designed to transform the economy, by focusing on how the nuclear-testing program has transformed the economy of French Polynesia and how hard choices must be made if the territory (or an independent successor state?) is ever to have a viable economy independent of massive transfers from France, Poirine has made a real contribution. Some readers may wish that he had disaggregated income figures by ethnic group and social class (ie, Metropolitans, Chinese, "Demis," and indigenous Polynesians), had paid more attention to Polynesian cultural values, and had discussed the corruption allegedly rampant in the territory. By concentrating, however, on the structure of French Polynesia's economic dilemma, Poirine has provided a much-needed analysis. That he chose to publish these results of his 1991 doctoral dissertation in this fairly readable form, rather than as a technical monograph, and that he cofounded a monthly economic and political magazine now published in Tahiti, indicates that Poirine is interested in influencing policy in French Polynesia. Furthermore, his position at the new French University of the Pacific would seem to put him into the position to sensitize Polynesian students to the economic realities of their island world. It remains to be seen, however, what role his economic realism will play in shaping the postnuclear economy of this affluent but currently troubled part of the Pacific.

BEN FINNEY
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa


In December 1986, the government of Nauru established a Commission of Inquiry to establish responsibility for the rehabilitation of worked-out mining lands on the island, and the cost and feasibility of any proposed rehabilitation. The issue had lain dormant since Nauru's independence in 1968. At that time the so-called partner governments—Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom—which had been joint owners of the British Phosphate Commission and, under a United Nations trusteeship agreement, responsible for the administration of Nauru, maintained that all outstanding issues between the parties had been resolved by the agreements that had seen the Nauruans win control of the phosphate industry and secure independence. Hammer DeRoburt, Nauru's founding president, disagreed, declaring that his people had not been a willing party to the mining arrangements and would continue to seek compensation for the rehabilitation of worked-out mining lands. The Commission of Inquiry had been established in response to the final dissolution of the British Phosphate Commission and the distribution to the partner governments of the very substantial surpluses it had accumulated. Weeramantry, then Sir Hayden Starke Professor of Law at Monash University in Melbourne, chaired the inquiry; this book represents that portion of the
The Commission of Inquiry found that mining had always been carried on under dubious title and contrary to the rights of the Nauruan landowners; that the partner governments, and the phosphate commission on their behalf, had violated the general principles of mandates and trusts, as well as the specific conditions of agreements affecting Nauru, and had abused their power as trustees. It is also argued that the partner governments created for themselves a monopoly that generated profits and commercial advantages for them at the same time as it caused loss to the Nauruan people. Although the Commission of Inquiry suggested that the Nauruans' total loss might total A$1 billion, it held that the partners should accept responsibility for at least the A$74 million that it would cost to rehabilitate that portion of the island mined before independence. The government of Nauru submitted copies of these findings to the partner governments, and has taken its case (against Australia only in the first instance) to the International Court of Justice.

The book presents a comprehensive review of the history of Nauru's phosphate industry, exploring the details of mining agreements, international negotiations and obligations, the relevant aspects of international law, and the role of the United Nations. In one sense, much of this is not new, at least not in its component parts, but what is new is the way in which Weeramantry has brought it all together in his defense of the Nauruan position.

The argument, if it is held to be correct by the court, has major implications for other former trust territories (in essence, the old German colonies), including Western Samoa, New Guinea, Micronesia, and, outside the Pacific region, South West Africa (Namibia) and Tanganyika (Tanzania). If this case is successful, others might follow. It is noteworthy that Weeramantry spends very little time discussing Banaba (Ocean Island, in the neighboring Republic of Kiribati), which was the subject of a court action for compensation brought in the English High Court by the Banabans. In that case, Justice Megarry held that the colonial authorities had no legal case to answer, though he saw a moral obligation to pay compensation in respect of certain aspects of the mining. Weeramantry argues that the cases are quite different by virtue of the fiduciary relationship established by the trusteeship. The argument is pressed not only in terms of the "sacred trust" of the original mandate, but also in terms of broader concerns of "the duty of care" implicit in trusteeship, reinforced by the principles of environmental law.

While tracing the evolution of environmental law to earlier beginnings, Weeramantry focuses his discussion on the Stockholm Declaration of 1972 and subsequent developments. This raises a fundamental issue underlying many of the book's findings, which at times are presented with the clarity of hindsight and with a seeming unawareness of the anachronism that some of them represent. There is no doubt that the partner governments used cheap Nauruan phosphate to assist their rural economies, or that they took steps to protect their monopolist position in the Pacific phosphate industry. But there is rather more emphasis here on applying mod-
ern legal and moral principles to past events than there is to understanding events and attitudes within the context of their times. For example, the partner governments generally addressed what they saw as Nauruan needs—hence the educational and medical services praised by the Commission of Inquiry—and, until they were forced to do so in the anticolonial atmosphere of the 1960s, did not give much attention to Nauruan rights. The issue is mentioned in passing but not explored in any depth. The overall argument also depends to some extent on the rejection, in the name of trusteeship, of reports, information, and policies that were accepted at the time by the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations and the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. Did the partner governments know that they were acting outside the law and codes of international behavior as often as Weeramantry implies, or were they, rather, behaving as other nations did under like, if not exactly parallel, circumstances?

