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The final form of this dissertation owes a great deal to many people and reflects the development of my theoretical interests over a period of more than ten years. I received my training at the University of Sydney and to my teachers there is due most of the credit for any merit in this work. During my time at the University of Hawaii discussion and argument with faculty members and fellow students have helped to build upon my early training and to sharpen my assessment of concepts and theories. There are too many people to name individually and it would be invidious to select a few for special acknowledgement, so I shall say a general thanks to them all.

The field work on which the dissertation is based was carried out in two parts. The first was a village study in Uritai made during 20 months between March, 1960 and March, 1962, while I held a Commonwealth Post-Graduate Scholarship in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Sydney. A grant from the University's Research Committee enabled me to travel to the field to carry out my investigations. The second portion of the study, in Port Moresby, was done during 15 months in 1963-64, while I was a Research Assistant with the New Guinea Research Unit of the Australian National University. For most of my time in the Department of Anthropology in this University I have been supported by a grant from the Institute for Student
Interchange, East West Center. I should like to express my thanks to all those institutions for their support.

While I was in the field my work was greatly facilitated by the generous cooperation of officers of various Departments in the Administration of the Territory of Papua-New Guinea. In addition, members of both the London Missionary Society and of the Sacred Heart Mission were kind enough to extend me hospitality at various times during my stay in the Papuan Gulf area. Without the help of these people my work would have been much more difficult.

My deepest gratitude, however, goes to the Toaripi people. Only through their kindness, patience and good humoured cooperation over a period of some years was it possible for me to carry out my investigations. I hope that I have understood the things they told me and that I have recorded accurately the way of life they so generously permitted me to share. Lest any of my many friends be embarrassed by their appearance in case histories, I have changed the names of all people except those who lived in the remote past. Place names have been retained, and incidents cited in the text have reported as accurately as possible, so that the analysis is on a firm empirical base.
The Toaripi of Papua have for the past 25 years or so been migrating in large numbers from their home villages and settling in towns all over the Territory of Papua and New Guinea. It is common to discuss a situation like this in terms of 'detribalization' or 'urbanization,' but I have not found concepts such as these very helpful. What is striking about the Toaripi situation is amount of continuity in the arrangement of social life, despite the fact that they have been in contact with Europeans for 90 years and this has resulted in many obvious changes in the culture.

Toaripi who live in Port Moresby and those who are in the home villages are constantly exchanging goods and news, and there is a great deal of movement between the two areas. This interaction has prompted me to describe the situation as a bi-local social system, with town-dwellers and village-dwellers equally members.

In order to analyze the material, I have avoided discussion in terms of enduring groups and have instead concentrated on activities. This approach draws heavily on the work of Raymond Firth, who has for many years suggested that structural theory needs to be supplemented by analysis of the organization of activities within a structural framework.

Beginning with networks of interaction, I have shown
the ways in which choices among possible courses of action are made according to the various social and environmental pressures felt by the individuals concerned. Choices are not made randomly, and I have argued that within a relatively enduring framework of rules and expectations Toaripi make choices according to their long- and short-term interests and plans.

The fact that there are two foci of activities has enabled me to set out very clearly the ways in which choices are made according to prevailing circumstances, because the town and village present many different problems for a person to cope with. Despite the variations in the two areas, however, there is a lot of interaction between those in the village and those in the town. Actions in the one locality affect events in the other. The result is that the Toaripi situation shows something of the complex interrelationships between continuity and change, stability and variation which are features of all social systems.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The Toaripi, part of the culture group known as the Elema (Williams 1940; Brown 1954), live in the Kukipi Sub-District, Territory of Papua-New Guinea (Fig. 1). They were first contacted by a missionary named James Chalmers in 1881, but few Europeans have since settled in the area because the swampy terrain is not suitable for economic exploitation. Toaripi contacts have been with missionaries, Government officials and occasional traders. Despite the long history of contact, there had by the early 1960s been no development of cash cropping, and the people's main economic activities were still sago collection and fishing. Copra making was the only local source of cash.¹

Labour migration from the Toaripi area began in 1920, but until the outbreak of the Second World War nearly all those who went away to work signed up as indentured labourers and returned home at the end of their contract period. After the Second World War, however, this pattern changed: men who went away to work were no longer indentured labourers and large numbers of them stayed in towns throughout Papua-New Guinea for long periods of time. Many brought their families to join them and stable settlements of migrants grew up.

¹ Since 1964 several local economic enterprises have begun: some men are now commercial crocodile hunters; others have job opportunities in a local sawmill.
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labourers and large numbers of them stayed in towns throughout Papua-New Guinea for long periods of time. Many brought their families to join them and stable settlements of migrants grew up.

There are communities of Toaripi migrants throughout the Territory of Papua-New Guinea, but the greatest number lives in Port Moresby which is not only the closest town to the Toaripi home area but also the largest town in the Territory.

Communication between Toaripi in the villages and those in Port Moresby is frequent: goods, people, gossip and letters pass back and forth constantly. Many activities are carried out co-operatively by those in the village and in the town. Of course, those who live in the village also carry out some activities not shared by those in the town, and those in the town carry out some activities not shared by those in the village. Even so, what happens in the one area has reference to what happens in the other.

The central theme of this dissertation is that it is valid and useful to analyze activities in the home village and in Port Moresby as part of one social system. In other words, Toaripi in the two areas are members of a single, bi-local, field of social relations.

Most of the material on which the analysis is based deals with Uritai village and with Uritai villagers in Port Moresby, especially those in Vabukori settlement (Fig. 4).
In the period 1960-64 there were approximately 750 people in the village and 250 in various parts of Port Moresby.\(^2\)

As will become clear later in the dissertation there are many factors accounting for migration from the village and the growth of permanent settlements in the towns, especially in Port Moresby. At this point it is enough to note the fact of migration and to say that, despite the constant movement of people between the village and Port Moresby, about three-quarters of the town dwellers seldom or never visit the village and about half of the village dwellers have not been to Port Moresby for more than a short visit.

In the light of this, it may seem strange to assert that the town dwellers and village dwellers are members of one, bi-local, social system. Analysis in this framework is useful, however, and has a number of implications which I regard as advantages.

In the first place, by looking at the village-town situation in this way, I can place historical incidents in their proper perspective. That is, the historical development of the present situation provides a context without which actions cannot be fully understood, but historical accidents do not have to be called in as substitutes for

---

\(^2\) My fieldwork was carried out during the period 1960-64 and the population figures given here represent a rough average for the 4 years.
sociological principles. In the second place, the approach I have adopted allows (or forces) me to analyze my material without relying on the well-developed theories and analytical tools concerned with the discussion of corporate groups. Boissevain's recent article discussing the importance of what he calls 'non-groups' (1968) in social science highlights a growing interest in this kind of approach as anthropologists attempt to deal with situations in which classic structural theories do not seem appropriate. In a number of important papers written some time ago, Firth (1951, 1954, 1955) pointed out the need to supplement structural analysis with an examination of 'social organization,' but very few have attempted to follow his suggestion and carry out such a full-scale examination. My analysis will attempt to do this. A third, related, point is that the approach I take involves throughout a careful consideration of social process as well as of social form (cf. Firth 1951:35). Again this has been advocated by many anthropologists but few have attempted it in the analysis of their field data.

Of fundamental importance to my analysis is Firth's notion of social organization, and the following quotation sets out far better than I could the general framework within which I propose to argue my thesis:

Generally, the idea of organization is that of people getting things done by planned action. This is a social process, the arrangement of
action in sequences in conformity with selected social ends. These ends must have some element of common significance for the set of persons concerned in the action. The significance need not be identical, or even similar, for all the persons: it may be opposed as between some of them. The process of social organization may consist in part in the resolution of such opposition by action which allows one or other element to come to final expression. Social organization implies some degree of unification, a putting together of diverse elements into common relation. To do this, advantage may be taken of existing structural principles, or variant procedures may be adopted. This involves the exercise of choice, the making of decisions. As such, this rests on personal evaluations, which are the translation of general ends or values of group range into terms that are significant for the individual. (1951:36)

I do not claim that I shall resolve the issues and problems implied by this viewpoint. I hope merely to indicate the significant points and to make an attempt at showing the value of my approach in their analysis.

I shall argue that Toaripi in Port Moresby are full members of a total social system whose continued functioning depends as much on them as on the village dwellers. I am not attempting a discussion of the material in terms of 'urbanization,' 'detribalization' or 'acculturation,' but I am seeking to make more general statements about social process and about change and continuity. The fact that there is constant interaction between town dwellers and village dwellers leads me to describe them as members of a single social system. On the other hand, the fact that there are two foci of activities within the social system enables me to set out very clearly ways in which choices are made in
different situations. Bi-locality highlights variation, change and continuity in Toaripi social life.

Plan of Argument

I shall begin with a description of the home area and a sketch of its post-contact history, showing the background of the recent large-scale migration to towns throughout the Territory of Papua-New Guinea. Then I shall describe the way in which Toaripi migrants settled in Port Moresby, show their present distribution in the town and discuss the bases of interaction among them.

Having thus set out the background, I shall discuss the principles according to which activities are organized, pointing out similarities and differences between the village and the town. This will involve a discussion of such notions as 'network' (Barnes 1954) and 'catchment' (Mayer 1966) as descriptive and analytic tools.

The ethnographic material is focused on economic activities, not because I hold that these are in some sense more important than other aspects of social life, but because they express and maintain social relations in all spheres of life from the intimate to the large-scale and ceremonial (Firth 1951:123-124). They are a convenient index of social relations, but not the only possible one. My choice of economic activities rather than, say, political activities is dictated partly by my own interests and partly by the kind of data I have collected.
Some of the material on political activities has been published elsewhere (Ryan 1969). It seems that economic activities and political activities can be described in the same general way, but a detailed working out of the interrelations of the various frameworks of activities is beyond the scope of this particular study.

Following the presentation of the ethnographic evidence, I shall discuss the Toaripi material in a wider ethnographic and theoretical context.
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: POST-CONTACT HISTORY AND THE GROWTH OF MIGRATION

The Toaripi live in eight villages scattered along the coast of the Papuan Gulf between Maipora creek and the Kapuri river (Fig. 2), and in one village situated approximately 20 miles upstream on the Kapuri. All of these settlements stem from the villages of Mirihea and Uritai, which at the time of contact adjoined each other at the mouth of the Lakekamu river (Fig. 2). Since then, washaways in the estuary and increases in population have caused the people to disperse to the limits of their territory. At the time of the first census, in 1920, there were approximately 2,100 Toaripi. In 1964, Toaripi in the villages numbered approximately 5,300, while another 1,300 lived in Port Moresby. In 1928 the Lakekamu changed its course and washed away a large portion of Mirihea and spoiled sago land. This disaster forced people to take up residence in fishing and garden hamlets, which grew into the present day permanent villages.

In 1881 the villages of Mirihea and Uritai each contained a number of large men's houses, the foci of ceremonies

---

1 Kerema, Patrol Reports 2/20-21.
2 1964-65 Census returns, Toaripi Census Division.
3 Figure obtained from my own census.
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featuring decorated masks. The social groups associated with the men's houses supervised the initiation of boys into religious secrets, regulated marriage through group exogamy, were the basis of large-scale economic activities and war parties, and provided leaders responsible for keeping peace within the village.4

James Chalmers, of the London Missionary Society, 5 set up a station in the Toaripi villages in 1884 and mission work has continued without a break since then. Today, all Toaripi are Christians, about 90% being members of the United Church. The first local pastors were ordained in the 1930s and all village pastors in the Moru District6 are now men of the area.

The Toaripi area has not attracted commercial enterprise and European business ventures have generally been small, one-man trading operations. Around 1910 there was a gold-rush to the Lakekamu field near Bulldog (Fig. 2) and the Toaripi villages were the jumping off point for miners and their equipment. The rush soon petered out, and the

---

4 For a fuller description of traditional Toaripi society, see Ryan 1965: Ch. I.

5 In 1962, this became an independent church, Papua Ekalesia. In 1968, the Papua Ekalesia joined with a number of other churches to form the United Church of Papua, New Guinea and the British Solomon Islands.

6 Moru District includes all the villages between Cape Cupola and Cape Possession (Fig. 2).
only apparent effects on the Toaripi area were thefts of garden food by labourers running away from the fields.

In 1906, shortly after Australia became responsible for Papua, a Government station was set up at Kerema (Fig. 1), about two days' walk to the west of the Toaripi villages. The Toaripi were not troublesome to the Government and received little attention apart from routine patrols. The first 37 years of contact were, on the whole, uneventful. There was little violence offered the newcomers; inter-village warfare died out quickly; the London Missionary Society continued its work unmolested though it is not clear with what success; and ceremonies, initiations, trading voyages and other features of traditional life continued apparently unchanged.

There is virtually no information available on this period, but contact with Europeans must have undermined some traditional institutions. Unless this were the case, it is difficult to account for the profound effect of the Vailala Madness, in which the Toaripi took part in 1919.

7 Patrol and Division (or District) reports that survive from the period 1906-1939 contain only brief accounts of routine patrols, except for the period of the Vailala Madness (see below, pp. 13-14).

8 The most spectacular occurrence was the murder of a Polynesian mission teacher by people from villages inland of the Toaripi, and long their deadly enemies (cf. British New Guinea Report 1887, p. 4 and Appendix J).
'Vailala Madness' was the name given by Europeans to a cargo cult that swept through the coastal region of the Papuan Gulf, from the Vailala river to Cape Possession (Fig. 1). Prophets arose and told their followers that the ancestors were about to return in a steamer laden with European goods. If people were to receive these gifts, they had to show their trust and worthiness by discarding traditional customs and following new modes of behaviour ordained by the prophets, who professed to be in contact with the ancestors and other supernatural beings. Many people involved in the cult claimed that 'Jesus Christ went through their heads,' causing them to twitch convulsively and to fall down from dizziness (Williams 1923). When the movement reached the Toaripi they participated enthusiastically. They opened the men's houses to women, discarded the sacred bullroarers and ceremonial masks, prepared mortuary feasts for the ancestors, built individual family dwellings to replace the separate houses for men and women, and in general discarded 'old ways' and embraced new, 'enlightened' customs. After some months of feverish excitement and activity, it became clear that the ancestors and promised goods were not going to appear. People went back to their accustomed round of subsistence activities, but they made no attempt

9 For a fuller account of the Vailala Madness, see Williams 1923. Ryan (1969) discusses this and subsequent cult activity among the Toaripi.
to revive any of the practices discarded at the height of the cult. The removal of the men's houses and their associated groups from their previously important position in the organization of activities had many far-reaching consequences for the Toaripi. Indeed, as I shall argue in Chapter III, contemporary Toaripi social structure must be described against this background.

In 1920, a head tax of A$2.00 a year on all able-bodied adult males in the Gulf Division was introduced. Many young men signed up as indentured labourers so that they would be able to obtain the necessary money. Hitherto, people in the area between Cape Cupola and Cape Possession had been reluctant to go away to work. Youths in the same age-group (heatao), who had previously been initiated together, now signed up for contract labour together. At this time, it was not possible for Papuans to engage in non-contract labour, and the laws of the Territory defined carefully the number of times a labourer was permitted to sign up before being returned home. Thus, going away to work as an interlude, after which a man returned home and generally stayed there. Even when it became possible for

10 Papua, Annual Report 1920-1921.


12 Gulf Division, Annual Report 1926/27, Native Labour Report, refers to a new Ordinance permitting casual labour.
Papuans to engage in casual labour, only a few Toaripi stayed away from home for long periods.

In 1940, the Second World War came to Papua and the civil administration was suspended. Contract workers were released and left to find their way home as best they could. Those returning to the west from Port Moresby placed a heavy burden on the food resources and hospitality of people living along the way, including the Toaripi.

When the Australian Army came to Papua, one of its camps was set up at Lalapipi (Fig. 2). Virtually all able-bodied Toaripi men were recruited as carriers: they travelled up the Lakekamu river to Bulldog, the jumping-off point for the operation that led eventually to the campaigns at Wau, Lae and Salamaua. Those men and youths not recruited as carriers worked around the Army camp.

The war was significant for the Toaripi in a number of ways. Like other native people in Papua and New Guinea, they saw the apparently invincible and superhuman white man fleeing, leaving them to fend for themselves against an unknown but terrifying enemy.\footnote{The missionary in charge of the Moru District, Rev. H.A. Brown, stayed in Papua throughout the war, spending most of the time with his own charges.} The Army camp in their midst gave many of them their first chance to observe Europeans at close range and to interact with them on a less formal basis than had been possible earlier. The soldiers
did not in general try to maintain a formal, distant, master-servant relationship in their dealings with the Toaripi, thus making a contrast with the behaviour of civilians in the pre-war period.

At the end of the war, carriers' accumulated wages were paid to them and reparations for damage to property were made. This meant that the Toaripi as a group had more money than they had thought possible. The immediate post-war period was in general a time of high hopes and inflated rhetoric: many of the soldiers had been careless in the promises they made to Papuans and New Guineans; the Labour Government in Australia said that the natives of Papua and New Guinea would get better treatment and that the Territories\(^\text{14}\) would now enjoy greater prosperity than before; so many changes had occurred all over the world that it was simply not possible to return to the pre-war state of affairs. The Toaripi, like many other groups in Papua and New Guinea, were spurred on to new aspirations and activities.

Between 1946 and 1950 all Toaripi villagers worked together to accumulate A$12,000, enough to buy a boat which was to ensure regular transport of copra to the market in Port Moresby and the carriage of trade goods back to the villages.

\(^{14}\) Until 1949, Papua and New Guinea were completely separate Territories. Since then they have been administered jointly from Port Moresby, though New Guinea is a United Nations Trust Territory and Papua an Australian possession.
The people would have a regular cash income, and something to buy with the money. The whole affair was organized as a Co-operative Association. In 1949, an Administration Officer was posted to the Toaripi area to help the people in their fund-raising activities and to advise them on the setting up of the co-operative. The first Government station in the area was built at Keauta (Fig. 2), the only suitable anchorage. Washaways forced the removal of the station to Mirivase in 1956; and in 1966 more washaways forced another move to the present site near Tapara (Fig. 2).

Many groups in Papua and New Guinea began cash cropping in the 1950s, but the Toaripi were not able to participate because they lack suitable land. They were no longer content with subsistence activities supplemented with a little cash from copra, however, for by this time they were by Papuan standards a sophisticated and well-educated group of people.

Mission schools in the Moru District remained open throughout the war, and the mission had for some years provided basic training in trade skills such as building, painting and plumbing. This meant that when the first High School for Papuans and New Guineans was opened near Port Moresby just after the war, many Toaripi youths were

---

15 For a fuller account of the formation and functioning of co-operatives among the Toaripi, see Ryan 1963.
eligible to attend. Older men had trade skills, and some had had the chance to improve their ability while working for the Army. These skills were in great demand during the post-war reconstruction period in Port Moresby, and few Papuans and New Guineans were able to provide them.

