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Preface

The fieldwork for what would eventually become this paper began one clear, beautiful Hawaiian night in July 2010. Te Lumanaki o Tokelau i Amelika, a Tokelauan culture and language school based in Central O‘ahu, was visiting the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa’s music department to record a performance video that would accompany several community members on their trip to Tokelau a few weeks later. Jane Freeman Moulin suggested that I meet the group that evening to establish relationships that would help with my proposed research on the internationally renowned Pacific music group Te Vaka. Because I wanted to offer something to the community, we made arrangements with Betty Ickes, the school’s executive director, for me to make audio recordings of the performance. When the night finally arrived, I packed up my recording gear and headed to campus having no idea that my life was about to change.

My nervousness at meeting so many new people at once quickly subsided the moment the music began. I fell in love. The power, energy, and beauty of the Tokelauan songs and dances performed that night made me never want to leave, and the kindness and openness of the community performers made me feel welcome to stay. Over the following nineteen months, my relationship with Lumanaki strengthened, and I decided that I wanted to dedicate my energy to participating more fully in the school, documenting its activities, and writing about the community’s efforts to sustain their cultural heritage far from the land of their ancestors. I wanted to find a way to return their kindness, but I also wanted to share with academia and other communities the valuable songs, dances, and surrounding lessons that Lumanaki teaches.

There are a few things to note in terms of the Tokelauan language incorporated throughout this work. As in many other Pacific Island languages, plurals in Tokelauan are...
not formed by adding the letter “s,” and I have followed that convention throughout this thesis. Plurality is, however, apparent in the English sentence. In terms of pronunciation, Tokelauan differs from Tahitian in that the letter “f” is pronounced “wh”; the letter “h” is pronounced like the “ng” in “ring”; and the letter “h” is pronounced “hy” when followed by the vowels “a,” “o,” and “u” (Thomas 1996, xii). Though Tokelau has officially discarded the use of macrons to indicate vowel lengthening, many educators in Tokelau and in the diaspora still believe that they are important and include them in their lessons (Akiemi Glenn, pers comm 1 April 2012). I therefore include macrons in this thesis in order to make the document accessible to both nonspeakers and new speakers of the language, including many Lumanaki students. Further, the inclusion of macrons in song texts enables a closer analysis of how the texts and their musical settings relate.

The research I present in the following chapters is based on participant observations and interviews that I conducted over nineteen months with Lumanaki, extending from July 2010 to January 2012. Per the teachers’ requests, I have helped students compose songs, complete classroom activities, and warm up their voices for song and dance practices. I have also made audio and video recordings of several practices and performances as well as an introductory compact disc for new students who need help catching up with other students, a project that the teachers had been wanting to complete for quite some time. Through these experiences, I learned about the school and its activities, and I formulated questions to ask the adults who dedicate their time and energy to running the school. I worked especially closely with Lumanaki’s executive director, Betty Ickes, and one of its two artistic directors, Bonnie Patelesio. Their wisdom greatly informs this work. A significant complement to the knowledge I gained at the school was the information I accessed through Hamilton Library’s comprehensive Hawaiian and Pacific Collections. There are not many publications on Tokelau, but most if not all of them that exist are housed in the library’s collection because of its dedication to the dissemination of knowledge and information about the region.

The things I have contributed to this research pale in comparison to the countless words, ideas, lessons, and love that others have shared with me and that I have, in turn, woven into this work. I have heard people speak of the writing process as an isolating experience, but in this respect I have been blessed. There has not been a single moment
during this entire undertaking during which I have felt or acted alone, and I want to thank everyone who has made this an enjoyable rather than lonely trip.

None of this would have come together without the incredible guidance and support of Jane Freeman Moulin. She has been a patient and devoted mentor at every step, counseling me on everything from the technical aspects of preparing ideas and writing a solid document to the importance of meaningful, reciprocal relationships in research and fieldwork. She has kept the same late hours as I have just to make sure that everything I do is done well, and I am eternally grateful. I would also like to thank Byong Won Lee and Terence Wesley-Smith for their patience and guidance over the years. They were my first professors in ethnomusicology and Pacific Islands studies, respectfully, and their early and continued encouragement set me on the path to writing this paper.

I am forever indebted and thankful to everyone in the Lumanaki community, from the “babies” to the elders. They welcomed me not only as a researcher but also as a community member, and they have become in many ways a second family to me. Without their inspiration and encouragement, I would not have made it to this moment; there would be no ideas to fill these pages, and my life simply would not be the same. I especially want to thank Akiemi Glenn for providing macrons for the song texts and for sharing her experience and knowledge with me while she graciously drove me to the school on Saturdays; Betty Ickes for serving as my first contact and friend at Lumanaki and for helping me pull together information and knowledge for this work, including song texts and translations; and Bonnie Patelesio for sharing her wisdom with me, inspiring me to compose again, and for asking “Why not you?” Fakafetai.

I would like to thank everyone in the University of Hawai‘i’s music department and the Center for Pacific Islands Studies for their assistance along the way, especially my fellow students and the faculty and staff who have always been there to listen to me and offer advice. Once again, the best word to describe their role is “family,” and I feel blessed to have them in my life. It has been a particular pleasure to work with the Center for Pacific Islands Studies’s managing editor, Jan Rensel. My time working under her tutelage has been immeasurably valuable, especially now that I am preparing this document. I will never forget and will always be thankful for her patience, support, and guidance.
My sincere thanks go to my roommates Vasu, Crystal, and Sharon for helping me pull through some of the most difficult experiences of my life so that I could finish this paper. In fact, there is not a soul on this list who has not in some way helped me overcome these obstacles, and I thank them from the bottom of my heart. Special thanks to Bonnie Patelesio, Tammy Hokoana-Coffin, and Crystal Tezuka for providing the lovely photos that fill these pages and add life to the work; to Susana P Fihaki for her beautiful cover art and incredible patience and kindness throughout the design process; and to Larry Catungal for reviewing my transcriptions with his keen ear and attention to detail to ensure that the energy of Lumanaki’s performances is conveyed as clearly as possible in writing.

Finally, my deepest gratitude goes to my family. Many thanks to Nick for giving me unwavering support and the space I need to achieve my goals; my sister, Kim, for the special kind of advice that only a sister can give; my niece, Ally, for being amazingly mature and understanding when I had to move thousands of miles away to pursue my research and educational goals; and my grandparents, aunts, and uncles for all the cards, care packages, love, and places to call home over the years. Finally, I want to thank my parents. I really do not know how to express just how much their unwavering support and unconditional love mean to me. They have always believed in me, and they did not so much as flinch when I announced I wanted to move from Kentucky to Hawai‘i to pursue my educational goals. As a first-generation college student, I feel immeasurably lucky to have such strong advocates. More important than anything, though, my parents instilled in me a sense of family, community, and reciprocity that has shaped my entire life as well as every word in this paper. They, with everyone else listed here, have supplied beautiful fibers from a myriad of places and experiences, and I have carefully woven each strand into my life and into the following pages. To everyone: Fakafetai lahi lele.
Chapter 1

Building a Future

Leaving their beloved Olohega (Swains Island), a small group of Tokelauans migrated to Pago Pago in American Sāmoa in 1953 and 1954 and later to the island of O‘ahu in Hawai‘i in the 1960s (Ickes 2009). Throughout their journey, they carried with them their Tokelauan culture, which they maintained in the realm of informal transmission for many decades. In 2004, descendants of the Olohega migrants, inspired by a recent performance event and frustrated that they were unable to communicate with visiting Tokelauan youth from Nukunonu, another atoll in the Tokelau group, expressed to their elders a strong desire to know more about the Tokelauan culture and to learn its language, songs, and dances (Ickes 2009, 449). Their families obliged, at first teaching classes in a community member’s garage and later moving to a nearby clubhouse. This move and the subsequent establishment in 2005 of Te Taki Tokelau Community Training & Development, Inc.—a nonprofit organization designed to oversee the community’s many programs—marked the official beginning of the school, Te Lumanaki o Tokelau i Amelika (The Future of Tokelau in America; hereafter referred to as Lumanaki; see figure 1.1). Over the succeeding years, Lumanaki has served many youth, including non-Tokelauans, and has established a strong presence in O‘ahu’s multicultural community through highly acclaimed performances as well as both personal and institutional affiliations. In addition to its local successes, Lumanaki has earned international recognition through recent visits to Tokelau, where members reconnected with other Tokelauans, and to Wellington, New Zealand, where they competed against large, professional, all-adult performing groups in the 2008 Tokelau Sports and Culture Tournament. At this important Tokelauan event, Lumanaki won the award for “Best Overall Performance” (Ickes, pers comm, 10 Aug 2011). In April 2012, the school returned to New Zealand to compete again.
At the heart of Lumanaki’s operations is an enthusiastic dedication to the promotion of the Tokelauan culture, as expressed in Te Taki’s mission statement: “to revitalize the native language and culture of Tokelau; and to enhance the socio-economic sustainability of the Tokelauan people in the United States” (Ickes 2009, 451). One of the many ways in which the teachers, parents, and other adults who participate in the school’s activities impart the Tokelauan language and culture to students is through the transmission of music and dance. The emphasis in this process, however, is not simply on the pehe ma fātele (songs and dances) but also on the cultural meaning and knowledge embedded within them and the successful execution of performances that feature them. In this paper, I present the history of Lumanaki’s founding community, situating Lumanaki’s culture and language education practices within an international context of culture and language schools. I investigate the special role of pehe ma fātele lessons and performances in Lumanaki’s efforts, and I argue that Lumanaki’s pehe ma fātele serve as comprehensive “textbooks” that aid the implementation of the school’s culture and language curriculum. In an extension of this metaphor, I suggest that Lumanaki’s regular performances serve as final assessments of the students’ progress in absorbing, processing, and internalizing the school’s lessons. More important, I propose
that, through performance, students demonstrate not only their skills in song and dance but also their ability to employ a multilayered comprehension of the “textbooks” in order to effectively and meaningfully communicate with the other people involved in the community activity and to contribute to this sense of community by stirring an admired heightened emotional state.

This first chapter introduces Tokelau, its culture, and its history. It describes the history of the Tokelauan community in Hawai‘i that founded Lumanaki in 2004 and discusses some of the issues that the community faces as a group in the diaspora. One of the many ways that diasporic communities in general respond to issues of displacement is by establishing culture and language schools that serve children, adults, or both. In chapter 2, I investigate this phenomenon, placing Lumanaki within a global context of culture and language education and cultural sustainability efforts in the diaspora. Lumanaki shares with these other schools pedagogical challenges surrounding language instruction as well as difficulties in imparting cultural knowledge and values that are often far-removed from the students’ lived experiences. As a Pacific Island community in a Pacific Island place, however, Lumanaki enjoys a certain level of support and shared understanding with the larger O‘ahu community. Further, while the school struggles with reaching students through Western educational methods, its teachers are able to pull from Pacific Island ways of knowing and learning in order to reach students with the lessons of Tokelauan history, language, geography, culture, and values that form the school’s cultural curriculum.

