood that acknowledge the importance of environmental contributions and by the conditions that govern relationships such as cultural and social performances, rather than biological or racial factors.

The growing body of work done by anthropologists on the issue of identity in the Pacific Islands is best exemplified by Linnekin and Poyer’s (1990) edited volume, *Cultural Identity and Ethnicity in the Pacific*. The collection of papers in this 1990 publication attests to a significant theoretical development in ethnicity, and that is the divergence between primordial and circumstantial analyses of personal and group identity. Identity is often described as either primordialist (collective identity based on shared claims to blood, soil, or language, seen as relatively fixed and unchanging) or circumstantialist (relationships defined by the social placements that underpin Oceanic ideas of group affiliation). The primordial approach seeks a psycho-cultural explanation for the behavioral aspects of ethnic group solidarity, and the circumstantial approach seeks a social explanation. The latter views ethnic group solidarity as resulting from certain social circumstances (both internal and external) which control a group’s existence. These two approaches have been treated as if they were mutually exclusive (Anae 1998).
Although Anae acknowledges the significance of this collection of essays, she is critical of Linnekin and Poyer for paying lip service to the notion of a ‘modern synthesis’, where both primordial and circumstantialist approaches are combined. Moreover, the “emotive aspects of ethnicity” have been subsumed within the “*a priori*, ineffable, and affective qualities of primordialism” that supposedly “survives because it is in the blood ‘given’ by the facts of birth” (Anae 1998, 61). Further, she notes that, “aspects of ethnicity not seen as strictly material or instrumental, such as cultural, spiritual, and emotive phenomena, seen as real and enduring by indigenous peoples have been reified and mystified by relegating them to some kind of mystical appeal and natural instincts, and therefore ignored” (ibid, 62).

It may be tempting to respond to the contradictions between primordialism and circumstantialism by choosing one or the other as a ‘truer’ account of ethnicity. After all, if ethnic identity is contingent and fluid, how can it also be fixed and primordial? Focusing solely on the circumstantial components of ethnicity ignores the personally felt power of many ethnic identities, however, while emphasizing only the primordialist aspects neglects the social conditions that generate, maintain, and transform ethnic and cultural identities. A schism opens between the western concepts of ethnicity and how ethnicity is generally understood in the Pacific where shared histories, ancestries, cultures, and environments are emphasized. Howard goes some way to providing an answer to this problem when he argues that,

*Ethnicity ought not to be looked at as a distinctive phenomenon, but rather as an instance of human propensity to categorize experience according to sameness or difference. From this point of view, ethnicity belongs to that broader class of phenomena concerned with individual’s identification with, or distanciation from, others. It has much in common, in other*
words, with conceptualizations of kinship, community, friendship, and other types of social relatedness (1990, 259-60).

I contend that the conception of fa’aa-Samoan as an identity for Samoans has elements of both primordialism and circumstantialism. A holistic view of these perspectives and how they are used by individuals to make sense of their personal and collective identities in changing contexts remains missing from ethnicity theory. For many of the reasons culture has been criticized, Howard (1990, 261) argues, “Issues of identity must be analyzed contextually—examining the ways in which individual actors label themselves and others within particular situations, and how this affects their thinking, feeling, and behavior.”

Emotion as emblem of identity

During my research several incidents took place that demonstrate the emotional part of fa’a-Samoan in relation to concepts of the self and relational self. It is difficult to attribute any particular cause to the highly charged Samoan ethos, but this research shows many Samoans feel quite emotional about their culture and identity. Although emotions are often evoked in communal life, they are rarely presented by social scientists as an index of social relationships rather than as a sign of a personal state. Many instances in this research illustrate that emotions are tied to social relationships, and illustrate values considered to exist outside of the individual person.

In Lutz’s (1988) study of the people of Ifaluk, a Micronesian atoll, she points out that the binary western conception of culture and identity is inadequate to understanding this phenomenon. Her study points to how emotions are tied to cultural meanings and relationships on Ifaluk atoll. The tendency to look at emotions in isolation from the
social field has led to an emphasis on emotions as singular events situated within the individual, rather than on emotional exchanges between individuals. Lutz’s analysis demonstrates how emotional meaning is fundamentally structured by particular cultural systems, and social and material environments. Lutz (1988, 5) writes, “As I listened to people speak the language of emotion in everyday encounters with each other on Ifaluk atoll, it became clear that the concepts of emotion can be more profitably viewed as serving complex communicative, moral, and cultural purposes rather than simply as labels for internal states whose nature or essence is presumed to be universal.”

Below is a description of a fight in Foua between 'Aukuso and a catechist (religious instructor) that illustrates how emotional outbreaks in Samoa are regarded as the product of social relations rather than as purely the result of inner feelings.

According to community members, 'Aukuso was drunk one night when he punched the church minister whom he suspected of having an affair with Lanu, the widow of one of 'Aukuso's uncles. Lanu was temporarily living with her two teenage children in 'Aukuso's house. According to one bystander, “The fight occurred at around 9:00 p.m., while the catechist was enjoying the evening playing with children and Lanu on the cricket patch at the malae (village green). The fight caused a big melee in the malae at Foua.” Rumors had already been circulating about an affair between the catechist and Lanu, but nothing had been confirmed. Bad feelings between the members of the 'aiga and Lanu and toward the catechist had been brewing. Everyone living nearby was at the scene of the fight.

'Aukuso’s emotional outbreak *ita* (anger) and *maasiasi* (shame) was instigated by what he interpreted as inappropriate behavior by the catechist. He saw this as an afront to
his many relationships with Lanu as his aunt, to the *va tapuia* (sacred relations) of *faife’au* (clergy) and to other members of the village. Recall Chapter Three how the *faife’au* category has been integrated into village social structure since the introduction of Christianity in the 1830s. In the current system, the clergy’s inclusion as a *fa’afeagaiga* (polite term for *faife’au*) is established within an unwritten code of relationship much like the sister-brother covenant. The village protects and cares for the clergy, and clergy reciprocate by providing spiritual guidance and advice. As culpable as ‘Aukuso’s actions were, his behavior was viewed by his *’aiga* as the product of social relations rather than the result of personal inner turmoil. The *matai* from Foua tried to keep the incident to themselves hoping to avoid a hefty fine, however, news of the fight reached the senior *matai* who lived a couple of subvillages away.

O’Meara (1990) reports that in Satupa’itea, a village near Salelologa, fine for drunken brawling in 1988 was 100 hundred large pigs. In ‘Aukuso’s case, it was 1000 large pigs, an astronomical figure. People rationalized that this huge *sala* (fine) was not only for drunken fighting, but also for assaulting a church minister. ‘Aukuso had overstepped the boundaries of *va fealoa’i* (sacred relations) and *fa’aaloalo* (respect). However, the excessive amount of fines doled out by village councils whether in Salelologa or any other village has also become a contentious issue in local Samoan affairs. Nevertheless, although the *’aiga* did not consider what ‘Aukuso did entirely his own fault, they never publicly questioned the fine imposed on them because the alternative would be his banishment from the village.

As in the 1988 case on which O’Meara (1990) reported, there was no trial in ‘Aukuso’s case. Traditional village authority is based on the unquestioning obedience to
culture and customs; the council had imposed fine according to the village’s unwritten standards. Neither ‘Aukuso nor the catechist appeared at the council’s formal proceedings. Rather, the matter was handed down by the village council to the *matai* of ‘Aukuso’s family. ‘Aukuso’s uncle is a Luamanuva titleholder and the whole event became a Luamanuva title affair. In the middle of conducting my research, I was also solicited to contribute to ‘Aukuso’s fine, as I am also a member of the Luamanuva family.

The emotions that ran high on this occasion demonstrate that the integrity and dignity of the ‘*aiga* were central to ‘Aukuso’s frustrations. These emotions and values are intimately tied to cultural meanings that are not easy to disentangle. The complex meaning of each emotion is the result of the important role they play in articulating the full range of a people’s cultural values, social relations, and economic circumstances. ‘Aukuso exemplifies the importance of integrating emotion and its relevance to identity and *fa’a-Samoan*. Members perceive of *fa’a-Samoan* as identity in both ethnic and cultural ways linked to emotions associated with *aiga*, villages, and communities. Thus, as Lutz (1988, 7) ably notes, “Talk about emotions, identity, and culture is simultaneously talk about society—about power and politics, about kinship and marriage, about normality and deviance.” In mobility, emotion and its link to *fa’a-Samoan* greatly influence members interactions with families at ‘home’ and at ‘reach’.

**Ethnicity and culture**

In a speech titled “Building Bridges to Diversity” given during Heritage Week at Salt Lake City, Utah in July 2001, the Minister of Finance of Samoa, Misa Foni Retzlaff
emphasized achieving ethnic harmony by following the *suli* (lineage system) of *fa’a*-Samoa.

Anybody born to a Samoan parent is called a *suli* to a *matai* title or an heir to a title, it matters for nothing what your other bloods are. In our present Parliament we have many *matai* who are part European or part Chinese. I myself have three *matai* titles: Misa from Matautu, Falelatai, Lesamatauanu’u from Malaela, Aleipata and Tugaga from Faletagaloa, Safune. I am also proud to be part Irish (Purcell), German (Retzlaff), Swedish (Nelson), and a Bostonian (Moors). Being a *suli* or an heir you are part of the *‘aiga*, but this alone does not entitle a Samoan to any honors. We Samoans consider being a *suli* without *tautua* or service to count for nothing. We have a saying in Samoan ‘*O le ala ‘i le pule ‘o le tautua*’ [The path to high honor is through service]. This same *tautua* is the backbone of our economy. Our Samoan people worldwide remitted back to Samoa in 2000, over 147 million Tala. This has a major economic impact on an island nation of 170,000 people (July 28, 2001).

Political pundits might be quick to point to the political nature of this speech but that might make them lose sight of the fact that the politics and culture of Samoa are not separate entities. The Minister of Finance here captures the feelings of the people, also shown in my research, about the relationship between *‘aiga* and population movement.

Thus, *fa’a-Samoa* is fundamentally a *lived* experience. Everyday practices engage Samoans day in and day out. Their ultimate aim is to enhance the status of the *‘aiga*, not just culturally, but also economically. It includes the *matai, ‘aiga, fanua* (land) *fa’alavelave* (life cycle events) and the values of *alofa, tautua*, and *va fealoa’i*. *Fa’a-Samoa* is not something that is stored away in dainty boxes of a museum or on the white pages of a text. *Fa’a-Samoa* is what Samoans do and value, it gives people guidance, role and responsibility and why they do what they do. Metaphorically speaking, in *fa’a-Samoa* people are *doing* culture, rather than *having* culture. Anae put it,
The concept of culture for these people is the *fa’a-Samoa*—a lived experience grounded in context, which at the same time expands vertically, and horizontally, inwardly and outwardly, and which intersects lines of history, social structure, and organization, myth, economics, psychological processes—and which finally is captured in the emotionally charged ethos of Samoan ethnicity (1998, 52).

The people I interviewed may be dispersed all over the Pacific but they are spiritually and emotionally connected to their ancestral ‘aiga and place. They express their allegiance to ‘aiga, and matai through *fa’alavelave* by contributing time, talent, and monetary resources. To the members in Salelologa and overseas, the historic landscape is marked by the village, both the drudgery and spirituality of place, and by the sea cucumbers the village is known for. All evoke a distinctive and idiosyncratic Salelologa. Material culture, religion, history, and language are some of the elements central to anthropological notions of ethnicity. The problem with ethnicity as a theoretical concept, as many scholars have noted, is that it assumes a rigidity not apparent in ethnographic detail. Ethnicity is like kinship, it appears and disappears, can be both central and marginal to Samoan social life. The views of Samoans I worked with, are reflected in Gertrude ‘Iuli’s statement:

> Among the Samoans, ethnic identity reflects culture in its roots, its history, its traditions, and its allegiances. An individual’s name binds him or her to a family, a village, an island, an infrastructure status, and sometimes religion. The diversity of identity among them is a valuable attribute of their being, formulating a sense of accountability to the separate entities of being Samoan. The homogeneity within the Samoan group is founded on the language and culture of the race, not on immigration status or biological composition, thereby extending the individual beyond the level of a statistic on a social index (‘Iuli 1991, 26).

What came out of my research about concepts of ethnicity and *fa’a-Samoa* as identity was the absence of a specific reference to the people themselves or ethnic
differences. Rather, they reference how people interact and perform deeds that hinge on the moral economy of fa’a-Samoa. In other words, it is what you do which matters. As one member said, “Simply put, it is not what you look like but it is what you do that is crucial to being Samoan and practicing fa’a-Samoa.”

**Fa’a-Samoa in action: cultural mandate, values, ideology, or power?**

As discussed in the first chapter, fa’a-Samoa is fundamental to Samoan culture but, like culture, it is not static. Fa’a-Samoa as a concept acknowledges the collective importance of the individual as a member of the ‘aiga. A human being therefore is not an individual person but somebody who carries the name of the collective ‘aiga. Fa’a-Samoa is useful for understanding the philosophical underpinnings of Samoan movements from the standpoint of a local community. From this epistemological stance, fa’a-Samoa conceives of individuals foremost as integral members of ‘aiga, not as migrants, immigrants, or emigrants. Individuals are constantly reminded of their important contributions to the collective welfare. In this manner of thinking, fa’a-Samoa does not conceive of movement as culminating in severance of ties or of uprooting oneself from ‘aiga at points of origin or departure. Similarly, lengths of time absent or distance traveled from ‘aiga are inconsequential with regard to one’s identity as a Samoan and member of ‘aiga. Fa’a-Samoa shifts thinking beyond oppositional structures of ‘migration’ typologies. It also suggests that place, as identity, is a significant component of the mobility process.

For heuristic purposes, a distinction can be made between the rhetoric and reality of fa’a-Samoa, or what people say fa’a-Samoa is and what they actually do. In thinking
about what I observed and garnered from interviews, it is clear the most important question is: What is it people value when it comes to fa’a-Samoa? This frame of reference guides much of the discussion below.

In Meleisea’s (1987) seminal work, fa’a-Samoa conveys a very deep meaning to Samoans. It is not simply a reactionary nationalism although as a political and economic system it did develop symbolic significance in the struggle against colonialism. Meleisea (1992, 23) writes, “Fa’a-Samoa was a framework for action based upon the social structure of the ‘aiga (family), the nu’u (village), and the authority of matai (chiefs and orators) and fono (village councils).” He analyses fa’a-Samoa in terms of claims, reactions to Land Court decisions, the pragmatism of changes in the political economy of Samoa, and the effects on the traditional and rational legal system. Meleisea uses a Weberian/ Marxist theoretical framework that focuses on identity centered on land and the political and economic systems, and their impacts on the social structure. He provides a historical explanation for the contemporary political problem of contradictions between Samoan traditional authority and Western rational legal authority.

Another view on fa’a-Samoa focuses on it as a worldview. Tuiatua Tupua Tamasese ‘Efi observes

*Fa’a-Samoa* is a body of custom and usage. It is a mental attitude to God, to fellow men and his surroundings. It is a distinctive lifestyle. It is not the physical makeup, the mood or passion of one man. It is a collection of spiritual and cultural values that motivates people...It is the heritage of a people. *Fa’a-Samoa* provides individuals, the ‘aiga and the nu’u with an identity and a place in the society with carefully defined, but unwritten roles and rules (quoted in Field 1984, 20).
My own research demonstrates that Samoans view fa‘a-Samoa differently. The most poignant issue of the research was to find what I perceive would be some differences in views of fa‘a-Samoa between the older and younger generations, between men and women, and between those at ‘home’ and at ‘reach’. Despite the different emphases each group had all pointed to fa‘a-Samoa as maintaining va fealoa‘i (social relations), connoting love and respect between parents and children, and brothers and sisters, and va tapuia (respectful social and sacred taboos), including giving tautua (service) when fa‘alavelave (life cycle events) are held. A good person is said to be one who is osi ‘aiga (sacrificing for the family), exemplified by attending to fa‘alavelave obligations. We are nobody without our ‘aiga and without our ‘aiga there would be nothing to speak of in fa‘a-Samoa. To illustrate these points, I present a variety of views on fa‘a-Samoa.

For example, the senior orator in Saleologa said:

In fa‘a-Samoa we don’t care how much money is spent when we have guests, no matter how poor we are the only thing we worry about is making sure we give the best to the guests [guests includes both outsiders and Samoans who visit a family]. Love prevails in the Samoan. When a guest comes, that’s when we take out the best silverware, cutlery, sheets, or bedding—everything that we usually save for special occasion or when somebody is sick. We buy the corned beef for the guest, something that we rarely eat except on special occasion. We don’t think twice about these things, that is our fa‘a-Samoa, our customs and traditions that we live in. God gave us this culture to guide our lives and it differentiates us from other cultures. No matter where you live or who you marry to, as a Samoan you will never forget that you are a Samoan. It’s your heritage, your role and responsibility, except of course when a person does not want to do it, then that is another story. But no matter how hard headed a Samoan wants to be, we know that one day he or she will come back.
A Salelologa woman from Auckland, New Zealand reflects:

*Fa’a-Samoa* is our culture, it is how we live, and carry ourselves. I doubt anybody can do without *fa’a-Samoa*, even when we are overseas. As for me, *fa’a-Samoa* is very important to me now where I live and work. When I was taking courses at Auckland University for my Bachelor of Education, there was a Samoan Students Club. They were going strong and they had Samoan speech competition, dances, everything, and they were very proud of it. The Samoan students were from everywhere, from Samoa but mainly New Zealand born Samoans. *Fa’a-Samoa* is alive and well in New Zealand, I don’t think you can let go of it completely because a person’s identity and dignity lies in knowing her culture and history.

**From your experience: Are there negative parts of *fa’a-Samoa***?

Yes there are, in the sense that here for example, in Auckland *fa’a-Samoa* what we call *fa’a-Aukilani* is getting too expensive. What we do in Samoa is nothing compared to what is done here. The church is very strong over here you know... Most *fa’a*alavelave are made through the church such as a funeral, wedding, even birthdays are celebrated here with elaborate feasting! On top of that you have the *Me* [annual donations], monthly donations to the minister, and other church collections.

**Is this the same in every church denomination??**

Not exactly, I am Mormon and we don’t do too much of that but my other brothers and sisters are not Mormon. I know from their church they have had a lot. I also know from my friends.

A Salelologa man from Santa Ana, California said:

*Fa’a-Samoa* are customs and traditions that are unique to Samoans, encompassing values of *alofa*, *fa’aaloalo*, and *va fealoa’i*. It does not matter where you go or live. You still take your culture with you. The distance does not matter, I am much closer in spirit. I never forget my family.

**What is involved in *fa’a-Samoa***?

*Fa’a-Samoa* is like the way you act, speak, walk, and carry yourself. It is everything we do such as helping your ‘aiga in times of *fa’a*alavelave, hosting visitors in a *malaga*, doing your duty as a *matai*, a sister, a brother, a parent, anything.
**Is fa’a-Samoa flexible?**

I won’t say it’s flexible because that means anybody can change fa’a-Samoa at a moments notice, but I say it’s more forgiving, it sways either way without giving up too much eh? It’s like an easy let down.

**What does that mean?**

For example, here in California what we know of fa’a-Samoa and how it is done is quite different. A lot of this is influenced from Tutuila, so Samoans bring that with them here and have fa’a-Tutuila which is a lot. Here we have fa’a-Kalefonia, it means, even more food, money, and fine mats would be involved in the exchange. For example, wedding cakes, some of them have twenty tiers, usually there are more than one wedding cake, one from the bride and one from the groom’s family. I tell you, Samoan weddings here are quite unbelievable! It’s phenomenal compared to what’s done in Samoa. We have also been to children’s lu’au [birthday party] for say a one or five year old and sometimes fine mats are exchanged, something that’s unheard of in Samoa.

All of three excerpts echo the principles mentioned previously. Knowing va fealoa’i implies how you carry yourself as a human being acting in ways of alofa (love, compassion). Inherent in the concept alofa is the concept of fa’amagalo (forgiveness) and fa’aaloalo (respect). These are reflected in the way one has been brought up, implying good behavior and attending to fa’alavelave. Again, the person is connected right to the center of his or her ‘aiga.

In all these accounts, there also is an understanding of the fallibility of human nature in terms of abiding to these principles. The weakness and failure of individuals to do what is expected is accepted. Recognition of the varied nature of people’s actions is found in words such as salasala a tagata (it depends on the person), or ‘e le tutusa tagata (people are different). These variations are negotiated within the expanded limits of fa’a-Samoa, however.
The interviews demonstrate that, *fa’ a-Samoa* has changed, *fa’a-Samoa* in Samoa is not consistent with *fa’ a-Samoa* practiced overseas. The malleability of *fa’a-Samoa* ensures its cultural survival. *Fa’a-Samoa* is flexible in being able to ‘give in’ to allow compromises as appropriate in the contexts, times, and spaces Samoans find themselves in. In other words, *fa’a-Samoa* is context dependent and context created. Its potential to adjust, expand, and grow is reflected in the many versions of *fa’ a-Samoa* including *fa’a-Aukilani* in Auckland or *fa’a-Kalefonia* in California, or *fa’a-Tutuila* in American Samoa. All versions of *fa’a-Samoa* note the magnitude of resources used for *fa’alavelave*. Some Samoans express ambivalence about this aspect of *fa’a-Samoa* when they remark that one of the reasons they left Samoa was to escape *fa’alavelave*, yet when they moved overseas they actually became more involved. After some reflection, one of the members living in Auckland expressed her feelings as:

In many regards, it wasn’t that we didn’t like *fa’alavelave* because this is our way of life, it’s us you know, but it means having greater access to resources to enable us to do the things important to us and to contribute in a meaningful way without always feeling guilty because we couldn’t provide.

Living outside of Samoa has not reduced *fa’alavelave*. Instead, being overseas and having better access to material resources has enabled Samoans to cultivate individual niches, while providing diverse forms of assistance to their relatives in the islands. This integrates them more than ever into the Samoan community as well as allows *fa’a-Samoa* to grow in more novel ways, yet remaining discernibly and proudly Samoan.

On the other hand, being away from Samoa has made some Samoans more aware of the importance of their Samoan identity. Geography forms the basis of identity for some Samoans, as distance from Samoa produces a rediscovery and redefinition of one’s
Samoanness. The values embedded within *fa’a-Samoa* become a source of stability for some Samoans living outside of Samoa. Morton (1998) interprets a similar resurgence of identity among Tongans (both island and overseas-born) as a means of coping with the alienation of modern society by providing a sense of belonging and continuity. Samoans outside of Samoa refer less to modernity, and more to their greater awareness of being Samoan as a result of being a minority in another society such as New Zealand or the United States. They struggle to make ends meet, face a language barrier, and must acclimatize to new environments, and new ways of life. While to some, New Zealand and America offer opportunities for education, higher incomes, and a partial escape from the strictures of some *fa’a-Samoa*, for others moving to New Zealand or America results in experiences of alienation and intense racism.

Cohen (1982, 3) argues that, “It is at the boundaries of ethnic groups that ethnicity becomes meaningful, that is groups become aware of their ethnic identity when they engage with others.” The same is true of localities too, and not surprisingly, for ethnicity and locality both are expressions of culture (see Bonnemaison 1981). Thus, one can state a more general principle that people become aware of their culture when they stand at its boundaries. Both locality and ethnicity come into being at boundaries and express cultural identities. The ethnic label ‘Samoan’ becomes an important marker, providing common ground for group solidarity, and organizing. In addition to a heightened ethnic identity, Samoan ethnicity becomes a lobbying mechanism to acquire equal access to political and economic opportunities.
Elements of Samoan Perception: Tautua, Fesoasoani, and Fa’alavelave

In the following, I discuss the concepts, tautua (service), fesoasoani (help), and fa’alavelave (life cycle events) and their importance in population movement and their role in enhancing status of the collective ‘aiga. Status is not static in Samoa. The status of an ‘aiga can fluctuate greatly depending on the cultural and social interactions of members of the ‘aiga with the matai at their head. The ‘aiga is the basis for group and individual identities, basis for claiming land and title rights, and for establishing obligations of participation and reciprocity. The centrality of the matai system is in the matai title itself, as source of kinship and identity for the collective ‘aiga. Samoans bring an intensity of emotion and defensiveness to protecting their measina ma mea taua ‘a ‘aiga (precious family histories and genealogies), the honored responsibility of the matai. As individuals are born and die, the title remains. The future mamalu (sacredness and good name) of the descendants of a title depends largely on those titleholders who came before and the legacy they leave behind. The weight of this knowledge is enough to make members of an ‘aiga feel proprietary.

It is worth looking in greater detail at the core cultural dimensions of fa‘a-Samoa, through fa’alavelave (life cycle events), tautua (service), and fesoasoani (help). Most of the reasons given for malaga (movement) center on enhancing the status of the ‘aiga. This is often expressed in interviews with phrases such as “Alu ‘i fafo ‘e su’e se lumana‘i ma alofa mai ‘i fa’alavelave ‘o ‘aiga (Go overseas to get a good future, and help in the fa’alavelave of the ‘aiga).

The concept fa’alavelave has many meanings, however the term has come to have a negative connotation in its current use because of the tendency in mobility studies to
associate it with ‘dependency’ by those at home on overseas relatives (see Cole and Parry 1988; Connell 1983, 1987; Shankman 1976). The dualistic framework of such structural dependency theories tends to separate the cultural from the economic, unwittingly denying an emic perspective on the politico-cultural economy, and the cultural foundations of mobility.

The basic linguistic meaning of *fa‘alavelave* is to make things knotted or complicated, a nuisance in one’s normal routine. For example, the term can be used to refer to something as small as to loaning one’s canoe to somebody, to the nuisance of a child interrupting while a parent is talking to a guest. Its most commonly understood meaning refers to major life ceremonies such as weddings, funerals, birth of newborn, or church dedications, however. Weddings and funerals are called *fa‘alavelave* because they involve a lot of mental thinking and planning as a family ponders the social web of relationships (*lavelave*) and the potential number of guests. It also involves a lot of physical preparation in procuring the material resources to actualize a *fa‘alavelave*. As the Samoan language instructor ‘Aumua Mata’itusi (2001, 468) writes, “*Fa‘alavelave* involves the *matai* and the ‘aiga, all those concerned have to find ways to come up with things to do *fa‘alavelave*.”

Samoans often find themselves temporarily or sometimes permanently putting aside their own needs in order to attend to others’ needs. Arranging for *fa‘alavelave* is an honor within *fa’a-Samoan*. *Fa‘alavelave* and *tautua* are about care and responsibility for the general good; this is an honorable job. As many of those I interviewed remarked, *Fa‘a-Samoa* is essentially about living in relationships; it happens anywhere Samoans live. While arranging *fa‘alavelave* often dampens a person’s daily routine, and can even
empty out a bank account, it is generally understood that such a sacrifice means that a
person is blessed, honored, and held in high esteem by the ‘aiga. The saying, ‘E sili le
manuia ‘o le foa’i nai le na te talia (Those who give are more blessed than those who
receive), attests to this belief. Both fa’a-Samoan and Christian interpretations of love and
compassion are inextricably linked in a common view of the politico-cultural economy.

Tautua to one’s aiga and matai is a far more complex concept than observers both
within and outside of Samoa have imagined (see Table 4.1). One form of service tautua
malele (literally ‘flying service’, from a distance) derives its meaning from the service
provided by members of the ‘aiga who live away from the home site, the seat of the
family title. This form of service is particularly important to women who marry into
other families and villages. According to the feagaiga (brother/sister relationship) a
brother has a lifelong duty to respect, honor, and protect his sister; and his sister has the
reciprocal obligation to support his aspirations and interests which are often centered on
the enhancement of family status and well-being (Meleisea 1989).

As wives, women render day to day service to their husband’s family, but as
sisters and daughters, they never lose sight of their own family. Each woman is an
economic linkage between two kin groups. Each calling on the resources of her own
family to assist her husband’s family, while simultaneously trying to extend resources
from her husband’s family towards her own family (Meleisea 1989). This remains a
source of ambiguity and tension in Samoan marriages today. In fa’a-Samoan, the
traditional system of land rights allows Samoans considerable personal mobility as young
people move to live with family members where opportunities seem best. In
anthropological terms, this is called ambilineal descent. In writing about Samoan
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migration to the United States, Shu (1980, 154) observes that, “A characteristic of
ambilineal kinship system is that a given individual may have hundreds of relatives
through intermediary relations. Also, there are interesting characteristics of the Samoan
kinship system in migrant communities, namely its extensibility and permeability.”
Nowadays, Samoans of both sexes leave not only their homes but also their country, yet
continue to render tautua malele while they are away.

Franco (1991) is correct in pointing out key themes in Samoan perceptions of
‘work’, that is, tautua, fa’alavelave and fesoasoani. The distinction between tautua
(service) and fesoasoani (help) is that tautua is conceived as something more profound.
It is expected amongst closely related matai and ‘aiga members. Fesoasoani is less
obligatory; it implies whatever a person can give at the time a fa’alavelave occurs.
Franco speculates that as ties to the ‘aiga weaken, it is likely that tautua will become
more like fesoasoani.

My research complicates this distinction, however. First of all, fesoasoani also
refers to gifts from distant relatives or acquaintances. It is also the term for the ‘helpers’
who do chores for the fa’alavelave. Furthermore, fesoasoani can also become tautua in
certain contexts, based on the frequency and amount of fesoasoani. Those who
fesoasoani a lot may eventually become a matai, as in sulu tamafai (adopted heir), or a
suli tautua (service heir) even if they are not suli toto (blood heirs). In other words,
although blood ties are important, they are not the only criteria for deciding who may
become matai or take on other major leadership roles in the ‘aiga.

Everyday practices and service are significant components of fa’a-Samoan, as is
the belief that only through pain and joy of serving others will a potential leader gain the
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cultural wisdom to guide an ‘aiga (family), pitonu’u (subvillage), nu’u (village), or atunu’u (country). This is confirmed by the saying ‘O le ala ‘i le pule ‘o le tautua (The way to authority is through service). Table 4.1 delineates these key concepts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>‘Good’ Tautua</strong></th>
<th><strong>‘Not so good’ Tautua</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tautua matavela</strong> or <strong>tautua matapala</strong> (lit. well cooked; delicious because of hard work)**</td>
<td><strong>Tautua fiamatai</strong> (lit. impatiently wanting to be matai)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending to the matai’s everyday needs; making and serving food for any function in ‘aiga, village, district, or national function</td>
<td>Calculating and manipulative service; serving in order to become matai, but bad service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tautua toto</strong> (lit. spill blood; dedicated, devoted service)</td>
<td><strong>Tautua pa’o</strong> (lit. noisy; banging things when angry, complaining a lot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving your life for the safety and security of the matai and ‘aiga; defending the title, land, and reputation of the ‘aiga</td>
<td>Noisy, bad, superficial service, lots of noise but no substance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tautua malele</strong> or <strong>tautua mamao</strong> (lit. like a flight of birds flying from afar; service from those who are distant)</td>
<td><strong>Tautua pa’a’a</strong> (lit. dry and brittle easily broken service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refers to service such as cash and goods provided by members of the ‘aiga who live away from the house site or where the matai resides. Services provided by ‘aiga members who live in other parts of Samoa, and overseas</td>
<td>Sporadic, and often superficial service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tautua tuavae</strong> (lit. like somebody who follows the matai around, attentive to his needs)</td>
<td><strong>Tautua gutua</strong> (lit. mouthful of words; ill-feelings, bad advice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service where the person uses his feet and hands all the time. He anticipates what is needed</td>
<td>Headstrong, refers to somebody who does not listen and retorts back to elders; noisy but no substance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tautua in the widest sense include the services provided by women as sisters and wives to men of an ‘aiga. Thus, the services provided by women are important and are given considerable weight in deciding a person to take on the matai title. This is important with regard to women’s role as advisors to husbands, sons, and daughters. Good tautua reflects a woman’s good influence, while bad tautua reflects a woman’s bad influence. Thus, tautua pa’o, tautua pa’a’a, and tautua gutua are bad, half-heartedly done service, they imply superficial service with the intention to get rewarded instantly. Such people want ‘authority’ and ‘power’ associated with matai for personal gratification instead of the collective welfare of an ‘aiga. This has huge implications on the cohesiveness and future integrity of an ‘aiga.

As Samoa became modernized, achievement has remained crucial to personal and ‘aiga advancement, yet the opportunities to stand out in a ranked society are very limited. As the examples above show, ascribed status is an advantage, but it is not enough in a competitive and ranked society. In addition to the ‘political and cultural status’ prescribed by fa’alupega (charter of honorifics), academic achievement and economic wealth have come to have more weight. Meleisea (1989, 69) argues that, “Status was an impetus for the large numbers of Samoans going overseas especially to New Zealand in the 1960s and 1970s. The attraction of migration to village Samoans in the 1960s and 1970s was not to win status overseas, but to win it at home.” My research three decades later confirms this insight. Status competition starts at the ‘aiga level then permeates the pitonu’u (subvillage), nu’u (village), and atunu’u (country) of Samoan society.

Kinship, whether actual or fictive remains one of the principal factors of social, political, and economic organization in Samoa. It has influenced patterns of movement,
for only through kinship links have men and women gained the capital and contacts to go abroad. Shu (1980) observes that migration tends to disperse kinship ties amongst most ethnic groups, but it does not for Samoans because of their selectivity in moving. The ‘aiga channels and defines the processes of mobility and is the key factor in political, and economic linkages.

**Fa’’a-Samoa and the Lotu (Church)**

In discussing fa’a-Samoa those at ‘reach’ and those at ‘home’ often refer to the lotu (church). As Anae (1998) also found, fa’a-Samoa is what Samoan people do, their everyday lived practices. Amongst those I interviewed, the lotu and fa’a-Samoa are therefore perceived as complementary. In overseas Samoan communities, fa’a-Samoa is perpetuated and elaborated through the church as has been well-documented (Anae 1998; Kotchek 1973; Lethwaite, Mainzer and Holland 1973; Shu 1980; Tiatia 1997; Va’a 2001). The church’s significance for cultural processes cannot be underestimated, especially in the (re) production of fa’a-Samoa in a mobile context.