The Toaripi by now needed cash for their everyday use as well as for large-scale expenditures. There was still no local source of cash income apart from copra, so that people looked increasingly to wage labour in the towns. Skilled tradesmen and young men with enough education to undertake clerical jobs were in considerable demand, so that many Toaripi either stayed in towns after the war, or travelled to Port Moresby to join those already there.16

I Migration to Port Moresby

Large-scale, long-term migration among the Toaripi did not begin until after the Second World War. In 1963-64, I counted 1310 Toaripi scattered throughout Port Moresby. Of these, approximately 19% (248) were living in housing provided by the Administration for members of the Public Service; approximately 22% (287) were living in housing provided by private employers; approximately 59% (775) were living in migrant settlements.

Tradesmen who stayed on in town after the war were the

16 Large-scale migration to other towns in the Territory of Papua-New Guinea generally took place later, after the Port Moresby reconstruction boom was over (cf. Ryan 1968).
foci of migrant clusters. Accommodation of any kind was desperately short in 1946 and all those engaged in reconstruction lived wherever they could.

Papuan and New Guinean workers lived in abandoned Army buildings at Konedobu and Kila (Fig. 4). As these were dismantled, the workmen took the materials and used them to build their own houses. Toaripi built on Crown Land, as at Konedobu, and on native-owned land, as at Vabukori (Fig. 4). Dwellings put up on Crown land were supposed to be temporary, an expedient that would give the Administration time to construct proper housing for its employees. The years passed, however, and the Konedobu settlement grew as people came to town to join relatives or to seek employment.

Settlements on native-owned land typically began in the following manner. The indigenous people of the Port Moresby area, the Motu, had traditionally participated in the hiri trade with people of the Papuan Gulf, including the Toaripi.17 There were thus numerous links between the two groups, based on trading partnerships; and since inter-marriage occasionally took place, there were also some kin links. In addition, Toaripi and Motu had often worked together during the war and the later reconstruction period. A Toaripi man would invoke some combination of ties based on trade partnerships, kinship or shared work experience,  

17 The Motu traded pots and armshells for sago and canoe logs (cf. Barton 1910; Williams 1932).
and ask a Motu with whom he had become friendly to allow him to build a house on Motu land. It was easy to obtain this permission, because such courtesy is very much part of the way in which ties between individuals or groups are set up and maintained in societies on the south coast of New Guinea. The Toaripi house would become crowded, and the Motu landowners would be asked to permit another house to be built. As this in turn became crowded, a third house would be built, and so on.

Many Toaripi at this time (the late 1940s and early 1950s) were independent sub-contractors, carrying out jobs for the Commonwealth Department of Works or the Territory's Public Works Department. They employed kinsmen, affines and age-mates as labourers, so that work groups were usually related to each other and to the contractor in socially significant ways. The contractors had to provide their workers with accommodation and as the Toaripi houses on Motu land increased in number there grew up clusters of dwellings containing men who frequently came from the same village because that was where these socially significant relationships were concentrated.

---

18 In my own inquiries I collected numerous accounts of such courtesies extended by Toaripi to people from other language and culture groups.

19 The Commonwealth of Australia and the Administration of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea both have Public Works Departments in the Territory. In the reconstruction period both Departments were engaged in building and allied tasks, so that the Toaripi sub-contractors were working for both.
Once they had accommodation in town, men with families brought them from the village to live with them there. The continued pressure on available accommodation meant that extra houses or rooms were constantly being built. Soon, the migrants stopped asking the Motu landowners for permission to build. If they asked anyone, it was likely to be the original Toaripi settler. Thus, in a few years there grew up around Port Moresby large settlements of Toaripi migrants who lived on Motu land but who had little contact with the landowners, and generally refused to pay rents or to offer any other acknowledgement of their indebtedness.

A settlement usually contained people from one village. If there were people from more than one village, the settlement was divided into wards, each ward having been founded separately.

Both the Administration and the Motu became alarmed at the situation, but there was little to be done because the migrants were an important part of the work force, and there was very little alternative accommodation for them. By 1955 the Administration had begun to build houses for its employees (Foster 1956:19), but for a long time the demand greatly exceeded the supply so that many Toaripi employed by the Commonwealth of Australia and the Territory

---

20 These were housed in accommodation provided by the Commonwealth, under much the same conditions as those that applied to accommodation provided by the Territory Administration.
Administration had to continue living in the settlements. Even when families moved from the settlements to Administration housing their place was taken by others who had come from the villages, so that the settlements continued to grow.

So long as the reconstruction boom continued, many of the Toaripi sub-contractors were fairly prosperous. Around 1958, however, the boom ended. Some Toaripi went to other towns (Ryan 1968:61), others joined the Administration or Commonwealth Works Departments and continued their trade as employees, a few went home to the village, and some continued to eke out a living as independent contractors. Many of those who had been contractors' labourers, however, had no skills to speak of and were forced to compete with hundreds of others for unskilled jobs.

The Toaripi as a group were no longer in a better position than most to obtain work in Port Moresby. People from other groups had had a chance to go to school and thus qualify for clerical and tradesmen's jobs, and the competition was fierce. Toaripi obtained their share of the available jobs, but were no longer in a pre-eminent position. Those coming to town now faced a more difficult situation than had those who preceded them. Nevertheless, the push to leave the village and earn money in the town was strong enough to ensure that people continued to come to Port Moresby in considerable numbers.
As early as 1956, the Administration was contemplating low-cost housing for migrants employed privately. Such a housing scheme would enable these men to live in town with their families, in houses that they would buy over a long term, situated on land to which they had some legal right (Foster: 1956:19-20). By the end of 1966, none of the various plans mooted by the Administration had had much success, and hardly any Toaripi had participated.

Apart from those working for the Administration and the Commonwealth, very few Toaripi had any job security and are thus not likely to be considered for participation in a housing scheme. And in general, their wages are too low to permit them to undertake even small payments such as repayment of a A$1,000 loan over a 10 year period (Foster 1956:20) or to make a $100 deposit (loc. cit.). Thus, those living in migrant settlements are generally unable to move elsewhere, even if they wish to. 21 Since the late 1950s, the Administration has made determined efforts to prevent further growth of the migrant settlements by forbidding the construction of additional houses. But people continue to arrive from the villages in greater numbers than they leave, either to go

---

21 Foster (1956:19) noted that Toaripi settlers at Vabukori displayed little enthusiasm for moving. When I carried out a survey in the Konedobu settlement in 1959, and later in my 1963-64 work in the Vabukori settlement, this had not changed.
into other accommodation or to return home. Thus, the settlers enlarge existing structures clandestinely, to help ease the pressure on housing.

The settlements remain, and have retained the characteristic of being village-based in their composition. Those migrants who live in other quarters have usually spent some time in one or more of the settlements and after their move retain many of their links there. This is partly because they have either given or received shelter while there, and are involved in the consequent obligations. There is also the point that other housing in town is tied, directly or indirectly, to employment. Some accommodation is provided by the employer, and loss of the job entails loss of housing. Other accommodation may cost around A$5.00 a week to rent (cf. Oram 1965:111), and it is necessary to have and to hold a well-paid job to continue living there. Since Papuans enjoy little job security, it is prudent to maintain links in the settlement, in case it becomes necessary to seek shelter there again. And, as many people told me, it is simply more pleasant to live with those who are familiar and trusted.

22 People living in accommodation provided by the Administration or by private employers are not, in general, permitted to have visitors. Thus people coming from the village usually go to a relative or age-mate in a settlement; and this perpetuates the pattern of important links between people in the settlements and in other parts of the town.
Thus, the Toaripi scattered throughout the town are involved in networks of exchanges and obligations which are phrased in terms of village of origin. As I have noted, however, the links that bring people to town in the first place and shape many of their actions once they are there, are socially important relationships which happen to occur more frequently within a village than between villages. Pre-existing relationships, in other words, underlie the urban network among the Toaripi.

In my description of contemporary social structure and social organizational principles among people from Uritai village (Fig. 3), I shall argue that the same relationships underlie the town-village network and the village network. For many purposes, it matters little whether Uritai villagers are in the town or the village, because they are participating in one overall social system. The historical sketch of the growth of migration among the Toaripi provides a background against which further analysis needs to be understood.
CHAPTER III
SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND THE ORGANIZATION OF
ACTIVITIES AMONG URITAI VILLAGERS

Thus far, in sketching the post-contact history of the
Toaripi, I have spoken in general terms because what I have
had to say applies to the whole population. From now on,
however, I shall concentrate my description on Uritai
villagers, whether in the village or in Port Moresby. This
is largely a matter of convenience, because the bulk of my
fieldwork was carried out among Uritai villagers, and
because detailed descriptions of activities are more easily
comprehended if they are located firmly in one group.
When I refer to the Toaripi as a whole, I am talking about
groups, actions and so on which occur generally. Major
variations among villages are noted as they become relevant.

The fieldwork on which this analysis is based took
place between 1960 and 1964, and statements cast in the
present tense refer specifically to that period. I have
retained the so-called 'ethnographic present' because its
use enables me to differentiate between specific historical
events and social processes that had been in existence for
some time when I was in the field and seemed likely to
continue after I left the area.¹

¹ Subsequent correspondence with Uritai and other
Toaripi friends has enabled me to obtain some knowledge of
changes that have occurred since 1964. These are noted as
appropriate.
In 1960-62, Uritai village contained approximately 800 people living on a small island in the mouth of the Lakekamu river (Fig. 2). The Kukipi Patrol Post and the village of Mirivase were also on the island.² The villagers go by canoe to their sago stands and gardens, and fish in the streams that lace the swamps as well as in the river itself. Travel between villages is usually on foot, with Government-subsidized ferries providing means of crossing the numerous streams in the area.

In many ways little has changed in the years since contact: the terrain is much the same, the subsistence bases are still sago, fish and coconuts and travel is still by foot or canoe. But the houses are different, the villages are more numerous and larger; and these differences reflect the many profound changes that have occurred in Toaripi social life. The next sections will discuss these.

Men's Houses and Their Associated Groups and Activities

At contact, in 1881, the Toaripi lived in two adjacent villages, Uritai and Mirihea, at the mouth of the Lakekamu river (Chalmers 1886:148-163). The villages were for many purposes autonomous, but numerous ties of kinship and consequent shared interests in land between the inhabitants meant that people from the two villages often cooperated in large-scale economic enterprises and probably in day-to-day

² The Government station has since been moved inland.
FIGURE 3. URITAI VILLAGE, 1962
activities. They did not necessarily go to war together, but they fought against the same enemies and never made war on each other.

Chalmers gives no detailed description of Uritai and Mirihea, either when he first visited them, or when he later settled there. In 1960, however, a number of old men were able to give me a consistent account of how the village was laid out in the 'old days' and to tell me something of the ways in which people lived then. The accounts are not entirely reliable because the men were drawing either on memories of their long-distant childhood or on stories told by their parents and older siblings. The overall picture, however, is consistent and is congruent with other observers' accounts of the Elema area (Williams 1940; Chalmers 1898; Holmes 1903; Brown 1954) and with present-day activities and groupings. I set it out here in general terms, omitting particular claims to prestige and prowess made on behalf of individuals.

In the 'old days,' then, there were thirteen men's houses (elavo) in Uritai. Associated with the men's houses were ten, named, ideologically patrilineal, totemic groups

---

3 The Toaripi were chronically at war with the Moveave villages (Heavala and Heatoare) up-river; and sporadically at war with the Moripi (in villages near the present site of Kavora) and Iokea villages to the east. Otherwise, they occasionally fought the Iariva ('Kuku-kuku') inland, and Maiva and Motu villages far to the east (Fig. 2).

4 It is not possible to specify the date, but the descriptions probably refer to the period approximately 1900-1919.
(elavoape, pl. elavoapeape). Each elavoape was ideally associated with one elavo; in fact, three of the elavoapeape had built second elavo to accommodate extra numbers. The inhabitants of the three extra elavo, however, were regarded as members of the parent elavoapeape.

Each of the elavoapeape had its counterpart not only in Mirihea but in other settlements throughout the Elema area (cf. Williams 1940:42). This meant in practice that a person in a strange village could claim protection or hospitality from the members of the elavoape linked with the same totems as he was.

Totemic affiliation was probably the most important criterion for demarcating an elavoape, but it was not the sole determinant of recruitment. The elavoape said to be the group occupying an elavo was seldom the only, or even the largest, such group. Many men in an elavo were known to be the descendants of those who had come from other elavo. These movements from one elavo to another usually took place after a quarrel, or in response to an invitation from an elavo whose numbers had been depleted through death or migration. Such moves usually meant that the migrants were joining non-agnatic kinsmen. After the move, the migrants passed on the new elavoape membership in the male line, but the former affiliation was noted in the name of the lineage. Thus, for example, descendants of two Sovoripiheaea elavoape men who joined Luipiheaea elavoape were called
Luipi Sovoripiheaea. I was not able to find out whether this identification was maintained indefinitely, though I collected a number that had been maintained for three or four generations. Nor was I able to learn whether a lineage thus reminded of its origin was regarded as less than a full member lineage of the elavoape. The old men said that migrants often retained at least some of their former totemic affiliations, but I was not able to learn whether these links were maintained for more than one generation. In 1960 the elavo had not functioned for more than forty years, and the whole question of totemic and elavoape affiliation was a somewhat academic one.

Despite the lack of detailed information, however, it seems reasonably sure that each elavo was ideologically associated with one elavoape and thus with a particular series of myths that depicted the adventures of heroes and heroines. These figures created natural species and features of the landscape and built the first elavo. They very often turned into animals, birds or fish, which were thus the primary totems of the elavoape. Other natural objects appearing in the myths also had a special relationship with the elavoape, but were apparently less important than the primary totems.  

---

5 See Ryan 1965:11-16 for a more detailed account of the elavo and their associated elavoapeape.

6 See Ryan 1965:16-18 for further discussion of totems.
Incidents in a series of myths not only indicated an elavoape's totemic affiliations but also provided its members with named religious objects and magical formulae. Bullroarers and masks which featured in cycles of ceremonies centering on the elavo derived their names, decorations and powers from their association with specific incidents in myths. Similarly, magical formulae consisted of spells uttered by the myth heroes and heroines on specific occasions and derived their power from this association. Knowledge of magical formulae was thus linked with elavoape membership and the power it was believed to bestow protected members from their enemies and enabled them to promote their own interests.

The sons of the members of an elavoape were initiated into the secrets of the bullroarer and the masks at the appropriate time. Initiation was the responsibility of each separate elavo but the ceremonies and feasts were co-ordinated throughout the village so that boys who were initiated at the same time were members of one, village-wide, named age-group (heatao). One of the ways in which the separate initiations were co-ordinated was through the duties of the initiands' mothers' brothers. Each boy was supported during the ceremonies by one of his mother's brothers; and at the subsequent feast, this man and the boy began what was to be a lifelong formal exchange relationship. The mother's brother necessarily belonged to a different elavoape from
the boy, and the consequent network of cross-cutting links meant that nearly everyone in the village had to be ready at approximately the same time if the initiations were to take place.

Every adult male, then, belonged to a named elavoape and a named heatao. I have already noted the importance of the elavoape in religious and other ceremonial activities. In addition, members of an elavoape were the core of groups that undertook pig-hunts, fish-drives, overseas trading voyages such as the hiri, and other large-scale economic enterprises. Knowledge of the requisite magical formulae was considered important to the success of such undertakings, and those with such knowledge tended to band together. Since magical knowledge was derived from elavoape-associated myths, members of an elavoape tended to band together. If a person was reputed to have particularly powerful magical knowledge, he was more likely to use it for the benefit of those in his elavoape than for the benefit of outsiders. Such work-groups, however, were not made up entirely of people from one elavoape: kinsmen from other elavoape would be invited to join. A man with special knowledge or skill would be in demand among his non-agnatic kinsmen as well as among his fellow elavoape members.

Such political offices as existed in the village were also associated with the elavo. Each elavo had at least one
pukari\textsuperscript{7} whose position was inherited and who derived whatever authority he had from his putative association with the bullroarers. The pukari supervised the distribution of food at certain feasts and was responsible for maintaining peace in the village. If a fight broke out, he would go to the scene carrying his insignia of office, a lime gourd and a string bag. If the fight did not stop at once, he would smash the gourd to the ground and tear the bag. This was the signal for the mai karu associated with him\textsuperscript{8} to sound the bullroarer, whereupon all fighting had to cease, on pain of some unspecified supernatural punishment. The disputants later provided a pig for a feast at which amity was restored, and the mai karu replaced the pukari's lime gourd and string bag. Such is the stereotyped account of

\textsuperscript{7} Information was conflicting and it was almost impossible to get a coherent account by collating the different versions given. One problem was the fact that the offices had been defunct since 1919. In addition, kinsmen of elavo officers were apparently referred to by the term used for the officers themselves, and it was not always clear whether people were telling me about a pukari or about his kinsmen. Finally, pukari and mai karu have come to be regarded as 'good' and 'progressive,' while the semese, who were important in warfare, have come to be regarded as 'bad' and 'unenlightened.' As a result the number and importance of pukari have probably become exaggerated, while few people are willing to admit knowledge of or descent from semese.

\textsuperscript{8} The mai karu belonged to a different elavoape from the pukari. I could not learn the basis of the link between the two men.
the pukari's actions. Detailed questioning elicited enough information to indicate that he often mediated disputes and that pukari of different elavo attempted to settle disputes between members of different elavoape by consultation. Invoking the power of the bullroarer may have been a last resort; calls for mediation and the feast that followed a fight were signs that the disputants were ready to settle their differences, and the pukari's intervention may well have been a public sign that the quarrel was over, rather than the cause of a settlement.

In each elavo was an object shaped somewhat like a bullroarer and called a semese. The semese was associated with warfare and was thought to take care of elavoape members who were away fighting. There is some indication that one person, also called semese, was particularly associated with this object either because of his prowess or because of his special magical knowledge. Beyond this, I have very little information. But each elavoape certainly had its own defensive and aggressive magic, for use in warfare as well as in intra-village disputes.

Elavoape membership was also important in the regulation of marriage. Because all elavoape members were ideologically kin, marriage within the group was forbidden. Accounts of restrictions on marriage into a man's mother's elavoape varied: some people told me that the whole elavoape was forbidden; others said that only the mother's close kinswomen
within the elavoape, possibly members of her lineage, were forbidden. Whatever the scope of the prohibition, some women in a man's mother's elavoape were forbidden as wives.

Finally, the elavo determined the physical layout of the village. Uritai consisted of its several large elavo, each on its own named plot of land. The initiated male members of the elavoape slept in the men's house, while their wives, sisters, daughters, and uninitiated sons and brothers slept in small houses clustered around the front of the elavo. The dead were buried nearby.