In chapter 3, I elaborate on this idea of Pacific Island ways of knowing and learning as central to culture and language education in Pacific Island communities by exploring the role of Pacific Island arts as vessels that carry cultural knowledge forward to future generations. As Lumanaki students learn, their ancestors carefully selected items to place in their vaka (canoes) and take with them as they voyaged across the Pacific. In a similar fashion, older generations of Tokelauans have carefully selected features of Tokelauan culture to embed in pehe ma fātele to ensure their safe passage from place to place and from generation to generation. With this metaphor in mind, I describe a typical pehe ma fātele practice, which regularly follows and sometimes replaces the school’s Saturday lessons, and I explain how this experience of learning Tokelauan pehe ma fātele
contributes to the students’ culture and language education as well as to their resulting identity development. Based on the Tokelauan belief that songs are the paper of Tokelau, I argue that the pehe ma fātele students learn at Lumanaki—and the performance practice that surrounds them—serve as “textbooks” that cover the entire Lumanaki curriculum. This metaphor, which places oral and written forms of documentation on equal footing and encourages the use of both in the culture and language school classroom, resonates well with the Lumanaki community.

Because student success is difficult to gauge without some form of assessment, in chapter 4, I turn to a particular Lumanaki performance for clues to how Lumanaki teachers evaluate the students’ absorption and comprehension of the curricular materials. I analyze the six pieces that Lumanaki performed as part of an important evening event, noting the textual and musicological features of each song and connecting them to aspects of Tokelauan culture and performance practice in the atolls and abroad. Emerging from this analysis is the importance of a holistic performance that combines cultural understanding and technical skill in a communicative event that elicits feelings of joy, inspiration, and community. According to Lumanaki teachers, these individual and collective feelings, called matagia, can be seen and heard as well as felt, providing a perfect indicator of students’ success in their final evaluation through performance.

Engaging Dual Perspectives

This paper emerges from a weaving of two fields and their respective methodologies: ethnomusicology and Pacific Islands studies. Each provides important tools for understanding the role of music and dance in Lumanaki’s culture and language education efforts to yield a sensitive yet rigorous analysis that serves both academia and the community that sang and danced its way onto these pages.

Rather than emphasizing the school’s self-acknowledged struggles with reaching students through methods of Western education, such as language drills (Ickes, pers comm, 30 Jan 2012; Patelesio, pers comm, 6 Feb 2012), I have shaped my analysis to highlight the school’s use of Pacific Island ways of knowing and learning to encourage
students’ success both in the Lumanaki classroom and on stage. This decision takes inspiration from Epeli Hau'ofa’s insistence in his landmark essay “Our Sea of Islands” that “only when we focus our attention also on what ordinary people are actually doing rather than on what they should be doing, can we see the broader picture of reality” (2008, 35–36). Though he was referring to Pacific Islanders’ breaking out of outsider-imposed geographical confinement in order to take advantage of the wealth of resources that their “Sea of Islands” and the rest of the world have to offer, the statement also rings true in the case of Lumanaki’s educational efforts. Instead of using only Western education models, which are valuable in the classroom but more difficult to implement due to time and resource deficits, Lumanaki enthusiastically supports pehe ma fātele practice and performance. Instead of devaluing these Pacific Island ways of knowing and learning, the teachers strongly support and cherish them. In this work, I take Vilsoni Hereniako’s advice “to give Oceanic forms of historical expression equal time and value with the written word” (2003, xiii), applying the term “textbook” to the unwritten pehe ma fātele in order to suggest that oral transmission is equal to written transmission in terms of effectiveness. Carefully composed to create records of information, events, and experiences, both written books and oral pehe ma fātele become physical representations of knowledge.

As David Hanlon has argued, “History . . . can be sung, danced, chanted, spoken, carved, woven, painted, sculpted, and rapped as well as written” (2003, 30). Olohega’s history reveals a constant devaluing of these vessels of Pacific Island knowledge, and Konai Helu Thaman insisted that “decolonizing Pacific studies is about reclaiming indigenous Oceanic perspectives, knowledge, and wisdom that have been devalued or suppressed because they were or are not considered important or worthwhile” (2003, 2). I therefore base this paper on the most recent part of Lumanaki’s story to show that pehe ma fātele lessons and performances serve as some of the most important means by which the teachers are successfully reaching the students with lessons of Tokelauan life, land, and language.

Undertaking this task in a rigorous way required tools for systematically examining the “textbooks.” I therefore conducted ethnomusicological analyses of the texts and transcriptions of six Lumanaki pehe ma fātele, all of which Lumanaki performed at a
reception for the Tokelauan head of state on 14 December 2011. Executive Director Betty Ickes, Artistic Director Bonnie Patelesio, and I chose this particular performance because it took place before an audience including important Tokelauan visitors from Tokelau, Tokelauans from New Zealand, Tokelauans who participate in Lumanaki, Tokelauans who do not participate for various reasons, and several non-Tokelauans, making it an important communicative event for the school. Through my analyses of the six pieces performed that evening, I sought to determine the kinds of knowledge about Tokelauan history, culture, and language that these pehe ma fātele and the surrounding performances contain and how teachers can assess students’ internalization and understanding of this knowledge through the performance event.

Ethnomusicological analysis, with its emphasis on examining and applying emic models, offers a valuable solution to the problem of how we as researchers can better privilege Pacific Island ways of knowing, teaching, and learning in our work. Ethnomusicologists value and consult the unwritten songs and dances that carry and transmit cultural knowledge, using these as keys to unlocking insights into cultural processes and events. As such, the performative aurality of music and dance offers more information than written historical accounts that often have more to do with the researcher’s culture than the culture being studied. Through a sensitive analysis of Pacific Island worldviews and practices, ethnomusicology has much to offer Pacific Islands research and decolonization efforts.

This work makes an important contribution to existing research on Tokelauan pehe ma fātele. The last published ethnomusicological study of Tokelau was Allan Thomas’s 1996 New Song and Dance from the Central Pacific: Creating and Performing the Fātele of Tokelau in the Islands and in New Zealand. Based on fieldwork conducted primarily in the 1980s, Thomas’s book, while very important, is significantly outdated. An entire generation has been born and grown to adulthood since that time, so it is very unlikely that the research still reflects Tokelauan culture as it did at the time of publication. Further, it features only one type of pehe ma fātele and performance only in Tokelau and the New Zealand diaspora—the Tokelauan community in Hawai‘i is entirely absent. This paper is a first step in expanding that research.
In addition to these contributions to academia, this paper aims to serve the goals and needs of Lumanaki. As chapter 2 shows, considerable time and effort go into running a culture and language school, and the people involved simply do not have the time to regularly document the school’s activities. With this in mind, I have heeded Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s call to find ways to give back to the community that helped make this research (1999, 15). This commitment on my part is both methodological and significant: methodological because of the important acknowledgment of the true source of knowledge for this work and significant because of the value such a snapshot in time has to the community that it represents. This snapshot also updates other research on culture and language schools in general. Migration is not new nor is it going to end anytime soon; communities are going to continue looking for answers to their questions of how to sustain their cultures in the diaspora. Indeed, as the effects of climate change intensify and increased globalism results in ever-growing displacements, we will likely see more and more communities on the move as their homelands become uninhabitable or new lands offer economic, social, or political havens (Water is Rising 2011). It is essential that stories and cultural sustainability models like Lumanaki’s be documented and made available to these communities if and when the time comes that this type of culture and language education is necessary or desirable. With this in mind, it is to Lumanaki’s story that I now turn.

**Tokelau: The Homeland**

Lumanaki’s story begins in Tokelau. Located in the South Pacific between approximately 8° and 10° south and 171° and 173° west, Tokelau culturally comprises four atolls: Atafu, Nukunonu, Fakaofo, and Olohega (Hooper and Huntsman 1991, 1; see figure 1.2). The total land area of the atolls is approximately 12.2 km² (4.7 mi²) (Huntsman and Hooper 1996, 20), or as the CIA World Factbook reports it, “about 17 times the size of The Mall in Washington, DC” (CIA 2011). According to Judith Huntsman and Antony Hooper, each atoll is made up of portions of dry land “set upon a coralline base which rises very steeply from the ocean depths, so there are no offshore anchorages . . . [the] unbroken
FIGURE 1.2. Map of the Pacific Islands. (University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Center for Pacific Islands Studies; modified with permission)
barrier reef [is] awash to depths of a meter or more at high water but bare and exposed during lower tidal periods, so there are no deepwater passes to the open sea” (1996, 20–21). Central lagoons and surrounding seas serve as equally important parts of Tokelau’s geography, as Tokelau is a culture deeply connected to the sea and its resources (Huntsman and Hooper 1996, 22–23).

Living in four closely grouped communities that together total approximately 1,411 people (Statistics New Zealand 2011, 5), Tokelauans must be able to live in social harmony with one another in an environment of sparse land resources. Consequently, many aspects of their culture help to discourage conflict, encourage participation, and ensure equitable distribution of food and other necessities. Tokelau is an egalitarian society. As Ingjerd Hoëm, Even Hovdhaugen, and Arnfinn Muruvik Vonen explained, in terms of individual roles in that society, people often show concern “about whether a person is working to the benefit of the whole community rather than merely striving to improve his or her own condition. . . . Personal and collective concerns must be balanced carefully, and great stress is placed on the primacy of the interests of the community over those of the individual” (1992, 23). They continued, describing the “Tokelau egalitarian ethic, the value placed on modesty and meekness, and the negative reactions against self-aggrandisement, where one of the most positive statements one can make about another person is that she or he has ‘fano kilalo’ literally ‘gone down, below,’ that [the person] is ‘below oneself’” (Hoëm, Hovdhaugen, and Vonen 1992, 27).