In this section, I examine how Samoans understood their culture prior to the introduction of Christianity and how the church has been influenced by Samoan culture. Although many of the churches in Samoa have been ‘Samoanized’, the degree to which each culture has influenced the other remains highly contentious. I then argue that fa’a-Samoa and the church are inextricably linked in how people view their movements. ‘Samoanized’ religion that is, the fa’a-lelotu (church way) plays a crucial part in social exchange and has had a profound influence on Samoan understanding of the political economy. Previous studies have marked the power of economics in determining
mobility, but have failed to explain the persistence of sociocultural, political, and economic interactions in the transnational mobility of Samoans. The Samoan conceptualizations of theology and culture provide greater insight into motivations to movement.

Kamu (1996, 36), a respected senior minister of the Methodist church writes, “While the general concepts of culture are attributed to human endeavor, the Samoans insist that their culture is of divine origin. This concept is consistent with their belief in God as the Creator.” According to Samoans, culture is not exclusively a human achievement because it originates from the god Tagaloa. Tagaloa gave us direction for organizing and living life. This is evident in a creation story where Tagaloa’s first council becomes the model for the fono (village councils) in Samoa (Fraser 1892). Fono (councils) are still regarded as the main source of authority, direction, and unity in Samoan villages. In Samoan theology, God’s participation in human culture is made intelligible and human participation meaningful. In other words, culture is indicative of the interaction between God and people.

Given this belief in the origin of culture, it follows that the people consider culture basically good for the whole society. Culture is also relevant because it has grown out of the lived experiences of the people. Through cultural structures and rituals, the core values of society are perpetuated. Culture is also regarded as a gift from God handed down by the tua’a (ancestors). Culture represents the interactions between God the Creator, his people, and the environment in which they live. It gives people identity, solidarity, and a basis from which to move to the future. The motto of Samoa, Fa’avae ‘i le Atua Samoa (Samoa is founded on God), reflects this.
Despite its divine origins, power is at the center of fa’a-Samoa. Human failure and selfishness sometimes come to dominate, producing injustice and suffering. Recognition of the plurality of meanings of culture should not preclude a more political understanding of its processes. The players in the game of cultural definition are by no means equal. Matai and ministers have used Christianity as the basis for political maneuvering. It is simultaneously part of tradition and a new ground for competition. Christianity also leads to new forms of cooperation and ways of dealing with new worlds. The churches of Samoa follow Samoans overseas, becoming the centers of Samoan communities, while the matai meanwhile ‘lose’ their power.

Lotu in transnational context

Anae’s (1998) study focuses on the church as the main factor enhancing Samoan ethnic identity outside of Samoa. She studied a group of more than fifty English speaking New Zealand-born Samoans who are members of the Pacific Island Congregation (PIC) church in Auckland, Newton. She examined notions of Samoan identity within both inter-ethnic and intra-ethnic dynamics with an emphasis on the Samoanizing of the Christian church. Hegemonic identity discourses of the dominant New Zealand society were considered and how they contrast with identity discourses amongst island-born Samoans.

Samoans at ‘reach’ initially attended palagi (foreign or European) churches. As the overseas Samoan population grew, Samoan recognized that their needs and sense of spiritual fulfillment were inadequately met by palagi ways of worshipping. This motivated them to establish their own churches. In part, setting up independent churches
was a response to the different identities that were emerging in New Zealand’s new multicultural setting. Anae (1998, 312), saw the making of what she calls “a coconut theology in Samoan churches where Samoan values of tautua, alofa, fa’aaloalo, and va fealoa’i remain central.”

My research confirms the importance of church in overseas Samoa. Amongst the members, everyone reported belonging to a Samoan church. They send their children to Sunday schools where they speak and write in Samoan. Children also learn values of love, respect, and obedience which are also core values in fa’a-Samoa. Church halls are used for cultural, social, and economic functions such as weddings, funerals, and hosting village trips from Samoa. The church mediates and stabilizes Samoan identity overseas with its emphasis on social relationships and importance of people through fa’a-Samoa. As one young man from Auckland said, “Going to church is like going to a Samoan village.” The church and fa’a-Samoa cannot be treated separately in the context of migration.

Although the people I interviewed overwhelmingly have great pride in fa’a-Samoa they also described feelings of ambivalence particularly handling the different demands of the church. Recent observers of Pacific Island communities overseas have decried the plight of families deprived of necessities because of the money they feel compelled to give in response to a call from home or even where they reside overseas. For example, Tuiatua Tupua Tamasese ‘Efi (1996) discusses a period when many church and village groups traveled to New Zealand and the United States to raise funds for a church, or a minister’s house. These fundraising trips have not ceased altogether.
Although he admits that schools are essential and that the minister's houses often double as community halls, he says that some of these construction projects exceeded real needs.

Is it possible that appealing to the competitive instinct to motivate large contributions tends to emphasize things material at the expense of things spiritual, orienting Christianity perhaps unwittingly to a materialistic bias? People should be discouraged from giving more than they can afford by way of parading a misguided generosity on the lame excuse that it is *fa‘a-Samoa*. A clear departure from the Christian norm should not be allowed to pass because of a mistaken allegiance to traditional values (1996, 51).

Tuiatua Tupua Tamasese ‘Efi was a Prime Minister of Samoa from 1976 to 1982. He holds one of the Paramount Chief titles, Tuiatua Tupua Tamasese. His other titles are Ta‘isi, Tupuola, and Tufuga. Like Hau‘ofa (1993), Meleisea (1987), Wendt (1976), and others, Tuiatua Tupua Tamasese Efi encourages a critical look at contemporary issues affecting Samoa and other Pacific Island nations.

My research bears out Tuiatua Tupua Tamasese ‘Efi’s critique. Members in Salelologa say that *fa‘a-Samoa* does not really burden Samoans, but it is *fa‘a-lelotu* things. For example, *fa‘alavelave* only happen occasionally, but *fa‘a-lelotu* events occur daily or weekly. Salelologa members in Auckland and Santa Ana echoed the same disgruntlement with the frequency and scope of monetary solicitations by the church. These include fortnightly or monthly donations for the minister’s upkeep, quarterly and annual donations to the church, mothers and fathers associations, Sunday school, youth clubs, and choir. Many of these church organizations whether in Samoa or overseas solicit money on a regular basis.

The boundary between *fa‘a-Samoa* and *fa‘a-lelotu* is porous. Members judge contributions by evaluating *tautua* (service), *alo‘a* (love), and *va fealoa‘I* (social
relations) with fa’a-lelotu. Members acknowledge this tension but what is important is they realize it is not the giving and serving in fa’a-Samoan that is problematic, but its scope and frequency, and its conflict with contemporary living and the church’s mission. Amongst those interviewed, population movement has a much deeper impact than pure economic gain. The saying, “Those who give are blessed more than those who receive” is commonly used in interviews. Regardless of motives, a certain amount of repute and community prestige is involved in such undertakings and members receive ‘payment’ from the esteem that accrues to those ‘who play the game according to the rules’. Part of this, is the realization that if one’s own personal or financial situation was to change one could rely upon the assistance of a widely ramifying network.

Catholic Church Cardinal Pio Taofinu’u and other church leaders have asked people to refrain from excessive celebrations which put an extra burden on the people (Kamu 1996). In the book of Tofa Mamao (Knowledge and Wisdom), priests and catechists who officiate at funerals are asked not to accept any sua (present of fine mat, pig, cooked taro, chicken, and money) from grieving families. Despite this proclamation, families often give sua at funerals as well as at weddings or other happier occasions. In most fa’alavelave in Salelologa, all eight church ministers from the different denominations attend and each of them is given sua. In addition, sua goes to other chiefs from the village and families who come from other parts of Samoa to show their respect to the host family.

This is also true at fa’alavelave amongst overseas Samoans. Tiatia, a young New Zealand-born Samoan, has been critical of the church and how it may have contributed to the plight of Samoan, Niuean, Tokelauan, and Tongan youths in New Zealand. Tiatia
(1998, 143) writes, “This practice of giving has placed financial strain on the parishioners, providing young people with a motive to reject their traditional churches.”

According to Liu (1991), the Congregational Christian Church of Samoa is losing the most followers because of its frequent demands for alofa (offerings for the minister).

The Methodist and the Catholic churches are also losing members. The Samoan understanding of these traditional churches Tiatia mentions, are the Congregational Christian Church, the Methodist, and the Catholic churches. These were the first denominational churches introduced to Samoa in the 1830s and are associated with Taeao o le Talalelei (Mornings of the Good News).

However, one matai observes, these traditional churches are also failing to provide spiritual fulfillment. In other instances, there have been a clash of personalities either between the minister and the congregation or among the matai. At the same time, evangelical churches have been coming to Samoa providing another challenge to the more traditional churches. Some of these evangelical churches include Moonies, Pentecost, and Assembly of God. Most of these ‘new’ religions are introduced by Samoans who have lived overseas. The cases described below illustrate how the church is used as part of tradition and a new ground for competition. Silia describes the following in August 1998:

In 1998, a new church group known as the Pentecost tried to establish a church in Salelologa. Upon hearing about this, the village council instructed the pastor and his Salelologa sponsor to end it. They did not stop. The matai council gave a second warning but the Salelologa [sponsor] and the new church pastor refused the order. After the third warning they still did not obey, and the matai and his family, as well as the pastor, were expelled.
It is often the case that when a new church is introduced, a Samoan *matai* and his family sponsor a pastor, providing support and accommodation. In the above case, the *matai* and his family that were expelled now live with relatives on Upolu island. There is no Pentecost church. The few people who attended and would eventually have become members of the new Pentecost church would have been drawn from the existing Methodist, Congregational Christian Church, Catholic, Mormon, Assembly of God, and the Baptist Churches (the last two denominations were introduced in the late 1970s).

In 1999 during the second leg of my fieldwork, a charismatic son of a Salelologa ‘*aiga* who had been in the United States was visiting Samoa. He attempted to preach over loudspeakers in the market at Salelologa but was met with fierce resistance from the village council. Despite earnest lobbying by some interested people from the village on his behalf, the village council’s decision did not change and he was not allowed to preach. A similar incident was reported in the village of Falealupo on the northwest side of Savai’i. Several families who sponsored a Bible Study group were banished from the village for not obeying the village council order forbidding bible study (*Samoan Observer* April 2001).

More and more of this kind of proselytizing is growing in Samoa’s capital city of Apia on ‘Upolu island, however. Some village councils may also be more lenient and supportive than others. The growth of new churches also depends on the personal aggressiveness of the preacher and the sponsor’s influence in the village. As these examples show, what local people refer to as the ‘rules’ of society are not politely negotiated, but more often than not imposed by the most powerful on the rest. The “neo-traditional strategy incorporates many *matai* into the hegemonic bloc by legitimating
local control in return for national control” (Nagata 1982, 332). The Village Fono Act of 1991 was an attempt to secure a national consensus giving primacy of local fono (village council) over the constitutional rights of individuals. Prior to the formalization of the power of matai through the Village Fono Act, village affairs were generally executed with integrity. However, the recent increase in village fines and expulsion of residents from villages may to some extent be attributed to the misuse and abuse of this power.

Local ‘elites’ or the village councils aren’t simply mouthpiece and enforcer of capitalist imperialism as suggested by some models of “global hegemony” (Featherstone 1990, 96), however. Local discourses work in a variety of directions. The cases above illustrate how the newer religions are resisted through stress upon local sources of power and religious traditionalism. In Samoa, the church has become a battleground for change, but in overseas Samoa, the church is also the arena in which fa’a-Samoa and Samoan identity is reclaimed.

**Fa’a-Samoa, Culture, and Mobility**

In this chapter, I examine the genealogy of ‘culture’, its origins in anthropology and geography, its importance in understanding how western knowledge has produced its ‘others’ and categorize the world. I consider the political economy of fa’a-Samoa and ideology by examining its relationship to people, values, land, and mobility, especially how colonialism, Christianity, and capitalism have interacted and informed fa’a-Samoa. Samoans view of culture encompasses the ‘essentialized’ or ‘objectified’ anthropological definition of culture as in material things, institutions, rituals, and customary ways that distinguish Samoans from others, but Samoans also understand fa’a-Samoa as something
that is strategic, negotiable, and contested depending on context and exposure of members to it.

I discuss *fa’a-Samoa* both as concept and identity and the importance of its core values to the mobility process, the *lotu* (church), and the overseas ‘*aiga*. In the face of rapid change, *fa’a-Samoa* has continued to survive in dynamic ways, in a ‘persistent identity system’ (Anae 1998). It presents different contextual manifestations in different places: *fa’a-Niusila*, (the Samoan way in New Zealand), *fa’a-Aukilani* (the Samoan way in Auckland), *fa’a-Ausetalia* (the Samoan way in Australia), *fa’a-Kalefonia*, (the Samoan way in California) and *fa’a-Tutuila* (the Samoan way in Tutuila, American Samoa).

Overseas movement has engendered rapid transformation as globalization is appropriated into the villages. In this sense, it is a dialectal process.

I also describe a new resource, *fafa* (foreign or overseas places), and access to movement appears to have become as important as access to land. But *fafa* provides more than remittances, although these are vitally important. To become rich and enhance one’s standing in Samoa one has to go abroad, to the source of transformation. This faith in foreign lands appears to contradict the customary importance of local land. Rather than building one’s position from just *i’inei* (local place), status and power are now derived from *fafa* (overseas places).

Franco (1991) cites Portes (1984) in discussing the *ethnic resilience* of overseas Samoans. His study of how Samoans work as a manifestation of the strength of *fa’a-Samoa* has led him to conclude that:
Ethnic resilience need not be a product of immigration exploitation, it can be a product of traditional cultural values such as the tradition of enterprise in Korean, Chinese, and Japanese communities. In the Samoan case, ethnic resilience is also a product of traditional system of exchange, *tautua* and *fa'alavelave*. Samoans generally feel their system of exchange has served them well in over 150 years of European contact. However, *tautua* and *fa'alavelave* are concepts in flux waiting for definition from a new generation of Samoans born in Samoa, New Zealand and the United States (1991, 353).

That *tautua* and *fa'alavelave* are dynamic concepts is a truism, but in what mobility contexts are these concepts being transformed? In interviews, words such as *atunu’u i fafo* (overseas countries), *nu’u i fafo* (overseas villages), *Samoa i fafo* (overseas Samoa), *latou i fafo* (those of us overseas), and *‘aiga i fafo* (overseas family) were compared to *‘aiga i’inei* (family here), *matou i’inei* (us here), *nu’u i’inei* (village here), and *Samoa i’inei* (Samoa here) came up many times. The concepts of *fafo* and *i’inei* are used to describe the connections between places, people, and movement. Movement (*malaga*) is intertwined with many cultural metaphors linked to *‘aiga* (kinship), *fanua* (land), *matai* (chiefs and orators), *fa’alavelave* (life crucial events), and the values and principles of *tautua* and *alofa*.
CHAPTER FIVE
JOURNEYS: SAMOAN UNDERSTANDINGS OF MOVEMENT

‘E lele le toloa ‘ae ma’au ‘i le vai.
(The albatross flies, but always comes back to its home, the water pond).

Now that an emic look at fa’a-Samoa and its different configurations has been presented, the time has come for a more detailed examination of kinds of mobility. In the following, I attempt to elucidate the interconnected links between the social, spiritual, political, and economic aspects of malaga (movement back and forth), and its relation to ‘aiga and place. The cultural dimensions and essence of movement are the primary concern here, with a focus on the connections that people establish and re-establish as they move. Drawing primarily on field data, this chapter describes the extent of past as well as recent movement between Salelologa, the rest of Samoa, and overseas. Circularity remains a significant part of the Salelologa movement experience, irrespective of gender or generation of those who move.

I also argue that the metaphors of fafo (overseas or foreign lands) as associated with things derived from overseas, and i’inei (local place) as associated with things derived locally, are continuously evaluated in terms of power differentials not only between places but also between people. Malaga is the cultural imperative that connects the ‘aiga i’inei (family here) with ‘aiga i fafo (family overseas). I highlight the embodied and social nature of malaga in dwelling and reaching. Fafo and i’inei cannot be presented as polar opposites, for within the context of Salelologa they are mutually interdependent. These metaphors are frequently drawn upon as people talk about
connections and relationships in general, rather than discrete individuals and mutually exclusive spaces. Metaphors provide an important means of how social experience is conceived, for it is through them that discourses are shaped and gain authority (Barnes and Duncan 1993). In addition to cultural metaphors of movement, this chapter is also concerned with the individual journeys made by those of Salelologa. Their journeys are not simply movements through space but, like all travels, lead to a reshaping of boundaries and reconfigurations of culture, community, and spirituality, as well as an expanded territorial distribution.

*Va* (social space) is another core concept tied to *malaga*. It connotes mutual respect in sociopolitical arrangements that nurture the relationships between people, places, and social environments. *Va* is conceived of as the space between, not empty space that separates, but social space that relates. Wendt (1999) writes:

> Important to the Samoan view of reality, is the concept of *Va*. A well-known Samoan expression ‘*la teu le va*’—cherish, nurse, care for the relationships is crucial in communal cultures that value group unity more than individualism, that perceive of things in terms of group, in terms of *va* or relationships (1999, 403).

The concept *va* is a way of thinking about space, specifically ‘social space’. In Samoan epistemology, *va* is a highly complex phenomenon influencing interactions in everyday life. *Va* governs and guides individual and ‘*aiga*’ behavior, inflected by factors such as gender, cultural status, age, and marital status. In both public and private spaces, food division and distribution, sleeping and sitting arrangements, and language usage are all conceived through *va*. Culturally proper and improper behaviors are signified by *va*. Thus, *va fealoa’i* (social respect in relationships between people and environment) is considered culturally appropriate. Its complementary opposite, *va tapuia* (sacred spaces
and taboo relationships), establishes limits and boundaries in sociopolitical and spiritual arrangements. Chief-orator, sister-brother, clergy-village, and husband-wife relationships are tangible examples of va at work. Transgressions of boundaries, either by physical contact or by the use of vulgar or obscene language, constitute va tapua. Fines that the village fono imposes on offenders are often to do with those who soli le va (transgress or disregard social space).

A more refined explanation of va is found in research undertaken in New Zealand by Tamasese, Peteru, and Waldegrave (1997) of Samoan perspectives on mental health and culturally appropriate services. They describe the Samoan sense of self as ultimately relational:

Samoa’s traditions and protocols explain the nature of Samoan being as that of a relational being, that is the Samoan person does not exist as an individual. There is myself and yourself. Through you, my being is contextually meaningful and whole. Through myself, you are given primacy in light of our collective identity and places of belonging (fa’asinomaga), our genealogical lineage (tupu’aga), and our roles and responsibilities and heritage (tofiga) (1997, 28).

This insight is important as I shift discussion to themes of legitimacy, belonging, and appropriate behavior in the second half of this chapter. I show that va remains a moral imperative and strongly influences ongoing relationships amongst people of Salelologa as they move around. Many discussions focus initially on mobility as a way of advancing the home site. The acts of giving and receiving, as manifested in exchanges of letters, care packages, phone calls, and remittances, symbolize va. Salelologa narratives expressed views of mobility, identity, and place.
Social space is also used here metaphorically to describe the cultural communications and social relations rooted in mobility. The underlying theme of mobility, viewed from the standpoint of a local community, is closely linked to the enhancement of the ‘aiga. The development cycle of the ‘aiga refers to its social, physical, and economic shifts in parallel with the life cycles of individuals within an ‘aiga. Life cycle and development cycle are both integral components of mobility, identity, and kinship.

Malaga as Concept and Meaning

Malaga is the Samoan word for ‘migration’, or more accurately to travel back and forth. It implies both visiting and returning, irrespective of time involved. Malaga is also the polite word for both alu (go) and sau (come). Simultaneously, malaga is a noun describing formal traveling parties of two or more people. A malaga is a ceremonial, planned visit following Samoan custom, characterizing dignified activity.

Built into malaga is a perception of the reciprocity between dwelling and reaching. Malaga plays a crucial part in maintaining relationships between matai (chiefs and orators), ‘aiga (extended family), and fanua (communal land holdings). Thus, talking about malaga is simultaneously speaking of fa’a-Samoa, values of alofa (love, compassion), fa’aaloalo (respect), tautua (service), and fa’alavelave (life cycle events). The conceptual basis for malaga is in the life cycle, cultural events surrounding births, marriages, and funerals. However, contemporary movements for the purposes of education, health, and economic opportunities have broadened its scope. The term
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*malaga* is also used to describe our being on earth as a spiritual journey. *Malaga* therefore has both physical and metaphysical qualities.

Samoans often travel across and amongst the islands, either on short trips or for long periods, and they go for a variety of reasons. Craig Janes describes some of the events which underpin *malaga*:

Marriages, funerals, church dedication, graduation, vacation, and family gatherings related to title successions involve brief visitations. Collectively, such visits are traditionally institutionalized in the form of *malaga* parties in which the visiting group headed by the *ali'i* (high chief) and his *tulafale* (talking chief) travel to another village for such specific purposes as seeking betrothal of a *taupou* (village maiden). Adoption of children, ambilocal residence upon marriage, pursuit of education and increasingly employment prospects are some of the other reasons (1990, 19)

Janes further argues that intra-Samoan movement can lead to journeys farther out to either the United States or New Zealand. What Janes glosses over, however, is how social relationships are cultivated, the cultural basis for *malaga*, the ritual interactions that legitimize and render it meaningful. I begin by examining the oldest forms of *malaga* that have great longevity and are deeply cultural (Table 5.1). All these movements invariably involve the mobilization of resources such as talent, ideas, service, people, and capital; they are rooted in the development cycles of the ‘*aiga* and the life cycles of its individual members.

**Weddings: faletautu and fa’aipoipoga**

One of the most important events that constitute a *malaga* is a *faletautu* (traditional Samoan wedding), where the *manaia* (unmarried chief or son of a chief) and orators of his village travel to another village to court a *taupou* (daughter of a chief). Kramer (1902) describes *faletautu* in his ethnographic record. In a *faletautu*, the chief
and his orators seeking the hand of a *taupou* have to convince her family and her father. If both the *taupou* and father accept the *manaia*, a traditional Samoan wedding takes place. Between the time of courtship and the actual wedding, which can range from three to twelve months, the orators of the *manaia* live with the girl’s family, acting as guards in case another chief comes along. They also serve the family by building a house, or stone platform, cultivating new land, or whatever else the girl’s family wishes. When the actual wedding takes place, the *manaia*’s orators are rewarded with fine mats, tapa, kava, and food.

‘Asomua Simi, an elder who described a *faletaautu* to me, emphasized that “If a union of this stature is consummated, it not only results in family alliances but also village and district alliances. Families and villages take great pride in such unions, as their genealogies and *fa’alupega* (honorific salutations) are enhanced by such alliances” (Personal communication, Foua, Salelologa, September 1999). The couple are traditionally called the *fale na fuafua* (house purposefully planned). The bride’s family presents her husband’s family with special fine mats, such as the ‘*ie avaga* (elopement fine mat) and ‘*ie tu* (stand tall fine mat), other sleeping mats, tapa, and handicrafts. The groom’s family reciprocates with productive goods in the form of pigs, chicken, cattle, and taro. Through these ceremonies, connections and alliances between the two families are officially legitimized. Upon completion of all marriage protocols in the bride’s village, the newly wedded-couple usually stay for a week or two before they move to the husband’s community.

The children of these unions are just as important as economic connections between the families. They are given traditional titles such as *tama o le fuafuataga* (child...
deliberately planned), or tama o le fa’asau (child declared), or tama a le malo (child of victory). These terms are used as honorific salutations, emphasizing belonging and legitimacy to the ‘aiga (kin group) and nu’u (village) of the husband and wife. These terms also connote how deliberate was the planning by families and villages to make sure their manaia and taupou were allied with the highest ranked chiefs. As discussed in chapter three, titles found in the fa’alupega (honorific salutations) of villages were brought about by these marriages.

As Samoa became Christianized and modernized, the traditional Samoan wedding has been modified. The contemporary version called a fa’aipoipoga is a legally registered church wedding. Like the older faletautu, the fa’aipoipoga lends legitimacy and authority to a marriage and the offspring later born (Table 5.1). Reciprocal exchanges between the husband and wife’s families continue, although families have changed the styles and kind of goods involved. For example, a wedding cake is now an essential element of a modern wedding and goods exchange now include bedroom sets and furniture, cash, and linens. Weddings are also held in church halls or hotels, not only in a bride’s village.

Any children born out of wedlock, tama a le po (child made in the dark), do not have the same well-defined status. Although such children may have legitimate claims to the mother’s ‘aiga, claims to the ‘aiga and title of the father remain highly contentious.

Fa’ailoagatama and fa’afailelegatama

In Samoan custom, when an expectant mother nears the due date, she returns to her family to have the baby. Her husband often accompanies her. Babies are delivered at home by a Samoan fa’atosaga (midwife). A few months later, the mother and father’s
families prepare for the *fa’afailelegatama* or *fa’aiлоагатама* (making known the child’s kinship); (Table 5.1). The *fa’afailelegatama* ceremony demonstrates the family ties of the newborn as the family of the father presents the mother’s family with Samoan oil, bathing items, a tub, soap, a mosquito net, and some baby clothes. In return, the mother’s family presents sleeping mats for the baby, tapa, and other essentials. A special fine mat called *‘ie ‘o le fa’amatua* (fine mat to cement the connections of the baby’s two families) is also presented to symbolize the arrival of the new child and to demonstrate the legitimate claims of the child to both the mother’s and father’s families.

Today, although many babies are born in a hospital in Samoa or overseas, *fa’aiлоагатама* continues to occur once the mother and her newborn return to the village. Since family members travel to attend the ceremony, it is another form of *malaga*, as members overseas come to Salelologa to celebrate. *Fa’aiлоагатама* may also be held to acknowledge relationships with any member, not just a newborn who may have been living with another ‘*aiga* in another village or island. *Malaga* is the foundation of a complex network of sharing, participation, and reciprocal obligation which continues throughout the lifecycle of individuals and the ‘*aiga*. *Faia* (social connections) continue to be legitimated through *malaga*.

**Funerals**

The other crucial life event that generates *malaga* is a death in the ‘*aiga*. In the case of a funeral, the exchange of special fine mats is compulsory: the *‘ie ‘o le mavaega* (farewell fine mat from son or daughter in law’s family) and *‘ie ‘o le measulu* (children’s farewell fine mat). If it is the husband who has died, at his funeral, the wife’s family presents to his family the *‘ie ‘o le mavaega* and *‘ie ‘o le measulu* and the husband’s family
does the same if it is the wife who has died. ‘Ie o le measulu is presented only if there are children from the marriage. These fine mats are obligatory in addition to other gifts contributed to the funeral feast. In all the different ritual occasions special fine mats are obligatory marked by particular names are always exchanged.

*Matai investiture: saofa’i and nofo*

The confering of a matai title is the other cultural event that mobilizes Samoan families wherever they reside. Saofa’i and nofo both refer to matai investiture, but saofa’i is used for orator titles and nofo for ali’i titles. Matai conferment occurs following the death of a senior matai, when a new matai is needed to lead the ‘aiga. In keeping with Samoa’s population growth, families now allow split titles, so that several matai may be conferred at one time after a family has given consent that they may lead the ‘aiga. At the ceremony, the family hosting the saofa’i presents a fine mat, called ‘Ie o le nofo (fine mat of the new matai), to the village council. This fine mat goes to the senior orator making the keynote speech. The exchange of fine mats, food, and cash from the host family to the village council legitimates the incorporation of the matai and ‘aiga into the decision-making process of the village. Relatives of the recipient of a title come from all over Samoa, and beyond, to help with the ceremony.

*Dedication of fale talimalo (guest house): maota and laoa*

Another event stimulating malaga is when a matai builds a faletalimalo (guest house) for the ‘aiga, which traditionally requires the collective effort of every family member, unlike new private sleeping houses or faletofa. Guesthouses are usually situated in the front row, facing the malae (village green), while sleeping houses are located just behind with cookhouses adjacent. Every matai title includes an associated site in the
village where homes for the family are built. Houses provide not only dwelling place but also constitute a link between identity and place, as Rensel (1997) explains for Rotuma in Fiji. Rotuman houses are central to the social production of kin groups, with blood ties reckoned from a common ancestor who lived at or had claim to a named house site. Thus “physical houses stand as tangible reminders and powerful symbols, embodying the responsibilities and relationships of all who participate in their construction, repair, and use” (Rensel 1997, 27). The Samoan term used for the home and house site of a chief is *maota* and for an orator *laoa*.

Completion of a new guesthouse is followed by a *umusaga*, (official dedication). Related families travel from all over Samoa, nowadays also from overseas, to show their appreciation and pride in the *matai’s* accomplishment as well as to reaffirm relationships by blood and marriage. At the dedication, the *matai* presents the builder and his wife a special fine mat, called an *‘ie o le fulumageso* along with other fine mats, tapa, goods, and cash to the construction crew. *‘ie o le fulumageso* means ‘fine mat to clear itching’ and reflects the end of construction. In old Samoa, when a *matai* arranged for a traditional house builder to construct a guesthouse he brought a gift to commit the builder to the job. Where the builder goes, so also does the wife. She helps by weaving the roof thatch made from sugarcane leaves which are itchy and unpleasant. The fine mat goes directly to them as a special token of their skill and commitment (Ala Laufou, Personal communication, Salelologa, December 2002).

Today, school buildings, churches, and community halls may also have dedication ceremonies. These *fa’alavelave* make visible the *tautua* (service) of the *matai* and other *‘aiga* members contributing to the enhancement of family status. These communal
projects also reflect tautua to the church and community, thus sustaining the social and economic fabric of a well-run village.

Dedication of Tatau (tattoo)

Malaga also occurs when members of ‘aiga want to have tatau which requires collective effort. Before individuals commit to having tatau they must be prepared mentally and physically, and must also inform their families because tatau is life threatening. In tatau, a person is not allowed to do it without a partner; as a result, there may be two to six people in a sitting. Those who undergo tatau must follow the protocol of being prohibited from moving around alone and not eating certain foods. If the person is strong physically and psychologically, it takes two to three weeks to complete a tatau. An unfinished tatau brings shame to an individual and his ‘aiga. During the tatau session, the tattooist and his crew stay with the family returning to their village when the tattoo is complete. Families of those undergoing tatau are continuously present to give encouragement, offer moral support, and provide food for the tatau artist and his crew. The crew also help by singing songs to soothe the pain, wiping away the blood as the tattooist’s needle works its way on a man’s lower back, torso, and just below the knees.

The tattoo for a woman is called malu, begins at the upper thighs and ends below the knees. Tatau also have umusaga (dedication), as for the official opening of a guesthouse (Table 5.1). Once the tatau is completed, the families members present the tattooist and crew with a special fine mat called ‘ie o le fusita, as well as mats, pigs, and cash. The public dedication symbolizes the successful completion of tatau and how appreciative are families of the men and women involved.
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Table 5.1 Ceremonial Reasons for Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural/Political/Economic Event</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>faletautu</td>
<td>Seeking betrothal of a village maiden or taupou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa’aipoipoga</td>
<td>A legally registered church or civil marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa’ailogatama or fa’afailelegatama</td>
<td>Birth of a newborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maliu or tu’umalo</td>
<td>Funeral of an orator or chief; any other funeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saafa’i,</td>
<td>Bestowal of title or matai investiture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>umusaga</td>
<td>Official opening of matai residential house, or Samoan guest house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa’aulufalega</td>
<td>Same as umusaga, official dedication of a new church, minister’s house, or school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tatau</td>
<td>To get a Samoan tattoo, and its dedication: for male pe’a, for female malu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa’apa’iaga</td>
<td>Ordination of a minister, priest, or nun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa’au’uga</td>
<td>To attend graduation from college or high school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Interviews 1999-2000

The ceremonial reasons for mobility also reveal their deeply cultural nature (Table 5.1). Nowadays, malaga to attend religious ordination of ministers, priests, or nuns or to celebrate graduation from college or high school are also significant reasons.
for families to come together. *Malaga* changes to suit new social configurations, but customary forms have not disappeared. They continue to have relevance in contemporary Samoan society at the same time that some old aspects of *malaga* have been discontinued and new ones added.

**Malaga and fa’alavelave**

Previous observers of Samoan life have noted the many opportunities for public display of social connections. Samoans live their private lives in a public arena, especially at *fa’alavelave* such as weddings, funerals, *matai* investitures, or the dedication of new residences or churches. *Fa’alavelave* attended by the whole village are said to have been shown high esteem, or *aloa’ia*. This is demonstrated by the saying, ‘*Ua a’afu ma a’ai le nu’u* (The village was well covered and they ate to their heart’s content). Although weddings may be considered family affairs, in Samoa the entire village often becomes involved as personal and social identities are intricately connected to both ‘*aiga* and village.

Moving away from one’s home does not result in severing of ties or loss of identity. As one member said, *E maota tau’ave pe laoa tau’ave le Samoa* (Samoans carry the manners of the house and morals of place with them). In other words, the cultural domain is inscribed in *matai* status, rights, and claims to particular land, house sites, and honors. This travels with Samoans wherever they go, for the honors and dignity inscribed in Samoan identity are not bounded in space or tied to particular locations (Galuvao Tanielu, Samoan Judge, Personal communication, Samoa, October 1999). This sentiment was echoed during a conversation with Loia Fiaui, a Samoan
educator in Hawai‘i. Routine or daily movements also are part of malaga, including more recent practices such as seeking paid employment (Table 5.2). In everyday life, many of these involve circular mobility between pitonu‘u in villages, interisland between Savai‘i and Apia, even between Samoa and American Samoa. However, their daily occurrence does not preclude people from moving beyond the Samoan archipelago to metropolitan rimlands.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event and Purpose</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fagafaga</td>
<td>To go hunting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa’atau meamata</td>
<td>To sell produce at market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faigaluega</td>
<td>To go to work either for the government or private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa’ailogaina o aso fanau</td>
<td>To attend a milestone birthday celebration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nofo a’oga</td>
<td>To go to a day or boarding school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asi ‘aiga</td>
<td>To visit relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asi ma’i</td>
<td>To visit a sick relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si’i ma’i</td>
<td>To seek medical help in a western-style hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su’e taulasea</td>
<td>To seek medical help from a Samoan healer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fagota</td>
<td>To go fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma’umaga or fa’ato’aga</td>
<td>To go to the plantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asi ‘aulotu</td>
<td>To visit a church or village trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa’amasinoga</td>
<td>To attend court cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su’egatupe: ‘aulotu, nuu, a’oga</td>
<td>To go on a fundraising trip for communal church, village, or school projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su’egatupe a faipule</td>
<td>To go on campaign fund-raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suegatupe: ‘aulakapi, ‘ausoka, ‘auvolipolo, ‘aunetipolo</td>
<td>To go on fundraising trip for a sports team: rugby, soccer, volleyball, or netball</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legitimacy and Belonging

Malaga, ‘aiga, and fa’alavelave interactions involve networks of sociocultural relationships that engage Samoans irrespective of geographic location. As Samoans move overseas, their territorial distribution expands and so does their ‘aiga and the fa’alavelave they hold. Samoans have obligations to both their ‘aiga o le tama (father’s family) and ‘aiga o le tina (mother’s family). Together, these are called the ‘aiga ‘o le fanau (families of the children). Village and church groups also malaga to fundraise for community projects. Just as any individual can find lodging with a relative overseas, group malaga can count on accommodations by fellow Samoans who came from the same original village.