The other named group that I have mentioned was the heatao. Both boys and girls belonged to a heatao, which began as an informal play group of children of about the same age. The heatao sometimes received its name then (cf. Williams 1939); sometimes it had no name until the boys were initiated into the religious secrets of the elavoapeape. After initiation, the male members of the heatao formed the core of village war parties. Later, as they married and younger heatao took over the primary burden of fighting, they were the group primarily responsible for building each other's houses and canoes (cf. Bastard, Rentoul). Members of a heatao were expected to marry each other, subject to the restrictions noted above. Throughout life age-mates were supposed to be friends and helpers, in a relationship generally free of tensions and pressures that could occur between consanguineals and affines. At a person's death,
members of his heatao took a prominent part in the mourning and in other parts of the funeral.

The heatao and elavoape provided the frameworks for a great many of the relationships and activities of Uritai villagers, but neither was associated with the transmission and activation of land rights. These rights depended on membership of unrestricted bilateral descent groups (toruipi pl. toruipiipi). In the following section I shall describe these toruipiipi and indicate the ways in which they were interdigitated with elavoapeape and heatao.

Toruipiipi, Heatao, and Elavoapeape

A toruipi consists of all the descendants of an ancestor whose name may or may not be known and who is usually believed to have lived 5-7 generations ago. In other words, it is an unrestricted bilateral descent group (cf. Goodenough 1955:72), and as such tells us little more about Toaripi society than does the word 'kinship' about our own. The central notion is that of people springing from the same source, having the same origin. Because there is no point at which those who know they have a common ancestor cease to regard each other as kin, there is no device whereby some people can be excluded from the kinship domain. In these terms, it is quite likely that all Toaripi are kinsmen, so that the fact of kinship is not in itself a useful criterion for defining social groups or the boundaries of social action.
In fact, however, no Toaripi knows all those who are 'really' his kinsmen. My own genealogical inquiries occasionally uncovered kin links between people who did not know that they were related. When I conveyed this information to Toaripi, they were either uninterested or incredulous.⁹

The span of a toruipi is situationally defined. It may contain only full siblings, as opposed to half-siblings; or it may contain all the known descendants of an ancestor 5-7 generations back from the oldest living members. The situation that defines the span of the toruipi is commonly one associated with land rights. Transmission and activation of land rights are the most important part of toruipi membership, and a toruipi of the widest span usually consists of the known descendants of a person who was the first to use a named plot of land. Because of their descent from this person, members of this land holding toruipi can claim the right to use the plot. A toruipi of this order has an identifiable continuity over the generations because of its association with one or more plots of land stemming from the apical ancestor (cf. Davenport 1959).

Any person belongs to many toruipi, and which of

⁹ In one or two instances, my discovery of kin links revealed a 'bad' marriage (i.e. one between people with a common ancestor) and occasioned some annoyance. Thereafter I kept my discoveries to myself and investigated this selective forgetting of kin ties in a more circumspect manner.
the many links are activated depends on the particular situation. I shall discuss the toruipi in relation to land rights and the organization of activities later on (below, pp. 61-71). Here, having described it in general terms, I shall discuss the ways in which it complemented the elavoape and heatao.

All Toaripi with whom I discussed the matter were quite firm that land and toruipi were always separate from the elavoape. In an elavo, then, there were men linked by an ideology of patrilineal descent and a common set of totemic affiliations, but separated by their different land inheritance rights. Obviously, the two sets of ties were not completely separate: elavoape members who were in fact close agnates shared memberships in a number of land holding toruipiipi as well. But the network of bilateral kin ties spread throughout the village, linking individuals in different elavo in socially and economically important ways.

The role of women also differed in the two contexts. A woman was a member of her father's elavoape, and probably retained her membership throughout her lifetime. She nevertheless took little or no part in the ceremonial life that was such an important part of elavoape activities, and she did not pass on her affiliation to her children. As a

---

10 Both informants and the literature give conflicting accounts.
member of a land holding toruipi, however, she not only had rights to land independently of her husband but passed these on to her children. Because of their shared interest in land, her siblings and her children were closely linked by many ties of social and economic importance, as well as by bonds of sentiment.

Insofar as the heatao was tied to initiation into religious secrets of the elavoape, it was another facet of the organization of that group. But because youths of the whole village were initiated at the same time, heatao links provided yet another set of ties that extended throughout the community.

The elavoape, then, was the framework within which religious and ceremonial activities were organized. Other activities that required magical knowledge were also organized on the basis of elavoape membership.

Complementing this was the framework within which most economic activities were organized, the toruipi. This cross-cutting organization accounts in large part for the emphasis on non-agnatic kin ties even within the context of elavoape-based activities. Toruipi links were important in social and economic terms, and were reinforced by interaction whenever possible.

Finally, the heatao organization took account of age differences, and allocated tasks primarily to those people best able to handle them. For instance, warfare was the
responsibility of young men who had not yet undertaken family responsibilities; more mundane but equally important tasks such as house building were the province of older but still able-bodied men.

Only by looking at all three frameworks of social action is it possible to see how Toaripi society was organized, and to see why it functioned as a village rather than a series of hamlets despite the fact that the village was a large unit and lacked any kind of central authority.

Similarly, the complementary functions of the three groupings indicate why some features of Toaripi society have disappeared, while others have remained. Thus, the elavo are no longer to be found, and the elavoapeape have so declined in importance that people under the age of about 25 years do not necessarily know the name of the elavoape to which their forefathers belonged. On the other hand, both the heatao and toruipi are significant features of contemporary Toaripi society.

Decline and Disappearance of Elavo and Elavoapeape

As Christianity spread, the pagan religious system became less important and finally disappeared. In 1919 the doctrines associated with the Vailala Madness urged that the old religion be repudiated and its paraphernalia be destroyed. The Toaripi obeyed these instructions and as a result there were many changes in their lives that continued long after the cult as such disappeared.
The repudiation of the old religion meant that there was no longer a compelling reason for holding the ceremonies that had been associated with it. The positions of the pukari and other office holders were also weakened because they could no longer call upon their magical knowledge or claim a special relationship with supernatural powers embodied in the bullroarers and such. One of the chief reasons for organizing large-scale garden work, pig hunts or fish drives had been the need to amass food for the feasts that accompanied the ceremonies. The occasions for feasting and the bases of leadership in these large-scale economic enterprises disappeared at the same time. Similarly, the special relationship between a boy and his mother's brother, signalled by the exchange of pork and shell valuables following the boy's seclusion in the elavo, was no longer activated and over time lost its importance.

The elavo remaining in the Toaripi villages were now simply club houses and no longer ceremonial and religious centres. If men frequented one elavo rather than another, there were not necessarily any implications for elavoape affiliation. Indeed, as the elavo fell into disrepair and were not rebuilt, the men of the two villages must have used whatever buildings were still standing.

Finally, in 1928, there was a major washaway at the mouth of the Lakekamu river and most of Mirihea village was destroyed. The danger had been apparent for some time,
and people were prepared to move elsewhere. Since the cessation of warfare Toaripi had made fuller use of the entire territory they claimed, between Maipora creek and the Kapuri river (Fig. 2). Temporary settlements near gardening and fishing places were set up and many people spent considerable periods of time away from the main villages working land to which they had rights through toruipi membership. When the Lakekamu washaway finally occurred, those immediately affected moved to these fishing and gardening settlements, some of which became permanent villages. People took up residence in these new settlements because they had land rights nearby. The villages themselves were laid out according to the same principles: a couple built their house on land to which one of them had hereditary, toruipi-based rights. No elavo were built in the new villages.

Since 1928, then, Uritai has been the only village in which elavo have ever stood. This village is divided into two sections: the 'old' section, consisting of the land that remains from the pre-Vailala Madness days; and the

11 Lelefiuru, Hamuhamu, Kukipi and Isapeape villages grew up in this way. Mirivase and Lalapipi grew up as population increases in Uritai village put pressure on land suitable for house sites. Keauta is an offshoot of Kukipi that grew up near the Government station. Popo was settled early this century as Uritai villagers assimilated the earlier Tati inhabitants (Fig. 2).

12 Minor washaways occur constantly, and some of the land on which the elavo stood is now under water.
'new' village, where people have taken up house-sites according to toruipi-based lands rights. Fig. 3 shows the plan of the village in 1962. The 'old' village is said to be settled according to elavoape affiliation, but investigation did not bear out this assertion. In both 'old' and 'new' sections of the village houses are built on land to which either the householder or his wife has hereditary toruipi-based right.

When the elavo and their associated groups began to disappear, the old religion also began to disappear. But the Toaripi were not left to deal with life bereft of religious belief and practice. The old religion was repudiated in 1919 because of a promise of a new way of life, a way coming directly from the supernatural. Christian missionaries had been working among the Toaripi for about 35 years when the Vailala Madness occurred. We do not know with any certainty what progress the missionaries made in that period, but the fact that the new teaching had had some influence is attested by the prominence given to Jesus and God in the doctrines of the cult. Furthermore, the mission felt sure enough of its converts to begin ordaining Toaripi pastors in the 1930s. All indications are that Christianity grew steadily in importance among the Toaripi until by 1960 all were professed Christians. The disappearance of the

---

13 See below, pp. 69-70, for a fuller account.
elavo did not deprive the people of religion; it was rather a factor making for their change from one religious system to another.

For some time, the London Missionary Society used the elavoapeape as a basis on which church activities were organized: each elavoape in a village elected one deacon to represent its interests. This organization, however, no longer obtains: in 1962, three of the twelve deacons in Uritai were of Luipiheaea elavoape, but this was not significant in their election or subsequent activities. They represented interest groups and were part of village political life, but these were not the concern of elavoapeape.14

Elavoape membership used to be an important consideration in the regulation of marriage: members of the same elavoape were not permitted to marry because of their putative kinship; and there was some restriction on marriage with a member of the mother's elavoape. Today, membership in the same elavoape is likely to be a bar to marriage only if the two people come from the same village. If they are from different villages, elavoape affiliation may not be known; if it is known, it is likely to be dismissed as irrelevant. If people who are married do know that their

14 See Ryan 1969 for an account of Uritai political organization.
fathers belonged to the same elavoape, they may say that they come from different itai and are thus 'really' of different elavoape. The continued importance of elavoape affiliation in regulating intra-village marriage is a reflection of the fact that members of an elavoape who live in the same village are likely to recognize each other as kin and to interact as such, so that the objection is to marriage between known kin rather than to the breaking of elavoape exogamy rules.

Case 1

Heva belongs to Luipiheaea elavoape and there is no story of migration to Morovelavi elavo from another elavo; his family is 'true' Luipiheaea. Heva's wife's father belonged to Laikipiheaea elavoape, but he was the descendant of one of a group of brothers who had moved from Morovelavi elavo to Elavomaoro elavo three generations previously. He thus belonged to Luipi-Laikipiheaea itai of Laikipiheaea.

Each elavoape was divided into a number of itai, which consisted of close kinsmen who were probably able to trace actual genealogical links. The itai may or may not have been lineages; I cannot say on the evidence I have. Some itai were known simply as 'true' Luipiheaea or whatever the elavoape name was. In other cases, the itai name signalled a migration: the itai name combined the names of the former and present elavoape with which the migrants were associated. The migrants apparently obeyed the marriage rules of their new elavoape and may have had to observe at least some of the rules of their former elavoape. Today, a couple with a 'bad' marriage justify it by emphasizing the fact of migration and minimizing the fact that immigrants became members of another elavoape.
elavoape. Heva and his wife, Lovoa, are members of different elavoapeape and were permitted to marry, but they are sensitive about their 'kinship,' of which they are constantly reminded because they hold some land in common, he from his father, she from hers. On the other hand, Lovoa does not appear to be at all embarrassed about the fact that her mother belonged to Luipi-Soveheaea itai of Luipiheaea elavoape, while her father belonged to Lupi-Laikipiheaea itai of Laikipiheaea elavoape. As far as I know, her mother and father did not share any land rights. It is also notable that Lovoa and Heva are not embarrassed because her mother belonged to Luipiheaea elavoape. Again, there do not seem to be any shared land rights. The relationship between Heva and his wife is phrased in terms of elavoape affiliation, but this does not seem to be what is actually operating.

Thus far, I have set out the ways in which the elavoapeape have declined in importance, so that they are no longer significant features of Toaripi life. They have not, however, entirely disappeared as Case 1 demonstrates. In addition, two activities closely associated with elavoapeape continued for some time after the Vailala Madness occurred.

The hiri trade between the Toaripi and the Motu continued until the Second World War, despite the fact that the elavoapeape were no longer the basis of large-scale economic enterprises, and despite the fact that magic
formerly believed necessary for success was no longer regarded as efficacious. The continuation of the trade can be accounted for largely because it remained an important economic activity: the Toaripi needed clay pots and arm-shells as much as the Motu needed sago and canoe logs. And the hiri was the only available means of obtaining these necessities. The hiri trading group had never been organized entirely according to elavoape affiliation, so that it was not difficult to organize groups for trading voyages in such a way that their composition was similar to that of former times. Supernatural protection in what was a hazardous undertaking was now provided by God instead of by magic spells. The Second World War disrupted the trade, as the Motu villages were evacuated and the Toaripi men were working as carriers. After the war, the Motu were increasingly involved in wage labour and thus less dependent on subsistence crops. Similarly, the Toaripi used aluminum and enamel pots and pans, and needed money as much as armshells for marriage payments. In the context of these new economic activities and needs, the hiri was no longer important. Certainly not important enough to justify the annual dangerous voyage, and the trade soon stopped. Toaripi men still occasionally make a trip to Port Moresby in a big double-hulled canoe, but they spend more time in migrant settlements visiting their relatives than they do in the villages of Motu trading partners. If they sell sago it
is for cash, not clay pots.

The heatao was intimately associated with the elavo and its ceremonies, and we might expect that it has declined in importance or disappeared along with other elavo-based groups and activities. Instead, we find that it is still in existence, and an important feature of Toaripi life. I shall discuss this in the next section.

Looking at the elavo and elavoapeape, I find that in present-day Toaripi life they are no longer so important as they were, but that it is not possible to say that they have disappeared. The elavo structures certainly have, but the associated groups still play some part in organizing activities. Reference to elavoape affiliation is a way of grouping people when activities are being organized or discussed. The reference does not necessarily relate to 'real' elavoape groupings, but it does provide a convenient way of clustering people, understood by the Toaripi, if not by the ethnographer.

This is seen clearly in discussions of landholding. A piece of land is often said to belong to a particular elavoape. Inquiry shows that in fact members of that elavoape do not have any special rights to the land and do not necessarily constitute a majority of the toruipi members using the plot. The elavoape affiliation may refer to the original user of the plot, to a contemporary user who is prominent in village affairs, or to people closely
associated with the one making the statement. Reference to elavoape affiliation seems to be a convenient way of designating a set of people with rights to use a piece of land. It can be used thus because a person has only one elavoape affiliation, and provided the speaker and his audience know which person is actually being referred to, the definition of the set of land users is clear. Toruipi affiliation cannot be used in this way because toruiipiipi have no names, and because each person belongs simultaneously to many so that the reference would not readily designate an individual and his fellow land users.

Elavoape affiliation can also be used when it is necessary to restrict recruitment to a group without offending those who are excluded. The toruipi, as an unrestricted bilateral descent group, is not suitable for this purpose.

Case 2

Kara organized a trade store with capital collected from members of Kaurilavi elavo. The shareholders included Kara, his children and those of his brothers' children whom he had reared. His SiSo, whom he had also brought up, was included; but his elder Br, with whom he was on bad terms, was not invited to contribute. Some of his other patrilateral kin were invited to contribute money, while others were ignored. Thus far, Kara's choice of shareholders followed the usual Toaripip pattern of selection from among
a wide range of kinsmen. Apart from the fact that none of Kara's matrilateral kin was included, the pattern of selection did not bear any particular relationship to elavo or elavoape. Those of the shareholders who could be regarded as members of Malaviheaea elavoape (or Kaurilavi elavo, as it was more commonly phrased) belonged to Kaurilavi itai, but many would be regarded as members of other elavaoapeape if this grouping was in question. It may be that Kara for this reason phrased the selection of shareholders in elavo terms, because those who were not agnates could be regarded as 'migrants' to Kaurilavi elavo and their elavoapeape connexions as of secondary importance. This, however, is my own interpretation: Kara himself merely told me that the shareholders were all Kaurilavi, and relatives. In addition to Kara's relatives members of Malaviheaea itai of Kaurilavi elavo were also invited to contribute. Most of the invitations to become shareholders could be seen as shrewd economic moves. The young BrSo whom Kara had reared were shareholders and responsible for running the store; they were under heavy obligations to Kara and unlikely to be careless or dishonest. Kara's SiSo had worked for some years in the co-operatives section of the Administration and was thus familiar with business methods. He also lived in Port Moresby and ordered the store's stock. Two other young patrilateral kinsmen of Kara worked on the Government station and lived in the village; as shareholders
in the tradestore they were more likely to shop there than at the village co-operative store. The people in Malaviheaea itai were few, but had regular access to cash: one of the men, Pava, received money from his long-absent son; Pava's SiDa was married to a schoolteacher who lived and worked on the nearby Government station. Again, the pattern of recruitment was one common among Toaripi and did not seem to have very much to do with *elavo*. By making the trade-store an *elavo*-based venture, however, Kara accomplished a number of important things: he excluded a very large proportion of the village from the field of possible subscribers, and was thus able to offer his shareholders an inducement to invest. Shareholders could obtain credit at the store. The number eligible for credit was thus restricted; and they were the very people who had an interest in seeing that credit was not extended indefinitely or in excessive amounts.

Under very special circumstances, other members of Malaviheaea or members of Lakoroheaea *elavoapeape*\(^\text{16}\) were permitted to buy on credit at the store, but this was a favour and did not extend to many people. Kara could give this extra credit without jeopardizing his store, yet it helped to prevent

\(^{16}\) There were two *elavo* named Kaurilavi in Uritai: the *elavoape* associated with one was Malaviheaea, containing Kaurilavi and Malaviheaea itai. The other *elavo* had been built to accommodate excess numbers, villagers told me. The *elavoape* associated with it was named Lakoroheaea, but was regarded as an offshoot of Malaviheaea. There were no adult males from Lakoroheaea in Uritai in 1960.
unfavourable comment on his lack of generosity to his fellow villagers. The store was set up in 1960 and when I last heard of it, in 1968, it was not only still in business but had branched out into buying crocodile skins from Toaripi hunters. Over the last forty years Toaripi have set up dozens of business ventures; Kara's store is the only successful one that I know of among Uritai villagers. Much of the success can be attributed to the restriction of credit. And this restriction is based on elavaoape membership, so that the other Uritai villagers cannot easily accuse Kara of greed and selfishness.

Persistence of heatao

It may at first seem odd that the heatao organization has continued to be important when so much else that was associated with the elavaoapeape has disappeared. There are, however, a number of factors that make the persistence of the heatao easier to understand.