Intimately connected to this egalitarian ethic is the Tokelauan concept of māopoopo. Huntsman and Kelihiano Kalolo suggested that though the term māopoopo denotes a gathering together, the ideology of māopoopo is central to life in Tokelau:

Gatherings are only māopoopo when all the people who should be present are indeed present. . . . If people have absented themselves [they are] not, and this is lamented by those who are present. Likewise, if there is a task to be done and everyone is present and hard at work, the work is māopoopo; but if workers have stayed away and work is desultory, it is not. A definition of māopoopo as ‘unity of being and spirit’ conveys the essence of this ideal in action. . . . Māopoopo cannot be decreed, it must be cultivated and nurtured. It is felt—a kind of euphoria at its height when all are enthusiastically engaged—or not felt—a sense of despair and disengagement. (Huntsman and Kalolo 2007, 41–46)

Ickes added that there is a political side to māopoopo as well. When there are decisions to be made, everyone present must participate in the process. The result is a group decision
that reflects the thoughts and opinions of everyone present. Those who do not like what they think the outcome might be, however, will sometimes absent themselves, and this sends a message of dissent to the others (Ickes, pers comm, 30 Jan 2012). As a tool for establishing and maintaining social harmony in the atolls, Hoëm, Hovdhaugen, and Vonen suggested that māopopo “is the primary value” in Tokelau (1992, 29).

These social manifestations of Tokelau’s egalitarian spirit are coupled with what Huntsman and Hooper called “institutionalized sharing.” As these authors wrote, “the most eloquent expression of the Tokelau ethic of equality is the system of inati, whereby every member of the village—man, woman, child and infant—is allotted an exactly equal portion of something” (Huntsman and Hooper 1996, 76). Certain types of fish, food from communal resources, and gifts to the community must be distributed according to the system of inati, and individuals selected for their trustworthiness and descent are responsible for dividing these resources (Huntsman and Hooper 1996, 77–78). Though there are complications related to the composition of the inati groups among which goods are distributed (Huntsman and Hooper 1996, 81), the inati system is yet another testament to the emphasis placed on equality and harmony in the atoll communities.

This harmony and social cohesion, however, has experienced a great rupture. The cultural definition of Tokelau differs from the political, and this has led to much debate and political activity in the past century. In her PhD dissertation, titled Expanding the Tokelauan Archipelago: Tokelau’s Decolonization and Olohega’s Penu Tafea in the Hawai‘i Diaspora, Ickes wrote, “In the mid-nineteenth century, British and American interests gained control of different parts of Tokelau after the cumulative efforts of foreign diseases, slave raids, resource exploitation, land alienation, and a new religion weakened Fakaofo’s rule. Hereafter, the history of the Tokelauan people diverged separated by physical and artificial, albeit informally-imposed, political borders that would later direct subsequent flow paths of migration” (2009, 2). Since 1925, the four islands have been artificially divided along political boundaries, with Atafu, Nukunonu, and Fakaofo tied to New Zealand and Olohega tied to American Sāmoa, a US territory. The politically defined Tokelau is now a non-self-governing territory of New Zealand (Ickes 2009, 3). Because of historical resettlement, educational schemes, and the aforementioned political associations (Hoëm 2004, 12), considerably more Tokelauans
live in New Zealand than in Tokelau. According to the 2013 New Zealand census, there are now approximately 7,176 people who identify as Tokelauan living in New Zealand compared to 1,411 in the atolls (Statistics New Zealand 2013). As Ickes’s description above indicates, Olohega is administered as part of American Sāmoa and thus has experienced a very different set of circumstances leading to alternate migration patterns.

**Olohega: Division, Departures, and Destinations**

The collective account of Tokelauan culture and history *Matagi Tokelau: History and Traditions of Tokelau* presents Olohega as historically tied to the other atolls. Accounts of these connections also appear in Tokelauan *pehe ma fātele* (Hooper and Huntsman 1991, 37). To Tokelauans, “Although there is no absolute proof of their truth, most of the Tokelau stories transmitted by word of mouth over many years are absolutely true. For Olohega, they confirm that it is a land of Fakaofo; they are historical accounts of Fakaofo and Olohega” (Hooper and Huntsman 1991, 43). Despite Tokelau claims to the atoll, Huntsman and Kalolo explained that “Olohega had been surreptitiously appropriated under the 1856 Guano Act . . . by Eli Jennings, originally of Long Island, New York. Successive male Jennings asserted ownership thereafter, and because the original Jennings was an American citizen Olohega became attached to American Samoa rather than Tokelau. Claims of the Jennings family were problematic, as were all claims under the Guano Act . . . which had been made to virtually all the atolls in the Central Pacific” (2007, 139). Regardless of the dubiousness of these claims, Tokelau’s own claims to Olohega through songs and stories were not sufficient to invalidate those of the Jennings family (Thomas, Tuia, and Huntsman 1990, 44).

According to Huntsman and Kalolo, in the process of establishing Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs), New Zealand and the United States reached an agreement that the United States “would give up its claims under the Guano Act to the [other] three atolls if Tokelau/New Zealand would never press any claim to Olohega/Swains. . . . New Zealand was placed in an invidious position” (2007, 139). Though it compromised the country’s rapport with the atolls, New Zealand discouraged Tokelau from further
pursuing the matter of Olohega’s inclusion (Huntsman and Kalolo 2007, 40). The case
did not truly close then, however, as many believe that Tokelau is not whole without
Olohega (Huntsman and Kalolo 2007, 232). Huntsman and Kalolo reported that in
August 2005, “after a ‘long and emotional wrangle’ and by a narrow vote margin,
[officials] agreed to move the reference to Olohega from Article One to the Preamble of
the Constitution. Consequently, Tokelau is constitutionally defined as ‘all the islands,
internal waters, territorial seas, and other areas to which Tokelau is entitled at
international law’, and the Preamble states: ‘At the dawn of time the historic islands of
Atafu, Nukunonu, Fakaofo, and Olohega were created as our home’” (2007, 233).
Olohega is thus symbolically a part of Tokelau according to the constitution. Tensions
over the issue remain, however, and the situation is an ongoing topic of discussion and
debate, especially for those families whose lives have been affected by Olohega’s
progressive political alienation and by the events that took place on the atoll one hot
summer day in 1953.

Settling into Olohega through intermarriage and suspicious claims to the atoll, Eli
Jennings and his descendants established an exploitative copra plantation system that
over the years became increasingly intolerable for Tokelauan families (Ickes 2009, 168,
255). On a particularly sweltering July afternoon in 1953, Ickes explained, Eli Jennings
III “refused to grant the workers a break until the vessel [they were loading with copra]
was completely filled,” seeking to turn a full profit regardless of the dangerous working
conditions it meant for the workers on such a hot day (2009, 260–261). When mealtime
arrived without refreshments, one of the workers sent others to fetch drinking coconuts,
and Jennings immediately publicly berated and then banished the worker and his entire
family from Olohega (Ickes 2009, 262–263). Everyone who stood in protest of his
decision—even many of Jennings’s own family members—received eviction orders as
well. Despite a people’s petition to the US government for an investigation of the
situation on the atoll and subsequent findings that called for individual protections and a
restructuring of the atoll’s administration, an additional forty-six people were illegally
deported from Olohega (Ickes 2009, 280–281). They spent several years at their first
destination, Pago Pago in American Sāmoa, and endured racial discrimination and
socioeconomic inequalities while there. Finally, members of the refugee group slowly
migrated in the 1960s to the island of O‘ahu in Hawai‘i for educational and employment opportunities (Ickes 2009, 309, 315–316). They worked in the pineapple plantations of Central O‘ahu, and it is there that many of the families took root and still live to this day. As members of a Tokelauan diaspora that ties communities in the United States and New Zealand to the culturally defined homeland of Tokelau, these families face many new dilemmas that their counterparts in the homeland do not.

As Ilana Gershon noted, “Ethnographers of the Pacific have long known that the Pacific is not just a sea of islands, but also a sea of families. Diasporas only exist because of the culturally specific ways through which families circulate knowledge and resources” (2007, 474). This approach builds “on Epeli Hau‘ofa’s insight that to understand the Pacific, one is better served by attending to people’s daily experiences of interconnected webs of exchanges and kinship than by focusing on the disconnections and isolations integral to a Western colonial perspective” (Gershon 2007, 474). Consequently, I focus on the story of agency and community that defines Tokelau immigrant history and the current lived experience. Taking advantage of the strength of family and pulling from all of the resources available to them on their long journey, Lumanaki’s founding community has stepped up to the challenges of living in the diaspora.

Weaving Identities in the Diaspora

Unlike individuals and communities that remain in the homeland, those in the diaspora often find themselves having to recognize and negotiate the multiple identities that exist in their new home. Helen Morton suggested that “cultural identity is constructed and reconstructed . . . primarily in response to ongoing encounters with other cultures” (1998, 3). Individuals, for example, often exist in an in-between space, neither wholly of the homeland community nor wholly of the host community in terms of identification (Morton 1998, 15–16). Sonja de Leeuw and Ingegerd Rydin described such diasporic identities as multilayered, continuously negotiated constructions of “senses of homely belonging” that simultaneously reference “both the new place and . . . what has been left
behind” (2007, 175, 179). Rather than employing the term “hybrid,” as those authors did (Leeuw and Rydin 2007, 179), however, I suggest an interpretation of these constructions in the Tokelauan diaspora context as woven identities. They are more complex than Smadar Lavie and Ted Swedenburg’s proposed “doubled relationship or dual loyalty that migrants, exiles, and refugees have to places—their connections to the space they currently occupy and their continuing involvement with ‘back home’” (1996, 14). “Back home” can mean different things. It could refer to Tokelau in general or Olohega in particular. Further, the places in between—whether locations of positive memories or sites of distress, as in the case of Pago Pago—affect identities as well. I suggest, therefore, that the Hawai‘i Tokelauans’ identities represent a carefully woven assortment of fibers that grew in many different places under many different circumstances.

This imagery of a multi-strand weaving allows for a sense of agency in how individuals negotiate their identities, as all fibers contribute to the structural integrity of the piece/person, even if some figure more prominently than others. Vijay Agnew asserted that “migrants use their intellectual, social, and political resources to construct identities that transcend physical and social boundaries, and they are rarely, particularly today, mere victims who are acted upon by the larger society” (2005, 5). Each fiber is a valid part of the individual’s experience, and it is up to the individual to decide how to go about the process of weaving. Like Anh Hua argued, “it is important to challenge and rethink earlier versions of diasporic narratives with their fixed notion of home, identity, and exile, where the homeland is perceived nostalgically as an ‘authentic space’ of belonging, and the place of settlement as somehow ‘inauthentic’ and undesirable” (2005, 195). These narratives take away the agency that the creative act of weaving requires.