Attending fa’alavelave reflects alofa (love), tautua (service), and fa’aaloalo (respect). It provides members of the ‘aiga with a sense of security and elevates family status. As one member put it, “In short, it shows your relatives and other ‘aiga that your son or daughter, uncle or aunt, niece or nephew is not a pa’u fa’i (banana peel), but somebody who has an ‘aiga.” Although some people with whom a specific fa’alavelave is associated may not live in Salelologa, their relatives in the nu’u will take a si’i (gifts to pay respect) for them and acknowledge their existence. Those overseas do the same for relatives in Samoa if a fa’alavelave occurs in New Zealand or the United States.

Legitimacy is at the core of the Samoan social world. People are proud when the family comes to demonstrate kinship, especially in the place where they now reside. It reaffirms one’s importance in society. Material resources, time, and energy are often expended at great cost, but malaga and fa’alavelave energize Samoan life. A wide range of relationships are renewed, political allegiances re-established, ties deepened, and
social encounters maximized. In this sense, *malaga* and *fa’alavelave* both deplete and replenish life. The conception of *malaga* is thus much larger than ‘migration’, which implies a narrow perception of movement and human relationships limited to concerns for survival and material consumption.

In *A Study of Place, Mobility and Embodiment in Fiji*, Raymond Young (1998) studied families in Lakeba, Lau Island, and in the capital of Suva. He speaks of *wakolo* (pathway) as a metaphor governing social relationships in Fiji where Fijian life is closely tied to a web of social networks. Young was critical of the dualisms of rural-urban or village-metropolitan that dominates mobility studies in Fiji and he writes, “Rather than construct conceptions of movement and identity around places rural and urban, local cultural metaphors expand and redefine people’s relationships with one another as they move” (ibid, page ii).

Similarly, I sought to understand how the people of Salelologa conceive of ‘migration’ and *malaga*. What emerged from interviews is the profound way that *malaga* is tied to social relationships and kinship. As one senior women put it:

Our word for migration is *malaga*, it captures our movements, the comings and goings of Samoans. A *malaga* does not occur out of the blue. There are reasons for *malaga*. A *malaga* is also a noun like a formal traveling group as in *malaga ‘aiga* (family trip), *malaga nu’u* (village trip), *malaga ‘aulotu* (church trip) or *malaga ‘autalavou* (youth club trip). When a person or ‘*aiga* or *nu’u* sets out for a *malaga* they usually take gifts, cooked food, finemats, mats, and so on. This is a little donation to help the hosts. The hosts are also prepared to await the *malaga*. There’s usually *‘ava* [welcoming kava ceremony] upon the arrival of a *malaga*.

**Does that mean we have to tell those people over there about our *malaga*?**

Yes, we always do that first. It also depends on the purpose of the *malaga*, eh? With local trips to our own ‘*aiga*, like in Apia or to other
villages we don’t have to, you can just arrive. But in cases where we have a son or daughter, whom we want to stay with, relatives to be near school or work, say in Apia, of course, yes.

**What about malaga overseas?**

Definitely, we consult our 'aiga overseas and they often sponsor a boy or a girl we want to send. Many Samoans go to New Zealand, or America, or Australia through our 'aiga.

**Is this the same with the village malaga or church malaga we hear about these days?**

Oh yes, definitely.

Samoans are not so much concerned about the monetary resources expended on malaga, although this can be important, as influenced by their being both recognized and consulted prior to implementation. For in that recognition, the principles of va fealoa'i and respect have been considered, so malaga is warmly welcomed. As ‘Ai’ono (1992, 123) explains, “Samoan culture firmly believes in the efficiency of the consultative approach in making long-term decisions, because it is the decision making process that makes the appropriately involved individual feel important by being consulted.” It is also a transparent way of identifying those within the family, community, public, or government ministry who will accept responsibility. Once everyone agrees, there is total commitment to seeing a successful implementation. In other words, because of Samoan pride in family and/or village affiliations, Samoans give of their best even under severe economic circumstances, a competitive aspect of fa’a-Samoa that can be manipulated sometimes (see Chapter Four).
Knowledge of connections is fundamental to mobility. In an interview with a parent in Salelologa, the interconnections between mobility, identity, and ‘aiga became clear:

We don’t just go to any fa’alavelave, we go because we have pathways and social connections, well-trodden pathways of relationships that are recognized through every fa’alavelave we participate in and reciprocal exchanges. This is expressed in the expression ‘O le ala ‘ua mutia, ‘ae le se ala fati [It is not a new path but a well-trodden path.] We go to present gifts at a fa’alavelave because we don’t want Sina or Sione to feel ashamed because none of her or his family comes to their fa’alavelave. It is no use saying, “My dear daughter Sina or son Sione” but not go to a fa’alavelave when it occurs at their husband’s or wife’s home village. The importance of our relationship to Sina or Sione means in fa’a-Samoa that we must go to demonstrate our relationship through giving a gift and love for them during fa’alavelave. Likewise when we have a fa’alavelave they should do the same. What’s the use of saying, “My dear parents” and none of them comes?

**What happens if you don’t go and take gifts to Sina or Sione’s fa’alavelave?**

It shouldn’t be a big deal, but to us Samoans it is a big disgrace. It tells others we don’t have love. In fa’a-Samoa, a daughter-in-law or son-in-law’s family is our shelter... If these relatives don’t show up at a fa’alavelave, you know what everyone will say, “My god! Where is Sina or Sione’s ‘aiga, what kind of ‘aiga is that?”

**So this is considered bad?**

Yes, it is bad public relations. We don’t want our family to be labeled an ‘aiga with no brains, no guts, can’t provide anything for their so and so, whoever the member may be.

**Does it make a difference if a couple have children?**

Yes, that is even worse. If the couple have children, the in-laws will say, “My god! Not even, one fine mat or $10 Tala. Alas! They did not recognize the eyes of the children, as if they don’t exist.
This interview demonstrates that the onus of kinship is on everyday interactions. It is not how much relatives provide, but the fact they appear that is important. The saying, ‘E mativa fesaga’i le Samoa (Samoans face each other irrespective of social and economic status), means that sociocultural relationships are crucial, far more than material things (Fa’alenu’u Lilomaiava Niko, Personal communication Salelologa 2001; ‘Aumua Mata’itusi, Hawai’i 2002). An overwhelming number of Salelologa people responded to mobility, ‘aiga, and fa’alavelave in this way. Time and time again, the essential dynamics of fa’a-Samoa were revealed and the role of the ‘aiga and fa’alavelave shown to be paramount. For these Samoans, there was clearly a primary motivation for population movement: the need and the desire to enhance the status of the collective ‘aiga. Fundamental to that enhancement is the traveling, malaga to attend the fa’alavelave.

From a Geography of Space to a Geography of Va (Social Space)

As should now be clear, malaga is conceptually tied to sociocultural relations. Whether at i’inei or fafo, Salelologa members relate the same sentiments about malaga, ‘aiga, and fa’alavelave. Distance does not separate them, but only provides further interconnecting social pathways. Nor does greater distance translate into diminishing commitment to the ‘aiga, because social connections constitute a significant part of their identity and self-esteem. It is therefore social connections rather than geographic boundaries that are central to Samoan conceptions of movement. Redirecting our attention to understanding Samoan mobility through kin connections carries us beyond
the geographic boundaries of nation states or origin-destination and rural-urban dichotomies. This is similar to what Olofson (1976, 70) calls a “geography of the mind.”

In a recent study of mobility on Satowan atoll, Chuuk state, Quan-Bautista uses the concept of social space to describe people’s understanding of mobility. She writes:

Social space may include mobility, and stresses the significance of subjective or cognitive ‘space’ as a way of knowing and evaluating the physical environment and behavior. Events are expressed by metaphors of staying and moving, coming and going, purpose and wander, commitment and estrangement, and trodden and avoided paths. People’s corresponding mobility is described as embodiments, journeys and travels, an imagery of relationships between people and social space (2001, 164).

As argued, we must think more socially and less geographically about mobility. Rather than emphasizing territorial boundaries, it is more meaningful to view mobility from the point of view of Samoans who, without hesitation, consider moving appropriate if it advances enlargement of the home site. In other words, the moral imperatives of moving are culturally, economically, and socially driven. As Buttimer (1985, 313) writes, the challenge is for researchers to articulate “new metaphors and cognitive categories in which the identity of the migrant may be understood contextually” rather than to focus narrowly on geographical mobility in its most obvious locational and physical sense.

One of the concrete ways to comprehend interactions between those at ‘home’ and at ‘reach’ is by examining exchange and communication networks. In a study of two agricultural communities in Nepal, Subedi (1993) used letters, remittances, and visits made by those at ‘home’ and at ‘reach’ to evaluate these connections. Most Salelologa members keep close contact through letters, telephone calls, and visits back and forth between Samoa and fafo. They also continue to evaluate the va between relatives at home and overseas. The question of whether to return to Samoa is not as much a visible
concern as the acknowledged commitment by those at ‘reach’ to help with fa’alavelave and to uphold the honor of their ‘aiga. Likewise, those at ‘home’ must act responsibly to take care of family land and titles, hence also contributing to the honor of the ‘aiga.

Legitimate forms of mobility are purposeful in the context of the development cycle of household or community. Nowadays, malaga includes the strategic search for better economic opportunities, formal education, or medical help. Leaving the home site is seen as appropriate if it helps sustain the socioeconomic integrity and development of the ‘au’aiga; moving overseas becomes the means to achieve goals nearly impossible to realize locally. Much of this reasoning reflects the notion that no source of income is adequate or secure enough in and of itself, so most families deliberately plan for financial success and security in old age. Although parents would prefer to have all children living in the village for life, reality dictates that one or two must have a regular wage job in Apia or overseas. This is a risk minimizing strategy given the uncertainty of economic times and conditions.

Among Salelologa residents, it is not important to define for how long a person intends to be away, which could be for as much as years, just as those living overseas do not always plan the time they will remain away. More central are the reciprocations between kin at i’inei and fafo, which informs malaga, as exemplified in the saying at the beginning of this chapter: ‘E lele le toloa ‘ae ma’au ‘i le vai (The albatross flies, but always comes back to its home, the water pond). Thinking on movement, identity, and place are best summarized as “We move only in body, not in spirit.”
Unstructured and Improper Mobility

Just as structured movements that constitute *malaga* are considered culturally appropriate, others are culturally inappropriate when ‘*aiga* are not enhanced. As with legitimate mobility, however, improper forms are guided by aspects of both the life cycle and *va fealoa‘i* (social space).

In a study of the Hausa people of northern Nigeria, Olofson (1976, 1985) analyzed different types of movement in terms of their legitimacy. Legitimate experiences are ‘useful’ as they help keep the place clean as well as improve family cohesion and economic standing. ‘Illegitimate’ experiences are those seen as ‘useless’ and do not contribute to household enhancement. Like Olofson, Quan-Bautista (2001) found that the Satowan people of Micronesia also perceive mobility in terms both legitimate and illegitimate, often associated with how it enhances the *falang* or home site. On Satowan, the term *uruur* refers to improper movement. However, young men who have been remiss in their responsibilities to the *falang*, often are forgiven on returning with something to compensate for their absence.

In Samoa, life stages, marital status, gender, and age greatly influence perceptions of mobility as being proper or improper. Young and able-bodied adolescents or *matai* who wander about the village are looked upon with disdain (Table 5.3). Both men and women are expected to be productively engaged or working on the family plantations, rather than hanging about aimlessly. Although this expectation applies to both men and women, the consequences for women are heavier, because the *feagaiga* (taboos) prescribed by *va tapuia* restricts the number of places to which women may wander, especially if unmarried. Young girls can go in groups to fetch firewood or play in the
malae (village green). At night, girls and boys are allowed to congregate on the malae but are expected to be home by nine o’clock. Those who stay out beyond this time, especially if female teenagers, are considered improperly mobile and not engage in legitimate behavior. Matai monitor these evening curfews and warn those who overstay the time, while repeated offences are reported to the village fono.

Although most local accounts of population movement are grounded in moral terms, that is how to enhance the household, to automatically condemn ‘improper’ movement could be to overstate the case and impose overly bounded categories on kinds of mobility. As one Salelologa member explained, the terms for improper movement are varied:

We call somebody, especially a young, able body who wanders from ‘aiga to ‘aiga all day without good purpose a ta‘ata’a, tafaofao or fealualua’i [Table 5.3]. If that person eats at his neighbors everyday of the week that isn’t considered appropriate and polite. We value sharing and have lots of love, but if somebody wanders like that continuously that is not proper Samoan behavior… Only pigs and chickens roam like that.

These terms are used interchangeably to describe and comment on movement made without apparent reason to urban areas or nearby villages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Improper Movement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tafaofao+solo</td>
<td>Aimless wandering, e.g., going to the market place and hanging out, short stays with relatives without really helping out solo as a qualifier means too much, all the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fealualua’i+solo</td>
<td>Unfocused wandering, visiting relatives in other villages or within the village without making permanent roots; does not know social boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta’ata’a+solo</td>
<td>To wander from place to place like a chicken, bothering people, even unrelated people in the village; does not know social boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaeva+solo</td>
<td>To wander around, especially at night, looking for something especially members of the opposite sex for unlimited hours and showing lack of cultural manners; likely to end up in trouble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laufa+solo</td>
<td>Borrowed from the word ‘loiter’; to wander aimlessly and bother people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Interviews 1999-2000

On the other hand, such movements are not always as lacking in purpose or as random as they may appear. A mother of a young man who had been absent told me, “My son has been gone for awhile, who knows where, maybe he’s in Apia or in one of my families.” Upon interviewing her two weeks later, she happily said that her son had returned with a bag of rice and carton of forty-eight cans of fish. The food was the son’s reward for helping his uncle, a house builder. When I asked the son about his recent
whereabouts, he still dismissed it as fealualua’i or tafaofao, even though in the end he had contributed to family welfare. Aimless ‘wandering’ can thus open up new connections and re-establish older ones. Unstructured and ‘improper’ wandering can become useful or culturally appropriate movement as illustrated in the story about a mala\textgreek{a} to fa’ailoa (demonstrate kinship) 1976 to Peva’ia’i, American Samoa:

In the late 1960s, Sio, a flamboyant young man, left his family in Salelologa to go to Tutuila, American Samoa. After living at different places looking for work he finally stayed with a Samoan family with whom he has no blood connections in the village of Peva’ia’i. He became a close member of the family and the family treated him like their own son. Words of Sio’s good work got to his family in Salelologa. The family in Tutuila where Sio stayed wanted to know more about Sio’s ‘aiga. Sio made contact with the matai of his ‘aiga at Salelologa. Soon after, several members gathered to prepare for the mala\textgreek{a}. This included the matai, head of Sio’s family, some tulafale, and five ladies from Sio’s village. Many things were taken, such as special fine mats, sleeping mats, tapa cloth, and Samoan oil, as well as sacks of taro. Upon Sio’s family mala\textgreek{a} arrival, an ‘ava ceremony and a reception was held. Greetings were exchanged, then fine mats, goods, and cash. Many more visits between the two families took place, also at times of fa’alavelave. Later, Sio was bestowed a matai title-Luamanuvae-by his family in Salelologa. In 1999, Sio passed away amongst his ‘aiga in Salelologa.

Under certain conditions, proper mobility can become improper. As a son or a daughter who receives a government scholarship to go abroad to study but fails examinations or becomes involved in drugs brings shame on the family. Similarly, ‘aiga members who hold responsible positions but are terminated for careless and irresponsible behavior bring shame to both themselves and ‘aiga, because their actions during movement have not assisted the family’s reputation and status.
Village Polity: Appropriate Social Behavior and Mobility

As part of social space, mobility is incorporated into larger frames of cultural understanding of behavior. Mobility also ties into village (nu’u) polity and the flow of everyday life. While everyone goes about the business of raising families and improving ‘aiga, by participating in communal activities they also observe well-defined social rules that enhance a cohesive society.

The nu’u consists of pitonu’u made up of clusters of ‘aiga, that in many cases, consists of smaller lineages in established alliances. Personal and family identity is therefore intimately associated with village identity; the two are not easily separated. While physical attributes of the nu’u include houses, people, and domesticated animals, its psychological attributes have to do with how people conceive of the village as a center of personal and collective belonging. Samoan villages are politically autonomous. Every village follows similar protocols of fa’a-Samoa, but particular histories distinguish every such community.

In the close proximity and personal closeness of Samoan society, being a member of ‘aiga is tantamount to being a village member. The matai is the ‘aiga’s representative to the village political forum or fono. On the occasion of saofa’i (matai investiture) each ‘aiga formally incorporates its matai into the fono, thus perpetuating the contribution of ‘aiga to the making of the village. The fono formally acknowledges the new matai, who takes a rightful position in the meeting house as prescribed by the village fa’alupega (honorific salutations). The fono is where all political, social, and economic decisions having to do with the village are made. A significant part of the identity of ‘aiga lies in
the fact that it is involved and recognized by the fono. Thus, each matai and ‘aiga is said to be totonu o le nu’u (inside the village political center).

There are times when a matai and ‘aiga might be excluded from political decision-making in the village, a period referred to as tua o le nu’u (out of the village; not in the center of village decisions). The fines and sanctions a village fono may levy on members of ‘aiga for various offenses also have consequences on people’s mobility (Table 5.4). Matai of that ‘aiga are excluded as the fono adjudicates the fine for these infractions, which depends on the seriousness of the offenses. Politically and socially to exclude someone, means to disconnect them from the center of village decision-making and overall community authority.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature &amp; stiffness of sanction</th>
<th>Consequence on dwelling and mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fa’asala</strong> (to penalise)</td>
<td>A light fine given for misconduct such as swearing at a matai’s wife in public, a fight between relatives, obscene language, shouting at a church gathering, embezzlement of village funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fa’ate’a (to disconnect, exclude) to exclude from the village fono</strong></td>
<td>A fine and the matai is barred from making decisions in the fono when a matai’s family member has been fa’atea for serious offenses such as adultery, beat up a matai, failed to apologize for a car accident, disputed a land boundary, or stolen taro from a neighbor’s plantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fa’atula’i or fa’asavali to pack up and hit the road</strong></td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fa’ato’ele’ele (to disown, disrupt, fall into an abyss, disconnect from soil/land)</strong></td>
<td>Banishment for extremely serious offenses or repeated offenses including adultery by a chief or church minister, incest, land disputes, extreme family disputes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘Oso ma le lau, or ati ma le lau (‘oso is planting stick for taro; remove the planting stick, remove the food)</strong></td>
<td>Same as above, but the food crops of the ‘aiga are also removed from the land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During research from 1998 to 2000, there were several instances of *faate’aga* (political and social ostracism). An individual who frequently incurs *sala* (fine) may be banished from the village and if fines are not paid on time departure may also occur. In many cases, such a person goes to stay with ‘*aiga* in other villages until they have calmed down and are more repentent. Return to the village can occur as soon as the fine is paid, although sometimes individuals decide to stay away permanently. Coming back to the village also depends on the continuous effort of the *matai* to convince the *fono* to allow this, for much negotiation is involved.

In one case, a serious fine resulted in limiting the mobility of a *matai* and his family—a story with a personal side, as it involves some of my own relations. In 1998, Savelio was banished for disagreeing with the village council’s decision to give land at the wharf to government. He argued this land included a plot belonging to his family as had been confirmed in previous court cases. He also thought the deal the *fono* negotiated with government was not in the long-term interest of Salelologa, whereas the village council considered the chiefs and orators to have jurisdiction over the land and that the council’s decision would be final. Savelio then took the village council to court, although to this day this case has not been heard.

Meanwhile, the government went ahead with its plans for resurveying land around the wharf area, and the village council has banished Savelio from Salelologa. Anytime he is seen anywhere in Salelologa, the family or individual housing him is fined, and several fines already have been imposed on his ‘*aiga*. In September 2000, Savelio’s sister passed away and his family announced her death on the radio. Since Savelio is the
matai of her family, his name was mentioned which prompted a fine of $3,000 Tala, along with another for attending the sister’s funeral. As long as Savelio remains stubborn, his chances of returning to Salelologa are slim. In the meantime, Savelio must minimize contact with relatives otherwise they will suffer more fines. The village council’s rationale for banishment was based on what they consider a disregard for the va fealoa’i.

In Sala’ilua: A Samoan Mystery, Shore (1982) analyzes from a structural perspective the murder of a matai and the banishment of his murderer, Tolova’a, along with his family. While Shore is largely correct in delineating the factors that led up to these sad events, the structure of village organization does not alone account for them. Many believe it was a breakdown of va fealoa’i (social respect) between matai and matai, matai and village fono, matai and immediate family that was crucial. The murder victim was considered arrogant, and demeaned Tolova’a during an ‘ava ceremony, thus failing formal village expectations of how a chiefly orator should behave.

Va, social space, is thus a cognitively complex phenomenon. Its structural and social protocols guide the moral economy of fa’a-Samoa and infractions can affect the lives and movement of people. The proverbial expression la laumato’oto’o (To deliberate methodically with care and respect for the dignity of those involved) highlights its significance. In village politics, public image and social harmony are highly important, indicative of a nu’u faimea lelei (good and well-administered village) or nu’u faimea maopopo (cohesive and well-administered village). No person wants to be associated with a nu’u fai mea leaga (village with bad administration, lacking integrity) or a nu’u vaivai (weak village, lacking leadership). To a considerable extent, lack of
social unrest and political turmoil in Samoa depends on the integrity and leadership of the ‘aiga and village fono. National courts in Apia work in parallel with the village fono. They recognize their role when sentencing those guilty of a crime, by taking into account punishments already mandated by fono.

Expulsion or banishment of a family member can be devastating to the ‘aiga, but processes of reconciliation exists. If the member of an ‘aiga has offended against somebody, an ifoga (penance or act of contrition) can be undertaken. Then the high chief and orators of the ‘guilty’ family bow down in front of the victim’s house. Their heads remain covered with fine mats until the matai of the victim’s family uncovers them signifying that the ifoga is accepted. Following reconciliation, the offending individual and family are allowed to return to the village and the matai may participate again in formal decision making. To be returned to the village center and permitted to participate in its administration is known as fa’aa’e.

Banishment is rarely meted out by the village fono, and usually for only extreme offenses. It has a profound impact on individual movement and people’s livelihood especially when entire families are ostracized. Sometimes, the stakes of village politics can lead to expulsion or banishment. In 2001, the Paramount Chief Tuimaleali’ifano Sualauvi Va’aletoa from Falelatai village (Figure 3.1) was fined and fa’ate’a (social and political ostracism) from Falelatai for refusing to step down as an election candidate, after the council had already agreed to support another person, Misa Foni Retzlaff. A fa’aa’e ceremony a year later, brought Tuimaleali’ifano back into the village, as food and fine mats were exchanged and reconciliation made. Misa, now Minister of Finance and Deputy Prime Minister was present. The village council welcomed Tuimaleali’ifano
back and the *Samoan Observer* (March 2002) reported Misa as saying, “I am personally very happy that Tuimaleali’ifano has returned to the district and hopefully this will bring peace to Falelatai.”

Over long swings of time in Samoa, Savai’i, and Salelologa, many forms of mobility have endured, some have been modified, and some have dissipated as new ones emerged. *Malaga* is deeply rooted in the society’s past, so that many forms reflect the vitality and shifting nature of customary life. Mobility also indicates how people respond to the sequence of life events, for as family members grow, marry, and have children, new households are established. But as Subedi (1993, 293) writes, “To leave ‘home’ in the quest for cash for survival, for maintenance, and for improvement in household status is not a contemporary phenomenon and for centuries has quite often driven people away from their cultural hearth.” The cases described here illustrate the political and social aspects of mobility as tied to maintaining a coherent and civil society. As demonstrated, mobility is constantly negotiated around family, village politics, and social exigencies.
CHAPTER SIX

DIASPORA, REMITTANCES, AND DEVELOPMENT RECONSIDERED

In this chapter, I examine the literature on diaspora as well as how those of Salelologa conceive of diaspora. In what is sometimes called the ‘age of migration’ concepts such as diaspora and globalization are being used to describe population movements that reflect the current political configurations of the global economy. The generic use of the term ‘diaspora’ is problematic, however. I argue diaspora includes competing and multiple narratives about places, movements, journeys, and returns. Diaspora as an analytic category only becomes useful when tied to particular contexts. In this discussion, I draw on the works of Avtar Brah (1996), William Safran (1991), Robin Cohen (1997) and James Clifford (1997) to illustrate the currency of the term in general.

I then focus specifically on how diaspora theory relates to fa’a-Samoa, mobility, and place by reassessing how remittances and development are viewed by the people of Salelologa at ‘home’ and at ‘reach’. Remittances and access to moving fafo (overseas) have become central to the sociocultural and political life of Salelologa, but are still evaluated in terms of i’inei (the local). As will be shown, the people of Salelologa have interpreted the fruits of social and economic mobility in their own cultural terms. The dialectical relationship between remittance and development, rather than modernist assumptions about movement’s effect on a society, is therefore the focus of this chapter.
Diaspora: Content and Meaning

According to the World Dictionary, diaspora means a ‘dispersion from’. Hence, the word embodies a center, locus, or home from whence dispersion occurs. It invokes images of multiple journeys. The dictionary also associates diaspora with the dispersion of the Jews after the Babylonian exile. As Brah writes:

In the Jewish example, it evokes a diaspora with a particular resonance within European cartographies of displacement; one that occupies a particular space in the European psyche, and is emblematically situated within Western iconography as the diaspora par excellence. For me, to speak of late twentieth century diaspora is to take such ancient diaspora as point of departure rather than necessarily as ‘model’ or as what Safran (1991) describes as the ‘ideal type’ (1996, 181).

Diaspora as an object of study has gone through several changes over the past fifteen years. A major one has been disengaging it from referring only to Jews and people of African descent. Diaspora has come to refer more generally to any immigrants, expatriates, refugees, guest workers, exiles, and ethnic communities who have left their countries of origin (Axel 1996). Despite the redefinition of diaspora as an object of study, the tropes of slavery and persecution based on earlier studies of Jewish and African diasporas continue to be articulated. In conjunction with problems of the ghetto, the stranger, and the marginal, theorizations of acculturation and assimilation remain central to diaspora studies (see Axel 1996).

Cohen (1997) provides a typology of diasporas: victims (Jews and Armenians), laborers (Indians), traders (Chinese), imperialists (British), and cultural movers (Caribbeans). Such a typology conceals the fact that none of these categories is really distinct. Different people within these groups carry on trade, labor, and cultural activities in the diaspora. Kapat (1999, 789) criticizes Cohen for his “fuzzy definition of diaspora,
his theoretical meandering and selective choice of examples and semi-politicized
treatment of his preferred themes.” He argues that Cohen draws too heavily on his own
background as an international migrant and a member of a counterrevolutionary Zionist
group in South Africa in his youth.

In contrast, Brah (1996) a British Indian, uses the concept diaspora as an
interpretive frame for analyzing the economic, political, and cultural aspects of
historically specific forms of population movements. This suggests fruitful ways to
examine the relationality of these factors across fields of social relations. Brah (1996,
183) writes, “the concept of diaspora offers a critique of discourses of fixed origins while
taking account of a homing desire, as distinct from a desire of a homeland.” This
distinction is important because not all diasporas sustain an ideology of ‘return’. At the
heart of the notion of diaspora is the image of a journey, yet not every journey can be
understood as diaspora. Journeys must be historicized if the concept of diaspora is to
serve as a heuristic device. The situatedness of each diaspora is central to how different
groups come to be relationally positioned in a given context.

Safran (1991, 83-84) provides six criteria that constitute a diaspora. Such
populations: 1) are dispersed from an original center to at least two peripheral places; 2)
maintain a memory, vision, or myth about their homeland; 3) believe they are not and
perhaps cannot become fully accepted by their host countries; 4) see the ancestral home
as a place of eventual return when the time is right; 5) are committed to the maintenance
or restoration of this homeland; and 6) define their group solidarity by this continuing
relationship with the homeland. There is a danger here of constructing a definition that
identifies the diasporic phenomenon too closely with one group. Large segments of the
Jewish historical experience do not meet Safran’s last three criteria. There is little room in Safran’s definition for the principled ‘ambivalence’ about physical return and attachment to land that has characterized Jewish diasporic consciousness. Moreover, Clifford (1997, 249) writes, there is a “teleological assumption of return to a single ‘center’, the Holy Land”

Contemporary Diaspora in Oceania

Just as the Samoan term malaga (movement back and forth) cannot be equated with ‘migration’, the terms fa’ataafea or aunu’ua, meaning to be exiled or float away without roots do not coincide exactly with ‘diaspora’. To be aunu’ua is to be somebody without nu’u, without the spiritual and cultural soul of a village. The term ‘diaspora’ was used during the German administration in the late 1890s, when Samoan chiefs and orators such as Mata’afa Iosefo, Namulau’ulu Lauaki, and I’iga Pisa were exiled to German colonies on Jaluit Island, the Marshall Islands, or the Northern Marianas for disobeying Governor Solf (Meleisea 1987). This concept of diaspora does not sit easily with Samoans who recall previous colonial experiences. To speak then of contemporary Samoan movements as ‘diaspora’ is to elide different contexts, times, and places of contemporary movement.

The voluntary movement of Samoans has been widely documented, prompted by families and the drive to develop their households by becoming part of the global flow of labor. As is well known their main destination is New Zealand, but some have also moved to California or Australia, even to Canada, Turkey, and Singapore. As with other
Pacific Island nations, their choice of destinations shows ongoing affiliation to their colonizers.

Individuals do not decide alone to cut ties and ‘emigrate’ to make their fortunes in foreign lands, however. Their decisions are made collectively in their families in order to diversify income streams. Nor are these movements prompted by religious or political persecution since they remain linked to the homeland. None of the members I interviewed see their movement as part of a ‘diaspora’. But the notion of diaspora as originating from a locus, center, or home does apply to their ongoing social ties with Salelologa. Qualitatively different from other diasporas, however, is the lack of a sense of victimhood or view of the homeland as something that has been lost and needs to be retrieved. Samoans are oriented not so much to roots in a specific place and a desire for ‘return’ as around an ability to recreate a culture in diverse territorial places. Thus, their spaces of movement would not be considered a diaspora by Safran. For Samoans, overseas or foreign countries have become incorporated into the socioeconomic sphere of their natal place. This is reflected in the comment, ‘O ‘outou ‘i fafo i Niu Sila, Ausetalia po’o Amerika ma matou i’inei, o tatou ‘uma lava lea e tasi (You guys in New Zealand, Australia, and America and us here in Samoa are one). Much like Rensel (1993, 237) has described the Rotuman community in Fiji similarly “as part of a single, multilocal community”

Studies of mobility and identity amongst other Pacific Island nations suggest similarly that people mainly move as part of a household strategy to take advantage of new socioeconomic opportunities (Underhill 1989). For example, Young (1999) draws on Brah’s notion of ‘diaspora space’ to emphasize the construction of indigenous
identities in conjunction with migrant identities in diasporic discourses. He argues that for the Lauans from an outer island group in Fiji, “diaspora is constituted by a constellation of ideas, and narratives that include constructions of indigenous cultural identities and metaphors” (ibid., 14). Lauans move in and out of Suva and Lau, and become more connected with Fijians in Wellington. In addition to the support that Lauans offer their kin in Fiji and New Zealand, important connections remain open through their regular movements to Lau.

Pessar (1997) observes that over the course of her research on Caribbean migration she has come to question the very meaning of the term ‘return’. The bipolar settler/sojourner model has become out of date as there are few cases of definitive return but many of “transnational mobility and transnational relations” (Pessar 1997, 3). Similarly, studies of labor migration from Mexico into the United States show that social networks enable domestic households to pursue economic strategies in defiance of national borders. As migration processes become institutionalized, they coincide more with family development cycles than with national immigration or trade policies. Such diasporas create a holistic circuit that Roger Rouse (1999, 44) calls “an alternative cartography of social space.”

Salelologa population movement connects those in fafo and i’inei within the context of fa’a-Samoa. Members remain socially linked unlike peoples who have been uprooted and disconnected from their home (e.g., Armenians, Jews, or Africans). Salelologa remains as central to members’ abroad as it is amongst those physically residing within their ancestral natal place. Although Salelologa remains the primary
'home', fafo are becoming acceptable alternative centers for congregating. Fa'alavelave and social gatherings are held either in Samoa or overseas wherever convenient.

Fa’a-Samoa is an identity that is bigger than the nation because it is unrestrained by territorial boundaries. This lack of confinement to a particular place complicates reading of Salelologa movements as ‘diaspora’ normally constituted by the desire to return to a nation-state. The deep commitment to keep up fa’a-Samoa can be read as a diasporic process, however, because it does link Samoans across time and space irrespective of territorial boundaries.