As I noted earlier, in 1920, before the Vailala Madness had subsided, tax was introduced in Papua and men had an incentive to sign up for indentured labour. Toaripi youths who were secluded and initiated at the same time had been playmates and friends from early childhood; they were likely to have a heatao name long before their seclusion. Following the Vailala Madness, seclusion ceased among the Toaripi but the youths who were members of one heatao tended to sign up as a group for indentured labour. If possible,
they would all go to the same plantation; then they would return home, marry and settle down. For a few years after the 1920 cult, there were still the heatao that had been named and had functioned as friendship groups in the expectation that their members would in due course be secluded in the elavo. Indentured labour replaced seclusion as a shared experience for members of the heatao, though the experience was no longer associated with the elavoapeape.

The question remains, however, why heatao continued to be formed and named. Not everyone went away to work; and it was not always possible to sign up as a group. Indentured labour by itself could not provide the mechanism for the continued formation of heatao. This was done in the village schools: the London Missionary Society had schools throughout the Toaripi area from the 1920s, and children who started school at about the same time were named a heatao. Thus, as the pattern of recruitment changed from indenture to free or casual labour, the heatao organization remained because membership did not depend on shared work experience. Virtually every Toaripi child went to school, however casually, and thus became a heatao member. Those who went away to work together shared more experiences, but those who worked apart from their age-mates or stayed at home nevertheless belonged to the group.

Although heatao were formally recognized on the occasion of the male members' initiation, they functioned
mainly as work parties. The need to organize labour in the village remained after the elavo had disappeared. Long before the Vailala Madness occurred, the young men had ceased to act as village warriors, but the heatao were still the appropriate groups for such tasks as house-building, canoe-building, and village-clearing. They have continued to the present day to be the basis on which work parties are organized among the Toaripi. Ties between age-mates are also useful in Port Moresby: those in the same heatao tend to go to school together and thus know how much education their fellows have had. When a job requiring a certain level of education becomes available, a Toaripi can recommend one of his age-mates on the basis of his schooling. This network of information about jobs and recommendations of age-mates can be regarded as yet another way in which heatao membership is a means of organizing the work force.

Heatao were also important in the regulation of marriage: there was a preference for marriage within the heatao after the boys had finished their period of seclusion. This preference persists partly because the heatao is village based, so that boys and girls in a heatao are likely to know each other well and to form attachments. Because the members of a heatao are of approximately the same age, they tend to become interested in marriage at about the same time.

The disappearance of the elavo and the decline of the elavoapeape, then, have been accompanied by many important
changes in Toaripi life. Some of the changes have been the outcome of the disappearance of the elavo, others have a more complex relationship to this event. Just as important and interesting, however, are the continuities in Toaripi life. In these sections, I have attempted to show that the elavo and their associated groups, the heatao and the toruiipiipi were important in different contexts of activity. As the contexts have changed, some of the institutions have declined in importance; all have been adapted to different circumstances. In the following sections, I shall pay a great deal of attention to the flexibility of Toaripi social arrangements, the importance of situation in the definition of groups and actions. One of the purposes of this historical sketch has been to indicate that this is not something wholly new: actual situations are, of course, different from what they used to be; but adaptation of institutions and principles to meet situations is not alien to Toaripi society.

Frameworks of Social Action

In my description of Toaripi social life, I have avoided discussion in terms of enduring groups, and have instead concentrated on activities and the contexts in which activities occur. This emphasis reflects my sympathy with a growing concern among anthropologists: the description and analysis of 'networks' (Barnes 1954), 'action-sets' (Mayer 1966), 'non-groups' (Boissevain 1968) or generally, social
situations that cannot be handled in a structural framework or by sole reliance on theories set out in terms of groups. Firth has long been a critic of structuralism in anthropology (Firth 1955:1; Stanner 1966:70) and his emphasis on social organization stems largely from his interest in adaptation, choice and process in social life. As he points out, an interest in social organization pre-supposes a structural analysis and does not aim to replace it (1955:3). Rather, an interest in the 'working arrangements of society' (1954:10) complements structural analysis and enables the anthropologist to make a richer, fuller presentation of his material.

While I am fully in sympathy with this position, 'social organization' is too general a term for my purposes, a point of view rather than a concept (Firth 1955:2-3), and I need terms of more specific connotation to enable me to set out my account of Toaripi social life.

Barnes's term 'network' is a useful starting point: it enables me to describe paths and patterns of interaction among individuals. In this sense, I can talk about the network of exchanges of goods and services among Uritai villagers living in Port Moresby. The notion of network by itself does not go beyond description of interaction, however, and I need a term that will help me to define the framework within which the interaction takes place, a term of wider connotation than 'action-set' (Mayer 1966:98) but narrower in scope than 'social field,' 'aggregate' or 'category.'
Mayer's term 'catchment' (1966:115) is one that seems to describe this framework, though I do not necessarily accept the theoretical position on quasi-groups set out in his paper.

Thus a network of interaction, which may or may not be ego-centered, is activated within a catchment consisting of all those persons socially important for the activity or eligible to take part in it. Catchments may or may not be exclusive, depending on the criteria of eligibility: a patrilineage may be a catchment from which a war party is recruited; or 'friends' may constitute a catchment from which a house-building party is recruited. Catchments make up a field of social relations (Firth 1951:28) defined largely in terms of frequency of interaction (cf. Oliver 1958). The interaction, however, is carried out within a relatively enduring framework of norms, expectations, jural rules, moral injunctions and so on – a structural framework (cf. Firth 1955:3).

The boundaries of the Toaripi social field are in part marked by language and cultural differences, and in part by the people's own views on the limits of the field. These, however, are not the only boundaries and even they may change according to circumstances. Thus, in the view of the villagers, all the Toaripi villages are a separate field of social relations, solidly aligned against the similar set of Moveave villages upstream on the Lakekamu and Tauri
rivers (Fig. 2). The two sets of villages exhibit minor dialectical differences and slight variations in details of customary behaviour. These are exaggerated and great significance is attached to them, while similarities are dismissed and the importance of the interaction is minimized. For most purposes, the two sets of villages can be regarded as separate social fields though the boundaries are not absolute. Two of the Toaripi villages, Hamuhamu and Lelefiru, however, share some land interests with the Moveave village of Savaiviri (Fig. 2) and there is a certain amount of visiting between the coastal and inland villages. These three settlements can be regarded as a separate social field for some purposes. While the Toaripi village is the focus of most intense interaction, there are situations in which the 'old' and 'new' sections of Uritai (Fig. 3) can be regarded as separate social fields. Such blurring of apparently clear-cut social boundaries could be repeated almost endlessly, and any of these units could validly be isolated as a social field for certain purposes of analysis. This means that the definition would make sense to the Toaripi, and that the analyst could make meaningful statements about activities carried out within the unit.

Having said in effect that a social field is just about anything an ethnographer cares to say it is, I should perhaps spell out more clearly my reasons for looking at Uritai villagers in the village and in Port Moresby as part
of one social system or field of social relations. My argument is not that this is the 'true' or even the 'best' way to analyze the material. Rather, looking at the situation as a bi-local social system enables me to point up variations in the arrangement of social activities more easily than I could if I were working in a different way. The description of such variations is necessary if we are to understand the processes of social change, or, indeed, social processes in general. Finally, conceptualizing the material in this way does make sense to the people themselves.

In the earlier sections of this chapter, I argued that the *elavoapeape*, *heatao* and *toruipiipi* were important in different contexts of Toaripi life. The decline of the *elavoapeape* reflects a decline in importance of the situations in which they were significant and their irrelevance in present-day activities. The *heatao* and the *toruipiipi* are still important, and I suggest that most social activities among the Toaripi are carried out within frameworks of cognatic kinship and age-grouping. These two principles provide frameworks of norms and expectations within which activities take place. Repetition and continuity in Toaripi social life stem from these frameworks of social action. Change and variation, however, also stem from these frameworks and a social organizational viewpoint is necessary for an understanding of these two aspects of the situation. To exemplify the way in which I propose to describe Toaripi
social life, I shall discuss land-holding and land tenure among Uritai villagers, both in the village and in the Vabukori migrant settlement in Port Moresby.

**Land-Holding and Local Grouping**

Inheritance of land rights is bilateral, and both the disposition of houses within a village and the location of villages throughout Toaripi territory reflect patterns of land use. I have already described the way in which hamlets grew as people moved from Uritai and Mirihea to exercise their hereditary rights to distant plots of land. After the Lakekamu washaway in 1928 some of the hamlets became villages as people took up permanent residence near their sago stands and gardens.

Those who exercise land rights in a particular area come to be regarded as 'bosses' of the land. Others who wish to work there must obtain the consent of the 'bosses.' A claimant must be able to establish his hereditary right to use the land by showing that he is a descendant of one of the original users of the land, and thus a kinsman of those who are now there. Recognized kinship is necessary but not sufficient to give a person the right to work on a piece of land. Those who are already there will not permit a person to join them unless he has previously acknowledged his kinship with them by giving and receiving cooperation in subsistence activities and on ceremonial occasions. Unless genealogical links among people are marked and reinforced in
such interaction the kinship tie is either forgotten or held to be obsolete.

Thus, the term 'Uritai land' means 'land used by people who live in Uritai village.' Neither the village as a whole nor any ward or section within it holds land corporately. People live together because they have rights to land in the same general area; they cannot obtain rights simply by going to live in a village and participating in its affairs.

Those suffering great hardship, especially refugees from other villages, however, might be given land rights on the basis of recognized genealogical links, even though the kin tie has not been reinforced by interaction.

Case 3

About 1900, a man fled from Moripi to Uritai and sought refuge with members of Morovelavi elavo. Rosi (the FaFa of Heva in Case 1) wanted to give him shelter, but other members of the elavo objected and the refugee went to Isoulavi elavo instead. He was a known kinsman of Rosi, however, and Rosi gave him some land. His descendants still use this, as well as land inherited from other ancestors. This case illustrates the fact that land rights and membership of an elavoape did not necessarily go together. Rosi could not sponsor his kinsmen in the elavo, but could give him land.

If there are no special circumstances, however, the descent-based land rights must be constantly reinforced; if the relationship is neglected, the land rights are soon
disputed. Thus, some people in Uritai village can claim rights to land near Lelefiru village on the basis of descent. Since 1928, however, these rights have seldom if ever been exercised. In 1961 some Lelefiru villagers began planting coffee and their distant Uritai kinsmen expressed interest in laying claim to some of the land suitable for the crop. The Lelefiru villagers made it clear that any such attempt would be firmly resisted because the people in Uritai had not shown any interest in the land or its users for a generation and thus could not expect to participate in this new venture.

Once a person's claim to a piece of land is allowed, his use of it strengthens his position and permits his descendants to claim rights to that plot. Thus, those people actually using a plot of land are very careful about allowing a person's claim to the right to join them. Affines, friends and visitors may be permitted to make sago, plant a garden or build a house on a piece of land but it is made clear that this is a short-term privilege and does not mean that such persons or their descendants can claim descent-based rights.

Case 4

Paripa's father died when he was very small, and his mother later married Serepi, who was not a known kinsman of her first husband. Serepi treated Paripa as his own son, and Paripa used Serepi's land. Neither Serepi nor his
sister had any children of their own; both had brought up step-children and treated these as their own offspring. As they grew older they decided to discuss the matter of land inheritance publicly, to make it clear that they wanted their step-children to inherit from them. At the public discussion in 1961, however, their kinsmen indicated that they would oppose an attempt to give land rights to those who were affines to the present land users. Paripa was by this time a grown man with adolescent children and could ill afford to be deprived of so much of the land he had used all his life. It seemed that he would not inherit land rights from his step-father, so he turned to the land that his own long-dead father had used, and planted some coconuts on one of these plots. His FaBr and FaBrCh asked him to remove the coconuts and when he refused they tore the seedlings from the ground. Paripa then took the matter to one of the village councillors and asked for a public discussion, or 'court.' Paripa's FaBr, Horike, said that he and his children had pulled the coconuts from the ground because they did not think that Paripa had the right to use the land after he had treated his kin as strangers for such a long time. Despite the fact that they had all been living in the same village, Paripa had made no attempt to work with his paternal kin on their land; he had neither given nor asked for help at feasts; and when his daughter had recently been married he had not given any of the marriage payment to Horike or Horike's
children. Paripa countered by saying that neither Horike nor any other of his paternal kin had made any attempt to care for Paripa and his widowed mother. A stranger had taken pity on her and married her and cared for her child. It was only right that Paripa should regard Serepi as a father and spend his time with him. He had nevertheless not forgotten his own paternal kin, and had waited in vain for a sign of recognition from them. Despite their continued neglect, he had named some of his children after them, but even this had elicited no response. Horike had never shown Paripa the land to which he was entitled and so he had had no option but to use Serepi's land. Now it appeared that he would not inherit any land from his step-father and needed to know the plots of land used by his own father so that he could take up his rights. Horike did not dispute Paripa's close genealogical tie with him, but said that because he had not behaved like a kinsman he was not welcome as a co-worker of the land. After a long discussion along the lines I have set out here, Horike and Paripa agreed to see more of each other and to behave towards each other as kinsmen, so that Paripa could begin to use the land that he had a right to from his father. I do not know what happened, because I left the field shortly after the dispute. But the discussion sets out very clearly the fact that a demonstrated and recognized genealogical link is not in itself enough to permit a person to begin using a particular plot of land.
Both Horike and Paripa claimed that the other had been remiss in his obligations and thus each attempted to justify his own behaviour. It was certainly true that the two men had not been close and it was clear from the discussion that until they began to interact as kinsmen should it would be very difficult for Paripa to assert his rights to his father's land.

The importance of interaction among kinsmen shows how the category 'cognate' is reduced to 'recognized kin,' the catchment within which an individual activates networks. The Toaripi do not have a cut-off point for the recognition of kin: the span of the toruipi is situationally defined, and may on occasion include all those with a common ancestor 5 to 7 generations past. No one actually remembers all the people to whom he is genealogically linked, but only those who are socially important to him. This social importance is defined by shared interest in land. So long as people share an interest in a plot of land, they recognize each other as kinsmen; to maintain the descent-based land interest they must interact and exchange goods and services. Interaction may diminish because a particular plot of land is no longer important to some of those who have the right to use it; as interaction diminishes the right to use the land becomes more difficult to establish, and eventually lapses. As the right to use the land is denied or forgotten the memory of the associated genealogical links fades too. Given that people live near the land to which they have
recognized rights, the close connexion between land rights and recognized kinship is a crucial factor in understanding the fact that an individual has most of his kin ties within the village and that the village can be viewed as a field of social relations defined largely in terms of recognized kin ties, with all that these imply.

It would seem that constant attempts would be made to revive obsolescent kin ties and to widen the span of personal kindreds because these attempts if successful would mean that people could lay claim to more land. While land disputes are endemic among the Toaripi and individuals do seek to maintain a wide network of kin, the marriage regulations mean that in most cases it is not expedient to trace all possible kin ties. The rule is that no two people with an ancestor in common may marry. In brief, a person may attempt to assert descent-based land rights among a set of related people, or he may seek a spouse there, but he cannot do both. In addition to this prohibition, there is a strong preference for intra-village marriages among age-mates. Toaripi villages are large, but it would be impossible to fulfill all these conditions of marriage unless a high proportion of kin ties were forgotten.

In addition, there is no need for people to assert rights to land in all places where it would be possible to do so. Sago land is plentiful; gardening is subsidiary
but there may be some land shortage;\textsuperscript{17} dry land for house sites is limited but I do not think that any individual is without rights to some land in the village on which he can build a house. Thus there is not any pressure on people to assert all possible land rights in order to survive. Furthermore, prestige, wealth and leadership are not related to the amount of land held or used. All families are expected to be able to support themselves and to care for aged parents when necessary; but sponsorship of large feasts is not the path to leadership, nor are extensive landholdings a means of recruiting followers or obtaining wealth. The marriage rules and descent-based land rights are connected in a complex manner and their interplay underlies the organization of many activities and the composition of many networks. Each set of principles constrains the working of the other, but they are not in conflict.

So far, I have described the principles of land holding and shown how they are important in determining the location of villages. The way in which the villages themselves are laid out is also closely linked with land holding patterns. Just as people inherit rights to land on which

\textsuperscript{17} Uritai villagers often claimed that garden land was short, but I had no way of checking on this because I could not find out whether larger sets of people were now laying claim to plots of garden land than was the case in the past. In 10 months of detailed household interviews, however, I encountered no case of food shortage attributable to lack of garden land.
they collect sago and make gardens, so they inherit rights to land suitable for housebuilding. I have already described how villages grew after the 1928 washaway at the Lakekamu mouth, noting that the new settlements were laid out according to individuals' land rights and not according to elavo grouping. The same pattern is found in Uritai village itself, in both the 'old' and 'new' sections (Fig. 3).

The 'old' section consists mainly of land on which the elavo stood. People refer to certain portions as 'Luipiheaea (elavaoape) land' for example, pointing out the plot on which the appropriate elavo once stood. But an examination of the relationship of household heads to the relevant elavoapeape does not support this description of the settlement pattern. In this section of the village 56% of the household heads have built on land to which they have patrilineally inherited rights, which are not the same as rights acquired through elavoape membership. Thus members of different toruiipiipi within the same elavoape claim descent-based rights in different parts of the 'old' section, or in different parts of the area said to belong to an elavoape. Those whose houses are on land to which they have patrilineally inherited rights have no superior claim to the land compared with others occupying it. And here, as in the 'new' section, some of the houses are built on land to which the wife of the household head has inherited rights, whether
agnatically or not. The rights of the women are in no way inferior to those of men, and once more agnatic descent does not confer special status.

The 'new' section consists of three named pieces of land: Seamava, Makovu and Isapeharo. Houses and small gardens on these plots belong to people who are recognized descendants of the original land users, or to people who have obtained permission from the landowners to live or garden there. Occasionally the plots, or portions of them, are referred to as land belonging to a particular elavoape, but investigation does not support this description of the land holding pattern. The elavoape affiliation may have been that of one of the original land users, or may be that of one or more of the current landowners. In any case, elavoape affiliation is not the criterion of contemporary membership of a land holding toruipi. A description of the situation on Makovu in 1961 will give a clearer idea of the way in which Uritai villagers acquire land on which to garden and build houses.

Makovu runs from one side of the island on which Uritai is situated to the other. The total area is approximately 27 acres, but not all of this is suitable for houses or gardens. The plot is divided into four portions, each associated with a different original user. There is no belief that these four were in any way related.

The first of these four that I shall discuss was named
Opu, who lived three generations ago. 18 His descendants included 44 adults regarded as residents of Uritai. 19 Of these, 13 were away from the village for the entire period of my field work. Two had houses and small gardens; and 19 had small gardens. In addition, six people had small gardens because they were the descendants of people who had been given permission to use this land by Opu or by one of his descendants. 20 The two houses were built there because of the inherited land rights of the household heads' wives. One of these women was a SoSoDaDa of Opu, the other a SoDaSoDaDa.