This is not to say that individuals have no guidance as they gather materials and set to work. As Gershon insisted, “diasporas would vanish quickly if the selves being circulated were perpetually making choices as though they were self-interested actors” (2007, 477). Leeuw and Rydin defined diaspora as “people connected to a cultural community, now living dispersed” (2007, 175). Building on Benedict Anderson’s pivotal work *Imagined Communities* (1983), they added that “as diaspora is a state of consciousness about the characteristics of the community one feels to belong to, it could be described as an ‘imagined community’ . . . a community hold [sic] together by stories,
images and symbols that represent shared meanings about itself” (Leeuw and Rydin 2007, 178). Sara Ahmed and her coauthors noted that this consciousness often involves a degree of nostalgia, “which plays a crucial part in the imagining of ‘cultures of relatedness’ . . . whether direct kinship or wider circles of ethnic and national belonging” (2003, 9). Feelings of nostalgia and the cultural symbols to which they are commonly tied become available fibers that individuals may use in weaving and reinforcing their identities.

With all of the different strands to choose from, however, communities must determine which ones to keep in plentiful supply and how to distribute them to the community. Gershon reminded us that “questions of identity often also involve questions of how knowledge circulates” (2007, 485). “In the late 1990s,” Ickes explained, “the Wahiawa [Hawai‘i] community experienced a post-resettlement transition from a fragmented, migrant population to a culturally-distinct community” (2009, 6), and this community began to take stock of its resources for weaving Tokelauan identities. The events that followed led to the establishment of a vehicle for allowing people to celebrate and employ the multiple fibers in creating a unique whole. This vehicle was Lumanaki.
Chapter 2

A Bud Flowering in the Pacific

Determined to provide their youth with opportunities to learn the history, language, and culture of their ancestors and to develop an identity that incorporates this knowledge, many diasporic communities establish their own schools. These schools take several forms, ranging from full-time, accredited programs to part-time, supplemental education. School structures and curricula largely depend on each community’s needs and resources. This phenomenon has a long history and an international scope. While some schools have intermittent success, open for only a few months at a time, others prosper for many years and become part of the fabric of the communities in which they developed.

In this chapter, I briefly present the culture and language school context in which Lumanaki operates; describe Lumanaki’s history, composition, and a typical school day; and explore the school’s Pacific Island context, which both cultivates school support and necessitates a critical consideration of what the school’s curriculum entails. I argue that although it shares many characteristics, struggles, and successes with continental culture and language schools, Lumanaki is a Pacific Island culture and language school in a Pacific Island place, so its curriculum must be examined in terms of Pacific Island ways of knowing and learning. I use the term “culture and language school” instead of “ethnic school,” which was popular among communities and scholars in the 1970s and 1980s, because it makes room for the woven identities of the students who attend. Most important, Lumanaki is open to anyone who is interested in attending, regardless of ethnicity, so it would be misleading to refer to it as “ethnic.” Its self-declared status as a “culture and language school” therefore takes its entire community into account. Regardless of the terminology used, scholars have documented an array of stories of
communities thriving in the diaspora through the development of educational resources, and these stories illuminate Lumanaki’s position in international and Pacific contexts.

*Culture and Language Schools*

The establishment of culture and language schools is not new, nor is it limited to one culture or place. In the opening chapters to *Ethnic Heritage and Language Schools in America*, a text documenting a 1982 American Folklife Center study on the culture and language school movement in the United States, Elena Bradunas and Brett Topping explained that the phenomenon has a national scope and a history that goes almost as far back as the country’s first immigrants (Topping 1988, 6; Bradunas 1988, 26). One can find culture and language schools in other countries as well (Bekerman and Kopelowitz 2008), such as Greek schools in Australia and Jewish and Muslim schools in England and Wales (Tsolidis and Kostogriz 2008, Tsounis 1974; Parker-Jenkins 2008). Immigrants around the world are proactive in establishing these culture and language schools, which create a sense of “home” in the diaspora.

Culture and language schools and their curricula serve primarily to fulfill cultural transmission needs and therefore reveal elements of their respective cultures that the founding communities value most and wish to pass on to future generations (Topping 1988, 3; Bradunas 1988, 14, 24; Tsounis 1974, 2). Zvi Bekerman and Ezra Kopelowitz referred to efforts to use formal and informal educational methods to transmit culture to future generations as “cultural sustainability” (2008, vi), and sociologist Erik H Cohen noted in his analysis of informal education and identity formation in diasporic communities that “education has always played an important role in the maintenance of ethnic groups” (2004, 96). Informal education is a key tool in fostering positive member identity. For instance, “Basque-American communities sponsor traditional games, dance, and music lessons as a way to socialise their children into Basque culture” (Cohen 2004, 91). This often results in a continual interweaving of identities and in the production of individuals who are confident in themselves as they strive to promote continued cultural
sustainability and growth (Bekerman and Kopelowitz 2008, 4). It is within the culture and language school classroom that these cultural sustainability efforts take shape.

In the preface to Ethnic Heritage and Language Schools in America, Brett Topping explained the nature of cultural or “ethnic” schools:

The ethnic school . . . organizes cultural transmission around specific, regular, and formal activities. Although it is but one of many possible means by which young people learn about their parents’ and communities’ culture, it is probably the easiest to observe and document. . . . It is a separate and distinct forum in which culture is transmitted in a conscious manner and where the teacher and student roles are clearly defined. As a conscious effort requiring coordination among a number of individuals, it is institutionalized within the community. But even as an institution, it is outside the formal, governmentally regulated educational system of our society as a whole. Usually it is a private, community-based venture, requiring voluntary organizational effort and grassroots sustenance to keep it alive. (1988, 6)

Bradunas later added that all of the schools in the American Folklife Center study sample shared “the stress on the importance of identity, an acknowledgment of the significance of the native language, a propensity to organize a school-like structure for educational programs, similar problems with teachers and curriculum materials, and the same headaches concerning enrollments and finances” (1988, 20–21). All of these elements rest in the hands of dedicated teams of parents, teachers, and other community members who organize and comprise school administrations, develop and implement school curricula, and sacrifice time, money, and other resources in order to support their schools (Bradunas 1988, 23). In many ways, Lumanaki aligns well with this larger context of culture and language education, having developed in direct response to the community’s needs and out of the tireless efforts of a number of dedicated community members.

Te Lumanaki o Tokelau i Amelika

In 2004, over fifty years after its founding families left Olohega, the Tokelauan community in Hawai‘i assisted the delegation representing Tokelau at the 9th Festival of Pacific Arts in Palau in securing accommodations as they passed through the islands (Ickes 2009, 448). According to Lumanaki teacher and Te Taki Executive Director Betty Ickes, “More than half the group from Nukunonu were young men and women who
connected right away with the Hawai‘i youth, despite the Tokelauan-English language barrier” (2009, 448). Still, the Hawai‘i youth were frustrated at not being able to communicate easily with their Tokelauan peers, so adults in the community began informally teaching them the language in a Wahiawa family’s garage (2009, 449). Ickes indicated that the traveling group inspired the development of the school in yet another way:

The travelers left in Hawai‘i their performance costumes, drums, and other carved and woven goods made in Nukunonu. As the Malaga (visitors) offered us these gifts, the speaker commented that the costumes were meaningless if we distributed [them] like inati (customary distribution), rather, he proposed Hawai‘i start a kauhiva (dance troupe) to maximize the costumes’ value. It was prescient. The Malaga had a profound impact on the Hawai‘i adult tupulaga and younger Tokelauan generations who found a reason for learning their heritage language. (2009, 449)

Following Lumanaki’s formal beginnings and its subsequent growth and formal establishment as a school, the Tafeta women’s club from Atafu visited Hawai‘i in 2005, also leaving behind their costumes and other items of cultural value as gifts to Lumanaki, as well as their “knowledge of local Atafu histories, genealogies, new pehe ma fātele and new personal connections to the homeland” (Ickes 2009, 249–250). Thus, from the very beginning, the community has firmly based Lumanaki on language education and the fostering of its own kauhiva.

Lumanaki is the main program of Te Taki Tokelau Community Training & Development, Inc. (hereafter referred to as Te Taki). As the school’s administrative organization, Te Taki is made up of an elected board of directors, an advisory council of elders, an executive director, and a chief financial officer, all of whom work diligently without compensation to promote the school and to secure public and private funds in addition to in-kind support for both its own operations and those of the school (Ickes 2009, 451). In addition to these individuals, the school currently has a grant-writing team that regularly works late into the night developing ideas and preparing applications. Their efforts are not futile, as the community has submitted many successful applications, including one submitted to the Administration for Native Americans that requested funding for the school’s language curriculum development. These funds enable the school’s further development and allow its services to remain free of charge to all who
are interested, Tokelauan or otherwise. Most of the administrative and teaching positions are filled by the students’ parents, grandparents, and other family members, all of whom are volunteers (Ickes 2009, 452). Without their support—which includes everything from driving students all over the island for school and performances to making and mending performance costumes and holding fundraiser after fundraiser—the school would not be able to operate. Many parents regularly attend school with their children and join them on stage for performances, continuing their intense dedication to the school and its activities by singing and sometimes dancing along in the rear of the kauhiva.

The following detailed, present-tense description is drawn from my notes during the 2010–2012 period of my most intensive research.

Lumanaki meets Saturdays at 9:30 AM in a two-story building in Mililani, a town on the island of Oʻahu in Hawaiʻi. Like many culture and language school facilities (NLN-NHCSA 2006, 4), the building does not belong to Lumanaki. Though its open floor plan allows the school to make the best use of the space, the facility is neither large enough nor properly equipped for all of the school’s needs. With this in mind, the community is currently raising money for a community center to house both the school and other community facilities, but in the meantime everyone is making do with what they have.

When students, parents, and teachers arrive at the building, they remove their shoes at the door, walk inside, and immediately begin greeting each person already inside with a kiss. Should they pass in front of someone else or between two or more people engaged in conversation, they bow and say “tulou” (a respectful announcement of intentions) as they pass (Ickes, pers comm, 30 Jan 2012). The female students tie their kie (sarongs) around their waists, and all of the students take their seats in a circle on the floor in preparation for opening songs and prayer. One of the two music directors, Bonnie Patelesio, begins the morning’s songs, which are often religious songs like “Jesus Loves Me,” fitted with Tokelauan texts and accompanied by guitar, which Patelesio plays. These songs give students time to arrive and settle in. Once everyone is situated, either Bonnie or one of the students leads the group in opening prayer. The language of the prayer, either English or both English and Tokelauan, depends on the prayer leader’s fluency in Tokelauan.
After the opening prayer, the teachers and parents engage students in conversation, asking them about what transpired over the week and having them use the Tokelauan language to tell the group things like what they had for breakfast that day. Other activities include games, discussions about prior lessons, and conversation comprehension exercises in which students are asked to translate brief conversations between two of the adults. There are two popular games. The first game is a circle game in which everyone in the circle claps a cadence that gradually increases in tempo while students take turns saying Tokelauan letters or numbers. If a student hesitates or says the wrong letter or number, he or she is “out” and must sit out with crossed arms until the next round of the game. The second game is a Tokelauan version of the popular game “Head, Shoulders, Knees, and Toes.” All of these exercises are designed to help the students become familiar with Tokelauan letters, numbers, words, and sentence structures; however, they mostly serve as warm-ups for the school day.