**Remittances and Development**

As discussed, movement abroad is undertaken in order to obtain incomes that can be remitted to Samoa to develop the ‘aiga. I therefore examine conventional interpretations of the impact of migration and remittances on development in Oceania (e.g., Connell 1983; Shankman 1976; Ward 1989) and contrast them with alternate views presented by Maiava (2001), O’Meara (1990) and Va’a (2001).

Development is imbued with the western notion that tends to equate it with rising national incomes and GDP. Development scholars assume that “industrial capitalism is not going to be overturned and that modern science and technology can solve all human and environmental problems” (Jacobs 1999, 7). This paradigm is overly economic, materialistic, technological, problem-solving, and focused on maximizing returns. Other interpretations of how people might ‘develop’ with respect to the wider environment are excluded from the debate. If, as Escobar (1995, 13) insists “development is a discourse”, 238
then it follows that we should be able to address alternative understandings of
development and human betterment.

The literature on remittances and sustainable development in the Pacific Islands
are almost always framed in terms of GDP, the rise and drop of remittances, and the
impact of economic development on a country. The emphasis is on predicting whether
GDP is likely to go up or down. Shankman’s (1976) study on migration and
underdevelopment focused on Sa’asi, a few selected communities from the 350 villages
on two islands of Samoa at the time and set the stage for future research not only on the
country, but also for the Pacific by other scholars such as Connell (1980, 1983) and Ward

Shankman’s (1976) central focus was on the relationship between migration,
remittances, and underdevelopment. He stresses dichotomies between rural and urban or
village and metropolitan areas. His preoccupation with the economics of wage labor
leaves him little room to examine the meanings of ‘migration’ for Samoans. Instead, he
focuses on the dependency of those who remain on those away. His study presents a
picture of a heavy ‘out migration’ at the other end of an interactive process.

Almost twenty years later, based on brief visits in the 1980s to Samoa and general
observation of migration studies, Shankman (1993) describes the sending of remittances
as still occurring, despite his predictions that it would taper off the longer migrants were
away. He observes (1993, 163) that “Remittances are not large enough for investment in
large scale development or capital equipment, nor was there much incentive to invest.”
By emphasizing capital investment, he misses the importance Samoans give to meeting
the everyday needs of families. He only sees remittances in terms of the dominant
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development discourse, and fails to problematize return migration. As Young (1998, 60)
oberves, “Scholars continue to see movement as a primarily behavioral response to
socioeconomic circumstances.”

The studies by Connell (1983) and Ward (1980) present similarly pessimistic
views of Pacific Island migration which, when linked with remittances and aid, are seen
prophesizes that the South Pacific might one day become bereft of indigenous people, a
mere playground for tourists and laboratory for academic researchers. Again, Pacific
Islander conceptions of ‘support’ remain in the background and migration and
development remain largely unproblematized.

The frequent citation of these studies in the literature makes it seem as if the
complex, lived reality of mobility and socio-economic change has been accurately and
completely described. Development for Samoans does not mean simply replacing fa’a-
Samoa with a rising GDP. Willing to change and desiring greater material wellbeing for
themselves and their families, they nevertheless also care to support an underlying moral
economy. In 1985, Bertram and Watters formulated the MIRAB model—Migration
(MI), Remittances (R), Aid (A), and Bureaucracy (B)—which presents a theory that is
more relevant to Samoa.

As discussed in the first chapter, the MIRAB model acknowledges the important
contribution of migration and remittances in the development of Pacific Island nations.
The authors suggest that this represents a “sustainable” development strategy, as long as
the “rent” from remittances and international aid can be obtained for an indefinite period
(Bertram 1993). An uneasy feeling is generated from close reading of the model,
however, in that some development experts tend to look at remittance-driven economies with a certain degree of scorn, calling them “rentier economies” as if it is somehow inappropriate to live off international aid and migrant remittances (Poirine 1998, 65). MIRAB theory illuminates some of the elements in the Pacific micro-economies which depend for their solvency upon migration, remittance and aid (James 1993), but operating at an abstract level, it emphasizes the impact of colonialism, modernization, and the integration of Pacific Island states into the global economy. Lastly, it fails to completely explain the persistence of remittance flow even during severe and bad economic conditions in locations abroad.

MIRAB assumes a dichotomy between economic development and social development and distinguishes between ‘productive’ capital improvement and social improvement seen as unproductive. Hau’ofa (1993, 8) distances himself from this pessimistic MIRAB thesis by encouraging Pacific Islanders to first think beyond the spatial confinement of the islands, and secondly to re-arrange their conception of Oceania as a “world enlargement” for Pacific peoples. Hau’ofa argues that migration is not a modern phenomenon in the Pacific but a cultural characteristic that can be traced back thousands of years. He stresses that most of the movement in the twentieth century came about not as a result of a great many individual decisions but of families acting collectively. Each Pacific Island state, has also independently chosen to articulate in varieties of ways with the market world system. The reasons for moving are not simply economic but are complexly tied to social, cultural, and political factors. Commenting on the debate on remittances, dependency, and development, Hau’ofa (1993, 13) writes that,
“For everything homeland relatives receive they reciprocate with goods they themselves produce. This is not dependence but interdependence.”

Maiava, a New Zealander married to a Samoan, examines these concerns in A Clash of Paradigms: Intervention, Response, and Development in the South Pacific (2001). Examining how cattle farming has been incorporated into Samoan cultural practices, Maiava tested four common assumptions made about Samoa through indepth field inquiries in Fagamalo village on Savai’i: 1) Samoan culture is a constraint to development; 2) that fa’alavelave constrain development; 3) fa’alavelave are of no intrinsic use and 4) Samoans kill breeding cows for fa’alavelave without understanding their economic worth. Maiava (2001, 2) did not find any evidence to substantiate these four assumptions, and asked, “Had development practitioners fallen into the trap of accepting perpetuated myths as truth, reinforced by frequent requoting?” She blames modernization theory for perpetuating ethnocentric concepts such as economism, social evolution, and the superiority of Western culture. She writes, “This led to a paradigm of development that was overly economic, materialistic, technological, problem solving, and return maximizing, and that considered social concerns as being of separate and secondary importance” (ibid, 7).

Modern development theory has been automatically transferred to Third World contexts as though it were a culturally neutral paradigm. This has resulted in major misunderstandings of Third World cultures. In Samoa, this includes a failure to recognize the social and economic importance of fa’alavelave. “Reciprocity, which results in a long-term trend towards equivalence in traditional societies, and social status gained by generous giving, provides a very important incentive to produce which is little
recognized” (Maiava 2001, 9). When interviewing parents in Salelologa, I enquired what motivated them to send their children overseas. Many pointed to the need to develop the *aiga*. A leading orator summarized this as follows:

In Samoa, it is hard to save to build a substantial house, as we know now. So many families do this. We send our children overseas to help us achieve these goals. In Samoa, we have land we get our basic needs here but it is difficult to save enough to build a house, or buy a car. The hard currency that comes from our children is more efficient, the biggest contribution comes from our relatives overseas. Look around us, many of the new houses, television sets, even cars in some families are all provided through the love from our relatives, especially our children overseas.

Sina, his wife, succinctly put it, “E tautala a le alofa mai fafo, e tautala a le tupe ma i fafo, e tautala a galuega mai fafo” [The impact of love from overseas speaks louder, money from overseas speaks louder, action from overseas speaks louder]. The material improvement in Savai’i communities provides tangible reminders of the love and commitment of overseas relatives. Reciprocity of equal proportions is not expected. Investment is a cultural strategy for making sure those at ‘home’ living on the land are taken care of. It is assumed that the pathways of those *fafo* and those *i’inei* will continue to cross at other places and times. From the local point of view, as Hau’ofa has emphasized, this is interdependence, and not dependence.

International level

The major sources of foreign income for Samoa are agricultural exports, remittances, foreign aid, and a growing tourist industry. Of these factors, remittances have become a major source (Table 6.1). Exports from the land and sea include coconut, cocoa, banana as well as timber and fish. Although they represent the largest sector of
the economy, fluctuation in production and world commodity prices have affected export earnings.

Table 6.1 Main Earners of Foreign Exchange (Samoan Tala in Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Exports</th>
<th>Tourism</th>
<th>Private remittances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>82.0*</td>
<td>100.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>107.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>115.2</td>
<td>109.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>125.8</td>
<td>132.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>135.1</td>
<td>145.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Fairbairn 1991; Va’ a 1995; Bank of Hawai’i 1997; Government of Samoa 2001; Country Profile: Economic Intelligence Unit 2002

* an estimate from 25.1 million Tala reported for the first quarter multiply by 4
* an estimate from 41.0 million Tala reported for the first half of 1996 multiply by 2

Complicating matters is low productivity and the need for more effective measures for insect and disease control. In 1990 and 1991, Samoa was struck by devastating cyclones that caused considerable damage to both agriculture and infrastructure. Recovery was just commencing when taro, the country’s major food crop and export earner, was
infected by a leaf blight in 1993. It had a direct impact on taro production and exports from 1993 onward.\(^1\)

Tourism is recognized as one of Samoa’s principal growth sectors, and the government has worked toward making it more so in recent years. Foreign exchange earnings attributed to tourism were estimated to be 41 million Tala in the first half of 1996 and at 82 million Tala a year, tourism earnings would be roughly equal to overseas remittances (Bank of Hawai’i 1997, 14). Tourism earnings have increased so constantly since 1996 that, in 2001, the Minister of Finance noted that they had reached 133 million Tala in the previous year, second to income earned from remittances (Figure 6.1).

International mobility has therefore had a profound effect on the nation. From 1980 to 1985, the country earned over 196 million Tala from remittances from overseas Samoans. The remittance proportion of the GDP rose from 11 percent in 1980 to about 28 percent in 1985 (Department of Economics, Western Samoa 1985). These personal transfers, which are dominated by remittances from Samoan residents overseas, totaled over 92 million Tala in 1990 and have nearly doubled in value since 1985. The Central Bank of Samoa (1990) reported that approximately three quarters of all remittances are from overseas Samoans, 20 percent come from churches and non-profit organizations, and five percent goes to expatriate Europeans working in Samoa. Of the remittances received from overseas Samoans, 52 percent come from New Zealand, 30 percent from

\(^1\) According to Australian International Development Assistance Bureau (AusAid) report, in 1992 agriculture which includes forestry and fisheries contributed 40 percent of GDP, 60 percent of employment, and 80 percent of export earnings. Total loss to agriculture from the early 1990s cyclones was estimated at 200 million Tala, 57 percent of GDP, and it was not until 1995 that coconut production began to return to pre-hurricane levels. The main economic story of the 1990s has been the near complete recovery from two highly destructive cyclones, and the government’s agenda to raise economic growth through privatization and economic diversification.
the United States, nine percent from Australia, six percent from American Samoa, and three percent from other countries.

Figure 6.1 Main Earners of Foreign Exchange (Samoan Tala in Millions)

Source of data: Table 6.1

A report conducted by the Bank of Hawai‘i shows that Samoa’s gross national income (GNI), which includes income earned abroad, exceeded the GDP by 28 percent in 1992 (Dahl and Johnson 1997). They consider such an unusually large proportion of remittances in foreign exchange a rare phenomenon in the Pacific and write:

Large differences between the GNI and GDP have been common in small-oil and other natural resource-rich countries that invest some of their income overseas. Unlike the resource-rich small economies of the Middle East that dominate this category of economies, however, Western Samoa has achieved its distinction on the strength of its people (1997, 10).
In the early 1990s, observers like Ahlburg (1991), Connell (1991), and Macpherson (1992) speculated that remittances might decline in the future because of changing lifestyles amongst expatriate Samoans, when except for drops to about 73 and 80 million Tala in 1991 and 1992, they have increased steadily (Figure 6.1). In 2001, the Minister of Finance stated that “The drop in export earnings was largely compensated by the strong inflow of remittances which recorded 145 million Tala in 2000” (Government of Samoa 2001, 3). Conveniently, the remittances give the government of Samoa time to seek and develop other income and foreign exchange sources.

Annual growth of remittances has slowed from the 1980s to the 1990s and now mirrors the general growth rate of the Samoan economy. Economic data from the Economic Intelligence Unit (EIU) and Samoan government publications indicate that, in a seven-year interval in the 1980s, the value of the Samoan economy doubled but that of remittances almost quadrupled (Table 6.2). In a comparable seven-year interval in the 1990s, the Samoan government economy grew about 189 percent and remittances by a similar proportion.

Table 6.2  Percentage of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and Percentage of Remittance Growth, 1982-2000 (Samoan Tala in Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>GDP growth (amount)</th>
<th>GDP growth %</th>
<th>Remittance growth (amount)</th>
<th>Remittance growth %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982-1989</td>
<td>124-248</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>23.2-87.4</td>
<td>376%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-2000</td>
<td>409-775</td>
<td>189%</td>
<td>80.5-145</td>
<td>180%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fairbairn 1991; Country Profile: Economic Intelligence Unit 2002
Examination of year by year data shows remittances growing from 18 percent to 35 percent of GDP in the 1980s, but remaining constant at 18 percent of GDP in the decade of the 1990s (Table 6.3). This simple comparison can lead to the perception that growth in the percentage of remittances sent by overseas Samoans, while remarkable in the 1980s, has slowed and now mirrors that of the national economy. This has led some to remark that overseas Samoans are not remitting with the same generosity in the 1990s as they did in the 1980s (Ahlburg 1991; Macpherson 1992).

Table 6.3  Gross Domestic Product and Remittances, 1982-2000 (Samoan Tala in Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gross Domestic Product (GDP)</th>
<th>Remittances</th>
<th>Remittance % of GDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>132.1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>145.0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Country Profile: Economic Intelligence Unit 1992-2002; Fairbairn 1991

*Hurricane Ofa and Valelia data are sporadic and not available
However, two important facts must be considered. Between the decades of the 1980s and the 1990s, Samoa was victim to two destructive hurricanes, ‘Ofa in 1990 and Valelia in 1991. This led to great destruction of agriculture and infrastructure, followed by significant increases in aid from foreign sources along with technical and economic assistance. In response, the government shifted from a more centralized approach of five-year plans to embrace greater privatization and market-driven growth in counting what was once a ‘remittance’ now being called an ‘investment’. In the decade of 1980s, the value of the Samoan Tala fell precipitously on foreign exchange markets, but in the decade of the 1990s it remained relatively stable. Between 1982 and 1989 the Tala fell by almost half its value, from US 81 cents to US 43 cents, paralleling the change between the 1980s and 1990s in the relative contribution of remittances to GDP (35 to 18 percent).

Because overseas Samoans earn their wages in American or New Zealand or Australian dollars, when the Tala was devalued in the 1980s, Samoans living and working abroad earned far more comparatively if converting money from metropolitan currencies. Therefore, from a Tala point of view, they had become ‘richer’ and could remit more. By contrast, in the 1990s, the Tala was fairly stable on foreign exchange markets so that from a Tala point of view, the worth of wages earned overseas by Samoans remained similarly stable. This is reflected in remittances holding at a constant rate of 18 percent of GDP throughout the country’s economic growth in the 1990s. In all likelihood, the overseas Samoan was remitting at about the same rate of generosity in the 1980s as the 1990s, but the impact of foreign exchange rates made it appear less generous than in the 1980s.
This economic analysis, based on detailed estimates made by Ian Fairbairn, a Samoan economist, is consistent with the data drawn from my interviews with overseas Samoans in Auckland and Santa Ana. Members at fafo continue to be generous with their remittances, on average sending each year in aggregate more than the previous year. There are ups and downs in amounts sent, but neither western acculturation and consumerism, nor number of years away or length of travel time to Salelologa, result in a decline of generosity.

'Aiga level

In the 1990s, a remittance-decay hypothesis by Forsyth (1992) reflected rising concern by some Pacific specialists (Ahlburg 1991; Connell 1990) about the sustainability of remittances and economic development as a result of lower migration rates, recession, and a decreased willingness to remit. The argument was flawed in relying on secondary data for balance of payments figures and making crude estimates of migrant numbers in host countries (Brown 1998). Brown and Walker (1995) tested the hypothesis in 1994 by surveying 609 Tongan households and 367 Samoan households in Sydney, Australia. They used multivariate regression analysis to delineate the functions of remittance and found that the remittance-decay hypothesis had no empirical validity. Migrants are motivated not only by altruism but also by the intention to accumulate assets and make investments back home.

One difficulty with assessing remittances is that cash and non-monetary items carried by traveling relatives are not captured by the formal banking system, so that national figures for total remittances are significantly understated. In the same survey
conducted in Sydney in 1994, Brown (1998) reported an average of AUD $3,162 for Tongan households and AUD $2,464 for Samoan households, far higher than usually estimated. The next year, also for Sydney households, Va’a (2001, 177) arrived at an average of AUD $2,708 in contributions. From a total annual amount of AUD $325,075, almost all was sent to Samoa, where 84 percent of the recipients live, 16 percent went to New Zealand, and less than one percent of each to Tonga and the United States. Most recipients were close family members: fathers, mothers, brothers, or sisters. Va’a found that contributions were to help with basic necessities such as food and education, as well as for fa’alavelave and to enhance the social status of families.

Given my goal to understand the dynamic interplay of different pieces of the intricate realities of remittance behaviors, I chose three households as case studies (labeled P, Q, and R). These households were seen not to be ‘representative’ as in a random sample but to convey events which exhibit the dynamics of ‘aiga, fa’asamoa, and mobility. Members of households P, Q, and R were asked about the number, type, and destination of contributions, supplemented by interviews with Salelologa people at ‘home’ and at ‘reach’. The rich details provided are used analytically to illuminate the purposes of remittances, cultural change, and patterns of reciprocity.

Both cash and the amount spent on items like food, medical supplies, radio or stereo systems, home appliances, and clothing were recorded. Except for big durable items for households Q and R, the value of small goods are added into the cash totals. Money is usually sent through Western Union, established in Apia in 1995, and in Salelologa in 1997. Prior to that, the most common medium for remittances was through the post office, which continues to be used on occasion. Briefly, for all three households,
spending on fa’alavelave is infrequent, but the outlay higher than for day to day events. Funerals, matai investitures, or weddings require large sums of money. There has recently been a rise in fa’alavelave costs, for legal land or title claims, or to pay village fines. A large part of contributions goes to other purposes, including paying for school fees, buying linens and cutlery, unexpected debts, international airfares of relatives, gifts when Samoans visit malaga, and supplementing the general income of families.

Three Households: P, Q, and R

Household P represents my own family, which includes the ali’i titles of Tinousi and Luamanuvae, two of three described in Salelologa’s charter of honorific salutations. Most members are located in Salelologa but some are in New Zealand, the United States, Australia, or American Samoa. The household includes three generations, beginning with my mother, who is now in her early seventies. She has eleven children, six girls, four boys, and one adopted son. The eldest daughter, who became a nun in 1977, now works in Turkey and the eldest son passed away in 1997. The others range in age from mid-forties to mid-twenties and, except for the youngest son, all are married and have their own children. Grandchildren range from two to twenty-two years of age. Five children live overseas, four of whom are women, two daughters are in Auckland. The older one went there in 1988 and the youngest daughter in 1995. Another daughter has been in American Samoa since 1988 and I left for Hawai‘i the next year. The adopted son also went to Wellington in 1988. One daughter and two sons live in Salelologa and one son lives in Apia. Although all overseas children in Household P send remittances, details were not able to be obtained from them all. Totals for all three households have
been converted into American dollars, the 2002 exchange rates for which were about one American dollar equaled three Samoan Tala and two New Zealand dollars.

Over the years 1996 to 2002, the daughter in American Samoa sent goods such as food items, paper products, laundry powder, and special goods needed for fa'alavelave, while those from Auckland and Hawai‘i usually contributed cash (Table 6.4). The average each year, from the three locations (New Zealand, Hawai‘i, American Samoa) is, $5,706.

Table 6.4  Remittances from three locations, 1996-2002, Household P (US dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hawai‘i</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
<th>American Samoa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$2,387</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$2,220</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$995</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$3,018</td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$6,101</td>
<td>$5,150</td>
<td>$780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$1,533</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$1,753</td>
<td>$475</td>
<td>$2,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total US $</td>
<td>$18,007</td>
<td>$7,650</td>
<td>$9,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ‘Reach’ household survey 2002
Figure 6.2  Contributions sent to Household P, 1996-2002

Source of data: Table 6.4

Table 6.5  Distribution of Remittance Use for Household P, 1996-2002 (US dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>For Other Purposes</th>
<th>For Fa'alinave</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2,787</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>4670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,958</td>
<td>4,685</td>
<td>6,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>10,830</td>
<td>12,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,883</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>4,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,218</td>
<td>22,314</td>
<td>35,532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ‘Reach’ survey 2002
Almost two thirds of contributions were used for fa’alavelave and a third for other purposes (Table 6.5). The sudden increase during 2000 was due to renovating a house, a funeral, and defraying the cost of village fines. The fono (village council) fined our ‘aiga because the name of a banished matai cousin, Savelio, was broadcast on the radio in an announcement of death of his eldest sister (see Chapter Five). If the fines that Savelio had thus incurred were not paid, it would have meant everybody related to him-our entire ‘aiga would have been banished. In 2002, another fine was paid because Savelio attended a funeral of an elder matai in Salelologa.

*Household Q* consists of four generations, with grandparents in their eighties. The head is a matai and one of six senior orators of the subvillages of Salelologa. He and his wife have nine children, three boys and six girls, the eldest of whom is in his late fifties and the youngest in her thirties. All children have married and had children, who now have their own. Three daughters are overseas, in New Zealand, the oldest since early 1970. Her two younger sisters followed in the 1980s. A son moved to Australia in the 1980s, and another son has lived in Santa Ana, California since 1968. The grandparents remain in Salelologa with their eldest son and three daughters, until the grandfather passed away in February 2001. All children in Australia, New Zealand, and the United States traveled to Samoa for his funeral.

Details of remittances for household Q refer only to the Santa Ana members of the extended family and especially to son lese who is a manager at the Phillips Tire Company in Fullerton. He is married to an American and they have four children and two grandchildren. Siblings in New Zealand and Australia also send money to the family in Salelologa, but details were not available, although lese noted that his sisters were
more likely to provide items like clothes, food, and small amounts of cash needed everyday by the parents.

Table 6.6 Remittances sent from Santa Ana, California, 1999-2002) for Household Q (US dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>22,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>376</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>286</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,076</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>18,461</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>29,741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ‘Reach’ household survey 2002
Over the years, 1999 to 2002, remittances sent by lese (household Q) averaged $7,435, often in large amounts for specific purposes (Table 6.7). Half were used for *fa’alavelave*, the largest contribution of $14,883 being for his father’s funeral. Lese also sent a car in 1999.
Table 6.7 Distribution of Remittance Use for Household Q, 1999-2002 (US dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>For other purposes</th>
<th>For fa’alavelave</th>
<th>Goods (car)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3,580</td>
<td>14,883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,883</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,741</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ‘Reach’ household survey 2002

Information for Household R came from a relative who had traveled from Auckland, New Zealand, to visit her mother in Hawai‘i. She brought a parcel from my sisters in Auckland and it was during dinner at my house that the interview took place. Although Household R is not from Salelologa, issues such as the relationship between fa‘a-Samoan aiga, remittances, and mobility mirror the experiences of other extended families in Samoa.

This household of three generations consists of parents in their late fifties and ten children: six girls, two boys, and two adopted girls. ‘Ofu, the source of this information, lives in Auckland with her husband and four children. She works part-time for the Manukau City Council and the husband has a taxi business. ‘Ofu’s father was a senior orator who followed a career as a public servant in the government of Samoa before moving to New Zealand in the 1990s, then to Hawai‘i in 1995. He founded a Samoan church in west ‘Oahu, where he was minister until passing away in May 2000. One son remains on the family land in Vini with the rest of the extended family, while one of the daughters in Samoa is married to a
church minister stationed in a village outside of Apia. One son has lived in Nevada since 2002; one daughter had been recruited in the military at North Carolina. One daughter is married to a marine and lives at Kaneohe Marine Corps Base in Hawai‘i, while the remaining daughters lived with their mother until April 2003 when she returned to Samoa following the death of her husband.

Each year, from 1996 to 2002, ‘Ofu sent an average of $3,531, mostly to siblings and relatives in Samoa and some to the husband’s side of her family (Table 6.8). The fact that ‘Ofu’s parents had not lived in Samoa for some years meant that many contributions were for airfares for family members to travel overseas, while in 2002 a car was sent to a sister (Table 6.9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>8345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>9050</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>24,720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ‘Reach’ household survey 2002
Figure 6.4 Contributions Sent From Auckland, 1996-2002, Household R

Source of data: Table 6.8

Table 6.9 Distribution of Remittance Use for Household R, 1996-2002 (US dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>For other purposes</th>
<th>For fa'alavelave</th>
<th>Goods (car)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>8300</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>10,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>4500</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,720</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ‘Reach’ household survey 2002
Household Remittances and their Implications

When remittances for all three households are combined over several years, fa`alavelave account for half, but these particular cash outlays are infrequent and higher than for everyday events. A further 16 percent were to purchase cars and 33 percent sent for various other purposes. Although the needs of Salelologa households vary, all contributions reflect the interconnection of both traditional activities and modernizing influences of Samoan life. Large amounts were used to purchase a truck or agricultural equipment for a coconut or taro plantation or to invest in a taxi, as evident in the increasing number of cabs in Salelologa.

Within households, reasons for remittances vary (Figs 6.5a, b, c). Parents of the two households (P, Q) who spent most money on fa`alavelave (Fig 6.5a) live in Saleloaga itself, which shows that when key relatives are domiciled in Samoa, greater amounts tend to be given. All three households contributed to funerals, two for parents, but the largest expenditure on fa`alavelave (household P) includes two funerals (1997, 2000), two investitures of matai (1999, 2002), and two sets of village fines (2000, 2002). Also in 2000, some money was used to renovate a house.
RECEIVED
AS
FOLLOWS
Figure 6.5a Percentage of Remittance Used for Fa'afavelave

- Household P: 49%
- Household Q: 32%
- Household R: 19%

Figure 6.5b Percentage of Remittance Used For Other Purposes

- Household P: 45%
- Household Q: 17%
- Household R: 38%

Figure 6.5c Percentage of Remittance Used For Purchase of Car

- Household P: 0%
- Household Q: 68%
- Household R: 26%
Remittances used for various other purposes (Fig 6.5b) include church- or village-related events, school fees, airfares for relatives to travel abroad, purchases of linen, cutlery, food, small appliances or medical supplies, as well as money to supplement family income. When parents live overseas, as for household R, ‘aiga and family events tend to gravitate away from Samoa, so that most outlays are for international air tickets, for small appliances for relatives to take back to Savai’i, or for gifts. Large contributions, as for cars (Fig 6.5c), may reflect solid permanent jobs and higher incomes (household Q).

Information about different places of 'reach', gained from both the survey and indepth interviews, resonate with Quan-Bautista's (2001) findings on Satowan atoll, Chuuk. One is that although males remit larger amounts of cash, the money sent by females tends to be less, more frequent, and for everyday items needed by parents, such as clothing, food, or medicines. This is certainly so for lese and his sisters (household Q). By contrast, the two households consisting mostly of females (P, R) also followed the pattern of remitting large contributions for fa’alavelave and small, regular amounts for various purposes. This suggests that the income of a household membership and the kind of activity needing assistance influences how much money is sent far more than gender.

The high percentage of contributions for fa’alavelave appear to support Shankman's (1976) thesis on remittances and underdevelopment in Samoa: namely that remittances tend largely to be redistributed within the 'traditional economy' or to be used for personal consumption rather than invested in capital gain. As already noted, this assumes that the 'traditional economy' is static and unchanging; it also pays far too little
attention to the social, political, and economic contexts within which all fa’alavelave occur. As reported by Va’a (2001) for Samoan households in Sydney, Australia, donors and recipients are close relatives—parents, siblings, nieces, nephews, cousins, uncles, aunts—and large fa’alavelave expenditures include home renovations and the purchase of automobiles.

The ‘reach’ survey, as well as conversations and interviews, do not confirm that increases in the socioeconomic status of Samoans and economic independence from the ‘aiga are correlated with a decline in remittances or participation in fa’alavelave, seen as an indicator of traditionalism. Kallen (1982) and Shankman (1976), among others, argue that the more Samoans get accustomed to western individualism and consumerism, the less funds those living overseas will have or want to send back to Salelologa. From a strictly economic perspective, this might be true, but the saying, ‘E mativa fesaga’i le Samoa’ (Samoans face each other irrespective of social and economic status) means that the links between people and the relationships through blood and marriage are far more important than material things. Each member has roles and responsibilities to fulfill. Tautua (service) still requires that one’s resources be placed at the disposal of the family, including ‘intelligence’ from formal education and ‘strength’ derived from wage and salaried labor.

Scholars have observed that, as people increasingly form households independent from the ‘aiga, the economic role of the matai becomes eroded. Discussions at ‘reach’ confirm this, but it is a shift that is slow, gradual, and subtle, rather than immediate as implied in previous studies (Freeman 1984; Kallen 1982, Shankman 1976). A fa’alavelave cannot be sufficiently and effectively carried out without service and
monetary assistance from the extended family. Outside observers have assumed the matai is a central and controlling force, who receives money to be used to meet the goals of everyone. However, this treats matai as external to the ‘aiga, when in many cases they are father, uncle, cousin, or brother. When a fa’alavelave is planned, all parental households of an ‘aiga gather contributions, which include giving money to the matai. In addition, overseas relatives send remittances to their parents or siblings to be distributed at their discretion.

Recent experience among Salelologa households also suggests remittances needed to pay village fines is rising and increased frequency reflects socio-political and cultural change in Samoa, as well as how modern population movements are affecting fa’a-Samoa. Members living in New Zealand, Australia, or the United States have more resources and more access to money which can be used to demand greater influence in selecting matai. Families incur the usual administrative and legal fees, in addition to which families involved in such cases are now expected to feed the fono council members who come to tapua’i (pray for the best solution to the problem). Samoans are ambivalent about the exact role of fono in family matters and are beginning to question their increasing involvement. The fono’s ability to remain impartial in light of increasing bribes has become a concern, making it especially difficult when fono members are related to those involved in petitions and counter-petitions. Rendering fair decisions is undercut by kinship affiliations and while the court seems to provide a last resort, it does not always have the final say. In two recent court-cases, finding the pule (authority) of an orator-title, the fono thought the matter should be returned to the village and be settled according to Samoan custom. Once the fono had gathered back in the fale talimalo.
back in the village, food and cash were given by those families involved in the court action.

Finally, discussions, interviews, and formal questions emphasized the strength of links between Samoa, New Zealand, and the United States. Although the flow of remittances is mainly towards Samoa, as a lynchpin connecting all members, assistance also goes to those living abroad. While those in Samoa send mostly fine mats and items of traditional wealth, cash comes mainly from overseas. The sending of remittances is determined by cultural appropriateness, although actual amounts are somewhat determined by the economic contexts and constraints of different localities.

**Salelologa, Auckland, and Santa Ana, California: Members and their Stories**

Biographies and personal testimonies were gathered to learn the thoughts and hear the concerns of Samoans about issues of development, mobility, ‘aiga, and fa’a-Samoa. Movement and access to fafo is today seen in Salelologa as the prime means for improving one’s economic position. Although overseas movement is theoretically open to anyone who can gather the small amount of capital needed for an airfare, quick access to fafo tends to be through channels of kinship with ‘aiga members overseas. Local people have been resourceful ‘consumers’ of new opportunities. Movement is not a static relationship between labor suppliers and receivers, but a continual negotiation between parties. To portray Samoans as simply reacting to the pressures of an exploitative labor market, as suggested by the structural and dependency models, is to simplify the complex mixture of individual gain and opportunism, dependency and vulnerability, which so often characterizes overseas movement.
Persons of Salelologa in Auckland and Santa Ana, California were encouraged to talk about their mobility experiences. One, now living in New Zealand (lineage A) had this to say:

Lineage A

I came to New Zealand in 1968. My wife’s family from Lefaga, from Upolu Island, helped us come here. When we came, we stayed with my brother-in-law for a year before we moved to our own place in Ponsonby. Our eldest son was born in Samoa. We came here when he was a two-year old. Altogether, we have seven children. Six of them were born here. In those days, it was easy to get work. I could easily leave one job for another if I didn’t want it and get two or three jobs if I wanted to. I remember thinking that I wanted to make a significant change in my own family and my family in Samoa. In Samoa, life was hard. We came from humble beginnings, eh? I did not have the education you guys have now. I did not want my children to work in the kind of job I was doing, like factory work. I made sure my children were reading books and did their homework; watching TV was not allowed. They rarely watched TV. I believe because of that discipline my children have good jobs and are doing quite well in their careers.

In those days, I had one good pair of slacks and that, I saved and wore only on special occasions. I spent 10 shillings for lunch; that was all I spent each day and I saved all my extra money. I had a savings account that I did not tell my wife about. I had also begun to save to build my parents a better house. In those days, the payment for the house was $15NZ a week; if a house was $30NZ that was considered expensive in those days. The pay was low but the cost of living was cheap too. Then in 1969 your father, Lilomaiava Niko, asked me if I could sponsor ‘Ano and Lafaele [my cousin and oldest brother] to come. In 1969, they came and stayed with us for a year before they moved out.

For me, I made myself a promise that when my eldest son turns 10 that was when I would allow myself to drink beer again, just to celebrate. My only form of relaxation was the weekend social dance at the Congregational Christian Church at Mata’aga Hall at Grey Lynn. That was like the thing all of our Salelologa bunch and other Samoans looked forward to in the weekend. All of us like Malia, Ano, Lafaele, and other Salelologa would meet there every single Saturday. It was fun! I believe that is where many of the weddings that follow started (laughs).

In 1972, we brought my sister Seine who is now in Australia, she moved there in 1990. Then my brother Fiu Ta’afuli who is in Wellington. My parents came to visit in 1973 and for Seine’s wedding in 1975. I also went in 1974 to Samoa for our matai investiture in the Luamanuvae title.
bestowed by your father, Lilomaia va Niko. There were five of us during our matai investiture, myself together with Sili, Savelio, Sa, and Fa’atau. It was a big occasion. In 1976, I went again for my father’s funeral.

