there. (Other studies could, of course, be profitably done elsewhere in Papua New Guinea. We fully endorse Smith’s call for “vigorous discussion and additional research on this vital issue”: we would certainly welcome, for instance, a full revelation about Wingti’s millions from MacWilliam or others.) Wewak was suited to our study, in other words, because it enabled us to provide the thickest record of both the habituations to, and the repudiations of, class happenings among a range of people whose lives intersected in many ways.

This brings up another consideration about both our mode of depiction and choice of focus: we wanted to do more than convey these class happenings in as truthful and as embedded a manner as we could manage. (This manner seems largely to convince Smith and Zimmer-Tamakoshi, who are both not only ethnographers but ethnographers of Papua New Guinea, a telling [disciplinary] difference between themselves and MacWilliam.) We also wished to convey these happenings to a variety of audiences, including the audience of Papua New Guineans. We wanted our renditions of these class happenings to be recognizable in their complexities, including that they be recognizable to the people—both the well- and the ill-favored—whose lives we were attempting to impart. In so doing, we sought to present, not the bureaucratization of academic categories calibrated into rigid typologies, but the subtlety of insinuation, of implication, of ambivalence as these happenings increasingly pervade and constitute daily Papua New Guinean life.

We do not think that everything worth saying about class can be encompassed by attending to such tellings. Nor do we think that our rendition of such tellings is definitive—and we wish to thank both Smith and Zimmer-Tamakoshi for their corrections, emendations, and elaborations. We do, however, insist that not to attend to such tellings would be to ignore crucial questions about the workings of class in differently positioned lives.

DEBORAH B GEWERTZ
Amherst College

FREDERICK K ERRINGTON
Trinity College

* * *


Volumes like this slender book, with their meticulous research and carefully crafted text, make history a valuable tool for analysis of contemporary events. The war on Bougainville was one of the great Pacific tragedies of the twentieth century, and the Panguna copper mine the trigger for it. It is hard to underestimate the impact of the development of the Panguna mine on the region; as Denoon states, Panguna was “pivotal to Australian decolonisation, Papua New Guinea’s independence, the minerals boom that was to transform much of Melanesia, and the erosion of relations between
national and provincial governments and landowner groups” (2). At a fundamental level, Papua New Guinea’s political and economic history has been dramatically shaped by the events on Bougainville over the last thirty years.

Donald Denoon has constructed a compelling and insightful account of the origins of the mine (and of the conflict) by drawing on the archives of the Australian administration in Port Moresby and the Department of Territories of the Australian Government (in Canberra), as well as interviewing some of the key individuals involved. This approach produces a particular view of the mine development, one that Denoon is quick to acknowledge. The study is, as he says, “shaped by the concerns of the Department [of Territories],” and hence the Bougainvilleans themselves appear only through the lens of administration officers, missionaries, or consultants. The strength of this approach is that it shows how much influence Australian policymakers had over the trajectory of the mine development.

The book is essentially structured chronologically. After an introduction to Bougainville and the Bougainvilleans prior to the arrival of Conzinc Rio Tinto Australia (CRA), the structure, policies, and imperatives of the Australian administration in Papua New Guinea are detailed. The history and origins of the relevant legislation and regulations relating to mining at the time of the arrival of the mining company on Bougainville are discussed in chapter 3, setting the scene for the accounts of the early (1964) encounters between CRA prospecting teams and locals. It is clear from these accounts that opposition to the notion of prospecting, let alone mining, was strong in most parts of the area that the company sought access to. This opposition was rational and well-founded: the communities had experience of gold mining before the Second World War, had heard of the environmental impacts of mining on Nauru, and argued that “all the ground on top and underneath the surface belongs to the owners. There is now an increase in the birthrate in Bougainville. If we give the ground to CRA we will have no land for the children” (quoted on page 66).

The approach taken by the administration (at the behest and urging of Canberra) is documented in the following chapters on negotiations over land and the agreement with the company. It was, in contrast, inflexible and, in the circumstances, irrational. The narrative culminates with the gripping and appalling transcript from the administration officer on the spot, when women were dragged by police from the path of bulldozers at Rorovana in August 1969.

The temporary resolution of these crises, which only occurred when the administration revoked its own position that all dealings over land must be an administration rather than a mining company responsibility, led to the subsequent construction of the mine (chapter 8). This brought with it a new series of disputes, this time concerning labor relations and the roles for different nationalities within the labor force and the environment (entry permits for seventeen Japanese builders, for example, led to political machinations in Canberra by various departments and industry pressure
groups). The degree of government, let alone public, scrutiny and comment was appallingly limited by today’s standards, due in equal parts to a lack of interest and expertise within Papua New Guinea and Australia at that time. Labor relations dominated a lot more of the department’s attention.

The longer-term consequences of the mine’s beginnings for the evolution of the provincial government system in Papua New Guinea, for the people who lived around the mine, and for the renegotiation of the original mining agreement are dealt with in the two concluding chapters. The volume ends with the author assessing the various judgments that have been made of the origins of the crisis. His own judgment is more prosaic and circumscribed: “if blame must be allocated, it should attach less to Australian individuals than to Australian principles, the transcendent value of the nation-state, and the value of land as a commodity. The long-term tragedy was that these principles survived Papua New Guinea’s independence, making it all too easy for landowners to be ignored until they turned to violence” (203).

An early (1968) report by the noted Bougainville anthropologist Douglas Oliver to Conzinc Rio Tinto Australia is included as an appendix to the volume. This is valuable material, and it is striking how similar the issues that arise in the context of contemporary Melanesian mining are to those that Oliver described for Bougainville in late 1968. The industry may have, as it professes, learnt what the lessons of Bougainville are, but the identification of the issues does not necessarily mean that their resolution is straightforward.

This book provides insights into late colonial history, but it also does much more. It provides a timely warning to policymakers everywhere that the value of legislation and regulation is limited to the extent to which these laws are widely held to be legitimate, fair, and just, particularly by those who are governed by them.

GLENN BANKS
University of New South Wales

* * *


It has been an interesting experience, reading Roger Thompson’s Australia and the Pacific Islands in the Twentieth Century interspersed with reports from Fiji of the attempt by George Speight and his henchmen to seize power in Fiji. At the time of writing, the situation remains unresolved—the hostages are still held in the parliamentary compound, Speight and the military leaders are both saying “Pick me” to the Great Council of Chiefs, pictures of downtown Suva look indistinguishable from those from Dili a few months ago, tourism is down, the sugar mills are silent, Ratu Sir Kamisese Mara has withdrawn to Lakeba, the west of Viti Levu is threatening to secede, and the future of former cabinet ministers is as uncertain as that of the leaders of the (attempted) coup.

This juxtaposition has been a reminder that imperialism is broader