Depending on the lesson for the day, students then separate into several groups by age. The lesson content and format varies from week to week, as the teachers are still in the process of implementing the new curriculum that they developed with grant resources. After the day’s lesson, the students usually have a break and then reconvene at about 12:00 PM for pehe ma fātele practice. The boys grab any implements they will need during the dances and place them at the back of the room, and the students get into position for physical warm-ups, usually standard exercises like stretches and push-ups, led by either one of the adult men or one of the students. They then proceed with practice, the contents of which I describe in detail in chapters 3 and 4 along with an account of the school’s performance activities.

Tired from a physically challenging afternoon of practice, around 2:00 PM, all in attendance either prepare to leave or get ready for a community meal. If a meal is prepared, which is more often than not the case, students will set up the food table and serve their elders, who regularly attend the school and its events, before filling their own plates and taking seats on the floor and in chairs around the room. Conversation is boisterous—among both the kids and the adults—and it is not uncommon for one or more of the people in attendance to pick up an instrument like the ‘ukulele or guitar once plates start emptying. When necessary, the teachers break off from the group and move into the
small office to discuss school matters. This informal part of the school day lasts anywhere from a few minutes to several hours, sometimes until well after dark (see figure 2.1). Late nights at the school reveal participants’ devotion to Lumanaki as well as their enjoyment of each other’s company.

FIGURE 2.1. Students, parents, and teachers stay at school after dark as they prepare for their trip to New Zealand in April 2012. (Photo: T Hokoana-Coffin, 18 Feb 2012, used with permission)

Lumanaki has established a strong presence in the host community of O‘ahu as well as a positive name for itself among Tokelauan communities in the home atolls and in New Zealand through its hospitality to travelers and its impressive performances at home and abroad. While I discuss the performances in detail in chapters 3 and 4, it is important to note here the role the performativé arts hold in garnering support from the host community, which shares with the Tokelauan community a Pacific Island identity. The school has been diligent in establishing what Bekerman and Kopelowitz referred to as “spheres of trust,” meaning “the social and cultural capital members of a group create between themselves and between the group and wider society. These relations are complex and, except for extreme circumstances, cannot be reduced to binary in/out
membership categories. Without these complex spheres of trust, particular cultures of any kind cannot survive” (2008, 3–4). Because Hawai‘i is a Pacific place with a strong Pacific Islander presence, the larger community understands, accepts, and values many aspects of Tokelauan culture, a dynamic that encourages and nurtures these spheres of trust. Many people in Hawai‘i are already familiar with Pacific performance practices and realize the value of the arts in transmitting and sustaining culture (see figure 2.2). Consequently they are more likely to support Pacific Island performances than people who have little exposure to, familiarity with, or understanding of the cultures involved. This shared cultural capital strengthens the relationship between communities like Lumanaki and the broader population. These spheres of trust, in turn, support Lumanaki’s rigorous efforts and are largely responsible for the school’s success in its efforts to accumulate resources, monetary and otherwise.

FIGURE 2.2. Members of the Honolulu community support Lumanaki at a performance at the Hawai‘i State Art Museum. (Photo: C Steiner, 7 Oct 2011)
In addition to knowledge of Pacific Island performance practices, Lumanaki and other Pacific Island communities in Hawai‘i share beliefs regarding ways of knowing and learning. The Pacific Island context in which Lumanaki operates is therefore key to understanding the school’s activities, as it reveals how other models in the region have influenced the school’s development and encouraged its success.

Curriculum in Context

As expressed in Te Taki’s mission statement, Lumanaki’s curriculum embraces two goals: language instruction and cultural education. As in other culture and language schools (Bradunas 1988, 27; Tsolidis and Kostogriz 2008, 323), despite the distinction between language instruction and cultural education, the lived curriculum is more complex. For instance, Lumanaki students must learn Tokelauan personal introductions, which require the learning of Tokelauan terms and grammar, as part of their general cultural education. When Tokelauans introduce themselves, they are expected to be able to locate themselves within complex networks of association, so each student must practice stating his or her name, age, parents’ names, grandparents’ names, hometown or district, and school. This exercise, an integral part of daily warm-ups, becomes especially important before voyages or exchange events wherein school members will meet many people of Tokelauan descent.

This practice echoes the goal of many culture and language schools to enable students to communicate with members of their own communities, at home and abroad (Tsounis 1974, 36). Both educators and students benefit from improved communication skills. For instance, Marsha Penti noted that one student at the Portuguese school in Taunton, Massachusetts, “was enthusiastic about her improved Portuguese reading and writing skills, especially her ability to write letters to a girl she had met on a recent trip to Portugal” (1988, 87). One of the reasons for establishing Lumanaki was the young generation’s frustration at not being able to communicate with their peers from Tokelau. However, while the language instruction efforts at Lumanaki do bolster students’ ability enough to communicate with other Tokelauans in a general way, the introduction
exercise described above also teaches them how to communicate with them in a very culturally significant way. Through it, they learn about how Tokelauans construct and conceptualize relationships between people, places, and generations. In another exercise, students were asked to translate a short story, and though the task was on the surface a very straightforward language lesson, the translation revealed a story deeply rooted in Tokelauan beliefs about consideration and conservation. Thus, in practice, the language and cultural education are fully integrated in Lumanaki’s curriculum.

The Tokelauan language itself has presented a challenge for the school. To develop their lesson plans, Lumanaki teachers draw on the official Tokelauan grammar; the *Tokelau Dictionary*, published by the Office of Tokelau Affairs in 1986; various Tokelauan-language print materials from New Zealand; the knowledge of the community’s living elders; and language models used in Hawaiian and Samoan courses at the University of Hawai‘i (Ickes 2009, 452–453). However, there are detectable differences between the official Tokelauan grammar and the dialect spoken by Tokelauans from Olohega, so one family hesitated to enroll its children in Lumanaki due to fears that they would learn the “wrong” Tokelauan language (Ickes 2009, 452). The differences between the dialects spoken by the students and their elders are indeed noticeable.

Despite this strongly intertwined network of resources, both written and live, true language fluency is difficult to attain. Lumanaki is not alone in this. Many schools face similar challenges surrounding dialectical differences and the limited amount of time that teachers and students have to spend on language instruction, and they experience similar results in language fluency (Tsounis 1974, 35). A common response to this is for schools to shift their emphasis from striving for language fluency to encouraging cultural fluency (Bradunas 1988, 27; Tsolidis and Kostogriz 2008, 323). In step with this sentiment, Lumanaki encourages students to become fluent in Tokelauan culture in general, not just fluent in the Tokelauan language. Students achieve this through the school’s lessons, both formal and informal.4

Basic definitions of such words as “curriculum” merit a closer examination when considering Lumanaki’s efforts within the Pacific context from which it draws inspiration and meaning. *New Oxford Dictionary* defines “curriculum” as “the subjects comprising a
course of study in a school or college” (Oxford University Press 2005). While this definition is not specific in terms of what does and does not count as a subject or a school, all three terms—“curriculum,” “subject,” and “school”—have Western connotations that do not always fit the Pacific Islands context. Acknowledging this, Konai Helu Thaman offered an alternative definition of “curriculum”: “Curriculum is . . . a selection from the culture of a society, of aspects which are regarded as so valuable that their survival is not left to chance, but is entrusted to teachers for expert transmission to the young” (1993, 249). Topping applied a similar notion of curriculum in studies of other culture and language schools, stating that from the curriculum of a particular culture and language school, one should be able to “discern aspects of cultural heritage that a group cherishes and deems worthy of transmission to the next generation” (1988, 7).

Western schools and many culture and language schools in the continental United States teach such subjects as history, science, language, mathematics, and social studies as first priorities, primarily using textbooks and other literature that privilege literacy and specific ways of knowing and learning (Topping 1988). Some schools in the Pacific, however, have begun developing curricula based on Pacific Island ways of knowing and learning. Some of the most prominent examples of such schools are the Native Hawaiian Charter Schools in Hawai‘i and Māori immersion schools in New Zealand, which implement Pacific Island ways of knowing and learning in order to close achievement gaps between students whose cultures fit well with Western education models and expectations and those whose cultures do not (Hansen 2011; Harrison and Papa 2005). Nā Lei Na‘auao, the Native Hawaiian Charter Schools alliance, “asserts that Hawaii’s traditional ways of learning must shape quality modern models of Hawaiian education, and that ancient Hawaiian ways of knowing must define 21st century Hawaiian pedagogy” (2006, 3). Similarly, Kū Kahakalau, founder of one of the first public Hawaiian Charter Schools on the island of Hawai‘i, explained: “Like the Indians of the Six Nations centuries before, these Hawaiian educators, along with indigenous colleagues from around the world, are declaring that ‘different nations have different conceptions of things,’ and that our ideas of education ‘happen to be different’ from those of the haole [white] colonizers. Furthermore, we believe that it is not only our indigenous right, but also our kuleana—our duty, to both our ancestors and our descendants—to define our
own epistemologies, develop our own research methodologies, and control our own comprehensive systems of education” (2003, 147). The charter schools’ efforts have served as an example for Lumanaki, which is unsurprising since the two communities share many cultural tenets, such as the importance of caring for others and stewardship of the land (Kahakalau 2003; Kaholokula 2003; NLN-NHCSA 2006).

Lumanaki is currently in the process of implementing a curriculum that it developed with the help of an Administration for Native Americans grant. This curriculum includes separate unit sets based on grade level that cover family, technology, food, daily life, arts, traditional arts and crafts, geography and environmental science, and history (Te Taki 2010). Each unit has a purpose, a goal, a breakdown of objectives, and a language support section for each lesson, and the emphasis is on learning Tokelauan vocabulary words and phrases and applying them in real-life situations, such as dressing or cooking (Te Taki 2010). Teachers have participated in several workshops designed to assist them with the process of implementing this curriculum, including one on lesson plan development, which I attended. This workshop focused on moving from a comprehensive curriculum to individual lesson plans that follow a standard format for each unit, including a unit title, grade level, description, goals, objectives, materials, activities, assignments, and assessment. We all had to work in groups and practice creating lesson plans, and we were encouraged to be creative with our activity ideas. Each group then presented to the other groups, receiving compliments on great ideas and corrections where necessary. These presentations revealed that everyone chose to include a musical activity to help students learn the material. Since music and dance are prominent features in Tokelauan culture and all teachers have at least some performance experience, it is not surprising that they would consider music a useful tool in the classroom.