When I went for my father’s sudden death, I did not know what to do. It happened on the weekend and the banks were closed, you know, so I took my savings bankbook to the travel agent to hold for my ticket, and he was satisfied. He let me go because I had about $2,500 which was a lot for someone like me in those days. We began building our house and in 1978, we moved to our own house in Mangere when it was almost done. When we applied for a loan to begin our house, the bank people were surprised that I had a down payment.

**How do you see your role now that you are matai?**

Speaking as a matai now, I have many responsibilities, not only here with our church and family but also in Samoa. Whenever something happens the guys in Samoa call here. My mother passed away in 1991; we all went for that. For example, since 1991 I have been going almost every year to help with fa’alavelave such as doing court cases concerning land and titles. For example, we had a court case concerning our piece of land at the wharf, a title at Sakalafai [a subvillage near the wharf]. I have won each of the court cases. I believe it is because of God’s blessing for all the good deeds that we’ve tried to do for the ‘aiga and the community. In 1983, I helped my family with a court case. It was about getting compensation from the government for our piece of land where the Post Office at Salelologa stands. I came back when it was done, but the compensation was still worked out. Those guys in Samoa got something, I heard about $2,000 Tala. Well, they distributed it among themselves (laughs) and I did not get any of it! That’s OK, I just want to make sure the right channels were followed and done properly in order to get the money.

**Apart from these events have members of your ‘aiga visited you?**

Yes, of course my nephews and nieces visit quite regularly. In fact, Vasati, my nephew’s wife, was just here last week.

**Lineage B**

I came to the United States in September 1968. I came on a Methodist Scholarship as a student. I vividly remember that date. I came on Pan Am via Tutuila, American Samoa with a stop in Hawaii, then L. A. I was really shocked and amazed when I arrived at the L. A. airport. I still
remember those days. I was quite lonely and homesick, but I knew I had to endure this. As soon as I set foot here, I knew what I wanted to accomplish. I knew that life in Samoa was hard, you know, the hardship. You know things were hard to come by, like there were no paved roads, few cars, no electricity, no running water, no flush toilets, so I wanted to help my parents. I tried very hard in school. English was difficult but I tried my best. Through trial and error and a lot of perseverance I finished school and got a good job. I am still working everyday. It's getting easier, but there are always new challenges. As a manager, we have to know about affirmative action, sexual harassment, all those issues here in California. You have to be careful and make wise decisions, eh?

My dad was a fisherman; that was our main source of income. When we got home after school, my eldest sister, Tausiva, and I went right to the wharf to meet our dad who had just come in from the reef. We would separate the fish: ones for our food and the extra fish we made into strings of fish to sell in the village. We used that money to buy our pencils and books for school. We had one book each, if we were lucky two for all the subjects for the whole term. I remember my mother, Faletolu used to tie our pencils in a string and we hung these around our necks. And God forbid we lose that pencil, we'll get a big hiding. We used to weave coconut baskets for our schoolbags; those were our bags in those days.

The other source of income was from making copra. We used to take our baskets of copra to Fa'alenu'u and Lilo's store [my parents' store] at Foua in those days to weigh. We did all these chores, but once these were done we could play and play to our hearts content until the bell rings, you know, about 6:30 p.m. for prayers. And we have to get in the house for prayers and dinner.

When I came to America, I saw this wealth and plenty of things. You know, the American dream, anything is possible. It is there for those who see it. Unfortunately, some of us did not take advantage of it, but I came and was determined to make sure I do not fall in the cracks. I know my family was struggling to improve, so I wanted to help my parents. I think that my upbringing really helped me survive and think clearly. It was not easy, but I always remember my parents and God first. I also got married and my parents came for the birth of our first baby in 1973. We had three more children. All of them are doing quite well. We are now grandparents. In 1975, I went for my saofo'a'i [matai investiture] in the title Pipi.

**Where do you consider home?**

My love and commitment for my wife and children is undeniable, but my commitment and love for my parents and Samoa is equally strong. For now, my family is my first priority, but if Susan goes first then I will consider returning to Samoa. The kids can come and go. I have visited
Samoa many times and my parents and siblings have visited as well. I took one of my sons for the first time in 1998 and he absolutely loved it our village, Salelologa.

**Did your relatives come here?**

Yes, we brought my younger brother Tevita to America in the late 1970s you know, to work, but it did not work out. After a few years, he went back to Samoa. Now, he lives in Australia. Tausiva, my eldest sister, and her family have visited us in Santa Ana and my parents. And we have gone to Auckland to visit my parents several times while they were visiting with my three sisters.

**Are there other ways this love and commitment to family and Samoa can be shown?**

Yes, through phone calls, sending money, they call and tell me about a fa'alavelave and we send money. Do you remember that hurricane Ofa and then hurricane Valelia in 1990 and 1991? We sent a container of goods: bags of rice, flour, sugar, salt, canned food, clothing, some farm equipment. I also had these bundles of fine mats, about fifty of them from fa'alavelave that I go to here. I gave them those, too, to use for their fa'alavelave.

Lineage C

I came to the United States in 1973. My uncle Ti’a Lavilavi brought me via American Samoa, where I was staying with my brother Sitivi. I stayed with my uncle up in San Jose until I moved out on my own. I brought my younger sister Leata in 1980 and then we brought our younger brother Pesaleli in 1982. Leata got married in 1986 and my mother and her friend, Teuila came with my uncle, Luamanuvae Vaosea, for the wedding. My mother and older sister came to visit in 1990 and went back. Leata has been back to visit a couple of times and so have I. Pesaleli is getting ready to go with his children this summer. In 1992, my father came to visit and later in the year Leata, Pesaleli, and I sent our parents a truck which dad uses for the plantation.

**Have you spoken to your parents since then?**

Yes, we often talk on the phone. In fact last month my uncle and mother called from New Zealand. They went there for my cousin’s wedding. One of my aunts lives there and her daughter was the bride. Our mother called;
they wanted some *mumu*. I said, don’t you have *mumu* in New Zealand? She said, yes, but American *mumu* are more stylish, different from here and some *tu* [Samoan colloquial term for dough, money] (laughs). So Leata, Pesaleli, and I collected some money and sent to Auckland with the *mumu*. You know, you can’t send only the clothes.

The themes that emerge from these stories about movement and mutual support focus on caring relationships and describe more than the pursuit of wealth for wealth’s sake. Moving overseas, leaving Samoa, has specific Samoan meanings. Each of these household members built *palagi* (European homes) for their parents in Samoa during their early years of living abroad. While members mention being ‘poor’ in material things, a stage in modernization theory which every society naturally experiences and survives, members are not poor in spirit and *fa’a-Samoa*. Moving for them is about self-determination as the *‘aiga* take advantage of opportunity. In their terms, taking the risk of going to New Zealand or America is part of *fa’a-Samoa*. Money and economies fluctuate, outsiders come and go, but the values of *alofa* and *va fealoa’i* keep the members of *‘aiga* integrated. *Fa’alavelave, alofa,* and *tautua* are hardly cultural deficiencies, but values and social strategies demonstrating the distinctive cultural competencies of *fa’a-Samoa*.

Young (1998, 43) explains that “The term ‘migrant’ is associated with the constructions of race by the state that are linked to discourses of difference.” The term ‘migrant’ becomes a dismembered construct in which people are seen as ‘out of place’, despite migrant expressions of identity involving continuity with their home communities. Clearly, the people in these stories do not conceive of themselves in these
terms, for they remain part of the collective ‘aiga. Those who go abroad do so to earn a better future for their ‘aiga and themselves. While their experience mirrors the classic story of the migrant who face problems of adaptation and acculturation, severing ties with the original culture is not evident. Instead, there are crisscrossing economies and intersecting systems of meaning, that both define and pursue socio-cultural and political purposes.

Remittances and moral imperatives

Rather than merely talking about dollar figures and how much people sent in remittances, people interviewed in this study discussed their relationships of ‘aiga. These, along with kinds of fa’alavelave, determine how much to send and whether all household members must be physically involved. Relatives discuss involvement in fa’alavelave in degrees, influenced by their personal relationships and the values of alofa (compassion), tautua (service), and va (social space). Contact is maintained through letters, phone calls, and traveling. Continual communication is considered as important as exchanging money and goods, so that i’inei and fafo measure closeness in terms of who keeps communicating and participating in family events. Those who constantly interact are said to have malosi le alofa (strong love), those who sporadically communicate have feololo le alofa (medium love), those who hardly interact have vaivai le alofa (weak love), and those who do not communicate at all have leai se alofa (no love).

In discussions, I enquired when a person might be considered inside or outside of fa’a-Samoa. Most agreed that those who invariably attend to ‘aiga and fa’alavelave are
the most involved, citing strong, medium, weak, or no love as a yardstick measuring involvement in fa’a-Samoa. However, nobody considered being inside or outside of fa’a-Samoa as dependent on location. Those in Samoa and overseas were weighed on the same scale of involvement. A mother of five put it succinctly:

No Samoan with all their different caveats [whether full Samoan, part European, part Chinese, or whatever] in Samoa or overseas can live without doing fa’a-Samoa. They will always do something one way or another. Just giving any little money for any fa’alavelave is doing fa’a-Samoa. We cannot write off our kin members based on whether they give remittances or attend fa’alavelave or not. They are our body, flesh and blood.

Thus members of Salelologa households interpreted others in terms of their fluctuating natural fickleness, but implied that malosi le alofa (strong love) is an invincible source of strength no matter what temptations are faced to abandon one’s ‘aiga. References to the bible, including the Ten Commandments, the Beatitudes, or Jesus’ Sermon on the Mount pepper their comments, along with Samoan proverbs that rationalize fa’a-Samoa relationships. The proverbial expression, ‘Ua ‘ai ‘ulu tuana’i Ta’isi (They eat breadfruit, and forget Ta’isi) is commonly used. It refers to an incident when an orator from Asau village went to Ta’isi, a chief of Safune village, during a famine and begged for some breadfruit for his family. Ta’isi gave the orator lots of breadfruit, but later when Ta’isi needed help, the orator didn’t return the favor. Relatives who have gone overseas and gained plenty of material things such as food, money, and goods may be criticized if they seem to have forgotten their ‘aiga and their humble beginnings in Samoa. Those overseas may likewise express discontent if their interests are not taken into consideration by kin in Samoa when making decisions about land and titles or if their tautua are taken for granted. However, these kinds of sentiments are
quickly forgotten as soon as relatives revive communication. Parents may then invoke
the Parable of the Prodigal Son, love and forgiveness, to make sense of a ‘lost’ child who
has returned. Even kin members who decide to cut ties cannot completely escape being
part of their ‘aiga. Kinship relationships may be central or marginal at different times,
but they never disappear from one’s consciousness. Even if remittances are not
forthcoming, kin and other social ties are never terminated.

At both ‘home’ and ‘reach’, I discussed the theory of dependency amongst those
in Samoa, Savai’i, and Salelologa. Parents tended to be pragmatic about this issue,
generally viewing money as only a means to an end, rather than a determinant of their
relationships. Rather than feeling that they had become dependent, parents noted the
reasons for sending children overseas and values of *alofa* and *va fealoa‘i*. The exchange
of money and goods is a manifestation of compassion, not merely an economic
transaction. An untitled man in his twenties, very interested in this question, believed the
fundamental thing that keeps Samoans together is *alofa*, not the ties of remittance. An
elderly lady quoted the Samoan expression, ‘*E manatua le alofa ‘ae le manatua fa’alaeo*’
(We remember love and sacrificial deeds but not personal gratification and selfish deeds).

Kamu (1996, 52), in his study of the relationship of Samoan culture and the
Christian gospel explains that “A Samoan’s wealth is not measured in how much he has
in the bank, but in how many friends he has. Sharing with others is an honor, linked not
only to the usual *fa’alavelave* and everyday practices, but also to Samoan attitudes
toward personal and group achievement.” Thus, members view remittances as one way
of measuring the dynamics of kinship, mobility, development, support, and caring. Such
a viewpoint contrasts with most scholarship on the economics of mobility, where
‘profiteering’ is seen as the ultimate goal of migrants, a perspective that in turn concludes remittances will not be sustained over the long haul. My findings suggest, however, that given the nature of fa’a-Samoan relationships and values, remittance flows are likely to persist from locations abroad even during times of poor economic conditions.

Fa’alavelave, Status, and Alofa

In the following interview, lese recounts the recent funeral of Pipi Esera, his father and matai of Household Q.

I have three sisters in New Zealand, a brother, and nephew in Australia. I went to the funeral myself. I would say since 1992, I have traveled every summer to see my family, my parents. But since October 2000, I have been in Salelologa for the last months of my father’s life. At home in Salelologa, I have an older brother and two sisters, all married with children, plus our parents. My older brother is Fiu Sa but he recently got the matai title. Pipi. I am also a matai with the name of Pipi but I got mine in 1975. It was on one of those trips that I talked with Pipi Sa and asked him about his game plan. When I went again to Samoa when dad was dying, we had a discussion with all my siblings. All my brothers, sisters, and I planned the funeral arrangement of our father. I asked Pipi Sa about his thoughts, since he is the oldest and is there, eh? My brother said, “He does not want any pusua ‘apa [cartons of fish], he prefers only pigs and cattle.” I said, “Well, that is fine with us.” All of us agreed with doing away with cartons of fish.

I, speaking on behalf of all of us overseas, said to Pipi Sa and our relatives in Samoa not to worry about coming up with cash. Their job is to make sure we have enough fine mats, and tapa, you know the more traditional stuff. Also, to pay special attention to the implementation of the funeral process, such as the accepting and hosting of visiting families to the funeral. While us, the ones from overseas would provide all the cash to buy ingredients to make food for lunch and goods for the ceremonial gifts. We calculated that we needed twenty-six sua. In Salelologa we have ten
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2 Pipi is one of the six senior orator titles in Salelologa. The other titles are Matamua, Tautua, Pauli, Seumanu, and Fiu. In traditional ceremonies, these orators debate finding a speaker for an occasion.

3 Gifts bearing tribute to important family connections or dignitaries, a vital expression of love and respect in both times of celebration and need; gifts consist of either a pig, piece of beef meat. Today, pig is substituted with carton of fish, or mutton, or keg of corned beef. Finemat and tapa are essential elements,
church ministers so there was a sua for each of them. Then we have the
district, village, and dignitaries from the government, because dad used to
be a pulenu'u [government liaison] in the village. There will be others of
course, along the way, but this twenty-six was used as a base to begin
with, eh... (laughs).
I calculated that all of us from overseas, that is, my brother Tevita, nephew
Fa’aiu from Australia, my three sisters from New Zealand Tausiva,
Vaisola, and Tufosa collected about $70,000 Samoan Tala. About
$27,000 Tala cash only was collected from all the si’i alofa [presents from
relatives] brought by ’aiga based on connections through our father, our
mother, through the spouses of my siblings, our nieces and nephews, or
through uncles and aunts. On top of these si’i alofa there were those si’i
alofa from where my father used to work as a pulenu’u.
There was the women’s group vigil at night while the body lies in state,
and the unexpected guests, you know. As you know in any fa’alavelave,
the host family always prepares in advance supplies of fine mats, goods,
pigs, cattle, food and so on for the occasion so that when relatives and
guests arrive they are given things different from what they brought, so the
understanding goes. So, we bought cases of frozen lamb and chicken,
cases of beef, and pigs. There were five cows and ten large pigs.\(^4\)

**Why did your family decide against cases of canned fish?**

We believe that we have seen cases of canned fish too many times in
fa’alavelave that they have become ‘cheap’, meaning anybody can have it,
but pigs and cattle have more value and therefore more esteem. We
wanted to use the best there is for our father’s funeral. If there were cases
of canned fish, they would come from other families who came to the
funeral.

**So the families who brought cases of canned fish were reciprocated
with a carton of mutton or case of beef, the supplies you had?**

That’s right, these are all the things we have to think about in the caring
for the people, the relationships, that’s what we often mean by to decorate
or embellish the va [social space].

**Any thoughts about the whole thing, this fa’alavelave?**

\(^4\) The estimated price for a cow today is 1,000-2,000 Tala; for a large pig 600-1,000 Tala, depending on
size. A carton of fish is 100 Tala.
In the end, dad’s funeral was a big success and we think people went home very content. At least that’s what people have told me. I was amazed and in fact very proud of the old man. The place was packed. Like a parade of relatives... There were so many ‘aiga who came that day. Our parents must have been so good to all these people who came. You know how busy and excited fa‘alavelave can get. It was great to see the love and pride in people’s faces. The ladies were doing their thing: cooking chop-suey, curry, cutting vegetables. The ladies in the house displaying the fine mats, young men roasting the pigs, butchering a beast and distributing it when the matai asks them, the kids doing little chores, and the matai in the house hosting, visiting ‘aiga. We were so busy. I saw many relatives I have not seen in a long time, mainly because I am here in California but they always interact with the guys in Samoa.

**Wow it sounds beautiful...Expensive too, eh!**

Yeah, but what’s new? We did our best, the last thing for our father. So now, it’s back to work again. After dad’s funeral, I told my mother, it is now time for you to travel, no reason for you to be home-bound. We went home to Salelologa to visit last summer, 2001, with my wife for the first time. And we came back with my mother and brother, Pipi Sa. It was my wife’s first trip to Samoa and my brother’s first trip to America.

Table 6.10 presents complete details for a Samoan funeral held in Hawai‘i in May 2000, for Household R. This reveals that despite the great expense of mounting a funeral, a net income often results for the immediate family of the deceased. O’Meara (1990, 205) describes the funeral of a chief in Satupa‘itea, Savai‘I, with a net income of $1,024 Tala; the funeral for Iese’s father netted $5,000 Tala; and the one in Hawai‘i provided US $78,900 to the deceased’s wife and children. Most of the fine mats were also distributed among the ‘aiga and friends who came from Australia, mainland United States, Samoa, and New Zealand, and some were given to church members and others who helped with various tasks. On being asked about the astonishing number of fine mats at this funeral, ‘Ofu said they had to shift to the church hall because they ran out of room; the two bedrooms in the church minister’s house were both full to the ceiling with mats.
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All fine mats came in bundles, each family bringing a gift of (say) 300 mats presented in 30 of ten mats each, with a good fine mat topping them all. One challenge for the host family was to devise a strategy to sort out all those mats and reciprocate appropriately, without offending anyone by returning what they had given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.10</th>
<th>Funeral Receipts and Expenses, Hawai‘i May 2000: Household R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Host family receipts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount from dad's ten children</td>
<td>$ 46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount from wife's family</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Si‘ialofa</em> (gifts from relatives, colleagues, and friends)</td>
<td>$ 344,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Receipts</strong></td>
<td>$ 410,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Host family expenses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burial materials (casket, cemetery, morgue, clothing)</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods purchased for reciprocating: 300 cartons of corned beef, 300 cartons of chicken, 200 kegs of beef, 20 pigs, 22 cows</td>
<td>113,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterer</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic Goods</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 yards material for gifts</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Haul Rental</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>145,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Amount spent reciprocating gifts from church ministers, choir, youth clubs, and 'aiga | 146,000 |

| Amount spent reciprocating wife's family | 40,000 |

| **Total Expenditures** | 331,100 |
| **Amount spent reciprocating wife's family** | $ 331,100 |

| **Net Income** | $ 78,900 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account of Finemats</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total fine mats received</td>
<td>21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine mats given in reciprocation</td>
<td>17,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net fine mats</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ‘Reach’ survey 2002
Scholars and development experts (Connell 1990; Shankman 1976) often describe fa’alavelave as draining people’s economic resources and a customary practice that squanders economic gains made by Samoans. Blaming fa’alavelave for lack of economic development reflects a failure to understand different values and multiple purposes set within particular cultural milieu. As noted in chapter five, there are multiple purposes of fa’alavelave and why it remains central to Samoan social life. Leaiataua Vaiao and Fay Ala’ilima (1994, 248) sum it up, “Fa’alavelave are a way to maintain an active connection with relatives, lands, titles, and dignities, they are a support network that will help one in times of need.”

Unlike business transactions in which making a clear profit is the ultimate goal, in fa’alavelave social, political, and economic goals are constantly intertwined and negotiated. Generosity fulfills social and political goals even if the result is an economic loss although, as the above examples reveal, not all fa’alavelave reach this result. A matai investiture results in a ‘loss’ as the ‘aiga invest in the new title holder, but a funeral often provides the mourning family with a monetary gain. Pipi Esera’s funeral described by lese netted $5,000 Tala to be distributed among the resident ‘aiga members who had contributed to the fa’alavelave. All the remaining cash was given to Pipi Esera’s widow and those of his children living in Samoa.

Building status is another aspect of fa’alavelave, although it is not the supreme or only motivation as scholars like Alan Tippet (1971, 151) have claimed: that seeking prestige is behind all Samoan “ostentation and generosity.” As seen in lese’s detailed
account, Samoans are endlessly concerned with retaining family status, honor, and reputation. This competitiveness takes place within a context of such social values as love, respect, and obedience. Parents teach their children these values and have them further reinforced by Christianity. Thus Iese relates the desire of his family to present only pigs and cattle at the funeral not only as a symbol of status but also as an expression of their love, respect, and tautua for their father. Cattle were introduced in the 1920s during the New Zealand colonial administration. Unlike pigs and chickens, which are domesticated animals and indigenous to Samoa, cattle are not. Cattle are high maintenance animals and so quite expensive. Thus cattle have become a status symbol much “like the status symbol of remittances from overseas, cattle have been incorporated into the moral economy” (Maiava 2001, 136).

Movement abroad has clearly had a profound impact on the scope and visibility of fa’alavelave activities and at least half of their funding comes from overseas relatives. Since access to fafo provides both the economic and symbolic capital, a Samoan overseas can command as much social and economic power as those living on family land. Following (Bourdieu 1977, 171), overseas movement, production capacity, and knowledge of fa’a-Samoa are all possible non-material investments which can provide “symbolic capital”, each can potentially be converted into economic capital in situations where physical conditions are insecure, and over the long run symbolic capital is often more important than economic capital.

---

5 Basic to this understanding of sharing is the giving not for self-glorification but it is done for the glory of God. It is not only a response to the human needs, but more to a response from the heart to the love of God, whether it is individual or communal (Kamu 1996, 55).
In Salelologa, this is becoming clearer where the access of families to overseas relatives provides both economic and symbolic capital. Close kin living abroad not only generate remittances, but also gain social prestige and knowledge, or ‘cultural capital’ from having been abroad. Other sources of non-material capital in Salelologa include educational achievement, athletic prowess, or proceeds from ventures in Apia which also can generate political, social, or economic power. In this sense, economic position and social power are inseparable.

Modernity and Ambivalence

To fully appreciate the interplay of cultural frames of reference, economic change, and people’s ambivalence, something should be said about Samoa as a place. Compared to other Third World places where poverty and extreme ecological imbalances exist, in the Pacific Islands economies may still be said to be fairly ‘subsistence affluent’ (Fisk 1986). Although Samoa’s economy has become increasingly dependent on imported goods and services, most households on the four islands have access to garden lands and reef resources. Samoans, therefore, can obtain a subsistence living from the land and sea.

The introduction of a modern cash economy over the last two hundred years has resulted in a mixed livelihood of cash and subsistence. As Samoa has become integrated into the global economy, people’s aspirations have risen but the government’s ability to keep up with the pace of development has lagged. Although there is no poverty in Samoa, it is hardly the paradise portrayed on film or in tourist brochures. People want improvement in their lives, but rely on family members instead of government to achieve
such change. Eighty three percent of Samoan land is held communally and, as elsewhere in the Pacific, land (fanua) has many physical, social, and cultural dimensions.\(^6\) Land and livelihood are closely linked for, as Ravuvu (1988, 76) writes, “A land without people is likened to a person without a soul. The people are the souls of the physical environment…land is thus an extension of the self.” Samoan social identity is firmly based in the corporate ideology of kin group and communal land. Land is a source of spiritual nourishment, political and economic power. Consuming the produce of the land is equated with consuming the power and energy which sustains life.

Samoans judge a place not only in terms of the economic power it may provide but also by the quality of life and satisfaction, akin to spiritual nourishment, able to gained there. Overseas lands are sometimes presented as glittering places where ‘milk and honey’ are supposed to flow freely, until Samoans experience first hand the biting reality of life overseas, when those domiciled in Samoa visit and see kin fako holding down three or four jobs to make ends meet. This, plus the impersonal nature of life in America or New Zealand where ‘everyone knows no one’, has made those in Samoa reevaluate their perceptions of life overseas. Similarly, for those living abroad, the comparative ease of life in Samoa where people can eat by just saying ‘Please’ and few pay any rent makes them reevaluate their options and alternatives.

Salelologa people constantly weigh the costs and benefits of movement and development. Asked about the power of fako, members were quick to make a comparison of the large numbers of homeless people and poverty in the cities of America and New

\(^6\) Fanua in Samoan or vanua in Fijian, whenua in Maori, fonua in Tongan or honua in Hawaiian is a metaphor for land, sharing the same meaning of soil as the source of livelihood for the people.
Zealand. One male in his late-forties living in Santa Ana, who was preparing to return home with a container full of vehicles, describes his feelings:

After working for seventeen years in Garden Grove Santa Ana, I decided to pack it and go back to Samoa. I am tired of getting up every morning at 2 a.m. every single day, sick from the monotony of work and lack of fulfillment in my life. I got early retirement and I bought three taxis, a truck, my personal car to start my business and help my 'aiga.

This is the “transnational space” (Small 1997, 193), where personal and social identities are simultaneously constructed in a transnational social field by those in fafo and those i’inei. Whether in Samoa, America, New Zealand, or Australia, movement is part of being Samoan and does not involve emphasizing rural-urban, village-metropolitan, or tradition-modern dichotomies. Instead, cultures and practices are blended, incorporating and appropriating foreign things into fa’a-Samoa. The people of Salelologa are not being swamped by modernization or overwhelmed by globalization. While individualism and images of corporate America as signifiers of an ‘ideal lifestyle’ are increasingly obvious, Samoans constantly conduct their own appraisals of life i’inei (Samoa) and fafo (overseas). Competing discourses about Samoa as a nation, village life, and overseas experiences are evaluated but not cast into the stark dichotomies suggested by academic conventions.

So far, the discussion has built on the notion that movement is a cultural process, which questions the distinction scholars tend to make between places rural and urban. The twin metaphors of i’inei and fafo are mutually interdependent, so that images of fafo are affected by how people view i’inei. Local constructions of fafo have much to do with conditions in Samoa, as with the objective benefits of overseas movement. The plenty
seen to be available in fafo becomes a metaphor for the relative scarcity of i’inei.

Movement means that people’s relationship to i’inei has changed and fafo has become a dominant myth for those who have never been overseas.

However, as argued, movement and development are interpretive processes and culturally defined. Samoans do not like being poor, but they value their culture highly, are proud of their kin groups, and enjoy the public displays that bring them together and provide a sense of shared history, tradition, and identity. To the hardcore economic analyst, this sounds elusive and regressive. Ambivalence, the holding of two opposing views or emotions at the same time, is a way of dealing with such contradictions. Ambiguity and ambivalence provide opportunities to explore the costs and benefits of moving, the decisions of what to keep and what to discard. Paradoxical as they appear, ambivalence and ambiguity are an essential part of the dynamic process of culture. The solution for Samoans is not to reduce their degree of involvement in tradition but to increase their access to the resources needed for that involvement, thus keeping their communities alive, integrated, and distinctive.

Asesela Ravuvu (1992, 88) points out that confidence and security derive from membership in kin groups in Pacific Island communities. Kinship provides a grounding in a volatile global world. If ‘corporate America’ has taught Samoans anything, it is that corporations will not rescue the average American in times of trouble. Although perhaps all humans want a ‘good life’ and access to the ‘goodies’ that enable them to achieve that dream, the process by which such goals are achieved vary. For Salelologa society, caring and concern expressed through alofa (love) and tautua (service) are central guide posts.
which form the core social fabric of a Samoan interpretation of movement and
development.

In *malaga* (movement), Samoans rely on their kin as “social capital, the
relationships and institutions on which they could depend for moral support and mutual
aid” (Cornell and Hartmann 1998, 214). The institutional completeness of the ‘*aiga* has
greatly helped Samoans adapt to life overseas (ibid, 215). In Salelologa, population
movement has a much deeper impact than pure economic gain. The saying, ‘*E tupu mea
foa’i* (things that are given keep growing), expresses the belief that those who have *lima
foa’i* (giving hands) are abundantly rewarded. Such responses and or rewards do not
necessarily occur in the same form they were given. Gifts, money, blessings, and success
are all intertwined, since *alofa* (love) is equated with *tautua* (service). The values of
*alofa* and *tautua* remain inherent in the movement process.
CHAPTER SEVEN
MULTILOCALITY: ‘HOME’ AND ‘REACH’

This chapter demonstrates the multilocality of place and its influence on identity and mobility. I use Shore’s framework for understanding fa’a-Samoa conceived as malae (village social and political center) and outer areas, then look at the transnationality of the people of Salelologa at ‘home’ and at ‘reach’ (i’inei and fafo). Contemporary inter-penetrations of the matai at ‘home’ and at ‘reach’ are also examined.

The cultural metaphors of i’inei and fafo are conceptually similar to the twin metaphors of ‘home and ‘reach’ when members speak of the interactions between places, people, and movements. Theirs is not an abstract intellectual concern but a focus on concrete links, interactions, and transactions that contribute to the color of specific places i’inei and fafo. I draw on interviews of Salelologa members at ‘home’ and at ‘reach’ to investigate mobility of household members.

In the second part of the chapter, I turn to the concept of transnationalism in examining how fafo and i’inei are linked in Salelologa, Auckland, and Santa Ana. I eschew romantic notions of the Samoan village in favor of an approach that recognizes the potential of transnationality for engaging power in oppositional spaces. Salelologa discourses on fafo and i’inei oppose i’inei as a source of spiritual, sacred, and material sustenance, against fafo as a source of economic power.
The relationship between 'aiga and fanua is not confined to the access family members have to land. The soil of i'inei and the shared blood of relatives are metaphorically and physically mixed together. More than simply a physical place or resource, land expresses wider notions of identity, group membership, and belonging. Individual land plots are less important than general conceptions of fanua ma 'ele'ele (land and soil) and nu'u (village). Land and home are closely linked, as an intrinsically social concept. Home is where one’s family is, or in Sarup’s terms (1984) where people share the same basic substance. Since the social group with whom one identifies alters according to context, i'inei can refer variously to nation, region, village, or household. However, while the environmental characteristics of the land may be altered by hurricanes and cyclones individuals are tied to i'inei as much as to their kin. I'inei remains fixed for it is defined socially as the place where one’s lineage originates.

Land is a vital component of the relationship between movement and the most basic unit of social organization, the ‘aiga because the proceeds of movement are ploughed back into the soil of i’inei. This process is continually modified by the enduring contradictions of movement. Although i’inei and local relations are always invoked, family members are always separated because of movement away from i’inei. As mobile as the people of Salelologa appear to be, they remain tied to the village of origin. The attachment to an identity associated with ‘home’ combined with the continuing mobility of people demonstrates the paradox of mobility. Over the years,
people have also developed linkages and sociocultural and economic networks with outside communities through mobility.

The *fanua* Salelologa residents occupy today is an ancestral birthright which has been cultivated by members of the same ‘*aiga* for generations. The meaning of the land on which they live is not limited to a capital resource but is considered a symbol of their ancestry and history. Every household in the village has land that has been handed down from generation to generation. Permanent change of residence is rare, but *malaga* (mobility) is a common way of life. The paradox of mobility and immobility are represented in daily conversations, as when a senior orator commented:

No matter where we go, we know that our existence derives from our land. Our land is the center of our collective identity, the places of belonging, our genealogical lineages, roles, responsibilities, and heritage. Land, family, and *matai* are what center us, our sense of identity as Samoans. Our land may be lacking in resources, impoverished, and unproductive, but that won’t diminish our love, care, and respect for our land because land is our gift from God, to care for and cherish. Our forefathers have passed on, but they left these trusts for us to care for and pass on to the next generation.

In other parts of the Pacific Islands, *fanua* is also linked closely to conceptions of social identity. Asesela Ravuvu (1983) explains that indigenous Fijians have strong attachment to and veneration of place. Kinship ties are tied to descent and the soil, or *vanua*. Margaret Rodman (1987, 35) describes that in Vanuatu people speak about their “home place” rather than house and describe themselves as *man ples*, ‘local person’, linking people to land. In a similar manner, the cultural geographer Joel Bonnemaison (1994) captures the paradox of rootedness and mobility in the metaphor of the ‘tree and canoe’ in his study of the Tannese of Vanuatu. The tree signifies the rootedness of Tanna
people, while the canoe symbolizes their social routes and wanderings across an expansive territory.

In applying the metaphors of ‘home’ and ‘reach’ to population mobility in agriculturally-based villages in eastern Nepal, Subedi (1993) also argues that ‘home’ represents more than just a dwelling and its physiographic boundaries. It is ancestral and spiritual land, equally powerful as sources of individual and group identities. ‘Reach’, rather than ‘destination’, identifies places visited or resided as part of this mobility dynamic, but ‘reach’ is also considered a station, suggesting that most villagers never intend to abandon their rural communities (Subedi 1993, 221). In short, movement is not simply a response to some ‘outside’ influence but a social and cultural collective reality. ‘Reach’ does not imply a dispersing, fragmented, or disintegrating community, but a territorial distribution of kin still firmly rooted in an identity of place of origin. Further, Subedi (1993, 200) argues that “unlike many developed societies, individuals in agricultural societies have strong feelings about their home and are closely attached to it.”

Although the above example is taken from rural agricultural communities in South Asia, many of the sentiments described apply to Samoans and other Pacific Islanders. People of Salelologa and of Savai’i have been defending their *fanua* from foreigners and other Samoan families for years. *Fanua* remains both a tangible (physical) and intangible (spiritual) space to which they belong, embodying the ancestral past and the present. In 1999, Luamanuva Poe, a senior *matai*, in his late fifties visited his sister in Auckland, New Zealand for three months. In an interview about place, identity and mobility, he observed:

...
My first time to travel overseas was to New Zealand in March 1999. I was very free, happy, not many fa’alavelave as in Samoa. New Zealand, like America and Australia, they have lots of things to satisfy you, good food, your mind is free and you don’t worry each day about where to get something for the fa’alavelave. This is unlike Samoa where we have this and that to do such as collect money from the women’s committee, the church committee, or village committee. There is nothing like that overseas, so you have more time to think of God, only God, and you, most of the time, you are at peace (laughs). I was very relaxed there. I enjoyed it very much. My sister was very kind.