The second of the original landowners was named Susuve, who lived five generations ago and had 24 adult descendants who were Uritai residents. Of these, five were absent; 11

18 In counting the generations, I use as reference point the oldest living member of the landholding toruipi. The four people used here (three men and one woman) ranged in age from about 55 to about 70.

19 Residents include those actually present, those who have gone to live in towns and those who have joined spouses in other villages. I have not included those who are the descendants of people who went to other villages, unless there has been subsequent interaction.

20 In the past, those who gave signal aid in warfare or feasting were sometimes given a plot of land as a reward. Such a gift did not entitle the recipient to rights to other land held by the donor. The exercise of these rights is sometimes disputed, on the grounds that warfare and ceremonies are things of the past, so that there is no need to mark prowess in them. The users of this gift land are not landowners.
had gardens and four had houses on the land. In addition, two people had made gardens and one had built a house, with the permission of the present landowners. These non-kin are not likely to be able to claim a right to use the land and to pass this right to their descendants. When questioned about it, villagers were of the opinion that these privileges were temporary and that any attempt to extend them to descendants would be opposed. The four descendants of Susuve who had houses on the land were a SoSoSoSoSoSo, and this man's sister; and a SoSoSoSoDaSo, and this man's son.

Kakare lived four generations ago, and 25 of his adult descendants were Uritai residents. Ten of these were absent, seven had gardens and two had houses. One other person had been allowed by the present landowners to build a house. The two houses of Kakare's descendants belonged to a SoSoSoSo and a DaSoSoSo.

Sevesoa lived three generations ago and there were 21 adult Uritai residents claiming land on the basis of descent from him. Six of these were absent, six had houses and gardens and six had gardens. All six householders claiming rights from Sevesoa have an affinal link in their genealogies. Four of the houses were occupied by a SoWiSiSoSoSo and three of his sons. The father of this man was orphaned early and brought up by his MoSiHu (Sevesoa's son). For reasons that I was not able to discover, this foster child inherited land rights and passed them on to his descendants. These
people are now regarded as full landowners, an example of the way in which the allowance of a claim to land rights strengthens the claimant's position as landowner rather than user of gift land. The other two houses are occupied by Sevesoa's WiBrSoSoSo and this man's SiSo. These two men claim that Sevesoa and his wife were cognates, with shared land interests, so that their link with the original land user is not merely an affinal one. They could offer no evidence of kinship between Sevesoa and his wife, and no one seemed to regard the matter as very important. These men are also full landowners.

Not all of the known resident descendants of the four original land users were exercising their rights on Makovu. Some were nevertheless active members of the landholding toruipi, interacting with their kinsmen and perhaps exercising similarly based land rights on other plots of land. Others knew of their hereditary rights to land on Makovu, but expressed no interest in taking them up; some claimed that they did not know the boundaries of the pieces to which they were entitled. Others were the descendants of people who had ceased to use land on Makovu; some of these were not aware of their hereditary rights. If a generation has gone by without the exercise of land rights, it is extremely difficult to obtain permission to take them up.

Houses in Uritai, then, are usually situated on land
to which the household head or his wife has hereditary rights. In some cases, a landowner will invite others to build near him. Such invitations may be extended to friends, relatives of the non-landowning spouse or kinsmen who do not have land rights on that particular plot.

Vabukori Migrant Settlement

So long as rights to house sites are obtained through the inheritance of land rights, it is not surprising that principles of land holding affect settlement patterns. It may, however, be difficult to see how these principles can affect the settlement pattern in an area where the people have no such rights, as is the case in the migrant settlements on Port Moresby. In order to show how land rights, and their concomitant recognized kinship ties, are important in Port Moresby, I shall describe the migrant settlement at Vabukori (Fig. 4).

I have already discussed the ways in which Toaripi settlements grew up in Port Moresby, so that village-based kin links provided the means of recruiting workers and hence fellow settlers. These kin ties have continued to be of fundamental importance in the definition of networks of interaction in the town. Here I wish to show how these kin ties, with their implied common land interests, underly the residence pattern at Vabukori. I shall begin by describing the growth of the settlement; then I shall discuss in some detail the section containing the largest number of Uritai
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villagers.

Vabukori settlement is adjacent to the Motu village of Vabukori, and in 1963-64 contained approximately 320 people (Fig. 5). The first Toaripi man built a house on the present settlement site before the Second World War, but the main growth is post-war. The settlement occupies portions of two blocks of Motu land, each with a separate set of owners. On these two blocks, the settlers' houses are arranged in three clusters, each cluster having a somewhat different history.

Before the war an Uritai man named Sovora who was working in Port Moresby had occasion to seek refuge with his father's Motu trading friend, James of Vabukori. Sovora obtained permission to build a house on James' land (house 4 in Fig. 5), and lived there until the outbreak of the war. After the war, Sovora returned to his house at Vabukori and his younger brother Kakaki built a house nearby (house 15, Fig. 5).

In 1947 an Uritai man named Foroe, who was married to an Isapeape woman, built a house near Sovora, who was a kinsman of his wife. Both men were working in Port Moresby at the time. Foroe and his wife became friendly with one of the Motu owners of the adjacent block of land. This man invited them to build a house on the land (house 3, Fig. 5).

In 1951, two Hamuhamu men obtained permission from the landowners to build houses on another part of the block to
which James had rights (houses 18 and 20, Fig. 5). The fathers of these men had been trading partners of one of the landowners and he gave them permission to build.

In 1963, the settlement was divided into three clusters. Cluster A, containing houses 1-3, is on the land block occupied by Foroe and his wife. Subsequent settlers came with the consent of the Motu landowner, and are all Mirihea people, related in various ways to Foroe's wife. Cluster B, containing houses 4-16, is on portion of the block owned by James and his kin. Most of the settlers are from Uritai or its offshoot villages and none of them has any contact with the Motu landowners. Sovora died in the early 1950s and Kakaki returned to Uritai village at about the same time. The later settlers have not obtained permission from James to build and make no attempt to cultivate the landowners' goodwill. Cluster C, containing houses 17-21, is on the other portion of the block owned by James and his kin. Most of the settlers come from Mirihea villages, and came to this settlement as a group in about 1958 when they were forced to leave another area in which they had been living. One of the two original housebuilders is still in the settlement, and maintains cordial relations with the

\[\text{i.e. They come from one of the offshoot villages of Mirihea: Lelefiru, Hamuhamu or Isapeape (Fig. 2).}\]
FIGURE 5. VABUKORI SETTLEMENT, 1964
landowners. The other has gone to live and work in another town.

In general terms, the settlement grew up in the way I described earlier. I shall now discuss the residence pattern in cluster B in more detail, to show how it resembles the pattern in Uritai and how this resemblance arises from the fact that kinship and land rights operate here as well as in the village.

Shortly after the end of the war, Sovora had a house on the site of house 4 (Fig. 5). His younger brother, Kakaki, had a house on the present site of 15. Sovora and Kakaki's MoBrSo, Heheri, lived near the present site of 12 but later moved in with Sovora. Since Sovora's death, house 4 has been occupied by Heheri and his wife's brothers and their families.

The present householder of 11 stayed with his kinsman Sovora for a while before moving to the site of his present house. Two of his wife's young kinsmen were staying with the family but after a quarrel they left and joined another man who was living alone, on the present site of 14. The present householder of 14 was at that time living with Foroe and his wife but after a quarrel they left and joined the three men living on the site of 14. Later, when house 11 was being re-built, the two young men in 14 took some of the materials and used them to build the present house. One of these men has since gone to live in another town and his
brother has returned to the village.

The occupants of all the houses in section B are either kinsmen or affines of the original settlers or of those who came to live at Vabukori in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Given the wide range of kin ties recognized and used by the Toaripi, it is no longer possible to trace connexions among all the present inhabitants. The settlers themselves say that there are sets of 'strangers' in the section, but inquiry into the history of individual dwellings shows that through the years kinship and affinity were used to obtain living quarters in the settlement. As people have moved away, portions of kin-based networks have become dispersed throughout the town, and these are the important bases of interaction.

The pattern of movement within the settlement, between settlements, or from settlement to other housing and back, generally follows the lines I have indicated above. In all cases of which I have knowledge, household units were set up and changed in the same way as the composition of land holding toruipiipi are defined and modified. That is, household units are formed and expanded most commonly on the basis of kinship and affinity. A newcomer to Port Moresby can obtain a place to stay in a settlement by going to a house where he or his wife has a kinsman or kinswoman. From this base he establishes himself as an active member of several networks of interaction in the town. The networks
are activated within catchments defined in terms of village-based kinship, which in turn is closely connected with shared land rights. It is not possible, however, to rely solely on past interaction in the village or to make claims on kinsmen in town simply because common relatives in the village are interacting. Village-based kinship gives a migrant the right to become part of an urban network, but he has to maintain his position in the network by his actions in the town.

The sanction on neglect of obligations is not denial of access to land, but denial of shelter. Until the late 1950s, a migrant at Vabukori would ask the person with whom he was living for permission to build a house nearby. Very few, apart from the original settlers, consulted the Motu landowners. Alarmed at the growth of migrant settlements, the Administration in the late 1950s prohibited further building in them. Newcomers now stayed with people who already had houses or sought permission from the householders to build additional rooms onto the existing structures.

In all these cases, those in possession of housing are in a position to grant or deny permission to join them in their houses or by building nearby. As is the case when a person seeks to have his rights to a particular plot of land recognized, those already in possession take a number of factors into account when making their decision. The
degree of crowding in the house, the need of the newcomer and the other options that he has, and the manner in which he has fulfilled his obligations of interaction and co-operation are all considered. In both the town and the village deliberations are usually carried out amicably, with both parties expressing their warm feeling for each other as kinsmen. But the possibility of denial is real, and it is unwise to count on only one set of landholders or house­holders to allow claims to land or shelter. On the one hand, it is usual and wise to have several options; on the other hand, the fact that there are other options may be given as an excuse for denying a particular claim. A person who attempts to cooperate with too large a number of kinsmen and affines runs the risk of falling short of their expecta­tions, because he cannot devote enough of his time and resources to them all. As I shall show in the next chapter, these constraints operate in the village as well as in Port Moresby. Here I shall merely note that failure to act properly towards fellow migrants does not endanger a person's land rights in the village, but it does mean that he may be left without money and housing if he loses his job.

Occasionally a family is taken in as a favour, because their need is great or because someone in the house is particularly friendly with some member. If this happens, the people thus invited are not regular members of the house­hold and may be asked to leave after a short time or if
kinsmen are expected. On the other hand, a person invited to join a household as a regular member strengthens his claim to continued residence simply by staying in the house. The householder of 14, for example, regards himself, and is regarded by others in the settlement as the owner of the house. Only my questions about building materials revealed the history outlined earlier. If either of the young men returned to Vabukori settlement he would not necessarily be able to go and live in 14. The importance of occupancy, analogous to the importance of exercising land rights in the village, is illustrated in the following case.

Case 5

When the two original settlers built houses in section C, Kohara helped one of them, his FaBr, to build 18. After several years' residence, both Kohara and his uncle left for other towns. Kohara returned in 1963 after about 6 years' absence and found that 18 was full up. He did not attempt to move in and no one invited him to join them. Instead he joined his kinsman in 20, and in 1964 talked of building another house for his family.

So far, the question of inheritance has scarcely arisen in the settlement. Sovora died and his house has been occupied by Heheri, who is undoubtedly the closest relative living in Port Moresby. No more deaths of householders had occurred up to 1965, so it is not yet possible to say how inheritance of houses will be handled. In the past, the
re-building of a house has often been an occasion for redistribution of iron and timber, which are used to build or extend other structures. It is not possible to build new houses in Port Moresby as it is in the village: opposition from the Government and the landowners as well as the expense of building prevent many migrants from building their own houses, or adding rooms to existing houses. Lacking land rights, the migrants regard rights to housing as of extreme importance. The movement of building materials as well as of people around the settlement and between settlements are in many ways analogous to the distribution of land rights in the village, with the difference that new building materials are constantly being introduced whereas the amount of land remains constant.

Summary

In this discussion of social structure and the organization of activities among the Toaripi I have emphasized the fact that analysis in terms of enduring groups is seldom appropriate. Rather, I have looked at the frameworks of action, asking what are the principles according to which networks are activated. These principles define catchments, the sets of people socially important or eligible for participation in particular activities, from which the networks are chosen or emerge. The catchments in turn are defined with reference to two very general principles: age-grouping and unlimited recognition of kinship, which between
them define almost the whole social universe.

Age-groups (heatao) are by definition relatively enduring social groups with clear boundaries, important in the organization of labour and in the regulation of marriage. The toruipi, however, is defined according to the context of activity and it is not easy to see exactly how cognatic kinship can operate in the definition of catchments. I have argued that the way in which this unlimited universe of kinship is defined is through shared land rights. The maintenance, extension and neglect of land rights define for an individual which of his cognates he recognizes and thus the kin-based catchments within which most of his socially important networks are activated.

In order to exemplify these points, and to show how the same principles of behaviour apply in the village and in Port Moresby, I have discussed land holding and local organization. Throughout, it is clear that an individual has several options in a given situation: he is not constrained by group affiliation, but on the other hand cannot count on solidary support from a group. In other words, choices among competing demands on time, loyalty and resources are constantly being made. In the next chapter, I shall discuss this further and show how an analysis in these terms allows me to describe Uritai villagers in the village and in Port Moresby as members of a single social system.
CHAPTER IV
SOCIAL INTERACTION BETWEEN URITAI VILLAGERS IN THE VILLAGE AND IN PORT MORESBY

In 1960-62, Uritai villagers numbered approximately 1,000, of whom about 700 were in the village. The rest were in towns throughout the Territory of Papua-New Guinea, approximately 200 in Port Moresby.¹ In this chapter, I wish to describe some of the important social activities of the villagers, showing how actions in the village influence and are influenced by actions in Port Moresby, and vice versa. First, however, I shall set out in some detail the ways in which choices are made among possible courses of action.

Age-Mates and Kinsmen

For most purposes the total field of social relations among the Toaripi is defined in terms of age grouping and kinship. Activities are carried out by sets of people recruited according to one or both of these principles.

¹ The 1964-65 Census returns, Toaripi Census Division, show the population of Uritai village as 1116, of whom 764 were present in the village. My own survey in Port Moresby, carried out at about the same time as the census, showed 316 Uritai villagers in the town. These are the latest figures I have, and indicate that the proportion of village dwellers to town dwellers has remained fairly constant. The 1960-62 figures are an average for the period, and the 1964-65 figures do not balance because my survey was carried out rather differently from the Government census.
Age-groups are important in large-scale economic activities, such as building houses and making large canoes, and in tasks such as clearing paths near the village. Age-mates are expected to marry each other, provided that they are not known to be kin. Members of an age-group are expected to be friends throughout their lives, and in fact age-mates commonly do spend time together, in small work parties, at Christmas feasts, visiting each other and so on. When a person dies his surviving age-mates take a prominent part in the mourning, and a man's surviving male age-mates may appropriately act as grave diggers.

Kinship, as I have noted, is the basis on which rights to land are defined, and thus underlies the residence pattern within a village and the location of villages throughout Toaripi territory. Work parties most commonly consist of kin and their spouses, as they go together to make sago or tend gardens on land to which the genealogically related members of the party have rights. House sites are also acquired on the basis of inherited land rights. Neighbours thus tend to be recognized kin whose proximity facilitates the exchange of goods, services and visits. Marriage between known kin is prohibited, partly because sexual intercourse between those who call each other 'brother' and 'sister' is shameful and partly because the couple will have rights to less land than would be the case.
if they were not related. In addition, those who are relatives of both spouses are called upon to act simultaneously as kin and affines, roles that are usually incompatible. A person expects kinsmen to help him in economic activities and on ceremonial occasions and to support him in disputes. In return, he should be prepared to help and support them. Toaripi are explicit in their belief that sentimental attachment between kin is based in such interaction. A person who does not spend time with his relatives is thereby denying his kinship with them, and they in turn come to treat him as a stranger and may refuse him aid when he needs it. Case 4 (above p. 63) illustrates this. Genealogical ties need to be reinforced by interaction if they are not to be forgotten or the obligations stemming from them denied. Since kinship is reckoned bilaterally, without any limit to the recognition of consanguinity, an individual has a great deal of freedom to choose which ties he will maintain.

Choices are not made randomly, but are related to the individual's need for land, aid in collecting money and armshells for a marriage payment and so on. I do not wish to be understood as saying that all social relationships among the Toaripi are based upon explicit calculation of long- and short-term material benefits to be expected from interaction with others. Indeed, the ideology of kinship is that of help given freely and without thought of gain
to those for whom one feels brotherly and sisterly affection. This emphasis on freely given help co-exists with other explicit statements to the effect that it is only right and proper that all goods and services received should be readily reciprocated. The belief might be phrased thus: 'We readily give goods and services to each other because of affection and generosity. We do not do so with the thought of gain, but those who receive our gifts should be prepared to reciprocate freely because of their generosity and affection for us.' Generosity and calculation, as these terms are generally understood in Euro-American society, are simply not applicable to the network of exchanges among the Toaripi. I make no attempt to try and guess whether help is given with an eye to future benefits, but simply set out the ways in which the exchanges operate. Where possible, I include explicit statements from Toaripi setting out the rationale of particular actions. In order to show how people actually behave in small, everyday exchanges, I shall describe two cases. 

Case 6

One evening an old couple who lived close to my house in the village brought me a whole bunch of bananas. I was quite overwhelmed at the magnitude of the gift and asked them to accept some tobacco in return. They were quite indignant at the thought of taking a 'payment' for their gift, and told me that they wanted to give me the bananas
because they felt sorry for me on account of my being so far away from my own people. About 15 minutes after they had returned to their own house, one of their grandchildren who lived with them came and asked me to send some tealeaves across to the old people because they were thirsty and had no money to buy tea from the village store.

Case 7

One day I went out to make sago with a party of women who lived near me in the village. We started out very early in the morning and planned to be away for the whole day, and thus had a supply of food and tobacco on the canoe with us. Shortly after we left the village we met a man from the next village on his way to spend a day fishing with hook and line. He was alone on his canoe and did not appear to have any food with him. One of our party, Areve, hailed him and gave him some cooked sweet potato, saying that she did not like to see her brother (he was a distant classificatory kinsman of the same generation) going off to work for a whole day without any food. As we continued on our way, Areve explained to me that the man would share his catch with her in return for her having given him food. And this is indeed what happened: we met the man again on our way back to the village late in the afternoon and he gave one fish to Areve and one to me. As she accepted the fish, Areve praised the man for his kindness and generosity in giving it to her, saying that he was indeed a true
An examination of networks of exchange shows that the pattern of these two cases is repeated endlessly. But not all social relationships can be described in terms of benefits and advantages sought. Some people spend a great deal of time in each other's company and exchange small goods and services, but neither is able to help the other in disputes or in organizing a feast or making a marriage payment, occasions on which effective public speaking or access to money or valuables is needed. Provided the two people get along well and neither is remiss in his small obligations the relationship is likely to last for many years. Other people who are equally close kin may be able to provide more effective support in disputes or at feasts, but the apparently unprofitable relationship is preferred. This, I suggest, is a relationship very like friendship in Euro-American society, and a large number of Toaripi have one or two friends in this sense, though the relationship between them is usually phrased as one of kinship.