The discussion of alternatives to the rehabilitation of mining lands, and particularly resettlement, is disappointingly brief. Contrary to the implication given here, the partner governments, together with Nauruan leaders, gave serious consideration to the resettlement option from 1947. The proposals were assimilationist, even racist, at times, but the fact remains that a Community Long Term Investment Fund was established, and that the Nauruans themselves did not finally reject the resettlement option until 1964. The fund, although financed from royalties on phosphate exports, was handed to the Nauruan authorities at independence and its existence used by the partner governments to defend their view that provision had been made for the long-term future either by resettlement or rehabilitation. (Again, needs versus rights.)

Some steps have been taken to turn what began as a section of a report of a Commission of Inquiry into a publication for a wider and less determined audience. (The original report runs to ten volumes including a large number of reprinted documents.) The transition is not always easily made, however, especially for a reader who has an interest in pursuing the issues. The argument is sometimes repetitious, and at times a series of bald quotations from official documents takes over from analysis and commentary. There are difficulties with academic trap­pings. The commission numbered in its own series the extensive array of documents that it located, though much of the claimed "vast amount of hitherto unknown material" was at least known to specialists if not published or widely available. The report, and now the book, references sources and quotations to this numbering, which covers some fifteen hundred documents, rather than to original series and locations. Copies of the documents may be seen at the Nauru consulate in Melbourne but, for the reader, the context, or even the date or source, of the documents quoted is not always clear. Within the notes there are inconsistencies and inaccuracies, and further inconsistencies between notes and bibliography.

Such criticisms may be valid in academic terms but, in the final analysis, this is not so much an academic work as a tract. Although it is written in a

The Pacific was the last major region of the planet to be settled by humans, and the last to be colonized by Europe and drawn into a world system of global economy and culture. The three chapters in this slim publication situate three great trajectories of the colonizing and expansionary experience of the human species within a Pacific perspective. Originally presented as the Macmillan Brown Memorial Lectures at Massey University in 1989, Finney’s three essays are each distinct in topic and increasingly wide in focus. The first two serve as case studies of the Polynesian expansion into the Pacific and the later European colonization of the islands. The third is a “thought exercise” that speculates about human expansion into the cosmos. That they mingle rather uneasily within a single volume is less significant than their usefulness as separate pieces.

The first essay, “Voyaging into Polynesia’s Past,” describes recent expeditions of the Hōkūle‘a, the reconstructed Polynesian double-hull sailing vessel now completing its second decade of voyaging. A sizable literature on Pacific indigenous navigation has accumulated in recent years, and Finney has been perhaps its foremost contributor. In the current essay, Finney reviews the Hōkūle‘a project and discusses findings from three recent voyages of the vessel: the eastward crossing from Samoa to Tahiti, the longer southwest passage from Rarotonga to Aotearoa, and the most recent round-trip voyage between Hawai‘i and Tahiti (1985–1987). Readers of earlier descriptions of the project that concentrated on problems of vessel design and construction and challenges to noninstrument navigation, will note that the emphasis here shifts to wind and weather systems. Having demonstrated the seaworthiness of a sailing vessel modeled on ancestral Polynesian design, and the trustworthiness of indigenous navigational techniques and principles, the Hōkūle‘a voyages are now being used to suggest that indigenous meteorological knowledge in the Pacific may have been far more extensive and systematized than outside observers previously appreciated.

BARRIE MACDONALD
Massey University

* * *

The Pacific was the last major region of the planet to be settled by humans, and the last to be colonized by Europe and drawn into a world system of global economy and culture. The three chapters in this slim publication situate three great trajectories of the colonizing and expansionary experience of the human species within a Pacific perspective. Originally presented as the Macmillan Brown Memorial Lectures at Massey University in 1989, Finney’s style that takes for granted its own conclusions, and is thus to some extent an exercise in self-fulfilment, it is in fact a powerful statement of the Nauruan case for compensation. The essential issue is the extent to which “the duty of care” extends to nations as well as individuals, and whether an administering nation (in many senses a colonial power) may profit in any way from the fiduciary relationship. Weeramantry holds that, by virtue of their status, trust territories have a fundamentally different relationship with their administering governments than do other dependencies. It now remains to be seen whether the International Court of Justice agrees.