Lumanaki’s use of music and dance extends beyond these classroom exercises. While continental culture and language schools hold music and dance performances and use music, dance, and other arts in the classroom, their reasons for doing so are very different from Lumanaki’s. Discussing some of these reasons, Bradunas made a statement that would surely shock the Lumanaki community: “[Communities] know that collective affirmation of selected values and traditions provides a significantly better guarantee of their longevity. The specific contents of that collective cultural information
bank are not always of primary importance to the group. It is the importance of having
the children sing songs in their language—and not necessarily just folk songs—that
prompts teachers to print song sheets and drill the children for performances” (1988, 18).
In contrast, every aspect of Tokelauan *pehe ma fātele* is important, a belief that the music
directors constantly emphasize. If the students do not know what they are singing about,
then they should not be singing. If they do not know about the culture whose life they are
dancing, they should stand still. If they do not understand the complex interrelationship
among language, music, dance, culture, and place, then there is no point in their taking
the time to learn the *pehe ma fātele*.

The next chapter explores this interrelationship and the notion that Pacific Island arts
are vessels that carry Pacific Island history, languages, customs, sense of place, and many
other aspects of culture forward to a new generation. Rather than merely language
practice, Lumanaki *pehe ma fātele* serve as comprehensive “textbooks” from which the
students learn about their culture and heritage.
Chapter 3

Embracing Pacific Island Ways of Knowing and Learning

Even as Lumanaki’s teachers work to implement the school’s new curriculum, there is another type of learning taking place, one that is deeply rooted in Pacific Island ways of knowing and learning. Knowledge of Tokelauan history, culture, language, and values is embedded in Tokelauan songs, dances, and the Tokelauan kauhiva itself, and it is through these media that information about and aspects of Tokelauan culture travel from generation to generation. In this chapter, I discuss the role of Pacific Island arts as vessels of knowledge and as a means of expressing Pacific Islander identities. I then present Lumanaki’s classroom song and dance activities and examine the lessons that the students are learning from these activities. Given a breadth of practice encompassing songs that serve as records of the past and commentary on the future, dances that communicate information about life in the atolls and in the diaspora, and troupe expectations and long-standing aesthetics that reflect central cultural values of egalitarianism and community participation, I argue that Lumanaki’s collection of pieces and practices unite to form a comprehensive “textbook” for learning Tokelauan culture in a Tokelauan way.

Te Pepa ā Tokelau: The Paper of Tokelau

In 1980, when representatives of the United States presented to the Elders of Tokelau the Treaty of Tokehega, which required them to relinquish their claims to Olohega, the elders
put forward a song as proof of their people’s ownership of Olohega and the three atolls to the north (Huntsman and Kalolo 2007, 139–140). To the US representatives, who were versed in Western practices of written documentation, however, this was not sufficient proof of ownership, and the elders’ claim was denied (Hoëm 2004, 25; Thomas, Tuia, and Huntsman 1990, 11). What the representatives did not understand was that, as one Tokelauan explained in an interview with Judith Huntsman, “Ko te pehe ko te pepa ā Tokelau / The song is the paper of Tokelau” (Thomas, Tuia, and Huntsman 1990, 11).

As an extension of this metaphor, I use the term “textbook” to describe the organized body of knowledge encapsulated in Lumanaki’s music and dance practices. I have done this to acknowledge that, consistent with Tokelaun beliefs, oral forms of documentation and dissemination are equally as effective as written forms in the culture and language school context. While Western practice is to compile historical data in written texts that are used in the classroom setting as a way of passing on information, Tokelauans embed their histories in songs and dances that can be passed on from generation to generation and later recalled as proof of historical events (Thomas, Tuia, and Huntsman 1990, 11). As Ingjerd Hoëm asserted, “Prominence is given to songs as the main medium through which inscription of ‘things’ of cultural importance takes place” (2004, 97). Hoëm, Even Hovdhaugen, and Arnfinn Vonen similarly noted that

Songs have a very prominent position in Tokelau culture . . . . Performances have great aesthetic and entertainment value . . . [and] serve . . . both as repositories of knowledge of the past and as running commentary on the present situation. Songs are remembered, and the lyrics may be used as historical documents and as arguments in ongoing debates. (1992, 6)

Tokelauan culture shares with other Pacific Island cultures this practice of using expressive forms like song and dance as accepted means of communicating identity and voicing public commentary, and many scholars have noted this use of Pacific arts in the diaspora. The book Pacific Art Niu Sila: The Pacific Dimension of Contemporary New Zealand (2002), edited by Sean Mallon and Pandora Fulimalo Pereira, presents a collection of essays on how specific media function with regard to Islander identity in New Zealand. Sarina Pearson’s chapter on Pacific film and photography discusses some of the mechanisms that people involved in those arts use in their work, including “irony and humor as a way of voicing political and post-colonial criticism” (2002, 175).
particular mechanism stems from subversive activities such as clowning, which has a 
long history of practice in the Pacific (Pearson 1999; Hereniko 1995). This use of 
performance also takes place in Tokelau and has extended to the Tokelauan diaspora in 
New Zealand (Thomas 1996, 96). As Allan Thomas explained, “Some faleaitu 
[improvised skits] contain predictable humor—veiled obscenities or double meanings—
but others develop specifically Tokelauan concerns such as those of the clash between the 
traditional world and modern ways” (1996, 93).

This kind of negotiation between the ways of the past and life in the present is 
important in identity formation and development in the diaspora because it enables 
individuals to reconcile some of the discrepancies between what their elders and 
ancestors experienced in the homeland and what they themselves face in the often urban 
sites of the diaspora. Indicating their own such fusion of the past with the present in New 
Zealand, for example, the Pacific Sisters, a collective of multimedia artists, stated: “We 
follow the ancient way of working from the environment. We get our inspiration from 
our immediate urban/media environment. We don’t stare at coconut trees—we stare at 
motorways” (quoted in Pearson 2002, 185). As Pearson suggested, diasporic 

Such a dizzying array of influences is also a common theme in Pacific Islands music 
and dance, as artists choose the tools that resonate most with their needs and the identities 
they wish to establish and nurture. Scholars April K Henderson and Kirsten Zemke-
White have presented detailed accounts of hip-hop in the Samoan diaspora and rap in 
diasporic communities in New Zealand, respectively. A common theme in their work is 
the idea that, rather than being “beaten over the head” by Western culture with such 
popular music forms, Pacific Islanders are selecting these forms because they share 
elements with long-standing Pacific Island performance practices, namely, the use of 
information-dense texts supported by dance, music, and visual art (Henderson 1999, 
2007; Zemke-White 2001, 2002). These elements allow for political commentary and 
activism that serve Pacific Islander needs and resonate with forms of social commentary 
that Pacific Islanders have been employing for centuries. Zemke-White added that 
“Pacific people have not only embraced and adapted pop music forms; they are also using 
them to celebrate indigenous and unique Pacific cultures, whether overtly through lyrics
or merely by personae and images” (2002, 128). As a clear example of this, the internationally renown music group Te Vaka stated that they celebrate Tokelauan culture by singing songs predominately in the Tokelauan language, which they believe is “a means of keeping the language alive as well as imparting, to the music, the rich colour and rhythm of the language itself” (Zemke-White 2002, 123).

Te Hiva: Dance and Bodily Writing

Another valuable physical representation of Pacific Islands knowledge is dance. Deirdre Sklar explained that “to speak of movement as a way of knowing implies that the way people move is as much a clue to who they are as the way they speak” (2001, 30), and this is apparent in Pacific dance. Discussing the key role that dance plays in the postcolonial agendas of Cook Islanders, Kalissa Alexeyeff argued, “Dance, because of its visual and affective immediacy, is a particularly productive arena for the performance and contestation of important personal and social identities. Dance is compelling because it communicates at affective and embodied levels as well as cognitive ones” (2009, 13).

In the case of Banaban dance, Katerina Martina Teaiwa wrote that it “illustrates a journey of learning, accepting, negotiating, and transforming I-Kiribati and other knowledges, forces, forms, and identities over the last one hundred and ten years of a tumultuous history” (2012, 87). Adrienne Kaeppler suggested that dance is also a means of understanding a community’s social organization, as danced compositions are repositories of aesthetic and social meaning that provide a window through which one can view the social structures that inform them and “the role these dances play in social cohesion” (1993, 49). In the Tongan context, one can observe the placement of performers within the dance troupe itself, with its hierarchies and social values, and see a microcosm of the society in which it exists (Kaeppler 1993, 58). Hoëm, Hovdhaugen, and Venen argued that Tokelauan song and dance performances also reveal the relationships working within such social structures, and they suggested that performances as a whole should be seen as “a running commentary on central values” (1992, 23).
Beyond social structures and the identities working within them, dance contains and transmits information about a community’s history, values, and everyday life. As Teaiwa demonstrated in her discussion of Banaban dance, “Dance becomes a choreographic instance in which the invisible links between past and present, ordinary life and extraordinary performance, memory and lived experience, converge and are illuminated” (2012, 82). She noted that “Banaban dancing . . . incorporates movements from all the cultures and places—the reservoir—that the community has encountered over centuries” and that “performances of Kiribati dance beyond the shores of its thirty-three islands . . . takes on meaning as extensions of that land and emplaced identity” (Teaiwa 2012, 75). Dance thus absorbs and reflects a community’s historical voyages through time and space, and dancing becomes a way of remembering the past and presenting the ever-developing identities that result from such a weaving of the past and the present. Susan Leigh Foster beautifully described this notion in her introduction to *Choreographing History*:

A body, whether sitting writing or standing thinking or walking talking or running screaming, is a bodily writing. Its habits and stances, gestures and demonstrations, every action of its various regions, areas, and parts—all these emerge out of cultural practices, verbal or not, that construct corporeal meaning. Each of the body’s moves, as with all writings, traces the physical fact of movement and also an array of references to conceptual entities and events. (1995, 3)

The activation of these bodily writings through physical practices such as singing and dancing is key to passing on certain types of information that cannot be transmitted through any other means. As Deidre Sklar explained, “The cultural knowledge that is embodied in movement can only be known via movement” (2001, 31).