The scope of an individual's network of social relations can be, and frequently is, yet further extended by the application of kin terms to people belonging to different age-groups. Thus, an elder brother's age-mates may be referred to as 'elder brother'; the elder brothers of a person's own age-mates may also be referred to as 'elder brother'; and so on.
Two age-mates may become particular friends, a relationship marked by a special term (moraitai paeai). The children of such particular friends call each other by the terms for siblings, and marriage between them may be forbidden. I have occasionally recorded instances in which this pseudo-kinship link is extended to the next generation, by which time the memory of the original non-kinship basis of the relationship is fading. It may well be that many ties described as kin ties actually stem from such non-kin relationships. If so, the facts have been forgotten and are no longer significant.

This description of the ways in which socially important relationships can be set up and maintained indicates that an individual can participate in as many or as few relationships as he wishes. He is constrained only by the fact that he has to maintain ties by interaction, and he has to rely on those with whom he has such ties for support and aid in his daily life as well as on special occasions. If he attempts to maintain too many social ties, the demands on his time and resources may be such that he cannot meet the expectations of the other members of his personal network. In this case, he may find it difficult to obtain support or help when he needs it. On the other hand, an individual who participates intensively in only a few relationships may also find himself without help when he needs it. All Toaripi
constantly choose among numerous calls on their time and resources, and a person with only a small personal network may find that many of its members have more pressing obligations elsewhere at the time he needs them.

Toaripi are thus constantly attempting to maintain just the right number of ties with their fellows, neither too many nor too few. This means, of course, that the networks to which an individual belongs are forever changing in membership and size. Phrased in this way, social relationships appear to be chaotic and almost impossible to describe. This, however, is not the case, because networks are activated not only according to their members' needs and plans but also within catchments defined by reference to kinship and age-grouping, so that there are relatively enduring frameworks within which variations occur.

For example, a group of age-mates is an appropriate catchment from which a house-building party may be recruited. If the age-group is not large enough, or its members are no longer strong enough to perform the task, the party will be augmented by people who join in as siblings of members of the age-group. On the other hand, if the house-building party is recruited from among the householder's wife's brothers (actual and classificatory), people will not join in because of age-group affiliations. The same person, however, may on one occasion act as a sibling of the householder's age-mate and on another occasion as a classificatory
brother of the householder's wife.

These, then, are the frameworks of social action in contemporary Toaripi society. I shall now describe in some detail the situations in which age-grouping and kinship respectively define the catchments within which networks are activated and action-sets (Mayer, 1966:98) are recruited. In doing this, I hope to show not only the ways in which change and continuity are equally features of Toaripi life, but also the ways in which the actions of Uritai villagers in the village influence the actions of those who are in Port Moresby and vice versa.

Work Parties and Age-Groups

I have already noted that age-groups are the basis of many work parties and that age-mates cooperate in subsistence activities, house building, making canoes and so on.

One of the consequences of extensive migration from Uritai village is that some individuals are unable to recruit enough people to help them build or repair their houses. In addition to the need for house-building and repair in the village, people are required to keep the general village area clean and the nearby paths free of undergrowth. 2 Village maintenance was for many years the

2 Throughout the Territory of Papua-New Guinea the Administration enforces regulations concerning the cleanliness of villages, the maintenance of tracks and roads, the repair of houses and the exclusion of pigs from the living area.
responsibility of the Administration-appointed Village Constable, who had the authority to instruct his fellow villagers to spend one day a week on 'Government work.'

In 1958, however, the Village Constables in the Toaripi area were superseded by elected Native Local Government Councils. Uritai taxpayers elected two councillors who, among other duties, were responsible for the maintenance of paths and the cleanliness of the village environs.

In 1960-61 the two Uritai councillors were Heva and Kara (cf. Cases 1 and 2, above), who set aside two days a week for Council work. This involved more than clearing undergrowth: the councillors in fact organized the bulk of village labour for house building and repair, as well as taking care of paths and such.

About 8 a.m. on the Council work days, Kara would blow on a conch shell, calling the village men to his house. In the next half-hour or so, the men would drift along to the house. Sometimes only 20 or so would appear, at other times there would be around 80. Kara and Heva would discuss the work that had to be done and note the composition of the crowd. Kara would then announce the tasks and assign particular age-groups to each.

In some cases, a householder would simply go to the councillors and ask them to assign a work group for a certain task on the next Council day. Those who worked on
the house were fed at the end of the day, the householder being expected to provide tea, sugar, betel and delicacies such as sago stew. Other householders would ask the councillors to assign to their task a particular age-group or set of kinsmen or affines with whom arrangements had previously been made. In this case, too, the householder was expected to provide delicacies for the meal at the end of the day. As these jobs were being handed out, householders might ask for more men or object that the people assigned were unsuitable for some reason. Similarly, those assigned to particular jobs might grumble or even refuse to obey the councillors. In general, however, all those present had a pretty clear idea of the jobs that had to be done and of the tensions that might make it impossible for certain individuals to work together amicably, so that outright refusals were rare though grumbling was common.

After these work parties had been organized, the councillors sent other age-groups to work on houses belonging to old people whose children were away, or to women whose husbands were dead or absent. Workers on these houses would usually eat together at the end of the day, but could not expect delicacies because the householders very seldom had the necessary resources. Most of the food would be provided by the workers' own wives.

Finally, if the area around the village needed to be cleaned up, the men still remaining were assigned the task.
These were usually older men or members of age-groups whose numbers were greatly depleted by death or migration. Village work of this kind, of course, did not entitle the men to a meal.

In assigning the various tasks, the councillors had to keep a number of things in mind. First of all, tasks were assigned according to skill and capabilities: senior age-groups were given light work, and very junior age-groups were either told to help older age-groups or given jobs that did not require much skill. Then, the number of men in an age-group actually present had to be considered. Finally, the councillors had to take care that the various tasks, with their attractions and drawbacks, were shared out fairly among the age-groups. The men did not always agree with the councillors' decisions, of course, and disputes were frequent. If the men did not care for an assignment, the councillors had either to change the arrangement or persuade those who were dissatisfied to accept the decision. They could not order the villagers to do anything, because one of the peculiarities of the councillor's office at that time was that he had no authority at all. Given this, the wonder is that the system worked as well as it did. Its success was due in large part to the fact that both

---
3 There have been many changes in the organization of local government councils since 1960-1, but I am here concerned only with the Council at it functioned then.
Kara and Heva were respected men of strong personality who usually took good account of the various factors involved in organizing the village work force.\textsuperscript{4}

Furthermore, abuses of the system were quickly rectified. If the councillors were unfair in their allocation of tasks the men refused to work. Age-groups sought to obtain the best jobs as frequently as possible, and there was a certain amount of competition among them. One age-group, of young men in their mid-twenties, had many members in the village in 1960-61 and was much in demand for work parties. The members began to complain that they were being given too much work. Then they attempted to take advantage of the situation: they refused to work on a house unless the householder agreed to provide a particularly large and tasty meal at the end of the day. This made them an expensive band of helpers, because they wanted a great deal of tea, sugar, rice, bully beef and so on. Soon householders stopped asking the councillors to assign this age-group to them; some

\textsuperscript{4} In the 1961 Council election, both these men lost their office, and their successors were not able to organize the village work force so successfully. People were more likely to recruit their own house building work parties without consulting the councillors. The number of Council work days was reduced to one a week, and this was devoted almost entirely to cleaning up the village, a task that took only a morning at most. I left a few months after the election, and was not able to see how the building and repair of houses belonging to those unable to carry out the work themselves was arranged.
refused to have its members if the councillors assigned them to a task. Then the councillors stopped assigning the whole age-group to any job: individual members were named to make up numbers on different work parties. No other age-group made a similar attempt to secure a favoured position in the village labour force while I was there.

The heatao, then, is still functioning as a work group, though it now looks very different from the village war party of old. As I suggested earlier, the heatao has persisted because it has remained an important part of the organization of economic activities. The adaptation of the age-group to the changing situation in the village is an interesting example of the way in which existing institutions are constantly modified according to the context of activities. Age-grouping was a feature of Toaripi society at the time of contact; it has endured through the years without remaining the same.

The heatao does not form the basis of work parties in Port Moresby in the same way as it does in the village, but activities in the two localities affect each other. The burden of village work is increased as more young men leave for the towns; if the work load becomes too heavy those who have stayed in the village are more likely to leave, thus leaving the work force smaller than before. On the other hand, a person in Port Moresby who has many age-mates in the village can ask them to repair or rebuild the house
belonging to his wife or parents. If there are very few of his age-mates left in the village, he is likely to return to the village to do the work himself, and incidentally to augment his age-group's numbers. The movement of people between Port Moresby and Uritai depends on the labour situation in the village as well as that in the town.

Cognates, Affines and Neighbours

I have already indicated some of the ways in which cognatic kin are important to each other: in establishing claims to exercise land rights, in subsistence activities and on ceremonial occasions. In addition the greatest number of a person's ties of affection are with his cognatic kin: the rationale of many actions is phrased as brotherly love, affection for cognates, sympathy for fellow members of a toruipi and so on. Toaripi say that affection is generated from and maintained by interaction, the constant exchange of goods and services, and interaction is an important index of significant social relations.

The bulk of a person's social interaction occurs within the village, partly because of the way in which kinship and locality are connected, partly because Toaripi villages are large. Within this field of social relations ties between people are activated according to various principles.

---

5 The 1964-65 Census report for the Toaripi Census Division has the following total populations: Lelefireu 808; Hamuhamu 755; Keauta 260; Kukipi 566; Isapeape 664; Uritai 1116; Mirivase 299; Lalapipi 238; Popo 500 (Fig. 2).
age-grouping, consanguinity and affinity being the most common. I have already discussed age-grouping. Here I want to describe interaction among cognates and affines and to discuss the extent to which neighbourhood as such is an important criterion of interaction.

Cognates who share rights to a particular plot of land frequently go out and work together, accompanied by their spouses. Sago making is a job for both men and women. Men fell the tree and cut the log into sections, and then each man strips the bark from one half of a section and chops pith from the resulting trough. Each woman takes the pith that has been chopped by one man and washes it in a trough made from the butt of a large frond of the sago palm. A coconut palm spathe makes a strainer pegged about two-thirds of the way down the trough, catching the pith but allowing the water and starch to go through. A receptacle made from the bark of a particular tree is placed at the end of the trough and the water and starch are caught there. Starch is extracted from the chopped pith by squeezing and pummelling by hand after water has been poured over it. At the end of the day the wet starch is placed in a bag made from coconut palm spathes that have been sewn together. A sago making party may consist of one family, in which case

---

6 See Ryan 1969 for a brief account of interaction based at least partly on common interests in church activities and the like.
only portion of the log is chopped and washed in a day. Frequently, however, two or three couples will go together and take sago from a whole palm in one day. In this case the initial felling is done by all the men in the party, but each man chops pith for one woman, and the starch collected by a woman belongs to her and the man who did the chopping for her. If the two are husband and wife, the product of the day's work is gathered up and taken home for consumption and distribution. If, however, the man and woman are siblings or otherwise related, the starch is divided between them and taken to their separate houses, or to their separate hearths if they live in the same house.

Gardening is of secondary importance to sago making, but sweet potato, yams, manioc and plantains are grown and eaten frequently.\(^7\) Greens do not grow well in the swampy terrain, but are collected casually in the course of other work. Small manioc and yam gardens are made near houses or elsewhere in the village, on land to which either a man or his wife has rights. Women do all the work in these gardens and the produce is used by the family. Sweet potato gardens are made in the bush, men doing the heavy work of clearing the ground, women being responsible for planting, weeding and lifting the crop. Work parties usually consist

\(^7\) Taro does not grow well and is not often seen. Pawpaws and mangoes are eaten occasionally as snacks. Vegetables common in Australia, such as tomatoes and beans, do not grow on the coast in this area.
of kinswomen and/or the wives of kinsmen who have gardens near each other. Again, each woman takes the sweet potato she has harvested for the use of her family. Plantains are grown wherever the soil is suitable, both in the village and in the bush. Their care and harvesting is the responsibility of men, each man taking the produce for the use of his family.

In all these cases, work parties are almost invariably recruited according to cognatic kin ties. Because of the division of labour between men and women, some members of any party are likely to be affines to the landholders. Occasionally age-mates will go together to make sago, usually in preparation for a feast that the age-group is going to stage. Sago is taken from land belonging to one or more of the age-group members, and those who share in the produce on one occasion are expected to donate one of their trees at some other time. In general, however, people obtain their food from their own or their spouse's land and the produce is for the use of the family. Use here includes distribution as well as consumption. A bag of sago flour is likely to become sour before a single family can consume it, so fresh sago, which is prized, is distributed among other families who return the gift when they in turn have fresh sago. Similarly, a woman brings back from the sweet potato garden more vegetables than the family can eat in one or two days. Some are distributed
to other families who return the gift later; others are kept for several days until they are all eaten. This pattern of distribution and storage means that a family has a continuous supply of food, but members are not compelled to go to the bush every day.

Sago palms take about 15 years to mature, and generally grow wild in the swamps behind the Toaripi villages. The land is divided into named plots and rights of use are inherited in the way I have described above. Palms are taken freely from the portion of a plot to which an individual has rights; it is not a matter of individual ownership of these self-propagating palms. A person will sometimes plant suckers for his children or grandchildren, however. In these cases the palms are owned by the people for whom they were planted and others with rights to that portion of land are not supposed to use them. Similar rules apply to the inheritance and use of coconut trees. These do not grow wild, but are planted in and around villages and in the bush, near gardens. A person's coconut trees are inherited by his own children, who may either continue to use them in common or divide them up. Most trees are planted on land to which the planter has rights, but sometimes a landowner allows an outsider to plant trees. In such a case, the planter's descendants are entitled to use the trees, but the fact that the trees are on a certain piece of land does not confer land rights. Coconuts are
used for drinking and eating, and are dried to make copra. If a person out in the bush is thirsty, he may take a coconut from a nearby tree, but should inform the owner when he sees him. Otherwise, coconuts are harvested by the family of the owner.

Fishing is carried out almost daily by groups of women who wade into the streams around the village and catch small fish of various kinds with hoop nets. These fishing parties may consist of women who live near each other or women living in various parts of the village who are kinswomen or age-mates. If a woman sees a run of fish when she is by a stream or on the beach she runs back to her house shouting the news as she gets her net. Women who live nearby usually join her. Hook and line are also used to catch fish. A married couple, or a larger party of cognates and their spouses go out together on a canoe. Several canoes will gather at a good fishing spot, but no one has particular rights to fishing grounds. In all these cases, each person takes his catch home for the use of the family.

Subsistence economic activities, then, are primarily the concern of the family. Aged parents or younger siblings of a couple may live with the family or be at least partly dependent on its members for food and shelter. Such dependents work with family members. It is common for two or more families to be living in a house at any
time. In these cases, each family acts as an independent economic unit, obtaining its own food and preparing it at a separate hearth.

As I have noted, there are many exchanges of foodstuffs among cognates, most of them taking place among siblings or first cousins. Such cognates are likely to live near each other, and it is difficult to say whether neighbourhood or kinship is the relevant principle of interaction. Queries elicit a reply such as, "We are all kin on Makovu," leaving the question unanswered.

In Port Moresby, however, the different weights given to the two principles of interaction are much clearer. Vabukori settlement is divided into three sections, A and C consisting mainly of people who come from Mirihea villages, B consisting mainly of people from Uritai and its offshoot villages (Fig. 5). There is very little interaction between the people in section B and those in the other two sections. In 1963-64 the people in sections A and C did interact but most of the contact was among four or five families whose members are cognates and affines.

---

8 There were 89 houses in Uritai occupied continuously from March, 1960 to March, 1962. Of these, 67 contained more than one family for part of the time. These extra families do not include visitors, even though some visits are extended for several weeks.

9 Villages set up after the 1928 washaway of Mirihea village: Lelefiru, Hamuhamu and Isapeape (Fig. 2).
Within section B, visiting and the exchange of goods and services took place among families that are genealogically linked. The householders of 11 and 12 are cognates and their wives recognize each other as distant kinswomen. There was a certain amount of interaction among the members of the two households. The householders of 12 and 13 are also cognates and they interacted with each other. There was on the other hand little contact between the members of households 11 and 13; while people in house 16 often interacted with those in 11 but seldom with those in 12. In each case the rationale of interaction was recognized kinship. If this is lacking, there is little interaction even among neighbours. The people in houses 1 and 2, for example, spent much of their spare time visiting kin in the Konedobu settlement several miles away (Fig. 4) but seldom interacted with other households in Vabukori. Similarly, the people in house 6 spent more time with kin from Hohola (Fig. 4) than with neighbours.

Visiting implies the sharing of food at meals, and visits are often occasions on which presentations of food or money are made. These networks of exchanges are described as networks of interaction among fellow villagers, but closer examination shows they are actually comprised of cognates and affines who in the village would probably live close to each other and would certainly share many interests in the same plots of land. The householders of
11 and 12, for example, have many common land-holding toruipiipi memberships.

Within the town there are two common patterns of exchange. The first is a reflection of the fact that migrants living in different parts of Port Moresby have access to different resources. For example, Papuans and New Guineans who live in Hohola are all wage earners, some receiving good salaries by Territory standards. In 1963-64 it was still possible for certain grades of Government employees to obtain portion of their wages in the form of rations: a standard issue of rice, tinned meat, sugar, tea and so on, designed to meet part of the nutritional needs of the worker and his family. Most of the men in Vabukori settlement, on the other hand, were at the time working for private firms, which no longer issued rations, or were unemployed. Women from Vabukori sometimes dug wild yams in the area behind the settlement and more frequently went fishing in streams beyond the Motu village of Paris. Uritai villagers from Hohola would visit kinsmen in Vabukori, bringing portion of their rations and/or some money as gifts. Then the women from the Hohola households would join parties collecting yams and going fishing. This enabled them to provide really fresh food for their families, and they did not have to pay the very high prices obtaining at the market in Koke.
The other pattern of exchanges reflects ties of consanguinity and affinity, as those so related visit each other, exchange food and money, give help in times of crisis and so on. These exchanges of goods and services do not reflect differential access to resources in the town.

Both exchange networks are village-based and their membership comprises those who are often mentioned as fellow-members of land-holding toruipiipi or other catchments in discussions in the village.