**What else did you think about this experience?**

I began to feel, boy this is the life, no headaches, food is good…You know, at times I felt like I wished I could stay for good, seeing all the wealth. I seriously thought that when I return I would prepare my wife for us to go overseas for a better future for the kids. And the thought was to go for a couple of years, then come back. We weren’t planning on going for good because we cannot abandon the ‘aiga. Well, I got to Samoa and my mind was confused. I realized yes, I was happy in New Zealand, but somehow something else was bothering me as I contemplated this thought, plus my wife was ambivalent too. Then I realized, I can’t leave this place because it is where my heart and body belong. I have the ‘aiga to look after. Maybe I am too old to move.

Luamanuva Poe’s account was echoed in subsequent interviews in Salelologa and among other family members in Auckland and California. The identification with natal place remains strong for many of them however, as highlighted in the chief’s account the myth of the ‘plenty of foreign lands’ feeds the imagination of villagers in Samoa. As a first time visitor, Luamanuva Poe was greatly impressed. As he said, “I received the best hospitality, like ‘royal treatment’ of love from my sister.” He was also pleasantly surprised that Samoans overseas still practiced the values of alofa as demonstrated by their gifts of money and goods when he met them in the streets of Auckland or at church. This is just one example of the many reactions to movement by those in Salelologa to relatives at ‘reach’.
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Malae and the Multilocality of ‘Home’

The esteem of land as ancestral birthright is an important characteristic of many pre-industrial societies. Murton (1987) demonstrates the strong attachment to land among the Maori of New Zealand, despite their movement into towns. He draws attention to the concept of marae. More than a physical locality, marae has psychological and social attributes. It represents the very essence of tribal genealogical identity embedded in surrounding land. The marae is the social and ceremonial core of the village and stands as a symbol of village prestige. The marae is sacred ground, and where Maori language and custom prevail. In “Waituhi: A Place in Maori New Zealand”, Murton (1979) uses the novels by the Maori writer Witi Ihimaera (Tangi 1973 and Whanau 1974) to explore the meaning of place and the role of ancestral marae as a focus for community life. Although the marae community (people) may be geographically dispersed, individual Maori can identify with a particular marae through kinship linkages. Murton continues:

The essence of Waituhi comes not so much from its location nor from its landscape nor even from the function it serves, although these are important, as from the largely unselfconscious intention that defined Waituhi as a profound center of existence for Ihimaera and his hapu [subtribe], the Whanau A Kai (1987, 106).

In other words, “a place often constitutes geographical imageries but importantly also an expression of identity” (Berry and Henderson 2002, 3). People imbue places with meanings. They become full of significance in terms of some human tasks or lived experiences. The Maori conception of marae is very similar to the Samoan malae. In the Samoan case, the malae is the sacred place where maota (chiefly house sites) and laoa
(orator house sites) are located. *Malae* define the center of Samoan social activities.

Accordingly, *maota* and *laoa* are important loci of identifications with *matai* and ‘*aiga*.

Moreover, *malae* represents Samoan genealogical links to *matai* and communal lands.

To examine the multilocality of ‘home’ I drew upon Shore’s (1982) Samoan spatial model of villages to ask questions about ‘home’ in relation to territorial mobility.

Shore’s framework for understanding of *fa’ a-Samoa* articulates the distinct boundaries of the central *malae* and outer areas. The *malae* is the village green, the core of Samoan life. The outskirts of the village is its periphery. Shore writes,

Samoan behavioral norms are closely tied to the center-periphery model and its contours shape local moral discourse. Discourse is keyed in to center-periphery distinction, centrality is grounded in local geography. The concentric model does not distinguish between sea and land but rather identifies certain equivalent outer areas whether bush or sea in terms of their relation to the centers of human political life (1996, 270-72).
Shore’s analysis emphasizes the structure of relations of *malae* as the center of power of the village *fono* which is the eyes and ears of social and political control in a community. The center-periphery distinction refers to the relative dignity of different spaces and the activities that occur there, connecting dignity to levels of social interaction and degrees of visibility. Shore’s model also makes distinctions between the back and front of houses and within household spaces, but anchors village life in the *malae*.

How viable is this model when Samoans have moved beyond the confinements of the village? I extend Shore’s concept beyond ideas of political and social surveillance in two ways. First, to include questions of identity *with* place. Second, to probe how
those in Salelologa see their identity to 'aiga within a context of overseas movement, and in a way that va (social space) between siblings or parents and children is maintained.

My study confirms Shore’s notion about the function of malae in monitoring social behavior: the assumption he makes is that the closer people are to their malae, the more dignified and polite they are, but the further away they get the less formal they become. His concept of malae assumes that distance matters as a variable. People of Salelologa certainly agree that being closer to the malae acts as a controlling mechanism on behavior, but being far away from it does not necessarily translate to less Samoan, or reducing social obligations.

This is how people of Salelologa think and contradict the theoretical distinction between core and periphery since distance and time away from the nu’u for instance is not an issue. It is not necessarily important to define how long others intend to be away from the village, which can last from a few days to twenty years. Similarly, those domiciled off island do not articulate how long they plan to stay away. What appears to be the more central issue is whether the person fafo continues to reciprocate to kin i’inei.

This understanding of remittance-decay contrasts with conventional studies on migration where commitment to a place is measured by length of time away and distance traveled. In Salelologa, the yardstick of malosi le alofa, feololo le alofa, vaivai le alofa, leai se alofa (strong love, medium love, weak love, no love) better describes the interaction and behaviors of reciprocity. Quan-Bautista (2001, 185) found that people from the Satowan atoll, Chuuk, similarly use reciprocity “to measure ‘time and distance’ between those on the atoll and those living elsewhere.”
As noted in the second chapter, considerable confusion arises from assuming that ‘aiga (households) are simply physical entities, shared houses in fixed localities. As Wilk and Netting (1984) point out, kinship structures embrace more than residences or the actual groups of people that together perform certain functions. If the household is understood as a set of relationships and transactions, physical and territorial propinquity becomes less relevant. Rather than rigidly bounded localities or entities, i’inei and fafo are fluid, dynamically interrelated categories. Likewise, relationships and control over resources can transcend locality, because household memberships are physically dispersed does not mean they cease to be a household. This reproduction of social relationships is both objectified and symbolized by the exchanges which occur between places, which in turn help cement ties and connections between people in diaspora and merge the boundaries of i’inei and fafo. Just as the relationships between individuals and places constantly change, so too does the nature and content of these transactions.

In rethinking and remembering home, the question of physical space is in many ways the least problematic aspect. It is clear that some people’s feelings toward New Zealand or America as home are ambivalent. For a young female New Zealand-born second generation Samoan, home is an issue intimately tied up with gender. Though her father has lived in New Zealand for many decades, he insists on his primacy as a Samoan man, but his gender privileges him in the land of his birth in a way that is not possible in the Auckland metropolitan area. For a grandfather in Santa Ana, California, it is a question of generation. One remarked how often he tells his grandchildren, “No matter how long you have lived here, though you are second generation, you are still Samoan.” He went on to state, “I think this is my home, but culturally, emotionally, my home is
over there.” Thus, home and its different contours are not determined solely by family
ties but also are inflected by place of birth, length of time in new country, gender, and
generation.

**Transnationalism and Fa’a-Samoa**

To expand on Shore’s framework, I draw on the concept of transnationalism and
how it is enacted in the Salelologa case. The transnational framework is especially useful
in delineating the importance of linkages between home and host countries. Basch, Glick
Schiller, and Szanton-Blanc (1995, 48) write many migrants are now transmigrants,
“whose daily lives depend on multiple and constant interconnections across international
borders and whose public identities are configured in relationship to more than one
nation-state.” They describe post-World War II migratory patterns of migrants who can
no longer be considered ‘uprooted’. Because they neither cut off ties to their countries of
origin nor fully absorb the new culture offered by host nation, these immigrants are
considered transnational. This concept acknowledges that links to the home country are
maintained from the host country as immigrants strengthen ties with frequent travel,
goods, resources, and funds (remittances, investments).

In a study of Brazilian immigrants in New York city, Margolis (1995, 29)
expands the concept by noting that immigrants “establish and maintain familial,
economic, political, and cultural ties across international borders, in effect making the
home and the host society a single arena of social action.” Earlier studies of
transnationalism had focused on evidence of material exchange between sending and
receiving countries (Georges 1990; Grasmuck and Pessar 1991; Pessar 1997). More
recently, scholars like Levitt (1999) have moved beyond this more tangible traffic to uncover ties based on ideas, beliefs, and values. Levitt (1999, 927) calls this “social remittance” recognizing that transnationalism need not be limited to tangible exchanges but also can include ideational and attitudinal linkages.

Strong components of ‘social remittance’ found in Salelologa made it possible to explore this sense of transnationalism and in so doing, to shift far beyond the dichotomy of receiving and sending countries still found in the literature. As important as those who move are those who ‘stay put’ for they have as much influence on diasporic processes and the two populations cannot be separated. The Salelologa case involves both tangible and intangible aspects of shared information, trust, contacts, and values that members traveling back and forth absorb and release in the process and dynamic of movement.

Salelologa has ceased to be the only center for its ‘aiga; there are now multiple centers, but this does not mean the *nu’u* has been abandoned. Rather the transformative force of movement *fafa* has been incorporated into local social and economic processes, forever altering them over the long run. While it is true that members of Salelologa have become physically dispersed from their households and village, such mobility does not deny the value of *i’inei*. Instead, mobility is involved in its reproduction; mobility strengthens rather than weakens the links between family and home.

At times, the ‘periphery,’ the edge becomes a central source of meaning and identity, as overseas ‘aiga, Samoan churches, and *matai* councils are established. The ‘periphery’ (*fafa*) has become more like Samoa (*i’inei*) over time. This complicates Shore's core-periphery model as the ‘periphery’ including Auckland, California, and Sydney increasingly becomes ‘cores’. ‘Core’ and ‘periphery’ are therefore always in
flux. Home is not only multilocal but translocal. In population movement, *fafo* and *i’inei* have become part of the inextricably transnational character of Samoan identity.

**Transnationalism and Translocality**

A closer look at the movement behaviors of Salelologa is needed to consider the organization of transnational spaces and the ways localities at ‘home’ and at ‘reach’ condition them. As discussed in the second chapter, mobility histories aimed to elicit the nature and purpose of movement, combined subsequently with indepth interviews of those at both ‘home’ and ‘reach’ to put more flesh on basic details. This information is used to demonstrate the multiple-grounding of members who construct and maintain social networks that are both rooted in and transcending place. I explore the maintenance of these networks through mobility, material, and symbolic interactions, and the ways they shape the transnational identities of Samoans from Salelologa. On this basis, I document and illustrate the transnationality of people’s activities, identities and the translocality of home.

There is scant literature on the return mobility of migrants. Most studies rely on aggregate figures from migration surveys of a single period and assume a unidirectional form of migration from rural to urban areas or from smaller to larger places. However, a radically different picture emerges by looking at movements of people over long swings of time (Chapman 1991). In my questions of the Salelologa-born, those in both Auckland and Santa Ana, I asked about the number of visits made to Samoa or anywhere else since their arrival in New Zealand or the United States. The number of people were forty-one
twenty-five females and sixteen males. Of those at ‘home’ who had traveled abroad, fifty-two were surveyed, twenty-eight females and twenty-four males.

Between 1963 and 2000, fifty-four people left Salelologa, with most (40) going to New Zealand, their first place of settlement (Figure 7.1). Each year immigration quota allowed 1,100 Samoans to work in New Zealand and a booming economy in 1963 coincided with the first year of Samoa’s independence from New Zealand. Nobody had gone abroad prior to 1963, and the first Samoans to do so were ‘afakasi (part European) living in Apia (Fairbairn 1962; Macpherson 1996).

The first people from Salelologa were sponsored by an aunt who had married a New Zealander in the 1950s in Samoa. These two ladies, now in their sixties, said they went by ship. At the time, the Matua and Tofua were cargo ships but had cabins for passengers. En route to Auckland, New Zealand, they usually stopped in Fiji and the trip took about two weeks, on the way back loaded exports from Samoa, Tonga, and Fiji. By the mid-1960s, travel gradually became more frequent as air links were established. In 1968 Iese was the first person from Salelologa to go to America. He went on a church scholarship and left by plane from American Samoa to Hawai’i, then to Los Angeles. The others went through the Mormon Church or through relatives in American Samoa.

Except for the period 1983-86, the number of people going overseas has been fairly steady (Figure 7.1). The greatest number left in 1983-86, when Samoa’s economy had been hit hard by an economic recession, made worse by a prolonged strike in 1981 by the Public Servants Association (PSA). At this time, many families worked with their overseas kin to have a member leave Savai’i. The number of Salelologa members to the USA also doubled in 1983-84, showing how aggressively some families have worked to
have a member live in another location. ‘Aiga members in Samoa report that some of their relatives in New Zealand have shifted to Australia. The Abel-Tasman Agreement between New Zealand and Australia allowed easy movement between the two countries and many took advantage of the opportunity. The depressed economy in New Zealand in the 1980s prompted the initial movement to Australia, but most Salelologa people in New Zealand went there in the early 1990s.
The ‘reach’ survey and interviews reveal that migrants are becoming longer established in both New Zealand and the United States. Most of those pioneers, now hold the status of ‘permanent resident’. Being a permanent resident of either country gives them flexibility, since it allows them to go back and forth to Salelologa and allows them to sponsor other relatives. Most recalled reasons for traveling to Samoa or having kin visit them, but could not always list specific purposes for such journeys. The home survey was used to identify and try to close these gaps in memory.

Of the forty households surveyed in the field census in Foua, Salelologa, twelve households (30%) have one living parent, and thirty-seven households (92.5%) had close relatives such as sons and daughters in New Zealand, fifteen households had members in both New Zealand and Australia, six households had members in both New Zealand and the United States, and four households had members in New Zealand, the United States, American Samoa, and Australia.

Between 1963 and the turn of this century, Salelologa people made 404 visits between faifo and i’inei (Table 7.1). Of those living abroad, more families are in New Zealand, indicating the concentration and maturity of Salelologa’s population in that country, followed by the United States. The first return trip was a decade later. The difference not only reflects the difficulty of sea and air transportation at the time, but also indicates that the primary goal of first migrants was to remain sufficiently long to save to build a European-style house for parents back in Savai’i. More trips were made to Salelologa from the mid-1970s, as development projects of ‘aiga were completed more families could travel home for Christmas to visit and perhaps attend the dedication of new homes. Starting in 1976, around Christmas, the number of empty seats saw the Air
New Zealand and Polynesian Airlines begin to offer *meaalofo* (concession) fares to return to Auckland. The frequent travel from *fafo* to *i'inei* and *i'inei* to *fafo* in the 1980s and 1990s reflect improved transportation and more flights between Samoa and New Zealand.

### Table 7.1: Distribution of Visits made by Salelologa Members, 1973-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Fafo</th>
<th>Number of Visits</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Fafo</th>
<th>Number of Visits</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the early 1970s, the dominant flow was from *fafo* to *i'inei*, but over the years mobility trends reversed from *i'inei* to *fafo*. This change occurs because during the years members *fafo* did not go to Samoa, their parents and siblings visited them instead. Compared to *i'inei*, sometimes tight work schedules for those living *fafo* made traveling for those *fafo* more difficult. A *i'inei* trip abroad serves both as an eye opening experience and a break from *fafo* routine. No parents have remained away permanently, most stay for a month to nine months, with three months the favored length of stay. When both parents are alive, visit of no more than one month to three months indicate village responsibility, but tend to be longer if a parent is widowed and has more freedom.
A visit for the birth of a grandchild by a grandmother, tends to be longer as it involves help with the child care. Children fafo often encourage visiting parents to receive a medical check up.

Fewer visits to and from the United States (Table 7.1) reflect smaller number of Saleologa members living there. Parents have visited their children once or twice, and repeat journeys include those to attend weddings and the birth of a grandchild. Logistics of travel such as obtaining a visa, and number of members in a locality influence frequency of mobility, so that far more parents travel to New Zealand than to the United States. In addition, the twelve-hour plane flight to California including a stop in Honolulu, is viewed as quite arduous compared to direct connection to Auckland. When parents visit or attend a fa’alavelave in New Zealand or Samoa, those domiciled in the United States tend to go to those places, rather than parents themselves traveling to California. Trips that include going on official business as part of government or to fundraise for church or village projects take place, however, no matter what.

Gender and Mobility

There is no significant difference in the total 169 visits made by fafo men and women, a yearly average of 3.0 for men and 3.2 for women (Table 7.2). Both men and women attend fa’alavelave such as funerals, and weddings in equal numbers, although men tend to travel more for matai investitures and for court cases when representing families. Women may also go to help with the investiture of a brother, but men who are matai, usually make the trip on village or church business, either to resolve issues in Saleloaga or to represent their congregations in Auckland or Santa Ana.
Table 7.2  Visits by *Fako* Salelologa Members by Gender, 1973-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand to Samoa</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States to Samoa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand to United States</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand to Australia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States to New Zealand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States to Australia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Visits</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Visits @ year</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Reach/Home Survey 1998-2000

Table 7.3  Visits by *I'inei* Salelologa Members by Gender, 1973-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samoa to New Zealand</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa to United States</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa to American Samoa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa to Australia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Visits</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>235</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Visits @ year</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Home/Reach Survey 1998-2000

More journeys to ‘reach’ are made by both men (4.33) and women (4.37) than those by *fako* living abroad (Table 7.3, cf 7.2). The absence of any marked difference by gender in travel or activities undertaken to some extent indicates parity and contradicts the assumption in mobility studies that men are more concerned with movement than women. Being equally engaged in mobility and development of ‘aiga, only kinds of activity determines who becomes the more involved.
Purpose of Trips

In the twenty-seven years between 1973 and 2000, most visits by fafo were primarily to see parents and family, followed by attending fa’alavelave such as weddings, matai investitures, funerals, or church dedications (Table 7.4). Most journeys from New Zealand were during the Christmas holidays, when the children can travel, but for the United States it was mostly in the summer time (June to August), when children also are out of school. Visits for village and community projects include church activities, conferences, or centennial celebrations such as the 100th anniversary of the Mormon church, the 150th anniversary of the Congregational Christian church, and 150th anniversary of the Catholic church.

Funerals are the most reasons for those fafo to go to Samoa for fa’alavelave. This indicates that parental and senior members of household are still in residence there, as well as the sense that Samoa is the central ancestral place. Although not directly related to life cycle events (weddings, births, funerals, church dedications), court cases as fa’alavelave require the immediate attention of ‘aiga. The fact that many living away are pioneer migrants, my findings find many returning to Savai’i to renovate homes, build new homes, or establish taro and banana plantations on family land.
Table 7.4  **Purposes of Visits from Fafo to I'inei, 1973-2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity and Fa’alavelave</th>
<th>Number of Visits</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visits parents and siblings</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court case</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matai investiture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit in-laws</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit sick uncle or aunt</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church centennial/conference</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s 80th birthday</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up Plantation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church dedication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School or church trip</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build or renovate house</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattoo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Reach/Home Survey 1998-2000

Visits to ‘reach’ have so increased since the 1970s, that in total, they outnumber those to home, 235 to 169 (Table 7.5). Purposes for travels in both directions are multifarious reflecting not just economic considerations but also the sociocultural and political life of households and village communities. Most common are journeys by parents i’inei to see children, for the birth of a grandchild or to visit a sibling, while travel abroad for fa’alavelave for relatives—like weddings, funerals, and church dedications—continue to be important. Village projects and church fund-raising activities are other reasons for trips. Within constant patterns of travel over the years, have come changes in direction, so that fewer from overseas attend weddings in Samoa than the reverse (4.1 to 8 percent). The fact that church dedications, take place equally both in Samoa and overseas, reflect the increasing dispersion of Samoan churches overseas, while ways to
raise funds also are different. While previously, village groups raised money by holding concerts in Samoan churches overseas, now they travel to pick apples in Hastings, the ‘fruit bowl’ region of New Zealand.

Table 7.5 Purposes of Visits from I’inei to Fafo, 1973-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity and Fa’alavelave</th>
<th>Number of Visits</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visit children</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit and holiday with siblings</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of grandchildren</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical treatment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church fundraise</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation of children or grandchildren</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church conference</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church dedication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick apples (church fundraise)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government training workshop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit nephews and/or nieces</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit in-laws</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat sick grandchildren</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring deceased body for burial in Samoa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthday celebration 75th years old</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>235</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Home/Reach Survey 1998-2000

Households and Mobility

Detailed focus on a few households can highlight the links between ‘home’ and ‘reach’, as well as probe the dynamics of mobility, transnationality, and translocality. The information shows the interplay of social and economic factors and was obtained from ‘home’ and ‘reach’ surveys along with interviews at i’inei and fafo. Households labeled P and Q are the same as in the sixth chapter, while household S is new. As
Chapman (1987, 129) writes, “In a process as complex and dynamic as a people’s mobility, single-factor explanations are simplistic distortions of reality.”

*Household P* represents my own family. My mother, in her early seventies has nine of eleven children still living who are involved in the development of the household: two daughters in Auckland, one in American Samoa, myself in Hawaii, and an adopted son in Wellington. Four, three sons and a daughter have remained in Samoa with my mother. Except for the youngest son, all her children are married and have their own families. Figure 7.3 shows the years members of Household P moved *fafo*. Most of the members moved *fafo* in 1988-89 period coinciding with a period of shortage of employment opportunities in Samoa, and they were coming of working age. At first glance, it appears F5 visits Samoa more frequently than F6 and F10 but movement from Salelologa to Auckland by both my mother and siblings are more frequent (Table 7.6). Visits among family members between Samoa and American Samoa are also more frequent than I can account here. The frequent visits of my mother to Hawai’i and to Auckland are to do with life cycles of her daughters’ families.

In all three households: P, Q, and R, parents’ airfares and incidental expenses cost them nothing, as they are often paid by the children the parents are visiting. In the (Figures) below children are identified by gender and number code by birth order.
Figure 7.3 Multi-locality of homes and *fafo* movements of Household P (1968-1995)
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Source: Mobility history/Home-reach survey 1998-2000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Trips from Samoa to fafa</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Trips from fafa to Samoa, NZ, or U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Father attends church fundraising in NZ, 2 months</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>F2 visits parents in Samoa, 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Father visits children in NZ, 2 weeks</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>M1 visits parents in Samoa and in-laws, 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>F5, F6 visit M1 in NZ, 4 weeks</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>F2 visits parents in Samoa, 4 weeks became a nun in 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>F5 goes on award to study in Australia, 3 years</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>M1 visits parents and in-laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Mother attends niece funeral in NZ, 3 weeks</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>M1, attends father’s funeral, 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Mother attends funeral of sister in NZ, 2 weeks</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>M1 returns to Samoa for matai investiture F2 family visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Mother to American Samoa, uncle’s funeral 1 week</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>F8 visits mother F2 family visit from Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Mother attends F5 wedding in Hawaii, 3 months</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>F5 visits mother, summer holiday, 2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Mother attends birth of F5’s baby in Hawaii, 11 months</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>F5 visits mother, 4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Mother visits F5, 3 months; M1 visits F5 in Hawaii</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>F5 accompany mother to Samoa, and visit F6 in NZ, 4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>F8 visits siblings in NZ, 1 month</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>F2 family visit from Turkey to Samoa, return via NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Mother attends birth of F6’s 2nd baby, 3 months; then visits F5, 5 months</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>F5 visits mother in Samoa, 4 weeks; F8 visits Samoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Mother visits F5, 2</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>F5 visits F6, F10 in NZ then Samoa, 4wks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>F2 family visit,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Mother attends birth of F6’s 3rd baby, 2 months; visits F5 in Hawaii, 2 months</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Mother visits children in NZ; F5 conducts research, in Samoa, 2.5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Mother visits F6 and F10 in NZ 2 months; mother visits F5 in Hawaii, 2 months</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>F5 conducts research in Samoa, 5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Mother attends birth of F10’s 1st baby in NZ, 3 months, then visits F5’s in Hawaii, 5 months</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>M9 from Wellington visits mother and siblings in Auckland, F5, 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>M3 attends a church fundraising trip to NZ 2 months; M4, M11 visit siblings in NZ, 3 weeks</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>F5 attends conference in Auckland, visits mother and siblings 10 days, F5 attends conference in Samoa visits mother, 10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Mother visits children, attends birth of F6’s 4th baby, in NZ, 3 months M3 visits Hawaii, 2 weeks</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Source: Mobility History/ Reach-Home survey 1998-2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Mother visits children in NZ and attends F10’s 2nd baby, 2 months</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Source: Mobility History/ Reach-Home survey 1998-2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
They are nine children in *Household Q*, and at the time of the survey (December 1999) both parents were still alive; the father passed away in February 2001. All the children are married and have their own families. Four of the nine, two daughters and two sons have remained in Samoa with their parents (Figure 7.4). One son is in the United States and one son in Australia, after a time in New Zealand; three daughters are in New Zealand. As do most Salelologa, both at 'home' and 'reach' they have access to plantation land for subsistence farming, supplementing any cash derived from wage employment.
Figure 7.4 Multi-locality of homes and fafo movements of Household Q (1968-1982)
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Table 7.7  Summary of movements of Household Q members, 1973-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Trips from Samoa to falo</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Trips from falo to Samoa, NZ or U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Parents attend birth of M3’s baby in U.S., 1.5 months</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>M3 to Samoa for matai title, 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Parents visit F2, F6 in NZ, 3 months</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>M3 visits parents in NZ, 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Parents to wedding of F6 in NZ, 2 months</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>M3 to NZ for F6 wedding, 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Parents to wedding of F7 in NZ, 2 months</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>M3 in U.S. Visit parents in NZ, 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Visit F2, F6, F7 in New Zealand, 3 months</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>F2 from NZ visit M3 in U.S., 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Parents to M3 in U.S. with F9 escorts parents, 1 month</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>M3 in U.S. Visit parents in Samoa F2, F6, F7 from NZ to Samoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>F4 visits siblings in NZ, 3 weeks</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>M3 in U.S. Visits parents with son in Samoa, 1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Parents visit F2, F6, F7 daughters in NZ, 3 months</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>F2 visits sick father in Samoa, 1 month M3 visits sick father in Samoa, 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>F9 visits siblings in NZ, 3 weeks</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>M3 from U.S. Visit sick father in Samoa, 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>M1 and mother visit M3 in U.S., 1 month</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>All children, 1 from U.S. 3 from NZ and 1 from Australia, attend father’s funeral in Samoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Mother visits M5 in Australia and all 3 daughters in Auckland, 5 months</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>M3 Visits mother, 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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For household Q, it is M3 and family who seem the most frequent travelers and thus contradict the gender equity in Salelologa movement (Table 7.7). As journeys from i'inei to fafo have become more common, so those in the reverse direction have declined. A change reflecting not only tight work schedules of those fafo but also the logistics of travel, lower airfares and since airfares are paid by those fafo for i'inei to travel abroad it is cheaper when paid in NZ or US dollars. Also visits are organized so that there are always family members from fafo or i'inei at ‘home’ or at ‘reach’. Parents were brought to New Zealand during those years when daughters did not visit Salelologa and on half of those occasions, M3 came from California. Since M3 is a matai, his visits to his parents occur more often and can facilitate family business.

The family of Household S is similar to P in having one living parent. When the husband died in 1974, he left his wife now in her seventies, with a young family of eleven children (Figure 7.5). It was fortunate that her husband had a niece, who by 1968 was already in New Zealand. She in turn, sponsored her cousin (M5 in Figure 7.5), who later brought his sister (F4), and then subsequently other siblings. All eleven children are married with families. The three oldest (F1, M2, M3) still live in Samoa with their mother, four daughters and a son are in New Zealand, and two sons have continued from there to Australia.
Figure 7.5 Multi-locality of homes and fafo movements of Household S (1973-1999)

Source: Mobility History/Home-Reach survey 1998-2000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Trips from Samoa to fafo</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Trips from fafo to Samoa, NZ or U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>F1 and M2 to NZ on church trip, 1 month</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>F4 visits mother, 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Mother visits children in NZ, 3 months</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>F4 visits mother and in-laws, 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Mother to U.S. for friend’s daughter’s wedding, 1 month</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>M5 visits mother and siblings, 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Mother to F8’s wedding in NZ, 18 months</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>F4 visits mother and in-laws, 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>F1 to visit siblings and daughter in NZ, 2 months</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>F9 accompanies her mother to Samoa, 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Mother visits children in NZ, 3 months</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>F8 accompanies her mother to Samoa, 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Mother visits children, NZ, 3 months</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>M11 visits mother and in-laws, 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>M2 visits siblings in NZ, 1 month</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>M5, M6 and M7 and F9 attend funeral of niece in Samoa, 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>F1 visits siblings and attends daughter’s wedding in NZ, 3 months</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>F11 visits mother and in-laws, 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>M3 visits siblings in NZ, 1 month</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>M6 visits mother, 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seen from the perspective of three households, and beyond them to all ‘aiga of the pitonu’u, the ongoing links between Samoa, New Zealand, and California are strong and resilient, with Samoa the lynchpin. The number and direction of trips to and from ‘reach’ show Salelologa mobility to exhibit both circular and transnational properties. Increased population movement between the ‘aiga in Samoa and abroad has facilitated a better understanding of life in New Zealand and America with far greater appreciation of the hardships and different expectations of overseas lifeways. As one father comments, “In fa’apalagi (Euro-American way), everything is money and you have to pay rent, food, and medical insurance, compared to life in Samoa, where we can get by just saying ‘Please’. However, the ‘myth of plenty’ at ‘reach’ still lingers and drives parents to send their children overseas.

For Samoans fafo, traditional ceremonies remain important and participating in them establishes their status within the ‘aiga. Returning home with gifts and attending ceremonies important to Samoan culture not only enhances personal status but also achieves a certain prestige for the ‘aiga. Those who travel to Samoa and back to their fafo communities return with their cultural values reaffirmed. Extensive circulation reinvigorates ethnic Samoan identity and its presence everywhere manifests a transnational Samoan social structure.

Increased mobility in the past twenty years between ‘aiga in Samoa, New Zealand, and America has educated families about how to travel less expensively. Life cycle and cultural events sometimes shift overseas when that provides a common ground for dispersed members to meet more quickly, easily, and at less cost. These kinds of decisions emphasize the embeddedness of family and ‘aiga relationships indicating a
great sense of connectivity and shared goals, irrespective of location. The
transnationality of kinship structures, activities, identities, and subjectivities are strongly
apparent. In short, social position and identity are constructed simultaneously within a
local and global context.

As Koletty (2002, 146) reports in his study of Samoan movement experience in
Southern California, “For Samoans, migration and circulation are not the disparate
processes that such categorization implies. They are part of the dialectic and a different
conception of place.” Today, with nearly half the population of Samoa living overseas,
mobility continues to be necessary to fulfill social and economic functions that maintain
status within the ‘aiga and affirm Samoan culture. Chapman and Prothero (1985) point
out that modernization in developing countries has reinforced these customary circuits of
mobility and added new ones. Circulation has taken on greater significance because
despite the distances involved, it invigorates fa’a-Samoa by linking overseas Samoan
communities with each other and with the homeland. Finally, although population
mobility and remittances have caused fundamental social changes in Samoa, the
direction, character, and nuances of those changes have been culturally determined
through family connections and the relationships among ‘aiga.

**Blurring Boundaries: Matai, and Tautua Redefined**

How are indigenous knowledge being maintained and reproduced in the diaspora?
If metaphors and metonyms define Salelologa movements and ongoing interactions in
new contexts what are the implications for matai and tautua? The discussion below is
based on interviews and the mobility survey.
The *matai* system has been described in detail by many authors (Freeman 1984; Franco 1985; Holmes 1957; Liu 1991) but in recent decades, it has undergone many changes including a decline in authority over production by the extended family. As *matai* titles have proliferated and *matai* have lost their authority and former economic role, families have become smaller, and the pool of potential servers limited. Young men can no longer be sure they will be able to command the service of the next generation in their old age (Maiava 2001; O’Meara 1990). Overseas movement and investing in formal education are some of the important ways ‘*aiga* have dealt with these changes. In turn, parents are relying more on their own children and the parent-child relationship has become increasingly emphasized. Similar conclusions have been reported of Fijian population movement, where nuclear family relationships are becoming more central (Young 1998).

Interviews and discussions in Salelologa, Auckland and Santa Ana also indicate that sibling relationships are becoming more relevant to the orchestration of movement and remittances, although this shift is gradual and subtle, not abrupt. This is because the actual composition of individual households is but a superficial indicator of reciprocities that exist or may be potentially reactivated at some future time. Some families in Auckland have no surviving parents but an eldest cousin has become their *matai*. Despite living in Sydney, this *matai*, Sefo, has taken on the leadership role for all his cousins and siblings in times of crisis, mobilizes this extended family to collect resources for *fa’alavelave* whether held in Samoa or overseas.

One of the basic criteria for receiving a title is the imperative to provide *tautua* (service) as expressed in the proverb, ‘*O le ala i le pule ‘o le tautua* (The way to authority...
is through service). Formerly, untitled men lived in the community and served their matai and fono until their turn to be matai arrived, often on the death of a senior titleholder. But with mobility, the bestowing of titles based on tautua has changed and matai conferment is happening more often overseas. As already discussed, ‘place’ is an important factor in retaining Samoan values but change is also negotiated and contested in different places. It is possible to invest in the ‘aiga not only through movement abroad and educational achievements but also by conferring matai titles overseas. Despite the decline in the traditional economic role of matai, their social and political roles remain intact. The village fono matai retain the political power to sanction unacceptable behavior. It is the matai who organizes the pooling of resources from immediate and extended family members, combining their contributions to hold fa'alavelave and then redistributing the gifts. Skillful organization of these institutionalized rituals enable matai to reposition their power base in society.