This concept is particularly important in the Pacific Islands, where communities have stored significant cultural information in bodies and voices for centuries. In the introduction to her University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa course on “The Body and Pacific Studies,” Teaiwa told her students:

For centuries and especially prior to the arrival of the written word, people in the Pacific survived creatively in and through their bodies and oral traditions. Throughout the region human bodies are intimately connected to place, landscape, plant and animal life, and the spiritual realms. Bodies and their movements are also reflections of history, social, political, and cultural orders and are vehicles for the expression of identity and creativity. In Pacific
studies, where decolonization and indigenous epistemologies are central, it is crucial that we incorporate the body as both corporeal and literary device in our approaches to learning Oceania. (2009, 312–313)

**Music and Dance Practices as “Textbooks”**

As Teaiwa indicated and as Pacific Island cultures assert, music and dance are valid sources of knowledge and tools for learning this knowledge. The voices and bodies of past communities crafted texts and choreographed dances that serve as physical representations of culture and lived experience. Songs and dances carry this information from generation to generation and from place to place and are thus vessels for Pacific Islands knowledge and viable, comprehensive “textbooks” for learning. These “textbooks” cannot be replaced, only complemented, by their written equivalents. As Foster noted, “The facts as documented in any recorded discourses . . . do not a body’s meaning make. . . . They substantiate only bodily reaction” (1995, 8). She continued:

It is one thing to imagine those bodies of the past, and it is another to write about them. The sense of presence conveyed by a body in motion, the idiosyncrasies of a given physique, the smallest inclination of the head or gesture of the hand—all form part of a corporeal discourse whose power and intelligibility elude translation into words. Bodies’ movements may create a kind of writing, but that writing has no facile verbal equivalence. . . . But to construe bodies’ movements as varieties of corporeal writing is already a step in the right direction. Where bodily endeavors assume the status of forms of articulation and representation, their movements acquire a status and function equal to the words that describe them. (Foster 1995, 9)

Thus, such physical ways of knowing carry the same weight as literate ways of knowing. The latter cannot replace the physical in the process of learning.

While Foster was specifically referring to dance, this theory also applies to the production of music, as this is also a corporal task that involves a type of bodily writing. For instance, guitarists do not simply learn to think of finger placement on the frets and chord patterns, they learn to feel them, and singers do not simply memorize the lyrics to the songs they sing, they memorize the physical sensation of the words and pitches resonating through their bodies. Thus, music and dance practice and performance
together create a type of bodily writing that contributes to one’s understanding of the “textbooks.”

**Lumanaki Practice**

According to Ickes, Lumanaki excels in terms of song and dance practice and performance, and students benefit greatly from the accessibility of these activities despite the school’s struggles with language education (pers comm, 30 Jan 2012). All the elements that go into and surround performance practice form a second curriculum that remains at the heart of Lumanaki, and students and teachers spend a great deal of time learning and practicing *pehe ma fātele*. As the following description and discussion of a typical learning session reveal, all elements of song and dance practice combine to teach students valuable information not only about music and dance but also about their heritage and identity as Tokelauans.

After the students have warmed up with exercises like stretches and push-ups, the music and dance practice begins. The musicians—usually the adult men, though sometimes women will play if not enough men are present—take their places at the instruments, the most important being the *pōkihi* (box) drum (Thomas 1996, 24). Lumanaki’s *pōkihi* is a very large, hexagonal plywood box with an open bottom and a strip of corrugated metal in the open space beneath for resonance (see figure 3.1).² It can be played by a single person or by several people at once, with the leader providing the full rhythm while the others, depending on skill level, reinforce the strong beats. The resulting sound is powerful, and the drum’s distinctive rhythm drives each performance (example 3.1).

![Example 3.1. Pōkihi Rhythm](image)

To elaborate the *pōkihi*’s rhythm, another musician might play the *apa* (tin) (Thomas 1996, 24), which in Lumanaki’s case is a biscuit tin played with two sticks (see figure
3.1). The apa pattern is march-like, with rapid left-right strokes decorating the main pulse (example 3.2). Someone else might also play a similar elaborative rhythm on the pātē, a small wooden slit drum played with two sticks (see figure 3.2).

**EXAMPLE 3.2. Apa Rhythm**

The pōkihi and the apa form the core of the Tokelauan instrumental ensemble and are responsible for controlling the momentum that is characteristic of Tokelauan performances (Thomas 1996, 24).

With the help of these drums, practice often starts with drills to help students improve their dance technique and stamina. During one particular drill, the strong pōkihi rhythm—though sometimes played on the pātē instead of the pōkihi—leads the dancers as they practice the basic movements of the dance. All of the dancers bend slightly at the knees and mark the beat by slapping their thighs, and the boys stand with feet wide apart, while the girls sway their hips with feet close together (but not touching). The drill begins at a slow tempo, but after ten to fifteen seconds the percussion player calls out “lalo!” (“lower!”), signaling the dancers to bend their knees even more, and quickens the pace. By the second or third change, the students are usually giggling and groaning because of their sore legs, but the effort proves worthwhile when they finally get to the full dances and face rapidly increasing tempos and cultural expectations to lower their bodies significantly.

Once the drills are finished, students take their places for the first piece. If dance implements are necessary at any point during practice, students grab them and place them against the wall or on the floor behind all of the dancers. In Lumanaki’s performances, there are two primary implements, the foe (canoe paddle; see figure 3.3) and the hikaki (a representation of the kofe “bamboo fishing pole”), which for performances is usually a rod made from a long dowel (Patelesio, pers comm, 16 Feb 2012). Both represent actual
tools used in the atolls, and male dancers employ them during many of the pieces about fishing, one of the most important features of Tokelauan life.

Students divide into rows by gender, with the most experienced dancers standing in the *unu mua* (front line) of their respective gender groups. Positions within each row are determined by height, and the goal is to avoid “peaks and valleys” (Patelesio, pers comm, 6 Feb 2012). Whether the boys or girls stand in front depends on the type of piece they
FIGURE 3.2. Pūtē on stand. (Photo: C Tezuka, used with permission)
perform. During dances in which the boys use implements, for example, they stand in the front. Sometimes the youngest students form a mixed row and take the lead for a particular song that is geared toward dancers of their age and experience. Consequently, choreographed row changes between songs become a feature of performance.

Once the students are in place, one of the artistic directors sings the first phrase of the first piece to set the pitch and initial tempo and then calls out “lua!” to signal the beginning of the piece. Lua is the number two in the Tokelauan language, so this call is similar to the practice in Western music of counting out a measure before beginning a song. As Ickes explained, Tokelauan singers and dancers should already know where the tahi (one) is (pers comm, 30 Jan 2012). Sometimes the teachers also signal the beginning of a piece or a drill with the call “Kāmata!” (start), though this does not usually happen in performance.

Each piece is a combination of text (either sung or chanted); hand, arm, and head gestures that elaborate the text; and some sort of rhythmic accompaniment, either the distinctive rhythm played by the pōkihi and apa or a basic timekeeping tap on the pātē,
guide the singing and dancing. The singing may be either monophonic (comprising one voice part) or homophonic (comprising many voice parts that work together), and while the students usually stick to practiced vocal parts, performers are typically welcome to improvise a harmony based on what they are most comfortable singing and what fits their vocal capabilities (Ickes, pers comm, 30 Jan 2012). Vocal blend is not a high priority, so the resultant sound is often rich with individual voices that weave in and out of the group, affording a level of individuality in performance without sacrificing the primacy of the group as a whole. This can also be seen in the dances. While everyone in the *kauhiva* dances the same movements according to gender, and while these movements must meet basic technical criteria, the dance is ultimately molded by the characteristics of each dancer’s unique body and personality. One dancer might have a rigid technique, articulating each gesture with great precision, while another dancer glides through the motions. Still another might emphasize certain movements more than others. This heterogeneous assortment of physically expressed personalities creates an entertaining visual effect, particularly for those who know the dancers.

Another outlet for individual expression is the practice of calling out when overcome with joy, pride, inspiration, or excitement. These calls range from the girls’ freely inserted “*Saia!*” to any number of rhythmic calls—like “*Io! Io! Io!*”—that the men contribute to enliven the rhythmic feel of a piece. Though during performance the performers are encouraged to freely express themselves in this way when they feel moved, thus adding to the overall excitement of the group, the students at Lumanaki have to be careful not to be too loud inside the small school building. Direct corrections for this are infrequent if they occur at all, but a subtle control is in place: should someone make a call that is too loud for the space, everyone will look at him or her with a pained expression. The music teachers, however, constantly assess the students’ general performance, calling out things like “bend your knees!” and “clean it up!” when students start to lose form or to sing off pitch or off tempo. For students who are just learning the dances or who might be slipping in terms of technique, the teachers offer individual guidance by either verbally or physically correcting students’ mistakes or by modeling the proper form.
There are times when the students struggle with the material, usually in terms of expression. Because many of the students are not fluent speakers of the Tokelauan language and have never been to Tokelau to see some of the contexts in which the songs and dances developed, they often find it difficult to gain an understanding of what they are singing and dancing about. When the group is learning a new song and dance, the very first thing they do together is translate the text line by line, a task that can be pretty painful given the students’ inadequate language proficiency (Ickes, pers comm, 30 Jan 2012). Still, they go through the texts, talking about the meaning and the world from which it comes. The students then speak the text together several times before moving on to learning their parts. Afterward, they stand up, sing, and dance. Sometimes there are a few students who are unfamiliar with the dances, so they follow the movements of the more experienced students. Once everyone is comfortable with a new song and dance, the teachers often have to provide additional contextual information in order to help the students better express the meaning of the words.

Many of the *pehe ma fātele* that Lumanaki students learn mimic aspects of Tokelau life, such as fishing, of which many students lack firsthand experience. During one practice, Bonnie and Mas Patelesio had to explain to the students that the particular dance they were working on mimicked fishing for marlin, so their movements needed to reflect the care one must take when doing such a dangerous task. In this dance the students hold their hands out with palms down, forming a diamond between thumbs and forefingers, and then lower and raise them as though pushing the marlin down. At first, the students performed this motion very loosely, almost as if they were trying to pet the marlin, but once the teachers reminded them that such a careless action in real life could earn a fisherman a marlin bill right through the chest, the students quickly took care to maintain a firmer posture and technique. On another occasion, Bonnie encouraged the students to think of the most beautiful, amazing thing they have ever seen in order to elicit the expressiveness needed for a particular song and dance about such an experience. Still, the ability to link the Tokelau context to the students’ lives in Hawai‘i remains a challenge for Lumanaki teachers.
The teachers realize that their students live in a very different world from that of the Tokelau homeland and that they must therefore think about what the students are getting out of the school. Ickes explained that a big problem they have at Lumanaki is finding a way to make the school’s lessons relate to the kids’ everyday lives: “They’re learning bits and pieces, and a lot of it is probably just sitting there. . . . I don’t think they apply it to anything. There’s no context for them to apply it to. . . . that’s part of the problem. The songs, of course, are contextualized in a . . . totally different geographical sphere and environment. So what do we do? Do we write songs about them going to school, going to the store here, struggling with their homework, winning at a soccer game—in Tokelauan?” (pers comm, 30 Jan 2012). She continued, however, to suggest that what the students are really getting out of the school are lessons on who they are as Tokelauans and how they should socialize with others. According to her, “There’s a huge social aspect of the learning,” and all of the lessons combine to form a holistic understanding of what it means to be Tokelauan (pers comm, 30 Jan 2012).