Case 8

In Case 4, above, the householder of 11 in Vabukori was mentioned as an important member of the land-holding toruipi to which Paripa was trying to gain entry. Horike, and the householders of 11 and 12 share interests in many plots of land, and the latter two interact a great deal in Port Moresby. On the other hand, the householders of 11 and 14 are not recognized kin, and the daughter of householder 11 married the first cousin of householder 14. Before the marriage the two households had little contact. After the marriage the two sets of people treated each other with some formality and restraint, partly because this is the proper behaviour between those who are affinally linked and partly because the young couple was having difficulties and each sought support from his own kin.

Important networks of interaction in both Uritai
village and Port Moresby are activated within catchments defined in terms of consanguinity and affinity. It is clear in the town that propinquity as such is not an important base for interaction, and I suggest that frequent interaction among neighbours in the village is a reflection of their ties of consanguinity and affinity.

Village and Town Links

These ties are also important bases of interaction between those villagers still in Uritai and those in Port Moresby. People travelling to Port Moresby, whether for a visit or with the intention of staying to find work, go first to the house of a kinsman, usually in one of the migrant settlements. A newcomer establishes relations with other kinsmen in Port Moresby, hears about jobs from them or from age-mates who have preceded him to the town, visits a number of them for varying periods and eventually settles to live in the household of one of his cognates or affines.\(^{10}\) He in turn, if he stays in town for any length of time, will provide similar hospitality to newcomers or to those who helped him in the past and now need housing or cash.

Kin-based networks have retained their importance in urban activities and in interaction between the village and the town for about 25 years now, and information from Toaripi

\(^{10}\) Even if a newcomer obtains a job in the Administration or with a firm that provides accommodation, he is not likely to get quarters for some time because of the great demand for housing.
who have kept up correspondence with me indicates that there is little prospect of change. The persistence of this framework of interaction is an interesting feature of Toaripi social relations because catchments of consanguineals are defined primarily with reference to shared land interests. Those who live in Port Moresby do not have land rights in the town, and many of them have been away from the village for several years. I suggest that, although catchments of consanguineals are defined by shared land interests, the boundaries are constantly changing according to patterns of interaction and that for many purposes it does not matter whether the interaction takes place in the town or in the village.

It is to the advantage of those who are in the town to offer hospitality to people coming from the village: it helps to maintain their interest in land, because those who receive such aid are likely to speak for them if their rights are disputed. Migrants have no land in the town and there has so been no provision made for those who live all their working lives in town and are forced to retire because of their age. The only security for Papuans and New Guineans is in their home areas, and it is thus to the advantage of every migrant to maintain some links with his place of origin. The Toaripi pattern of hospitality is thus a very common one among Papuans and New Guineans who have left their homes.
It is also to the advantage of those Toaripi who have stayed in the village to maintain links with migrants and to look out for their interests. To do so not only means that a person going up to town is assured of hospitality, it also means that his personal network is extended and that if necessary he can count on the support of at least some of his cognates and affines who are no longer in the village.

There are, of course, situations in which the location of interaction is critical. I have already noted the fact that a town dweller cannot expect cooperation and help from other migrants simply because they are all cognates and/or affines. He has to reinforce these ties by interaction in the town. Similarly, interaction in the town does not by itself establish obligations and bases of support in the village. It is possible to maintain interests in land by taking part in exchanges with cognates who are still in the village; it is also possible to have land rights denied if these cognates are ignored.

Case 9

A man who had been away from Uritai for about 15 years returned in 1963. The husband of his classificatory sister had invited him to return to the village with him. But when he attempted to make sago, build a house or otherwise exercise his land rights, this same classificatory sister stopped him. There were only two other members of the
land-holding toruipi in the village at the time, so there was no question of pressure on limited resources. The old woman said that she had not heard from this cognate for 15 years and she did not see why he should be able to come back to the village and use her land. She and her husband argued about the matter for a time, then the husband allowed the man to use some of his land while he tried to persuade his wife to change her mind. The old woman was undoubtedly being difficult, but it was true that the man had not attempted to maintain links with her or other members of that land-holding toruipi. He had participated in activities in Port Moresby but had not reinforced ties in the village.

Once again, it is clear that the individual has to seek a compromise between too wide and too narrow a spread of his personal network. The village dweller needs to maintain his land rights so that he can obtain food and housing, and this means that he must interact with cognates who are in the village. The town dweller also needs to maintain links with those around him because he is likely to need their help to obtain food or cash and housing. It is thus important to spend a large proportion of his time and resources in face-to-face interaction. But it is also important for most people to maintain ties with those in the other locality of this bi-local social system. A large number of Uritai villagers do attempt to reach a satisfactory compromise in heeding demands that are both competitive
and complementary.

In order to show how these compromises are sought, and often achieved, I shall examine marriage arrangements and funeral feasts. These are ceremonial occasions on which formal prestations and exchanges take place. They are also markers of important social relations, at which principles of interaction are frequently made explicit.

Marriage and Marriage Payments

As I have already noted, marriage is prohibited between those who are known to be kin, and it is preferred that unrelated members of the same age-group who live in the same village marry. The connection between active land-rights and remembered genealogical ties means that the unbounded category of kinsmen is limited to catchments of recognized cognates, so that it is possible to follow the marriage rules and preferences and still find a spouse.

Opposition to a marriage increases the greater the geographical and social distance between the families of the couple. There is more opposition to a marriage between a person from Uritai and one from a Mirihea village than there is to a marriage between people from two Uritai villages, for example. This opposition occurs despite the fact that the greater geographical distance between the couple's families makes it less likely that the two are recognized kin. Various reasons for the opposition are given: it is not possible to exchange goods and services
with affines who live far away and so the relationship is not firmly based on interaction; a girl who joins her husband in a distant place has no one to look out for her interests and make sure she is well treated; and the children of a couple coming from widely separated villages are in effect deprived of some of their land rights because they cannot interact with the kin of one parent.

In fact, about two-thirds of Toaripi marriages occur within the village. Most of the villages are large enough to enable people to find spouses without violating the prohibition on marriage between kin. And inter-village visiting is not common, so that there are few opportunities for people from different villages to form attachments.

If two people are determined to marry despite opposition, there is very little that their families can do to stop them. Even refusal to give or accept a marriage payment does not necessarily prevent a marriage. Cohabitation and the acknowledgement of each other as spouse are the only requirements for the recognition of a marriage. If the families are obdurate in their refusal to give or accept a marriage payment, the children of the union may have difficulty in asserting land rights. Almost invariably, however, both families accept the situation after a time.

According to Toaripi ideology, there are three payments associated with marriage. The first (mai etau) is a betrothal payment, a small sum of money and/or a few
armshells, given by the boy's family to the girl's family. After this, the girl may go and live with the boy's mother and help her in her work. The boy should not be present at this time, and the couple should not sleep together. If the betrothal period, of about a year, passes satisfactorily the marriage payment (ua ve tova) is made and the couple begin to live together. Shortly after the marriage payment is made, the bride returns to her parents' house and they load her with household utensils and valuables before sending her back to her husband. These goods are the woman's own property and she may use the valuables to make her own contributions to other marriage payments.

An examination of actual cases shows considerable variation from this pattern. The betrothal period used to coincide with that of the youths' seclusion in the elavo. Later, youths who signed up for indentured labour left their betrothed behind in the village and the marriages took place on their return. It is no longer possible to say how closely practice followed the ideology in the past, but it is possible to look at the current situation and describe the ways in which marriage arrangements have been adapted to meet new situations.

Today, both boys and girls are frequently away at schools of various kinds until their middle or late teens. If a couple want to announce their intention to marry, the boy's parents and other close kin give a small sum of
money (usually A$10-A$20) and/or three or four armshells to the girl's parents. Whether the girl stays in the village or goes away to school or elsewhere, her parents are responsible for her behaviour and reputation. If she is involved in a scandal the boy and his parents are likely to call off the betrothal and insist on the return of the payment. If the boy is known to have been involved in sexual adventures elsewhere the girl's parents may call off the betrothal and refuse to return part or all of the payment. The amount of the repayment depends on the particular circumstances of the case and the disagreement is usually mediated by a village councillor or some other respected person. Whether or not the payment is returned the public announcement that the couple have changed their minds relieves them of further obligations to each other.

Throughout the betrothal period there are exchanges of goods between the prospective affines, and the longer these exchanges are made the more difficult it is to call off the betrothal.

Case 10

The daughter of householder 11 in Vabukori (Fig. 5) settlement was betrothed to Kaisa, the first cousin of householder 14. The girl was completing her education at the mission school at Moru station (Fig. 2) and Kaisa was working in Port Moresby. He frequently visited the girl's parents, ate at their house and gave them money and other
gifts. The girl at one stage expressed doubts about the marriage but her parents urged her not to change her mind, on the grounds that it would be difficult for them to return the many gifts that Kaisa had made, and that his assiduity in making prestations indicated that he was likely to be a good husband and dutiful son-in-law. The marriage took place shortly after this, despite the fact that the girl had not finished school. I think that the parents urged Kaisa to marry quickly before their daughter changed their mind, though I was able to obtain only ambiguous replies to my questions on this point. In any case, the girl's doubts were apparently not serious because the marriage has now lasted for about six years.

The actual marriage occurs when the boy goes to the girl's house late at night and takes her to his parents' house or to the house of another kinsman or an age-mate. They spend the night there and in the morning the new relationship is made public. The girl's parents go to the house in which the couple have spent the night and publicly recognize their daughter's marriage. The size and timing of the next payment, the *ua ve tova*, may be discussed at this time but this is rare since the payment is seldom made until the marriage has endured for some years and children have been born.

On numerous occasions a couple spend the night together in this way despite the fact that no preliminary
payment has been made. In some cases this is done with the knowledge of the girl's parents, though they express surprise and dismay when they hear of her elopement. They go to the house in which she and the man have spent the night and spend some time upbraiding the couple before they recognize the marriage. A payment called *ua ve tova* is arranged at this time though it is actually a preliminary payment, like the *mai etau*.

Sometimes the elopement comes as a genuine surprise to the girl's parents and they may not approve of her choice. In any case, they usually bring her home with them while the matter is discussed. If they have no particular objection to the man with whom she has eloped, the girl's parents will allow her to return to him and begin to discuss the *ua ve tova*. If they object to the man, however, they may refuse to recognize the marriage and then there is likely to be a period of uncertainty and dispute. The couple may elope again and attempt to force the girl's parents to recognize the union, or they may give up in the face of opposition. If the parents do recognize the union, they usually demand a very high payment in an attempt to dissuade the man from continuing with the marriage and as an expression of their disapproval. Opposition may stem from personal dislike, from the fact that the man has a bad reputation, from the fact that the two people are distantly related, or from the fact that the man is a stranger or a
villager living in Port Moresby or some other town.

I have noted that inter-village marriages occur in only approximately one-third of cases, and very few of these are with people from distant villages. It is now common for young men to return to their natal village for a holiday and to marry while they are there. In some cases, the marriage has already been arranged and a betrothal payment made. More commonly, however, the marriage is a surprise to the parents of both the young man and the girl. The girl's parents may not know the man very well after his absence, or they may not like him. In any case, their daughter will be going a long way away and they express anxiety for her well-being. They cannot stop her from marrying if she is really determined to do so, but they can stop her from leaving the village to join her husband. Thus, the parents demand a very high marriage payment, and refuse to let their daughter join her husband until it has been paid. This means that several months pass before their daughter can leave, and in that time the kin of both the man and the girl can consider the matter. If the man's kin are prepared to help collect the money for the payment, this indicates that they are prepared to accept the marriage and that they consider that he is likely to make a good husband. If he does not, they will not be able to ask for

---

11 About one-eighth of Toaripi marriages are with non-Toaripi, including the neighbouring Moripi and Moveave.
a return of their contributions. On the other hand, if the man is prepared to make the effort to collect a considerable amount of money he is probably going to make a good husband. He would not go to all that trouble if he were not serious in his intention to marry and treat his wife well. When the man can collected from one-half to two-thirds of the stipulated amount he usually asks his wife's parents to allow her to join him. If they agree to do so, they have a further guarantee of his good behaviour: so long as the balance of the payment is outstanding the man is not in a position to refuse his wife's parents hospitality for extended periods of time, so that they can visit their daughter freely. If the man mistreats his wife her parents can very easily take her home with them and he has virtually no chance of getting any of his money back. Three cases will illustrate the ways in which arrangements are made to meet different situations.

Case 11

Parau had been married once but his wife had left him and he had remained unmarried for about three years. He had been in Port Moresby for about five years, then went back to his home village for a holiday. Just before he was to return to town he eloped with a village girl. Her father asked for a A$200 payment and would not let his daughter leave the village until it was paid. Parau collected about A$90 and then apparently gave up the idea
of getting married. He had difficulty in persuading kinsmen to help in collecting the necessary money, partly because they had lost their contributions to his first marriage payment. A year after the elopement, Parau had not collected the money for the payment and was saying that perhaps he was not really interested in the girl after all.

Case 12

Seroa had spent most of his time away from the village since he went to the school at Kerema when he was about 12. After three or four years in Port Moresby he returned to Uritai village for a couple of months, and while there eloped with Verai. The elopement was a surprise to Verai's sister, who was responsible for her in the village, and she opposed the marriage. Seroa had a reputation for drunkenness and violence, and Verai's kin did not care to have him as her husband. The couple insisted, however, and Verai's sister reluctantly agreed. Verai's father lived some miles away at a ferry crossing and when he heard of the marriage insisted that Seroa pay A$180 because Seroa and Verai have an ancestor in common, four generations back. Seroa returned to Port Moresby and began to collect the money. He saved some of his A$8 a week salary and asked kinsmen for help. Five months later he had gathered A$100 and asked Verai's father to let her join him in the town. After an initial refusal, Seroa's father had agreed to contribute money and armshells and this support from his father may
have persuaded Verai's father that he could allow his daughter to leave the village. In any case she arrived and they lived in Port Moresby.

Case 13

Vovea was the second wife of a polygynist who frequently beat both his wives. He was finally gaoled for assault on Vovea's co-wife, but while he was in prison he wrote only to the other wife and not to Vovea. Vovea went back to live with her parents, who urged her to leave her husband, but she demurred, apparently fearing that she would lose custody of her son. About three months after she had returned to her parents' house, Vovea married a man named Vilike who had come down from Port Moresby with a lot of other Uritai villagers to spend Christmas in the village. Vovea's parents did not ask Vilike to make any payment at all, and refused to return the payment made by the first husband or to let him have the child. He got A$10 for his son, but nothing else. Vovea took the boy and went to Port Moresby with Vilike. Two years later there had still been no request for any kind of marriage payment.

These three cases illustrate the ways in which the size and timing of marriage payments are varied to take account of different circumstances. They also illustrate the fact that marriages take place with reference to village-based kin ties. Men in Port Moresby try to marry girls from their home village, but are in many ways
treated as people from outside the village.

This is a situation in which place of residence is important. A man who returns to his home village to find a wife is subject to the usual restrictions on marriage with known cognates. Because he has been away, however, it is not entirely in his power to decide who are to be regarded as kin. Those of his kin who have remained in the village have continued to interact with others in the village, and as a result of this interaction in the village certain people are regarded as cognates of the migrant. He is involved in village-centred networks of exchanges and obligations and his marriage to a village girl will not deprive his children of some of their land rights, as would be the case if either he or his wife came from a distant village. In this respect marriage between fellow villagers is approved, even though one of the partners does not usually live in the village.

Despite the fact that a migrant is part of many village-centred networks, he is not resident in the community and is in many ways a stranger to his fellow villagers. Village dwellers know him by reputation but cannot judge him by performance. And the fact his village-dwelling kinsmen can support their families does not say anything about his ability to support a family in the town. Few of the wife's kinsmen can watch out for her welfare, and this is the reason usually given for insisting on the payment
of a large sum before a migrant is permitted to have his wife join him in the town. Here is a situation in which the location of activities seems to count as much as membership in village-based networks, with the two working against each other. As a villager, the migrant is an approved spouse; as a town-dweller, he is to a certain extent a stranger whose worthiness has to be tested. Activities in the two locations of the Uritai village social system affect each other, but do not necessarily reinforce each other in their consequences. A town dweller who is assiduous in fulfilling obligations to village-dwelling kin is not necessarily able to support a family in town. On the other hand, a town dweller in good standing with his fellows there has probably neglected some of his village-dwelling kin and may not be able to enlist their support in the negotiation of his marriage.

The fact that so many young men have migrated from the village does not mean that the women and girls left behind have fewer chances of getting married. Uritai villagers in Port Moresby look to the village for their wives despite the difficulties I have noted. So far, only a very few marriages have taken place between young people in the town. The pattern, in the beginning at least, is for the same prohibitions and preferences to be expressed. For example, a Mirihea girl in Vabukori attempted to run off with a youth from Uritai and the marriage was opposed by
her parents in part on the grounds that he came from a
different village.

Interaction between the village and the town is
important in another way in the arrangement of marriages.
Marriage payments should consist of both cash and armshells.
Armshells are hard to get in Port Moresby and are very
expensive, being around $A40 each. Town dwellers thus rely
on kin in the village to provide armshells for their
marriage payments. On the other hand, cash is much more
readily available in the town than it is in the village
and those rely on their town-dwelling kin to provide the
bulk of the cash needed for a marriage payment.

In either case, the payment is made up of contribu-
tions from several kinsmen and kinswomen, as many as six
or seven people participating. The payment is distributed
among a similar set of kin of the bride. This kind of
support is very important to an individual and is yet
another occasion on which he activates a kin-based personal
network within a catchment of recognized cognates. The
fact that a marriage payment is collected by a set of kin
who interact intensively makes it more difficult for a
person to marry a known cognate. Such marriages create
many awkward social situations, as well as being morally
repugnant, and few people are prepared to contribute to a
payment that will set up such a relationship.

The second marriage payment is not made until a
couple has been married for several years, and the organization is somewhat different. The husband is nominally responsible for the payment himself, but obtains small contributions from a large number of people.

Case 14

Fevei was a medical orderly who had been widowed for several years when he re-married and took his wife to live with him at Popo (Fig. 2), where he was working at the time. The marriage had taken place in 1957, and late in 1960 he gave a large feast and made the second marriage payment to his wife's father. He had kept a record of the payment previously made to his wife's father, and of prestations made to his wife's close kin. The payments made on this occasion were also noted. In 1957 Fevei had paid $54 to his wife's father, and between 1957 and 1960 had made cash prestations totalling $47 to close kin of his wife: her father, her sister, her brothers and her mother's brother. On this occasion, he was giving $80 in cash, 43 armshells and a pig costing $20 to his wife's father. In addition, he purchased another $20 pig for his helpers and bought $4 worth of store food for the feast. I recorded the names of 54 people who contributed $15.80 in cash and 25 armshells towards the payment. All the cash contributions were small, none being more than $1, and many being as low as 20¢. The donors gave a number of reasons for their support: return for help in the past, general obligations of kinship and so
on. One man, Heva (Case 1), said that he was contributing $20 on this occasion so that he would be able to call on Fevei for help when his own son was collecting a marriage payment. The boy at this time was about three years old.