Traditionally, certain matai titles (either chief or orator) came with the right to confer other titles (Meleisea 1987; Va’ai 1998). These can be conferred based on service to the matai and ‘aiga by those related by toto (blood), and tino (by adoption) or service connections and usually assumes that the conferment is done in Samoa on the malae where maota (chiefly house site) and laoa (orator house site) are located, for this adds legitimacy and authenticity to titles. During investiture, the matai receives recognition from the presence/attendance of the village fono. Recently, however, matai titles have been conferred overseas, not only by the matai of Salelologa to other pitonu’u members, but sometimes by matai from other villages. Samoans express concern that this is making a chop-suey of fa’a-Samoa and some question the legitimacy of these new matai.
holders. Most however, say legitimacy depends on context and point out the creation of new *matai* as a pragmatic and sensible action.

Samoans draw upon traditional cultural principles to justify the changes they are making to their own practices. In many occasions, *matai* titles conferred overseas are given as reward for relatives’ generosity to the resident *matai*. Conferring titles expands the circle of economic and political obligations of support. These are not limited to the untitled and those in Samoa, but also to *matai* living *fafo*. The power of *i’inei* (resident *matai* from Samoa) to bestow titles provides another avenue for receiving *tautua*. The larger size of Samoan communities and growing number of Samoan churches *fafo* have combined to push *matai* investiture overseas. Some people argue that a *matai* title adds depth, history, and status to an individual’s educational achievements or economic wealth of an individual. In so far as this conservative sentiment is shared by everyone in Salelologa, it works to bond the community, for *matai* titles are intangible links which hold together the members of the group.

One of the most obvious forms of symbolic capital in Salelologa is modern education as a primary sign of prestige and household advancement. Tutai, a women in her middle fifties, has six children and with her husband, Luamanuva Taylor, an entrepreneurial chief, own a store at the wharf. When interviewed in September 1999, four of their children had obtained government scholarships, graduated from overseas universities, and today work for the government in Apia. Tutai argues:

> I suppose people can live without doing *fa’a-Samoa* and that is because when you are economically independent you don’t need the support of the ‘*aiga*, I guess. But in reality we have so many of our upwardly mobile Samoans both here and overseas who still participate, when in theory they don’t need to. For example, a rich ‘*afakasi* or a highly educated Samoan
could be the director of a department, but when he or she goes to the villages or their 'aiga they are not readily recognized, that is, given full recognition of their education credentials or the economic wealth they might possess without a matai title. So many of them take up matai titles. It seems without a title your other attributes, like intelligence, strength, and wealth are insignificant.

The same argument is given by those overseas who have a role in the church. They say it is necessary to have a matai title because they need the recognition and respect which comes with it, in the process acknowledging that traditional status thus complements modern achievements. However, it also is a way for matai to reassert their authority in overseas contexts where the church minister’s authority is becoming quite hegemonic. This illustrates how local idioms and international processes interrelate to shape the dynamics of modern Samoan chieftainship. Indigenous institutions have been assumed in development theory as barriers to modernization, yet we see here that they have been adapted by Samoans to suit their needs.

Although Samoans would like to think of its chieftainship as timeless, it has changed to suit modern socioeconomic conditions. The institution of matai set within its new context of modern socioeconomic development, is similar to people’s response to matai suffrage. Since Samoa’s independence in 1962, only matai could vote and campaign for a seat in the parliament. In the 1970s to 1980s, new titles being created for election purposes not only saw an overall increase in titles, but just about anybody was given a title, and resulted in what is known as matai palota (ballot matai). People saw the matai palota as rapidly eating away at the integrity of chieftainship, which had been based upon tautua and selection of titleholders through consensus. The concern to preserve the integrity of fa’a-Samoa prompted universal adult suffrage in 1990, allowing
all men and women over twenty-one years of age to vote and run as candidates in the
country’s general elections.

In overseas Samoa, family and community provide the social basis for the
occupation of urban space and symbolic resources for cultural regeneration. This does
not deny the fact that neither the material nor symbolic conditions for the regeneration of
cultural practices are stable. The renewed interest in matai and the conferment of matai
on members fafo I suggest is twofold. First, many overseas Samoans have accumulated
‘real’ power by virtue of their economic positions relative to those in Salelologa,
therefore their desirability has become enhanced. It is also a sign that indigenous
Samoan institutions remain paramount, as Tutai stated in her interview. The prestige a
matai title can bring constitutes, in Bourdieu’s terms, ‘symbolic capital’. It adds weight
to one’s status.

The reassertion of indigenous institutions also counters secular power of fafo
(overseas). Senior matai conferring titles make some money, while at the same time
promoting redemptive, emotional, perhaps nostalgic ties with Samoans fafo. The
institution of matai is being used by Samoans to maximize their accumulation of wealth
and enhance personal and ‘aiga status. In so doing, they are redefining yet again the
concept of tautua (service). Thus, the politics of the matai is inextricably linked to
economic and social power. The ability to influence matai and events is often couched in
terms of tradition and seniority, while cultural meanings are often renegotiated, and none
too politely.

Conferring matai titles in Samoa has also changed. In the not so distant old days,
it was the productive capacity of a family in the form of pigs, taro, breadfruit, yams, and
fine mats which constituted gifts given during matai ceremonies. Most of these gifts during matai ceremonial events are being expressed in terms of cash. While it appears modernity is eclipsing tradition, this issue is not that simple. When I asked some matai the reason for this change, they responded it was to fa’amama ‘avega (lighten the burden) on the provision of gifts by the hosts of saofa’i (investiture ceremonies), this way, family members are not burdened with the task of doing all the provisioning and cooking for these events; it is a more efficient use of time.

Others question the integrity of the matai system when investitures are conducted through the medium of cash gifts. While village council members can benefit, certain individuals may take advantage of the Samoan propensity for conspicuous distribution. The traditional role of the tulafale (orator) prescribes that they act as negotiators speaking on behalf of the ali’i (chief). This usually justifies their share of food or money in the redistribution process, but discretion is advisable, the va fealoa’i (social space) of both the host and guest, tulafale and ali’i, must be considered. Excessive demands in a saofa’i by some tulafale during the embellishment of the village council is a clear breach of tradition (Tuimaleali’ifano 2002, forthcoming). Certain individuals have overstepped their mark by demanding more money for their lafo (gift from the host) making what some call an abuse of the system. The ‘commoditization’ of the matai system can be seen in a saofa’i which took place in early December, 2002. While I was in Samoa an older sister of my relative had got a matai title in Salelavalu, a village near Salelologa. A few weeks later my relative wrote in an email (January 8, 2003):
Well the saofa’i was alright except that we hardly got any rest with the work and preparations. We just stayed at the family house. There were no fine mats or fa’aaloaloga [that is sua, exchange of gifts] since Salelavalu was only after the money, so that was like thousands of Tala. There were in fact 39 matai altogether that had saofa’i on my dad’s side, it made me sad to think that it was not the real way of getting titles.

The example gives a sense of the complex issues that are involved with everyday life in Samoa. People are negotiating tradition and the modernizing effects of a globalizing politico-cultural economy. Tradition and modernity are not simple binary opposites, however. Resourceful individuals and collective opportunism interact, producing and in some ways radically changing fa’a-Samoan.

**Transactions between I’inei and Fafo**

The sacred power of i’inei can be seen in the case of fa’alavelave held fafo where someone coming from Samoa and bearing gifts is indispensable. The attendance of those i’inei at a wedding, funeral or graduation is a symbol of family pride and social identity. As sisters of Household S, now living in Auckland, said, “We had our uncles come for our weddings and one of them was the master of ceremony. He handled the ‘aiga, guests, visitors, and all the protocols of fa’a-Samoan. They brought a special fine mat from Samoa.” The presence of Samoan relatives bringing traditional gifts to overseas fa’alavelave is viewed as adding authenticity to the occasion. The exchange of gifts symbolizes the importance of genealogical links to the past. As Howard and Rensel (1997, 147) put it in discussing status and power in Rotuma, “Without chiefs ceremonies of all kind—births, marriages, welcomings, village and district fete—for it is the presence of chiefs that lends dignity and historical depth to such
occasions.” The Rotuman case highlights a comparable understanding of the importance
of ritual status for Samoan communities. It remains integral to their ethnic identity in
overseas communities, while at the same time it reproduces the power of Samoa as a
place.

The importance of gift exchange and remittances in the maintenance of
socioeconomic and sociocultural relations has also been described by Werbner (1989) in
her study of Pakistanis in Great Britain. She argues that British earnings are always
converted into inalienable gifts, bringing permanent debt and indelible reciprocity to
those exchanging them. While gifts and exchange are key to the creation of social
networks in Britain, they are also a “metonymic exchange of substance between South
Asia and Britain” (Werbner 1989, 204). Subedi’s (1993) study of remittances and
exchange in two rural communities in Nepal shows similar behaviors. Exchange between
places does more than reproduce social relationships; exchange surpasses gifts of goods
or money at fa'alavelave. Exchange carried from Samoa and members fafo seeking a
Samoan healer and medicines to cure ma’i (Samoan illness) demonstrate the reproductive
power of places, goods, and people.

Particular goods express notions about the places from which they come.
Consumption of i’inei (here and local) produce is also a social statement of its spirituality
and an ability to sustain its inhabitants. In contrast, goods from abroad link their
consumers with the economic and political force of fafo, the object of desire. Goods thus
carry ideas about power which are exchanged between people in Salelologa and overseas.
Beside the usual remittances, gifts sent by Samoans abroad tend to symbolize the essence
of fafo: economic power, industrial production, and popular Western culture. Electronic
goods, videos, TV sets, DVDs, microwave, refrigerators, and lawn mowers are all
featured in Salelologa households.

During my interviews, one ‘aiga member who had been given a lawn mower
when visiting New Zealand transformed it from a personal use to an informal business,
charging $20-30 Tala to mow lawns in Foua. This demonstrates people’s creativity, but
such small subtle changes sometimes produce contradictory effects on the community.
While the lawn mower effectively cuts the grass in fewer hours, and thereby frees young
girls and boys of the ‘aiga for other responsibilities, it also means families have to find
the money for this service. Furthermore, just as the European style houses have become
ubiquitous, so ‘aiga members will put pressure on their children working locally or
overseas to provide these kinds of goods. Just as home appliances have gradually found
their way into Salelologa homes, so too will lawn mowers and other agricultural
equipment.

Overseas relatives wish to share their wealth with those at home, because hard
work and generosity are core social values by which one is evaluated. At times, the
desire to provide such goods produces intra and inter-family competition that motivates
heightened productivity. At other times, it also sets off individualism, jealousy, and
dissatisfaction. Part of the balancing act of being Samoan is the reconciliation between
the implacable Euro-American demands of the individual with those of the often
hegemonic and Island collective self. How can the seemingly irresistible be fused with
the seemingly immovable? Indigenous Pacific Island scholars and writers such as Albert
Wendt, Epeli Hau’ofa, Konai Thaman, and Sia Figiel explore and question this
throughout their work. Ambivalence, the holding of two opposing views or emotions at
the same time, is a way of dealing with these contradictions. In the mobility process, these countervailing forces are usually resolved by appropriating them into fa’a-Samoa, although many people are not always aware of this.

‘Aiga need malaga for economic, social, and cultural development; migrants need spiritual and emotional nourishment themselves. This replenishment of the soul is fulfilled in the exchange of gifts and especially by the deliverance of delicacies from home such as palolo (special one time delicacy), fagusea (sea cucumber), fai’ai pusi (eel in coconut cream), fai’ai fe’e (octopus in coconut cream), or koko Samoa (Samoan cocoa). Salelologa people produce the essence of i’inei for kin in diasporic space to consume but themselves consume modernity through the goods sent back to them from fafo. Gift exchange is thus as much about social relationships and the respective power of givers and receivers as it is about the hegemony of places.

When migrants die overseas, their bodies are flown back to Salelologa for the funeral. This further represents the continuing primacy of the ‘aiga and its material roots in the land. While I was conducting the mobility survey and related interviews, a son described his deceased father was brought back from California in 1991, and in 1997, a deceased aunt was accompanied back by relatives for burial in Samoa. Family is still attached to its community of origin, because the nu’u (village) defines one’s identity and status overseas. The interaction between i’inei and fafo, specifically the importance of fafo and i’inei to the group, shows the inappropriateness of theorizing village-metropolitan dichotomies in an increasingly transnational world.

Fa’a-Samoa frames work within local idioms, which in turn feed into and influence change. Local culture is not simply acted upon by external agents, as many
accounts of change in Samoa suggest for people are dynamic, proactive, and perpetually creative. As we have seen in previous accounts, while *i’inei* has been transformed through contact with *fafo* the relationship is reciprocal. Not only is *fafo* imagined and constructed through *i’inei* idioms, but more practically, it too is transformed through the ideological, economic, and physical exchanges which take place in movement.

Through negotiations made possible by population movement, ‘*aiga* and *i’inei* have changed, become multi-local and translocal. Households are neither simply expecting ‘expatriates’ to send remittances and receive partially symbolic gifts of taro, sea cucumber, or handicrafts in exchange, nor are these transactions purely bilateral between the island home and one or another rim country. Instead, Samoa, New Zealand, the United States, and Australia are all sites of transnational, triangular, and circular exchange. As Hau’ofa (1993, 11) emphasizes, “The resources of Samoans, Cook Islanders, Niueans, Tokelauans, Tuvaluans, Rotumans, I-Kiribati, Fijians, Indo-Fijians, and Tongans are no longer confined to their national boundaries. They are located wherever these people are living, permanently or otherwise.” In Salelologa, multilocal families are achieving increasing dominance. None of this dynamic is captured by the twin imagery of emigration and depopulation formerly theorized in the mobility literature.
The Samoan saying, ‘A’ e iloa a’u i Togamau, ‘ou te iloa fo’i ‘oe i Si’ulepa (If you recognize me in Togamau, I recognize you in Si’ulepa) commonly comes up in conversation. Both Fa’amele Luamanuva'e, a senior woman of Foua, Saleologa and Aumua Mata’itusi, a Samoan language instructor at the University of Hawai’i, used the expression during our interviews. Misa Telefoni, Samoan Minister of Finance, used it in a newspaper commentary titled, “An ounce of short-term courtesy is worth a pound of long-term diplomacy” (Samoan Observer, March 2003).

This proverb has its origin in an old story about a chief who went on aumoega (betrothal) of a taupou (daughter of a chief). The chief’s malae is called Togamau. The taupou’s malae is called Si’ulepa. The chief and his retinue of orators had gone to Si’ulepa and successfully arranged the betrothal. But one of his orators, who had not participated in betrothal negotiations, later complained because he was not given a tofa (special fine mat) by the chief after the wedding. Traditionally, a tofa is given as a reward for orators who have negotiated on behalf of their chief. The chief replied, “You were not there during my crucial time of need, therefore you don’t get a tofa.”

In other words, if the orator had recognized his chief in the first place by showing up, the chief would have made sure he was recognized for his work later on. Elders relate this saying to refer to a Samoan understanding of human interactions in both local and overseas contexts. The proverb points out the special significance of fa’aaloalo (respect) and va fealoa’i (social space). It denotes the idea that reciprocal relations
should be part of every interaction. Whether between Samoans or Samoans and outsiders, mutuality and compassion are key values.

The primary goal of this dissertation has been to examine the mobility of villagers from the perspective of Salelologa, on the island of Savai‘i in Samoa. Mobility from the inside out is an entrée to understanding the dynamics of fa’a-Samoa, and ‘aiga. Although initially conceived as a case study of Salelologa focused on fa’a-Samoa and international movement, my research led to examining concepts of culture, development, and diaspora for a more holistic understanding of Salelologa mobility.

My study is inspired by a humanist philosophy. I take an interpretive stance in giving the meanings of human behavior more prominence than normative positions. I approach people’s mobility with a particular concern for the contextual, cultural, social, and historical dimensions. I adopted the linked metaphors of ‘home’ and ‘reach’ from the work of the humanist geographer, Anne Buttimer (1980). She examines the human experience of space and place by emphasizing both dwelling at home and reaching beyond to encompass the holistic nature of communities and dynamic wholeness of individuals. In my study, ‘home’ represents more than just a dwelling and its physiographic boundaries. Home includes ancestral and spiritual place, equally powerful as sources of individual and group identities. Reach, rather than ‘destination’, identifies places visited or resided within as part of a mobility dynamic; it does not imply severance of ties from places of origin.

A multi-sited ethnographic approach took me to Auckland, New Zealand and Santa Ana, California, the other places Salelologa people reside. This approach was necessary in order to understand the pathways, links, and juxtapositions of locations in a
transnational social field. I was able to do interviews and surveys at ‘reach’ as well as at
‘home’. I explored both the structural conditions and the motivations underlying
decisions to move. My goal was to understand population movement and fa’a-Samoa
through the eyes of Samoans. I compared a lived reality to theories of population
movement set within the western intellectual tradition. In particular, I interrogated the
dualistic framework currently applied to analyses of contemporary transmigrant
communities. A multi-sited methodology and the tight intersection of several field
instruments made more evident indigenous concepts of movement, history, and identity,
and allowed historical explanation to be synthesized with material gained from primary
enquiries among contemporary Samoans at ‘home’ and at ‘reach’. I thus provide
“important insights as to why Samoan culture and lifeways have remained so vitally
Samoan in the contemporary, increasingly globalizing world” (Anae 1998, 4).

I also use notions of circular mobility and transnationalism to examine mobility
between ‘home’ and ‘reach’. The circular mobility approach is closely identified with the
work of Chapman and Prothero (1985). It takes a more microscopic view in emphasizing
the constant ebb and flow of people in and out of village communities. It points out
traditional bases of mobility and, most importantly, its circularity. Chapman and
Prothero argue that cultural and territorial interpretations are as important as
macroeconomic factors in understanding population mobility behaviors.
Transnationalism signals the fluidity with which ideas, objects, and people now move
across national borders and administrative boundaries to specific sites and sets of material
relations (Basch, Schiller and Blanc 1992). Transnationalism describes macroscopic
economic, political, and administrative structures. Although the approaches of
transnationalism and circular mobility underpin this study of population movement in
general, equally important is the idea that structural dichotomies of rural/urban or
village/metropolitan are inappropriate to understand mobility behaviors based on fa’a-
Samoa. In the rest of this chapter, I outline the three main findings of my research: 1) that mobility theories based on simple dichotomies are inadequate for studying Samoan movement; 2) that culture-fa’a-Samoa is deeply related to mobility; and 3) that Samoan conceptions of movement are intimately bound up with social relations, especially kinship.

**Approaches to Population Mobility**

A major finding of this research is that assuming movement only occurs between
two poles, as migrants leave home and settle elsewhere or move from rural to urban
places, fails to describe the dynamism of cultural and social worlds. I use the more
holistic term ‘mobility’ to problematize the category of ‘migrant’. Mobility highlights
the social constructedness of such categories as ‘labor’ and ‘migrant’ that sustain the
dichotomies of social scientific inquiry (Lawson 2000).

In his 1991 paper, *Pacific Island Movement and Socioeconomic Change: Metaphors of Misunderstanding*, Chapman questions the construction of separate rural and urban identities and evokes a broader range of narratives. To him, (1991, 267), population movement in the Pacific Islands has reached an intellectual impasse: “A complex social process was reduced to a mechanical sequence of discrete events, abstracted from the broader structural contexts of environment, history, culture, society, economy, and polity.” Moreover, two forms of movement, circulation and migration,
have been transformed into “epistemological artifacts” by the academy, “so that a rise in the incidence, the visibility or the character of one automatically translates into an equivalent decline of the other” (ibid, 289). My concern with metaphors and images led me beyond deconstructing rural/urban and traditional/modern dualisms. Using interviews and biographical accounts, I focused on the subjective interpretation of movement. Given the absence of actual voices in mobility studies, I insert Samoan interests into the foreground. From the outset, I include their ways of understanding place, culture, and movement.

From the 1960s to the mid-1970s, ‘intent to return’ distinguished ‘circulation’ from ‘migration’, noted by such Pacific specialists as Ward (1971) and Connell (1978). This distinction between migrant and circulator was usually drawn on the basis of residential permanence but assessing degree of permanence was inevitably difficult. Gould and Prothero’s (1975) study of Black African mobility reveals the difficulties inherent in the absence of a universally accepted definition of permanence. They suggest (1975, 42) “If there is a specific desire on the part of the individual or group of individuals who are moving to return to their place of origin, and when before leaving in the first place this intention is clear, then the movement may be considered as circulation rather than migration.” Based on experience of population movement in Papua New Guinea, Ward (1980) argues against the utility of the distinction between ‘permanent’ and ‘impermanent’, acknowledging the work of Bedford (1973), Chapman (1970), Hugo (1978), and Prothero (1969) which led him to this position. Ward considers the distinction between migration and circulation unhelpful to understanding Pacific Island movement, yet he continues to argue (Ward 1997) that circular migration represents an
early phase in a longer process of migration transition rather than a pattern that will continue. As Chapman (1975, 144) points out, “Over the years… research [on island societies] has crystallized larger questions, that is the cultural specificity of the conventions of ‘migration’, and the need to elucidate ones that are locally relevant but reported in ways that still permit cross-cultural and international comparison.”

The use of ‘intent’ as an indicator of whether a person is a migrant, a sojourner, or a circulator continued to strike me as spurious the further my research progressed. Increasingly, my focus turned towards movement as a process of establishing and re-establishing relationships. Bonnemaison (1985) begins to delineate this prospect in discussing the ‘tree and canoe’ metaphor, where he likens the people of Tanna, Vanuatu, to trees rooted in their kin group but collectively venturing out, like canoes that have paths to explore in the wider world. Bonnemaison suggests that places cannot be described as ‘urban’ or ‘rural’ because notions of territory transcend such obvious boundedness. The relationship between physical and conceptual spaces can be grounded in examination of metaphors, which are simultaneously part of cultural communication and reflections of social relations.

Similarly, in a study of the Pullapese of Weno, Chuuk, Flinn (1992) indicates a shift away from the notion of bounded community structures. She argues (1992, 164) that “cultural notions of people and mobility structure interaction with others and define social and cultural boundaries, they affect perceptions of locale and its relationship to social structure in the context of mobility, and they shape interpretations of past to meet present goals”. In his study of movement in Lakeba, eastern Fiji, Young (1998) draws on the metaphor of *wakolo* (pathways) to express identity and conceptions of movement and
place, in the Fijian social world. In wakolo, Lakebans conceive of mobility not around rural and urban places but as an embodiment of both place and people who define and redefine their relationships as they move. Quan-Bautista’s (2001) study on Satowan atoll similarly demonstrates that ‘migration’ viewed from the standpoint of villages or communities yield definitions that better reflect a lived reality. Movement is conceived of as a complex articulation of people and places that has its roots in enduring cultural knowledge. Such an understanding often appears contradictory and its essence can be evasive, but it more nearly captures people’s experience.

Similarly, in this study I have focused on Samoan cultural metaphors of mobility like malaga (movement back and forth) and the connections that people establish as they move. Samoan conceptions of movement and identity are associated with the complex goals of households desiring economic and political advancement. My work confirms the suspicion that conventional ‘migration’ analyses are founded on inappropriate assumptions and stereotypes which unfortunately have informed research on Pacific Island mobility from the early 1960s. In Chapter Five, I focused on emic understandings of mobility by examining va’afealoa‘i or ‘social space’, the space that relates rather than separates. What people emphasized was the coming and going that describes the interconnectedness of land and society. Social worlds are not bound by geography and ‘return’ is a simple shift of residence between places. The concept of malaga provides a powerful instance when ‘migration’ is investigated from a specific cultural viewpoint, in this case fa’ a Samoa. Physical displacement, the result of movement, is not necessarily tantamount to social displacement.
To fully comprehend the epistemology of fa’a-Samoa, mobility, and identity, in Chapter Five I teased out various cultural and sociopolitical dimensions of mobility. Conceptually, this went beyond the conventional economic understanding of mobility to highlight the sociopolitical dimensions of the household. The centrality of ‘aiga development is an inherent aspect of Samoan movement and going to live overseas is no escape from or a disavowal of fa’a-Samoa. As Susan Maiava writes:

They [Samoans] have also invested in education and in emigration, which has not been motivated so much by the desire to escape from the culture but the desire to achieve culturally desirable objectives. The decision to migrate is made as much by those who stay as by those who go. Emigration is often considered a result of western influence, but Hau’ofa argues it is a longstanding Oceanic cultural practice (2001, 91).

More and more studies in the Pacific Islands are pointing to a complex Oceania, requiring nuanced analyses of mobility, identity, and development. In a recent study of population mobility in Micronesia, Quan-Bautista (2001) examines Satowan conceptions of movement and concludes that whether one actually returns is not as important as the intention, without invoking the notion of long-lasting or fleeting absence. Understanding movement is broadly informed by cultural ideas about home and the atoll, rather than perceived as a distinction between rural/urban or atoll/metropolitan. Movements are conceived as proper or improper depending on the intentionality involved. For the people of Satowan, what is important is how those away enhance the fa-lang (home site) through reciprocity, remittance, and continued interaction.

To study the social and cultural worlds of mobility, I drew on notions of i’inei (here, local) and fafo (abroad, overseas) as metaphors for the culture of Samoan mobility. The village/metropolitan, core/periphery, or local/global dichotomies found in the
literature tend to focus too much on inequality and economic opportunity. *I inei and fafo* go beyond such polarities to emphasize relationships and social spaces (*va fealoha'i*).

*I inei and fafo* also allow us to see the historical and cultural meanings of mobility, home, and identity. Mobility involves both continuity and change. *Fa'a-Samoa* values and meanings remain largely intact, but they vary between *fafo* and *i inei* in that some cultural practices are emphasized and others not. Over long swings of time, many forms of mobility have endured, some have been modified, some have dissipated as new ones have emerged. *Malaga* is deeply rooted in the past; many forms reflect the vitality of customary life. Mobility also indicates life changes, how people respond to birth, marriage, reproduction, and aging. As households extend and as family members grow, marry, and have children, some establish new households. As (Subedi 1993, 293) writes, “To leave ‘home’ in the quest for cash for survival, for maintenance, and for improvement in household status is not a contemporary phenomenon and, for centuries has quite often driven people away from their cultural hearth.”

Often, mobility has been presented by scholars as a narrative of economic flows, social disjunction, and process of discontinuity set within the bounds of rural and urban spaces. These depictions are couched in a dualistic model of the push and pull of core and periphery areas. These dichotomies have become entrenched in mobility and development studies in the Pacific, especially as these imageries have been promoted in development discourse. Such a view of the world is hard to resist when dominant and so compellingly portrayed in development plans, national censuses, and international studies. Young argues:
In the Pacific where physical demarcations of rural and urban often mirror the relationships between a political and economic core and an outlying periphery, such views have gained the status of reality among both scholars and government officials, particularly those interested in the ‘development process’ (1998, 319).

Things are not so straightforward, however. Local concepts more profoundly influence mobility than is suggested by structural, dependency, or MIRAB models. The positivist nature of much of these works, and their assumptions that ‘migration’ is the result of rationalizing economic forces and can thus be statistically modeled, means they have little to contribute to our understanding of ‘migration’ as a social or cultural act.

As already noted, this study has deliberately drawn from a mix of outside and inside perspectives reflected in the work of humanist scholars such as Bonnemaison (1985, 1994) and Chapman (1985, 1991) and of indigenous academics such as Hau’ofa (1982, 1993), Meleisea (1987, 1992), and Wendt (1976, 1999). All these scholars recognize the conceptual and epistemological challenges facing mobility research. They address their concerns through ongoing inductive studies, as well as suggest a significant shift to biographical and autobiographical narratives of movement.

Following their lead, I have shown that life in Salelologa has been deeply affected by overseas movement. Many families have been economically and social transformed, resulting in a reconfiguration of local hierarchies and the ways in which they are expressed. Remittances and access to overseas opportunities have become central to the sociocultural and political life of families in Salelologa, but they continue to be evaluated in terms of i’inei (local). The social institutions of fa’a-Samoa, such as household and chieftainship, have been affected, adapting in a variety of ways to fit the overseas movement of their members. Likewise movement has had multiple effects on
the lives of those remaining at 'home', including their expectations of themselves, notions of allegiance, and cultural identity.

Simplistically, all these changes could be understood as reactions to external forces emanating from a capitalist core. Dependency in the Pacific like Connell (1980) and Shankman (1976), and the globalization theorists Featherstone (1990) and Wallerstein (1990), see mobility as the domination of the core over Samoa, the periphery. For many writers, this is the essence of globalization as manifested in Western goods, computers and the internet, videos, and the ubiquitous power of television. Indeed, the world is functionally shrinking, “but the ‘global village’ still retains its distinctive neighborhoods, colonialism and the recent globalization have failed to erase their particular properties” (de Blij and Muller 2002, 29). Many studies of movement have put greater emphasis on the socioeconomic aspects to the neglect of ideological change and the culture of mobility.

Culture and Fa’a-Samoa

The cultural metaphors of *malaga* (movement back and forth), *fafo* (overseas, abroad), and *i’inei* (here, local) provide alternatives to dualistic frameworks. To explore the interactions of Salelologa members both *fafo* and *i’inei*, I draw on Buttimer’s (1980) twin metaphors of ‘home’ and ‘reach’, Bonnemaison’s (1985) imagery of ‘tree and canoe’, and Pierre Bourdieu’s (1977) idea of ‘symbolic capital’. In Chapter Four, I analyzed outside and inside understandings of culture, identity, and mobility, but with a focus on ideological changes and their theoretical underpinnings. As Hau’ofa rightfully observes:
Any unity or success that we may conceive cannot be fully realized if we take only the socioeconomic factors into consideration. The realm of the mind and values, and that is culture, cannot be divorced from that of society and economy. The two are two sides of the same coin. We are creatures of culture and history as well as biological entities with need for nourishment, shelter, and protection (1993, 130).

Ideological change in fa’a-Samoa cannot be understood separately from local hierarchy. This study finds that fa’a-Samoa, fa’a-fafo (overseas ways), fa’a-palagi (foreign/western ways), and fa’a-lelotu (church ways) are operating simultaneously. Not only are these systems of thought not mutually exclusive of each other, but they have the capacity to undercut each other. My narratives from local groups also pointed to the complementary role of fa’a-lelotu and fa’a-Samoa, which at times act in concert to counter fa’a-fafo or fa’a-palagi. This manifests itself in village resistance to new evangelical churches that appeal increasingly to the younger generation. In the villages of Samoa, where the church is both a part of the culture and a way of life, new religious movements are often seen as a threat to the status quo, especially to the combined power of church officials and the matai council. Despite the separation of church and state in the Samoan constitution, established churches and village councils work closely to counter the introduction of new and especially evangelical churches.

I also examined the historical development of culture and the approach taken was determined largely by the premise that culture, as a ‘scientific category’ is a social construct. My examination of the genealogy of culture, its origins in anthropology and geography, reveals them of huge importance in understanding how western knowledge has produced its ‘others’ and so categorized the world. Social scientists now understand that knowledge and power are not evenly distributed among all people in all places.
although they are diffused everywhere. As Foucault (1978, 94) puts it, “Power is not
something that is acquired, seized or shared, something that one holds on to or allows to
slip away, power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of non-egalitarian
and mobile relations.” Until recently, preoccupations with objectivity and dichotomy
have made it difficult to recognize that the concept of culture is infused with power.

Studying culture and power relations are an important step in understanding the function
of power in scholarly discourse.

My conception of fa’a-Samoa was informed by postcolonial theory, where culture
is understood to be negotiated rather than static and given meaning through symbols,
places, and relationships (Gupta and Ferguson 1997; Silvey and Lawson 1999). I
considered the political economy of fa’a-Samoa in an ideological sense by examining its
relationship to people, values, land, and mobility. Specifically, I looked at how
colonialism, Christianity, and capitalism have interacted and informed fa’a-Samoa.

Samoan views encompass an ‘essentialized’ or ‘objectified’ definition of culture as
material things, institutions, rituals, and customary ways, but also understand fa’a-Samoa
as something strategic, negotiable, and contested.

Drawing from Bourdieu’s (1977) insights, I demonstrated how cultural meanings
are hierarchically arranged and controlled by particular groups, such as the matai council
(ali’i and tulafale), aualuma, tama’ita’i (unmarried sisters/daughters), faletua ma tausi
(wives of matai), the clergy, the government and state bureaucracy. In Bourdieu’s
interpretation, economic class channels cultural flows, rather than culture creating social
structure. Although economic class was not given as much priority as Bourdieu, I did
examine the ideology that underpins concepts of social relations as in va fealoa’i (social
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space), *fa’alavelave* (life crises events), *tautua* (service), *alofa* (love, compassion), and *fa’aaloalo* (respect). I drew on Bourdieu’s notion of ‘symbolic capital’ to describe alternative, yet powerful cultural interpretations that explain why Samoans continue to value their *‘aiga* and *fa’a-Samoa* even though structural and MIRAB models consider this to be ‘irrational’ economic behavior. The perspectives of Salelologa people demonstrate that *fa’a-Samoa* and interconnections with *‘aiga* have a profound influence on what movement means to Samoan households.

In seeking to understand Samoan behavior, many writers start with rank and status (e.g., Freeman 1984), viewing them as primary concerns that apparently determine what Samoans do. When such writers tie chieftainship too closely with rules of kinship, they neglect the question of how culture integrates with mobility. As Maiava notes, “To understand Samoan culture is to understand that the family or *‘aiga* motivates all behavior, including purposes involving rank and status. A Samoan’s interest and emotion is centered on his or her family, and from there to the family’s place in the community” (2001, 79). Self-esteem is related to family position and status; to be a member of a well-respected family and socially well located is a universal goal of all families. Davidson (1967, 29) observes that “Samoa contained no proletariat, none who could not take pride in their family connections.”