I recorded only a portion of the distribution of the payment among Fevei's wife's matrilateral kin: 16 people received $32 in cash. Some of the recipients distributed their share among others. One man who received $7, for example, gave $2 to one man and $1 to another. These prestations were not made on the basis of kinship with the woman, but as part of the recipient's own exchange network among his cognates.

In the second marriage payment, the husband is responsible for a considerable outlay of cash and valuables, and also has to organize a feast. He is, however, aided by a large number of cognates. An occasion such as this probably allows an individual to activate the largest number of his cognatic kin ties, and Fevei's case illustrates clearly the way in which it is useful to have a large number of such ties. It should not be forgotten, however, that every person who helped on this occasion can and will call upon Fevei for some kind of aid and support in the future. Heva was unusual only in his announcement of a specific intention to call upon Fevei for aid in a marriage payment far in the future. The distribution of the marriage payment marks the extent of another cognatic kin network, that of the wife. Her father uses the payment
to mark and reinforce ties with his own wife's kin as well
as with his own kin. Sharing in the original distribution
of the payment is said to be restricted to those who have
participated in past marriage payments, so that this is a
return for earlier outlays. The further distribution of
the money, however, is not made with reference to the
marriage as such. As a result, it is common for a person
who has contributed to a marriage payment in the afternoon
to receive a portion of it that evening as a prestation in
a separate exchange network.

Major payments such as these are rare occurrences and
I witnessed only two during my stay in Uritai. I saw none
while I was in Vabukori. There is some evidence that when
a man is planning to make such a payment he returns to the
village, partly because he needs sago, areca nut and
vegetables for the feast and partly because the acquisition
of a large number of armshell from his village dwelling
cognates can be arranged only if he personally shows his
willingness to acknowledge the obligations of kinship by
interaction. In any case, it would not be possible to make
a payment like that of Fevei's without the cooperation of
those who have armshells and those who have cash. In
general, this means cooperation between village dwellers
and town dwellers.
Mortuary Feasts

There are three feasts associated with death among the Toaripi. The first takes place at the time of the funeral and is a small meal for the mourners and grave diggers. Any time from about two weeks to six months after the funeral a second feast is given. On this occasion mourners and grave diggers are fully and finally recompensed for their services, and kin who have been observing food taboos or taboos on shaving or wearing new clothes as a sign of grief are relieved of the restrictions. Finally, any time from about six months to about eight years after a death a third feast is given. This is usually a large undertaking and following the feast the person is finally dead in a social sense. Personal belongings and other things associated with him are destroyed, and it is henceforth inappropriate to mourn for him.

The first, small, feast is held wherever the funeral takes place, whether in the town or in the village. The second feast is a more complex affair. Its timing depends on a number of factors. In one case, the whole series of feasts for a young woman who had died in childbirth was completed in six months. Her husband was not free to remarry until all three feasts had been held and he needed a stepmother for his three children. On the other hand I observed a case in which the second feast for a small boy was not held for more than a year after his death. In this
case, the boy's father was a Government employee working at Kerema and he wanted to hold the feast in the village, so he had to wait until he had leave and could come home. As a result, the second feast for the death of a small boy was a very big affair, a reflection of the involvement of his father and father's brother in various exchange networks rather than a reflection of the boy's own social importance.

The second feast may be held in either the village or the town, people travelling from one location to another in order to participate. In many cases, however, two feasts are held, one in each location. The particular arrangement made seems to depend partly on personal preference and partly on the availability of food for the feast. Both sago and vegetables, and store bought goods are needed for the feast. It may not be possible for village dwellers to obtain enough store bought foods, and so they ask for contributions from their town dwelling cognates, or invite the town dwellers to join them in organizing a feast in the village. Similar arrangements are made by town dwellers, so that once more cooperation between town dwellers and village dwellers is needed for the proper observance of a ceremonial occasion.

Two cases will give some indication of the variation in the arrangements for the second feast.

Case 15

Ivuta, the son of Horike (Case 4) sponsored a feast for
his brother's son, who had died about a year earlier (see above). The feast was divided into five bundles, distributed thus: one went to the heatao of the boy's father; one to Ivuta's sisters and classificatory sisters who had helped him when he was ill; one to the mourners for the boy; one to the people who had buried the boy; and one to the women who had helped prepare the feast. Ivuta also killed a pig, giving the head to the heatao of the dead boy's father and dividing the rest among the recipients of the feast and certain special individuals such as the pastor. In addition, Ivuta spent about $16 on store food.

Case 16

The parents of a small boy decided to give a funeral feast for him about six weeks after his death. This was to be the only feast. No pig was killed, but the feast consisted of produce and about $6 worth of store goods. No one had formally observed mourning, so this was not an occasion for the lifting of taboos. The feast was divided into four portions: one for the men who had buried the boy; one for the father's classificatory sisters from Lalapipi village (Fig. 2); one for the mother's classificatory brothers and sisters; and one for the father's MoBr, probably the most senior of the father's socially important cognates.

The pattern of the distribution is fairly clear in each case: those who mourned or helped at the funeral are
recompensed; and sets of people socially important to the dead person and to the sponsors of the feast are given food as a token of goodwill and an indication that the death was not caused maliciously. In addition, the sponsor may use the occasion to repay other obligations not connected with the death.

The third and final feast may be given a short time after the death, or it may not be given for many years. If the surviving spouse is anxious to re-marry, the feast will be given quickly; otherwise many years may pass and the widow or widower may also die without having given the feast. In such cases of long delay the survivor usually says that he is not interested in marriage, and does not want to give up the memory of the dead person. I have no record of the occurrence of the third feast in town. When it is given it is usually a very big affair, requiring the cooperation of a large number of people and the amassing of huge amounts of food. In such cases those who are living in the village provide sago, betel, vegetables and so on and those in the town provide sugar, tea, rice, flour and so on. I observed one such feast in Kukipi village (Fig. 2) in which hundreds of people danced for three nights and ate for two days. The feast was sponsored by the brother of the dead man, who had been a person of no particular consequence. As in the earlier feast, the magnitude and timing depend on the obligations of surviving kin and on
their social prominence or pretensions rather than on the social importance of the dead person. Once more, there is a great deal of variation in the size of the third feast.

Case 17

Taopai had been a widower for about five years before he gave the third feast for his wife. He bought a pig for $14 and spent about $4 on store food. Produce was contributed by a number of cognates and affines throughout the village, and the small feast was not divided into portions. The simple organization of the feast was in part a reflection of the fact that Taopai has few kinsmen, either in the village or in town.

The variation in the size of the feasts is somewhat puzzling. It requires the mobilization of many resources and the incurring of many obligations to sponsor a huge feast, yet the effort does not seem to bring commensurate return. Sponsorship of a large feast does enhance a person's reputation, but does not ensure his position as a 'big man,' as it does in many other parts of Melanesia. Nor does it necessarily mean that he can count on support if he seeks elective office as village councillor, cooperative society official or as church deacon. Indeed some of the very big feasts I observed were sponsored by men who did not even seek such offices.

The rationale of the feasting must be sought in the religious rather than the political sphere, though there
are still many puzzles. Feasting to honour the dead has long been a feature of Toaripi religious activity (cf. Williams 1923:46). Current religious beliefs also emphasize the importance of the dead (cf. Ryan 1969), but the feasts are not described as means of placating the dead or of inducing them to send rewards to the sponsor. Honouring the dead is regarded as the right and proper thing to do and the occasional elaboration of the ceremonies appears to be the result of personal preference on the part of the sponsor.

The organization of the large feasts does, of course, enable a person to activate a wide range of socially important ties, and to reinforce those ties through interaction. In addition, aid given on the occasion of a funeral feast can be returned on any one of a number of occasions, so that the acceptance of help in giving the feast indicates a willingness to meet a wide range of obligations in the future. I have already noted the fact that a sponsor may use the feast as an occasion to discharge an obligation that has no particular connection with the mortuary feast itself.

In other words, the mortuary feasts can be seen as formal occasions on which socially important ties are recognized and reinforced by co-operation in the distribution and consumption of food. For, of course, those who receive food from a feast are thereby acknowledging ties
with obligations to those who have distributed it.

Summary

In this chapter, I have emphasized the fact that within a general field of social action defined in terms of consanguinity, affinity and age-grouping catchments of socially significant persons can be isolated and that within these catchments networks are activated and action-sets recruited. None of the frameworks of social action refers to sharply defined groups so that it is very clear that choices have constantly to be made among competing demands on time and resources.

Such choices are made in terms of short-term goals, long-term plans and personal preference, all interrelated in various ways. Choice in a given situation is constrained not only by the structural frameworks of action, but by the outcomes of choices made in the past and by the individual's social position at the time. Not all choices result in the efficient utilization of time and resources: people do not always understand the implications of their actions, and on occasion idiosyncratic preference will override other considerations. The most common example of the working of this idiosyncratic preference is the insistence of cognates that they be allowed to marry: such an insistence arouses opposition and carries other penalties inherent in the social system (cf. Nadel 1953). Nevertheless such marriages occur.
I have described interaction and cooperation, but these imply competition: the fact that A interacts with B implies that he has chosen not to interact with others who were making simultaneous demands on his time and resources. The outcomes of these manifold choices is not unvarying regularity, but a series of compromises more or less satisfactory to the actor. Variation is inherent in the system of social relations.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

I have tried in this dissertation to do two things: describe a social system whose main features are probably to be found in many other places, and make some contribution to the understanding of the interrelationships of change and continuity in social systems.

Toaripi and Other Pacific Societies

One question that arises is the degree to which the situation among the Toaripi is a peculiar one, the outcome of a particular series of historical events. If it is indeed unique, or even very unusual, the description will add to the body of ethnographic data on Melanesia but the information is not likely to be used in the elucidation of theoretical problems.

Despite the fact that towns and migration from villages have been part of the Pacific scene for more than 50 years, anthropologists have written little on either topic. Belshaw (1957) and Epstein (1963, 1964, 1969) have dealt indirectly with the towns Port Moresby and Rabaul as part of their studies of peri-urban communities in the two places. Belshaw's work deals primarily with the ways in which the Motu and Koita villages at Hanuabada (Fig. 1) have changed over the years as the inhabitants have become more deeply involved in a Western, money economy. Epstein's work on the Tolai has stressed the importance of
continuity in social life, even as the people are experi-
encing many new things and their lives are changing in
important ways. Neither study deals with migration or
rural-urban ties but both discuss the more general question
of social change, one of the problems with which I have been
concerned in this dissertation.

The symposium on Pacific port towns and cities edited
by Spoehr (1963) and a number of short papers on various
Pacific towns in a publication issued by the South Pacific
Commission (1967) are also important sources of information
on urban centres in the Pacific. The material on people who
have migrated to the towns is sketchy but there are indica-
tions that links between town-dwellers and village-dwellers
are important, though their exact significance is not
discussed at any length.

Maher's study (1961) of the people of the Purari Delta
area in Papua (Fig. 1) and Oram's papers on the Hula of
eastern Papua (1968a, 1968b) pay considerable attention to
migration to Port Moresby and migrant settlements in the
town. In each case there is a lot of movement between the
rural and urban areas, and links between the two centres
are socially and economically important. Neither author,
however, has discussed the situation as a single social
system with movement from one place to another an integral
part of it. Both Maher and Oram provide a fair amount of
material on rural-urban links and on the ways in which
village affairs affect events in the town. There is less information on the ways in which the town-dwellers are important in village activities, but it is possible on the evidence available to say that both the people from the Purari Delta and the Hula could be described as I have described the Toaripi.

Both Metge's work on rural and urban Maori (1964) and Firth's recent (1969) paper on the influence of Tikopia chiefs among those who have left the island to work on a plantation, are studies from other parts of the Pacific indicating that the result of migration is the development of multi-local social systems suited to new and changing circumstances, rather than the breakdown of traditional systems.

The limited amount of comparative material available from the Pacific, then, suggests that the situation as I have described it for the Toaripi is not unique, and may indeed be quite common. This means that my discussion should be useful in a wider theoretical framework.

Toaripi in a Comparative Framework

Anthropologists have long been concerned with problems of migration, urbanization and change, and many theories and models have been proposed. I shall not attempt to review the vast literature on these topics, but shall note two views that have been very influential in anthropology. One is the 'folk-urban continuum' model associated with
Redfield's name; the other is the 'townsman-tribesman' frame of analysis frequently found in the writings of anthropologists who have worked in Africa.

Discussion of rural-urban contrasts has a very long history in social theory (cf. McGee 1964), and Redfield's 'folk-urban continuum' model (1941, 1947) is part of this larger debate. His particular formulation has been influential in anthropology, despite the many criticisms of it. The model, whatever its validity or applicability elsewhere, is simply not relevant to the analysis of my material because it is a static model, concerned with ideal types of society. There is no place for migration; indeed, the failure to take account of population movements between town and country has come to be regarded as one of the chief weaknesses of the model (McGee 1964: 160). Constant flow of people, goods and news between town and village is at the centre of my analysis, and Redfield's model is not applicable.

I have noted the 'folk-urban continuum' model partly because it is still an important part of social theory, and material such as mine is frequently used to illustrate the strength or weakness of the model. It seemed worthwhile to point out my data are simply not relevant to this debate. More importantly, however, is the fact that the 'townsman-tribesman' frame of analysis is essentially the same. Mitchell's recent (1966) survey of urban studies in Africa
sets out the various ways in which anthropologists have approached the problem of rural-urban contrasts. Many of the towns in Africa have grown up as trading or industrial centres which rely on migrant labour for their existence. Migration and inter-tribal relations in the towns have thus been an integral part of urban studies, but most anthropologists have continued to look at these phenomena from the point of view of the 'townsman-tribesman' distinction. Because this is an essentially static typology, it is not suited to the analysis of situations in which movement of people and adaptation of behaviour to novel situations are of central importance.

Gluckman (1960) has argued that, when the African leaves his tribal area and come to town he becomes a 'townsman.' This is an attempt to break away from the older view of migration as an evil that results in the breakdown of the traditional culture and means that the town-dweller is a man without a society in which to exist. But, while Gluckman's view is free of the moralism that often coloured the theories of earlier workers, it does not solve any problems. Rather, it raises many questions, such as: exactly how does an individual change from one type of person to another? what happens if an individual in town retains many of his 'tribal' characteristics? to what extent is it useful to describe social units in town as 'tribal' or 'urban'? I would argue that Gluckman's
view, which is an influential one, deals with a pseudo-problem. The difficulty stems from the use of a static typology in the analysis of situations in which it is irrelevant.

Many other anthropologists have attempted to deal with the general question of the relationship between town and country, and have approached it in various ways. Watson (1958) and van Velsen (1960) have discussed the ways in which migration contributes to the maintenance of the rural society. Philip Mayer's study of Red and School Xhosa in South Africa (1961) is based on the assumption that town-dwellers and country-dwellers are members of one social system. Epstein (1961) discusses behaviour in town in terms of networks, on the grounds that ordinary structural analysis is inadequate. Despite the emphasis on migration, interaction between town and country and the importance of the individual, all of these studies are premissed on a 'townsman-tribesman' typology. None goes beyond the discussion of urbanization or migration as a problem needing some kind of special explanation.

My own analysis is not a discussion of these specific topics, but an attempt to describe social process and its relationship with social form, exemplified in the Toaripi. This more general theoretical viewpoint enables me to discuss migration, urbanization and social change as processes in which it is possible to see continuity as well
as adaptation to new circumstances. In this view, variation and change are not special problems to be solved, but integral parts of social life.

**Choice, Organization and Change**

In the Introduction, I said that I would attempt to show the value of social organizational analysis by describing my own field material in this framework. I have set out some of the historical changes that have taken place among the Toaripi, arguing that these are more easily understood if they are viewed as adaptations to novel situations. My discussion of contemporary Toaripi society is set in this historical context, showing how adaptation occurs constantly, is an integral part of social life. To do this, I have emphasized the importance of individual choice. A Toaripi acts within the constraints placed on him by the moral and jural rules of his society, and also attempts to take account of the pressures brought to bear on him by his fellows and by the larger social and physical environment. These constraints do not necessarily act together, so that choices have to be made among various rules and injunctions. Each set of rules in turn allows choice among different courses of action, and any one course of action can be carried out in several ways. Each choice, once made, closes some possibilities and opens others, so that variation is inherent in the organization of activities and the rules according to which the activities are carried
This approach to the description of a field of social relations means that classical structural theory, with its emphasis on analysis in terms of groups, is not adequate. As I noted earlier, an increasing number of anthropologists have in recent years felt the need to supplement structural theory, and some have argued that it would be best to discard group-centred theory (see, for example, Boissevain 1968). I would not go so far as that, but I am in favour of going beyond group-centred analysis and I have in this dissertation made use of many concepts developed by others who have earlier dealt with problems similar to mine.

I have described Toaripi behaviour in terms of networks of interaction, emphasizing the importance of the individual as actor. Interaction does not occur at random, of course, and there are regular ways in which Toaripi decide who are the appropriate people with whom to interact on various occasions. These decisions are generally made with reference to kinship and age-grouping, which together define the field of social relations within which interaction takes place. Within this general field there are smaller sets of people with whom it is proper or appropriate to interact in particular ways. These are the catchments within which action-sets are recruited or networks activated.
Networks and catchments may or may not be ego-centred. Each individual, of course, has a personal network activated within the catchment that consists of all those who are socially important to him. There are, however, also networks and catchments that are not ego-centred. For example, it is possible to discuss the network of exchanges among Uritai villagers who are living in Port Moresby, though this network has no centre and is defined largely in terms of frequency of interaction among all or most of its members. Similarly, it is possible to view an age-group as a catchment within which various networks are activated. The age-group, however, is not ego-centred.

Social boundaries among the Toaripi are seldom clear-cut, and not all activities are integrated. This is part of the 'working arrangements' of a society (Firth 1954:10). The fact that there are two foci of activities has enabled me to set out clearly ways in which variations in behaviour occur without necessarily disrupting the system of social relations. The system itself is not clear-cut and unchanging, but a more or less enduring set of expectations and relations which are capable of variation as necessary.

Stressing these features of Toaripi activities has, I believe, indicated not only the usefulness but the necessity of complementing structural theory with organizational analysis. By taking account of differences as an integral
part of social life and attempting to isolate the factors underlying variations in behaviour and social relations (cf. Barth 1967) it is possible to discuss social change as an aspect of social process in general. In this way, change and continuity are seen as two facets of all social systems, both needing to be discussed and understood.
APPENDIX

Glossary

elavo: men's house

elavoape (pl. elavoapeape): ideologically patrilineal totemic group associated with men's house.

heatao: village-wide age-group of boys initiated into their various men's houses at the same time. Also named group consisting of boys and girls of approximately the same age.

itai: section of elavoape whose members could trace actual genealogical links with each other

toruipi (pl. toruipiipi): bilateral descent group whose span is situationally defined. Particularly important in the transmission and exercise of land rights.
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