**Culture and development**

Another finding is of the relationship of culture to development. Culture plays a vital role in how members and households evaluate their options and the choices they make. In the case of Samoa ‘development’, as it is used within the context of movement
and remittance, is often counterposed to culture. However, the effects of remittances and
development are better understood when situated in a dialectic relationship between *fa’a-Samoa* and modernity. Culture and development are counterposed: development based on economic rationality, good governance, and socioeconomic progress is set against culture or custom, traditions, and identity. As Hooper writes:

> The decay of custom and impoverishment of culture are often seen as wrought by development while failures of development are haunted by the notion that they are due, somehow to the darker irrational influences of culture. The problem is to resolve the contradiction between them so as to achieve the greater good—access to material goods, welfare and amenities, ‘modern life’ without the sacrifice of the traditional values and institutions that provide material security and sustain diverse social identities (1994, page ii).

Between Salelologa people and dependency and structuralist theorists, there is a clash of views about motivations for moving. The MIRAB (Migration, Remittances, Aid and Bureaucracy) approach, although helpful in acknowledging the unique features of island societies, is still macrostructural. James (1997) argues that MIRAB is more useful for accounting for national aggregate economic indicators than for interpreting local movements. The case of Salelologa clearly illustrates the crucial interplay of macro-and micro phenomena.

In Chapter Six, I reconsidered conventional conceptions of diaspora, development, and remittances, then probed their cultural underpinnings in *fa’a-Samoa* to present an ideology that goes beyond the confines of economic rationality. Development is a problematic and ambiguous concept that remains over determined and overused in both the Pacific and other literatures. Because the welfare of the family group is deeply rooted in *fa’a-Samoa*, it is antithetical to the individualistic ethic of growth advocated by
most development theorists. As Gibson (1994, 142) argues from a developmentalist standpoint, "Development is seen from the narrow strictures of economic growth and modernization. Solutions are seen as mutually exclusive yet a monolithic formula of development growth can't solve for all." Samoan culture is not necessarily opposed to development. Samoans, however, are concerned that development proceeds in culturally appropriate ways founded on a communal framework, rather than exclusively prioritize making money for its own sake. As Slatter observes (1994, 34), "Growth and development are not the same thing, and pursuing the former at the expense of the latter is a sure recipe for impoverishing the Pacific. The growth imperative is already fundamentally altering the meaning and nature of development in this region...perhaps worst of all, undermining the redistributive ethic which lies at the heart of Pacific Island culture."

Fa'a-Samoa is constantly being negotiated as Samoans seek to achieve a balance between capitalist and western culture on the other hand, and its own cultural imperatives on the other. Samoans believe their culture has served them well, even for the last two hundred years since contact with Europeans. They uphold their culture with pride and honor, although sometimes become susceptible to over-generalizing about fa'a-palagi (western culture). My research highlights the ambivalence, contradiction, paradox, and conflict that are integral parts of any culture, exacerbated especially when two cultures with different epistemologies interact. How Samoans innovate to survive technological and social change without losing their cultural identity will be key to the success of fa'a-Samoa. It is an ongoing process that cannot be fully captured during the course of one researcher's field experience.
The enduring strength of *fa’a-Samoa* has been suggested for some time in scholarly studies of movement and remittances. The sociologist David Pitt (1970) emphasized that ‘migration’ and ‘remittances’ have reinforced *fa’a-Samoa* without adversely affecting the island economy, maintaining that movement actually supports cultural continuity. Shankman (1976), an anthropologist, links migration with underdevelopment arguing that although remittances bring short-term income benefits to many Samoan households, the increasing dependence on remittances make for a problematic future. Studies of migration and social change in Samoa tend to emphasize loss of tradition, seeing migration as something external to Samoans. Thus the action of movement is seen as negative as theorists neglect the agency and self-determination of villagers.

Structuralist models of migration are also greatly flawed with dependency models presenting a pessimistic view of the effects of migration on sending communities. Various authors argue that the dependence of a local economy on the global world market eventually leads to its collapse. To what extent is such pessimism reflected in empirical reality? To answer this, it is important to bear in mind two points made in previous chapters. First, movement affects not just individuals but also households, communities, regions, and states. Second, as Franco (1991) points out, Samoans shape the influences of migration through adaptive strategies or cultural competencies such as *fa’alavelave*, *tautua*, and *fesoasoani*.

*Fa’alavelave* will always be part of Samoan life. Although observers often warn that the ‘excessive’ redistributive nature of *fa’a-Samoa* might lead to its demise, those from Salelologa frequently dispute this. It is not the giving and serving involved in
traditional fa’a-Samoa practices that is problematic but rather its scope and extent, frequency and conflict with contemporary living styles. Malaga between i’inei and fafo has increased awareness of life overseas and Samoa. Families are reevaluating what constitutes adequate resources for fa’alavelave as against development and status of ‘aiga. The ‘search for money’ (O’Meara 1990) is very much part of fa’a-Samoa and movement abroad is an integral aspect of local economic development. Members look favorably upon movement for the perceived benefits-macroeconomic for Samoa and microeconomic for the ‘aiga. Samoans from Salelologa argue that the country does not need to be westernized; instead, indigenous ways should adapt to changing times and contexts on their own terms.

Fa’alavelave, status, and alofa

This study makes it clear that Salelologa people perceive overseas movement as an organizational strategy aimed towards developing the ‘aiga. Remittances and contributions to fa’alavelave are seen to be a caring practice motivated primarily by love and commitment to family, including the upholding of status in the community. The workings of a ‘moral economy’ were clearly present. As Ravuvu (1992) explains, many Pacific Island communities focus on the need to feel good, to belong, and feel secure. True development is seen in the totality of a people, founded on human dignity and respect. Most important in fa’a-Samoa are day-to-day social existence, institutions (fa’alupega, matai, ‘aiga, church), and values of alofa (love), tautua (service), fa’aaloalo (respect). Fa’alavelave give these principles explicit form (‘Ai’ono 1992; Anae 1998, Meleisea 1992).
In Chapter Six, I described how rank and status are made visible at fa’alavelave through the extended example of Pipi Esera’s funeral, which became an occasion to enhance the collective status of the ‘aiga. A lot of cash and other resources were expended and exchanged which from the structural-dependency and MIRAB points of view, is conspicuous and unproductive consumption. Bourdieu (1977) has made it clear, however, that economic capital is only one form, albeit the most important in western countries, for the ‘symbolic capital’ of political power, prestige, contacts, and formal education is one of the most important for accumulation. In Pipi Esera’s funeral, cash was not used to ‘develop’ Samoa but to empower fa’a-Samoa by injecting dollars into the practice of exchange. Economic and social power are inseparable in fa’alavelave, while the cultural concepts of ‘aiga and alofa complicate conventional interpretations of ‘development’. Viewing fa’alavelave in a holistic manner dissolves the distinction between capital and social investment since money serves multiple and reciprocal purposes. Brown and Walker (1995) find that Tongans and Samoans are motivated by altruism, as well as the intention to accumulate assets and make investments back home. Remittances also come in kind. In Tonga, inexpensive goods sent by overseas Tongans are resold at a local flea market (Brown and Connell 1993) and the same process is revealed in the growing number of Salelologa families who sell goods at the local market.

Being a Samoan abroad commands as much social and economic power as if living on family land for overseas relatives provide both economic (remittances) and symbolic capital. These ‘transnational corporations of kin’ noted in the MIRAB literature generate money for well-tuned and connected ‘aiga. Samoans overseas also
provide ‘cultural capital’ in the form of knowledge of another culture, modern technology, and social prestige, while remittances themselves contribute to ‘social capital’ by reflecting kinship reciprocity and retaining ties to ‘home’ communities. Va’a (2001, 242) notes, “Many Samoans consider that remittances and contributions to fa’alavelave are forms of investment for the future for themselves and their children especially if later on they return to Samoa, or run for political office. Their participation in fa’a-Samoa is not irrational.”

This research partly responds to Franco’s (1991) speculation about how tautua (service) might change. Traditional elements of tautua still remain in Salelologa but are manifested in a host of practices that capitalize on the fruits of economic mobility. The boundaries of fafo and i’inei are blurred, for instance, when matai conferment is done overseas. Tautua is not only derived from the untitled, but also from both other matai and the economically mobile and formally educated Samoans at both fafo and i’inei. This practice highlights the use of matai titles to complement modern status; individuals do not necessarily need to live in Samoa to authenticate titles, further suggesting that fa’a-Samoa as identity is not tied to place or defined by territorial limits. Franco (1991, 352) further also speculates “that as ‘aiga connections in Samoa became severely attenuated over time remittances in the form of tautua (service) might become more like fesoasoani (help).” As argued in Chapter Six, flows of cash are of many different orders from regular remittances for everyday needs to money sent to cover specific events or projects. Nor are remittances just unidirectional, from fafo (abroad) to i’inei (here), as often assumed. Rather, as I argued, because ‘aiga are geographically dispersed and fa’alavelave occur all over the Pacific, diverse forms of support move in many directions.
This makes it difficult to distinguish between tautua and fesoasoani as movement affords members more opportunities to manipulate a situation. What constituted ‘aiga in Samoatoto e tasi ‘blood relations’ and tino e tasi ‘body relations’ is now expanded to include other Samoans and even non-Samoans as friends and acquaintances.

Everyday actions and individual opportunism push the boundaries of the social hierarchies that structure Samoan interaction as captured in the phrase O Samoa ‘o le atunu’u ‘ua ‘uma ‘ona tofi (Samoa is a country that has been neatly divided). Scholarly studies of Samoa have clearly demarcated the hierarchies, roles, functions, and responsibilities perpetuated among Samoans. However, economic position and/or hereditary rank are not the only measures of status and power, for life opportunities and strategies are influenced by birth, education, overseas movement, and having wealthy or powerful kin. These factors are not static. During research in Salelologa, Auckland, and Santa Ana, it became increasingly clear that access to cash and the ability to influence events because of economic wealth is growing in importance, some of which are precipitated by movement.

Fa’a-Samoa and Social Relationships

My third finding reveals rather different conceptions of social relationships than are theorized in traditional anthropology. ‘Legitimacy’ and ‘knowledge of kin’ are at the heart of these interactions, while Samoan conceptions of movement are intimately tied with social relationships and connections (faia). People share and reestablish social links by moving; kinship and other social connections define who, when, and where people travel.
The Samoan formula for maintaining identity and ensuring the recognition and support of others is often expressed publicly in the saying with which these concluding reflections began: ‘Ae iloa a’u i Togamau, ou te iloa fo’i ‘oe i Si’ulepa (If you recognize me in Togamau, I will recognize you in Si’ulepa). This expression refers to va, or the social space that informs the Samoan concept of relationships as related to an underlying moral economy. Relationships are holistically conceived within their social, economic, and political contexts. As argued in Chapter Five, there is a sense that one lives relationships through responsibilities that are maintained over time. One may be part of a kindred, but if it is not expressed in tautua (service) and va fealoa’i (social space), it is without much substance. This is also evident in Samoan understanding of ‘culture’ as everyday lived fa’a-Samoa. It is at the heart of notions of common courtesy, hospitality, and caring for the social space (va fealoa’i), the unity-that-is-all (Wendt 1999).

Young (1998) explains that, in Fiji, there is a difference between ‘being kin’ and ‘knowing kin’. “Being kin is encoded in relations where sibling hierarchy, gender, and age structure social relations while ‘knowing kin’ embodies memories where the distinctions between past and present relationships is both personal and shared” (Young 1998, 298). ‘Being kin’ is not enough, observes Young, one has to live it through participation, reciprocity, and obligation whether one lives in the village or away from it. “Knowledge of kin relationships is central, as legitimacy of claims to titles is often subject to challenge even within closely related families” (ibid, 299). Just as the Fijian social world emphasizes legitimacy and recognition of kin in the pathways they establish and maintain, so also is legitimacy at the heart of the Samoan social world.
In Chapter Seven, I examined how ‘home’ has become multilocal in the diaspora demonstrated through a focus on ‘aiga or household rather than taking the individual as the unit of analysis. Examining mobilities of Salelologa households emphasizes both the presence of transnational and circular mobility. Traditional ceremonies remain an important part of Samoan culture at both fafo and i’inei, the extensive circulation around both reinvigorates ethnic Samoan identity and manifests a transnational social structure. Circulation takes on greater significance when greater distance is involved, for it invigorates fa’a-Samoa by linking overseas communities both with each other and with Samoa. The Salelologa experience suggests that both cultural and economic considerations determine movements back and forth; formally locating movers within the household finds support for both transnational and circular mobility.

Although the structural constraints imposed by immigration laws and overseas governments can greatly affect the ability of Samoans to move, ‘aiga connections allow members to work around these. Decisions to move or to stay are constrained by macro-economic and political structures as well as by cultural interpretations of mobility, but however diverse, they result in multilocal communities. Decisions affecting a household, moreover, are made not in just one household but across a number.

Despite the persistence of fa’a-Samoa and its influence on mobility behavior, there is no one fa’a-Samoa and its transformation is a process of articulation, disarticulation, and rearticulation in different contexts in the diaspora. The concept of diaspora and its application to fa’a-Samoa was examined in chapter six. Diaspora is usually associated with the nationalist or nation state project (Axel 1996; Cohen 1997; Safran 1991), but “fa’a-Samoa ”both as identity and as an intellectual tool was found to
connect Samoans everywhere regardless of national boundaries. *Fa’a-Samoan* is greater than the nation, because it is unrestrained by territorial boundaries. This lack of confinement to a particular place complicates the reading of Salelologa movements as diaspora which normally suggests the ‘desire’ to return to a former nation state.

Nonetheless, the deep commitment to maintain *fa’a-Samoan* can be read as a diasporic process, because Samoans are linked across time and space, but not in itself as a nation. Anae examines ethnicity and *fa’a-Samoan* among New Zealand-born Samoans, concluding that “The kind of ethnicity exerted by my research group was not primarily concerned with the project of nationalism, but with the maintenance of a transnational community or a version of Safran’s (1991) ‘diaspora’ in which cultural, social, and economic advantages can be pursued by Samoan people across time and space” (Anae 1998, 361). The views of Salelologa at *fafo* and *i’inei* support Anae’s results. They may have multiple affiliations related to place of birth, education, and socialization experiences as well as a “persistent” Samoan ethnic identity that she documents. Both Anae’s study of church membership in Newton, Auckland, and my own of Salelologa communities in Savai’i, Auckland, and Santa Ana converge to reshape the ontology of diaspora. Yet, recently, such scholars as Bedford (1997) and Connell (1999) have used ‘diaspora’ to describe population movements in Oceania but without problematizing the concept. *Fa’a-Samoan* transcends physical space, but locality matters. Those *fafo* (overseas, abroad) with economic power remain important to Salelologa, just as those *i’inei* (here, local) and the spiritual and cultural power of ‘home’ remain important to the lives of Salelologa Samoans. No matter where anyone resides.
In this study, I have chosen to focus intimately on particular places and relationships, but the themes examined extend beyond the boundaries of a particular project. Through a sound geographic and ethnohistorical account of Salelologa movement, the fa’a-Samoa way of knowing has been brought to the fore and compared to western concepts. My approach has been to interweave local meanings and communal understanding with the academic discourses set within the western intellectual tradition. The meaning of movement and expansion of Island worlds occurs through a complex of journeying, exchange, and kinship; using fa’a-Samoa as a conceptual framework provides more nuanced conceptions of migration, diaspora, and transnationalism. Samoan understandings not only challenge western conceptions but also their inability to be automatically transferred to new or different cultural contexts, as has become clearer through increasingly informed studies of Pacific Island mobility over the last three decades. Culture matters, even as boundaries are contested and transgressed through population movement.

This study has attempted to shift beyond the dichotomies of rural-urban or village-metropolitan and the assumptions contained in applying them to Samoan social and cultural contexts. Future research on Samoa should continue to critically examine western academic categories and definitions that although rooted in the EuroAmerican experience, are taken as given. By focusing on sociocultural relationships, people’s associations with places, and knowledge of both village and metropolitan environments, future studies will better elucidate the definitions, categories, meanings, and epistemologies of people’s movement. Scholars should also seek to integrate methods from a number of disciplines. A concerted effort at longitudinal studies of island
communities at home and abroad, along with a deliberate mix of inside and outside perspectives would produce more nuanced conceptual approaches. Empirical detail informs theory. Cultural and population approaches to mobility research are often textual and hypothetical but can benefit greatly from field study, which enables scholars to understand the meaning of movement rather than merely describing or explaining it.

As attention is turned to the possibilities of concentrating on the embodied dimensions of people’s movement, so there must be a related shift to embrace the narratives and concerns of those who move. Questions of Salelologa people led to thoughts of personal and group relationships and of how social connections express the continuity of interactions with others who move, rather than around notions of cultural rupture and social dissipation. Samoans, through personal narratives of identity and movement, evoke *va* (social space) or the space that relates rather than separates and which guides appropriate behavior, acts of reciprocity, and continued links and interactions between people and place.

*Va* is a deeply embodied and prismatic concept that drives many of the interactions between movers and stayers. *Va* remains a moral imperative and strongly influences ongoing relationships amongst people of Salelologa as they move. *Va* is conceptually tied to a web of social networks; interrogation of *va* as it relates to movement can yield more nuanced understanding of Samoan mobility than the rural-urban or village-metropolitan binaries. *Va* has cultural, economic, and social imperatives which at a fundamental level describes ways of thinking about place, legitimacy, and belonging. *Malaga* (movement) of people and act of giving and receiving manifested in letters and remittances symbolize *va*.
Movement may geographically disperse ‘aiga members but it does not automatically translate to lesser involvement. Distance does not separate ‘aiga, but only provides further interconnecting social pathways. Nor does greater distance translate into diminishing commitment to families, because social connections constitute a significant part of people’s identity and self-esteem. It is therefore, the va, social connections rather than geographic boundaries that are central to Samoan conceptions of movement. Va like malaga is a concept larger than ‘migration’ which implies a narrow perception of movement and human relationships limited to concerns for survival and material consumption. This research has only begun to unravel the epistemology of va, much more research could be done in the future.
Field Census and Demographic Survey of Foua, Salelologa.

The purpose of the field census is to count how many people there are in Foua. A *de facto* (actual population present) and *de jure* (those who belong) count of the population is conducted. Thank you for your support and kind consideration in filling out this questionnaire. Your time and effort are greatly appreciated.

*Matai ma lona 'au'aiga* (matai and his specific extended household) MHH survey:

1. **Background**

- Village_________________ Sex: M or F  DATE _______
- MHH#_______________ Respondent’s name___________________
- Age_________ Generations lived_____ Education attained: primary, secondary, tertiary, university (circle correct one) Occupation_______________ Marital status_______________

1. How many of you in this MHH who live together and share the same kitchen or do things on a regular basis?

2. How do you define who belongs to the ‘aiga? 

2. **Demographic and personal characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Birth place</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g. Sina To'alepai</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>12/71 Foua</td>
<td>26/f single clerk</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
De facto and de jure count of population

1. How many people in your household who are members but do not live here at present?

2. Where do they live or work? Please write their addresses?

More individual information

Children born: (to be asked only of adults 15 years and over)
Children living now: males______ females______ Total children ever born: Males______ females______

Schooling:
- a) Too young for school (under 5)_____
- b) At school what grade or year?______
- c) Finished school_____
- d) No school_____

If b) or c) Name of school______ Place__________ Highest level completed?

Language: first language______ Name other languages person speaks or understand________

Literacy:
Is person able to read and write with understanding in own language? Yes or No_____
In English? Yes_____ or No_____

Occupation: On what activity do you spend most of your time?
- a) Garden for own food_____
- b) Garden mainly crops for sale_____
- c) Copra production_____
- d) Fishing_____
- e) Operating own business_____
- f) In paid employment_____
- g) Other: such as combination of a) and b) and c)_____
- h) None (for younger children and old people/sick people)_____

If e) own business describe type of business________
If f) paid employment: Type of job________
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APPENDIX B

‘Home’ Survey/Mobility Experience and Knowledge of Members at ‘Reach’

1. Do you have relatives overseas? Name places?

2. If NZ, USA or Australia, Where do they live? Please write their addresses.

3. When did your children or relatives leave for NZ, USA or Australia?

4. Who helped facilitate and arrange their going overseas in the first place?

5. Have you visited them? When? What occasions were these visits made?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>frequency of visits</th>
<th>visiting occasions</th>
<th>length of visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Did your relatives overseas visit you here in Samoa? How often? What occasions were these made?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>frequency of visits</th>
<th>visiting occasions</th>
<th>length of visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How are these linkages kept? Is it via letters, telephones, friends, or via friends or relatives traveling?

7. How often do you hear from relatives overseas?

8. Do you inform them about significant events happening in the family here in Samoa or other places?

9. Do your relatives overseas inform you about significant events happening there?

10. Were there group *malaga* overseas either organized by the church or village in which you were involved? What was the purpose of the *malaga*? Please describe the event including date and location.

11. How do you feel about your relatives overseas?

12. When do you become concern about members of your ‘*aiga* overseas?
APPENDIX C

‘Reach’ Survey/ Mobility experience of Salelologa Members *(fafo)*

1. Background

Address (tuatusi) ___________________________ Phone ___________ Sex: F or M
Family matai name _______________ Your name (Iou igoa) __________
Age _______ Generations lived (Augatupulaga) ______ Education attained: primary,
secondary, TTC, TTI, Nursing, University (circle correct one)
Occupation (galuega) ___________ Marital status _________

How many people in your family?

How do you define those who belong to your family?

When did you come here? Who facilitated your coming?

3. Did you visit Samoa or other places since you arrived in New Zealand or the United States?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>frequency of visits</th>
<th>visiting occasions</th>
<th>length of visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a____</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>_________________</td>
<td>______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b____</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>_________________</td>
<td>______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.____</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>_________________</td>
<td>______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.____</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>_________________</td>
<td>______________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Did your relatives in Samoa visit here? Who are they? How often? What occasions were these visits made?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>frequency of visits</th>
<th>visiting occasions</th>
<th>length of visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a____</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>_________________</td>
<td>______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b____</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>_________________</td>
<td>______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.____</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>_________________</td>
<td>______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.____</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>_________________</td>
<td>______________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How are linkages kept? Is it via letters, telephones, gifts, remittances, or via friends or relatives traveling?

6. How often do you hear from relatives in Samoa?

7. Do you inform them about significant events happening in the family here in NZ or United States?

8. Do your relatives in Samoa inform you about significant events happening there?
9. What is your relationship to your family here and in Samoa? How do you see that link?

10. How do your children, wife or husband feel about the ‘aiga in Samoa?

11. Are there other members of your ‘aiga in other countries of the world?

12. When do you become concerned about your ‘aiga in Samoa?

Life History and Biography

Please, could you share your story of when you came here and your experience: work, church, family, travels? As you reflect on this try and relate them to fa’a-Samoa and its influence on your life and important stages of your life experience.
APPENDIX D

Interview Questions on Concepts (used in interviews of those at ‘home’ and ‘reach’)

1. *Fa’a-Samoa*

1. What is *fa’a-Samoa*?

2. How do you define it and its use in the context of Santa Ana, Auckland and Samoa?

3. Are there changes or continuity in *fa’a-Samoa* overseas based on your experience? How might your residence in Santa Ana affect your identity as a Samoan from Salelologa? Do you see differences, similarities, or links? How does *fa’a-Samoa* practiced in Santa Ana differ or similar from that practiced in Auckland and that practiced in Samoa?

4. How do you know a person is inside or outside of *fa’a-Samoa*? Who decides that a person is inside or outside of *fa’a-Samoa*?

5. What mechanisms a person who is considered outside of *fa’a-Samoa* must do in order to come back into *fa’a-Samoa*?

2. **Concept of Malae: ‘Home’ and ‘Reach’**

1. What does ‘home’ mean to you? Are there other meanings attached to ‘home’? What is the literal meaning of home and what is its figurative meaning? How do you differentiate between these?

2. In relation to the question of *malae* (center) how does that center or what we may consider ‘home’ operate when we have many of our relatives overseas, for e.g. Santa Ana, Auckland or Australia. How is ‘home’ affected in a situation like that? Which one is the real center? How do you assess the importance given to each center, and on what basis? Are we having multiple centers or multiple ‘homes’?

3. How do you feel about being overseas and what do you think those at ‘home’ think of you or us?

4. How does distance from ‘home’ or *malae* affect your identity, do you think you are less Samoan by living away from the ‘*aiga* in Samoa? Do you need to live in Samoa to affirm your identity?

5. How do your travels back and forth affect perceptions of yourself, ‘*aiga*, and *fa’a-Samoa*?
6. Do you see change as good or bad for Samoa and fa’a-Samoan in what way?

3. Concept of Malaga and Diaspora

1. What is the meaning of *malaga*? When is travel/movement considered a *malaga* or not?

2. Is *malaga* taking on new meanings? How, and what context?

3. Are there other kinds of movement not considered *malaga*?

4. Did you receive *malaga* here? What was the purpose? Please describe the event, location and the activities.

5. What does diaspora mean in Samoan?

6. Do you see Samoan population movement as diaspora? If yes in what way it is OR if no in what way it is not?
APPENDIX E

List of People interviewed/had conversations for further explanation of Samoan phrases or main events in history of the village.

‘Aumua Mata’itusi (Honolulu, Hawai’i August 2002)
Sina Leatigaga Muavae (Salelologa, December 2002)
‘Asomua Simi (Salelologa, September 1999)
Fa’amele Luamanuvae (Salelologa August 1998, Auckland April 1999)
Fa’alenu’u Lilomaiaiva Niko (Salelologa August 2000)
Galuvao Tanielu (Apia, Samoa October 1999)
Ofoia Fiso (Apia, Samoa, October 1999)
Leatigaga Muavae (Salelologa September 1999)
Pauli Taetafe (Salelologa (August 1998, 1999)
Tuilimu Matofa (Salelologa November 1999)
Matamua Pua’atoga (Salelologa November 1999)
Loia Fiaui (Honolulu, Hawaii January 2001)
Luamanuvaes Poe (Salelologa 1999, 2000)
Luamanuvaes Tapelu (Auckland March 1999, 2002)
Ti’a Eti (Auckland March 1999)
Pipi Iese Esera (Santa Ana 2000, 2002)
Peta Logovi’I (Santa Ana, 2000)
Leata Logovi’I (Santa Ana, 2000)
Pesaleli Logovi’I (Santa Ana, 2000)
Ti’a Sitivi (Salelologa 1999, Santa Ana 2000)
Pipi Sa a.k.a. Fiu Sa (Salelologa 1999, 2000)
Tutai Taylor and Luamanuvaes Taylor (Salelologa 1999, 2000)
Silia Luamanuvaes Filipo (Salelologa 1998, 1999)
‘Asomua ‘Elia (Salelologa 1999)
GLOSSARY

Samoan Alphabet and Pronunciation

There are seventeen letters in the Samoan language:

a, e, i, o, u, f, g, l, m, n, p, s, t, v, h, k, r

a is pronounced as in farther

\( a \) is pronounced as in farther

e is pronounced as in egg

i is pronounced as in bit

\( i \) is pronounced as in bit

o is pronounced as in hot

u is pronounced as in shoot

\( u \) is pronounced as in shoot

g pronounced 'ng’ as a nasal sound

s less sibilant than in English

Most consonants are pronounced as in English

‘aiga family, household, kin group

‘aiga o le fanau children’s families

‘aiga o le tama paternal family

‘aiga o le tina maternal family

alalafaga welcome gathering, also polite name for village

ali’i chief

aloa’ia recognized and legitimate

aloha love, compassion (Samoan)

aloa love, compassion (Hawaiian)

atunu’u country

‘uala social pathway

aualuma sister and daughters of matai in villages

‘aumaga untitled men, sons and brothers of matai in villages

aunu’ua without a village, to be exiled

‘ie avaga name for bride’s wedding fine mat (elopement mat)

‘ie o le fa’amatua name of fine mat to demonstrate children kinship

‘ie o le futumageso special fine mat in new building dedication
‘ie o le fusita  special fine mat in tattoo dedication
‘ie o le mavaega name of fine mat given by in-laws on behalf of daughter or son in law given at funeral of his/her parent or grandparent
‘ie o le measulu name of fine mat given on behalf of children of deceased parent or grandparent
‘ie o le nofo special fine mat in matai investiture
‘ietoga fine mat
‘ie tu name for bride’s wedding fine mat (stand tall mat)
i’inei here, local
ioe yes, affirmative
ifoga act of contrition
ita anger
itumalo district
oso presents or gifts to take on a trip
‘outou you
usu to welcome somebody after being away on a trip
fa’aaleoalo respect, venerate
fa’aioloagatama to demonstrate kinship
fa’aipoipoga legal wedding
fa’ailelegatama to demonstrate kinship of children
fa’a-fafo foreign ways
fa’alavelave lifecycle crucial events: weddings, birth, or funeral
fa’a-lelotu church ways
fa’aliu tupe convert to cash
fa’alupega charter of greetings or honorific salutations
fa’amagalo forgive
fa’amama ‘avega to lighten the burden
fa’amatai matai system, or matai way
fa’amavaega farewell gathering
Fa’a-palagi: western ways
Fa’a-Samo: Samoan way of life
Fa’asinomaga: heritage, where you belong
Fa’atafaga: to be drifted in nowhere
Fa’ate’a: to ostracize from village council
Fa’atosaga: midwife
Faia: social connections
Fai’ai fe’e: octopus in coconut cream
Fai’ai pusi: eel in coconut cream
Faife’au: messenger, to do errands
Fafo: overseas or abroad
Fagu sea: bottle of sea cucumber
Fale: generic term for house
Faleaitu: comedy
Fale na fuafua: honorific name for an arranged marriage
Faletalimalo: guest house
Faletoa: sleeping house
Fale tautu: traditional arranged marriage
Faletua: polite word for wives of chiefs
Faletua ma tausi: polite word for wives of matai
Fanua ma ele’ele: land and soil
Feagaiga: polite word for faife’au (church minister), also means covenant
Feololo: medium
Fesoasoani: to help, helpers
Fono: village council or matai council
Fonua: land (in Tongan)
Lalo: gift or present
Leai: nay, no
Lima foa’i: generous, and giving hand
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Translation/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>maasiasi</td>
<td>shame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malae</td>
<td>village green, its social and political center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malaga</td>
<td>movement back and forth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malosi</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manaia</td>
<td>polite term for son of chief or unmarried chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manupapalagi</td>
<td>polite word for cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matai</td>
<td>chieftainship consists of chiefs and orators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matai palota</td>
<td>ballot matai, titles made because of elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matou</td>
<td>We</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marae</td>
<td>tribal sacred center, gathering place of the Maori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nofo</td>
<td>polite term for orator title conferment, also means sit up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu'u</td>
<td>village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu'u fai mea leaga</td>
<td>village with bad administration, lacking integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu'u fai mea lelei</td>
<td>good and well-administered village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu'u fai mea maopopo</td>
<td>a coherent and well-led village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu'u vaivai</td>
<td>weak village and lacking leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palolo</td>
<td>special seafood delicacy comes once a year in Oct or Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palu fa'atasi</td>
<td>to mix together, to blend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pitonu'u</td>
<td>subvillage, hamlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saofa'i</td>
<td>polite term for chief title conferment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siapo</td>
<td>tapa cloth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si'i or si'i alofa</td>
<td>cultural gifts taken to funerals or weddings of relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sua</td>
<td>cultural gifts taken to make known connections or received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>during reciprocal exchange in fa'alavelave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tama ale malo</td>
<td>honorific name for children born of traditional/legal marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(child of victory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tama a le po</td>
<td>child born out of wedlock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tamaiti</td>
<td>young children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tama o le fa'asau</td>
<td>honorific name for children born of legal marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(declared child)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tama o le fuafuataga</td>
<td>honorific name for children born of legal marriage (child planned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tapua‘i</td>
<td>to wish well, pray and hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taeao o le Talalelei</td>
<td>Mornings of the Good News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taulasea</td>
<td>herbal healer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taupou</td>
<td>polite term for village maiden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasi</td>
<td>polite term for wives of orators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tautua</td>
<td>service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talanoa</td>
<td>talk story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tatou</td>
<td>Us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teuga o le nu‘u</td>
<td>the embellishment of the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tino e tasi</td>
<td>to do with kinship body relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tofī</td>
<td>responsibility, role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toto e tasi</td>
<td>to do with kinship blood relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tulafale</td>
<td>orator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tulaga</td>
<td>place, position in Samoan society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tulaga laoa</td>
<td>polite term for orator house site and seat of title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tulaga maota</td>
<td>polite term for chief house site and seat of title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tupu‘aga</td>
<td>ancestral birthright/links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va</td>
<td>social space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaivai</td>
<td>weak, small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va tapuia</td>
<td>social sacred space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vanua</td>
<td>land (in Fijian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honua</td>
<td>land (in Hawaiian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koko Samoa</td>
<td>Samoan cocoa bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whenua</td>
<td>land (in Maori)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Samoan Proverbial Expressions

‘Ua ‘ai ‘ulu tuana’i Ta’isi.
In times of plenty you eat breadfruit
and forget Ta’isi, or those who help
you during your hard times.

‘E manatua le alofa, ae le manatua fa’alaeo.
Love or compassion and sacrifice are
remembered, but not selfishness.

‘O le fa’ataualofa.
You give, I give. Reciprocal
exchange of love.

E mativa fesaga’i le Samoa.
Samoans face each other irrespective
of economic status.

‘E lele le toloa ‘ae ma’au i le vai.
The frigate bird flies but always
returns to its nest, the waterpond.

‘E tupu meafoa’i.
Things that are given keep growing.

‘O le ala ‘i le pule ‘o le tautua.
The way to authority is through
service.

‘Ua a’ai ma a’afu le nu’u.
The village was well covered and ate
to their heart’s content.

‘E maota tau’ave pe laoa tau’ave le Samoa.
Samoans take the honors of their
titles (chieflty or orator) with them.

‘E malae tau’ave le Samoa.
Another way of saying the same
epigraph above but it combines chief
and orator titles in malae (village
center) where house sites of both
chief and orator are located.

‘O le ala ua mutia ae le se ala fati.
It is a well-trodden path and not a
new path.

‘Ia lauamato’oto’o.
Deliberate with care, use caution
when dealing with social
relationships or social space.
Those who give are blessed more than those who receive.

If you recognize me in Togamau, I recognize you in Si’ulepa.
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