Every time the students speak the Tokelauan language and participate in a Tokelau community with other young people, they take away a little bit more knowledge about their heritage. Even at the level of physically performing the songs and dances, most of which were composed and choreographed either in the homeland or by someone who has been there, the students are absorbing bodily information about Tokelau, its environment, and the lifestyle of people in the atolls. The lyrics teach them about the history of the atolls, the beauty of the land, and the structures that organize society, while the motions teach them about how people express themselves and how they perform vital tasks such as fishing for sustenance and distributing certain catches according to the customary system of inati (Huntsman and Hooper 1996, 77). The act of participating in a Tokelauan kauhiva teaches them about the social organization of Tokelauan communities, the importance of egalitarianism in an atoll environment, and the centrality of the group in Tokelauan culture. The fact that all of these lessons are learned in the company of others makes students’ time at Lumanaki all the more effective. As Ickes shared, “When you’re
learning it with the other kids . . . it raises the level, the prestige . . . for each child because, hey, there’s other kids doing it too” (pers comm, 30 Jan 2012).

The shared experience of Tokelauan culture becomes an important part of each student’s identity, with song and dance performance providing a safe outlet for the pride that inevitably results. Ickes said that she will never forget the first year and one of the students who wrote in his journal, “I’m proud to be a Tokelauan ‘cause now I know something about it!” (pers comm, 30 Jan 2012). The students especially connect to song and dance performance, which is one of the reasons why the teachers use it at the school. In Tokelau, such activities are limited to young adults and older adults, while children usually stand at the very back or along the sides—if they are even in the building in the first place. It is just not something that is done (Ickes, pers comm, 30 Jan 2012). Ickes believes, though, that song and dance performance is a very significant identity marker for people in the diaspora:

For us . . . here, and I think for many . . . people who are removed from their homeland . . . it’s an identity thing. . . . And I think song and dance is like a way that you could identify yourself with your culture . . . you’re expressing something that’s different from everybody else, but at the same time, I think there’s something about singing and dancing that doesn’t come off as . . . a negative kind of identity. . . . I think it’s a safe way to express your identity. And it’s also safe for the performer because there’s an entertainment and a side of performance that . . . is very different from saying, “I’m Tokelauan.” (pers comm, 30 Jan 2012)

Students learning the songs and dances are thus able to take their performances to the stage, regardless of who is in the audience, and proclaim their pride of heritage through their voices and bodies in a nonconfrontational way.

In addition to being a means of expressing Tokelauan identity, the performance also becomes a way of evaluating students’ progress in learning Tokelauan culture, heritage, and song and dance practices. If they can perform for others with pride in their heritage, precise technique, and enthusiasm for performance in a way that communicates with the audience and fully engages everyone present, then they have successfully taken away from Lumanaki the most valuable lessons of song and dance learning.

An analysis of a performance helps in understanding Lumanaki’s curriculum and the pehe ma fātele “textbooks” that implement it. The next chapter therefore examines one
particular performance in order to investigate both the content of the “textbooks” and the way that learning is displayed through performance.
Chapter 4
Making the Gathering Complete

Lumanaki’s administration, teachers, parents, and students devote a considerable amount of time and attention to performance preparation. The school has become known for its performances around the island of O‘ahu, making appearances at such events as the Wahiawa Pineapple Festival, the Dole Pineapple Plantation fair, First Friday at the Hawai‘i State Art Museum, University of Hawai‘i concerts, and countless community events such as birthday parties and funerals. The performers, their powerful voices, and their energetic delivery leave lasting impressions on audiences, and the performance experiences in turn leave lasting impressions on the students. In 2008, the school was invited to perform at the Tokelau Sports and Culture Tournament, also known as the Easter Tournament, in Wellington, New Zealand. Lumanaki won the perpetual trophy for “Best Overall Performance” (Ickes, pers comm, 10 Aug 2011), a significant achievement for a small, student kauhiva from the United States.

The students have time and time again proven their ability to take to the stage and succeed in performance, but there is much more to their success than the mastery of basic performance techniques. In this chapter, I examine one particular Lumanaki performance in order to assess the textual, musical, and extramusical elements involved in Tokelauan performance practice. This exploration takes a close look at a sample of the school’s pehe ma fātele “textbooks” to see what kinds of information these songs and dances contain and to determine how this information fits into Lumanaki’s pehe ma fātele curriculum and influences how teachers gauge student and curricular success. I argue that the performances Lumanaki cherish serve as final assessments of students’ progress, as they require the students to combine everything that they have learned about Tokelauan music, dance, culture, and values in pursuit of meaningful communication with everyone involved in the performance activity. Though the skillful execution of musical and
choreographic elements is still essential, the ultimate communicative event emerges from students’ shared experience, through song and dance, of being Tokelauan—with all of the cultural understanding and knowledge that such a task requires—rather than from the repertoire of songs and dances alone.

**Experiencing Matagia**

A key feature of Tokelauan performances, whether they be on the stage or on an athletic field, is matagia. Derived from matagi, the Tokelauan word for wind, matagia is an experience of great joy, pride, and inspiration during an activity (Ickes, pers comm, 30 Jan 2012; Patelesio, pers comm, 6 Feb 2012). As Thomas reported, it “is the inspiration to excel in certain fields, especially in the dance. But it has also the energy and physical properties of wind, like a tingling on the skin or the threshing energy of the fronds of the coconut palm” (1996, 44). As this statement indicates, matagia is not restricted to the realm of music and dance performance, and it is commonly experienced during sporting activities like football and cricket (Ickes, pers comm, 30 Jan 2012; Thomas 1996, 45). Matagia is contagious, as Thomas explained; “One dancer will ‘catch’ the state of excitement from another; it may spread through the dancing group, and affect the audience who may call out in support of the dancers” (1996, 42).

In performance, Thomas continued, “Fakamatagia and related states are a form of excitement or ecstasy in the dance which may be seen as the ultimate fulfillment of the performance event” (1996, 42). Ethnomusicologist Jane Freeman Moulin explained that in Polynesian performances, “essence and meaning lie in an expanded realm that is neither music nor dance per se” (2011, 2). All of the “structured and unstructured sounds—an aurality that involves both expected, scripted action and unplanned, spontaneous emotive reaction”—combine in what she refers to as the “noisiness” of performance (Moulin 2011, 2). In the Tokelauan performance context, this “noisiness” is valued as both an indicator and an elicitor of matagia, and without this “noisiness,” performances seem lackluster. Though certain elements of Tokelauan pehe ma fātele, such as the tempo, are designed and manipulated to increase the likelihood of matagia
(Thomas 1996, 44), they do not ensure it. It is the combination of music and dance with cultural meaning that creates excitement. Matagia’s connection to the wind provides a deeper understanding of this phenomenon. As Thomas put it: “Memories . . . are fundamental to song, and are themselves within the domain of matagi, the wind” (1996, 45). Hooper and Huntsman stated that “Matagi carries connotations of messages, news and memories, often of an intense and personal kind. It also connotes (rather like the English “breath of life”) vigour, activity, even life itself” (1991, v). Because of matagia’s pivotal role as “the ultimate fulfillment of the performance event,” I will return to it throughout this chapter.

*Lumanaki Performance Practice*

Several important characteristics define Lumanaki’s performances and make lasting impressions on their audiences. First, almost everyone in the Lumanaki community who is in attendance—from young children who have not yet started dancing with the group to the community’s elders—joins the dancers on stage (see figure 4.1). These additional performers stand behind the dancers, and male community members often join the percussion ensemble, assisting the leader on the pōkihi or playing the elaborative apa or pātē. Lumanaki’s artistic directors, Bonnie and Mas Patelesio, usually lead the ensemble as guitarist and pōkihi leader, respectively.

The second distinctive feature of Lumanaki performances is that everyone sings: the dancers, the musicians, the community members standing at the rear of the performance area—everyone. Because the text is the most important part of Tokelauan songs, powerful vocal delivery is imperative. As Moulin explained, “Polynesian cultures admire full, strong voices. . . . Vocal blend and a uniform, controlled tone are not the governing aesthetics on islands where group participation, sonic power, and individuality within the group are all more important than a homogenous sound” (2011, 16). Unlike performing groups in Tokelau and New Zealand (Thomas 1996), Lumanaki’s kauhiva is very small, consisting of only fifteen to twenty dancers, and the students tire very quickly when trying to produce the energy and volume required for Tokelauan performances. With this
in mind, teachers are constantly seeking ways to help the students warm up their voices and improve their projection, and they encourage students’ parents to practice the pehe so they can support their children during performances.

A final consideration of performance is costuming (figure 4.2). The girls wear conservative, short-sleeved dresses called kofu (clothing), which stop at or near the ankle.
In the past, these dresses have been royal blue, like the background of the Tokelauan flag, as well as red, white, green, and other colors. Over these dresses, the girls wear titi (grass skirts) made from the bark of the Kanava tree (*C. subcordata*) or the leaves of the laufala, or pandanus plant (*P. tectorius*) (Patelesio, pers comm, 16 Feb 2012). Boys wear similar titi over their shorts. Dancers wear pale (head adornments) that surround the head and usually consist of short pandanus leaves or coconut leaves, and girls wear hei (adornments placed in the hair), which are traditionally flowers. Dancers may also wear fau (lei). Accessories include taulima (accessories for the hands/arms); tauvae (accessories for the ankles); and kahoa (necklaces) with tifa (mother of pearl) centerpieces (Patelesio, pers comm, 16 Feb 2012). Finally, all dancers practice and perform barefoot. Parents and teachers do not wear costumes but usually try to coordinate their attire so that everyone wears the same Lumanaki color, either blue or black. Dressed for the occasion, the entire group takes to the stage to present their *pehe ma fātele*.

On 14 December 2011, Lumanaki’s parent organization, Te Taki, hosted a reception for the visiting Tokelau Head of State, Ulu o Tokelau Aliki Faipule Foua Toloa, and other Tokelau representatives. The event started at 6:00 PM and lasted approximately four hours. In attendance that evening were Tokelauan elders and community members from the Hawai‘i diaspora, including both Lumanaki families and families not affiliated with the school, as well as Tokelauans from New Zealand. Also present were US Congressman Eni F H Faleomavaega, representative for American Sāmoa, and a handful of other non-Tokelauan individuals. Because of the complexity of the situation surrounding Olohega’s history and political status, it important to note that a perceptible tension filled the air at this event. Some people in the Tokelauan community in Hawai‘i do not share Lumanaki’s beliefs and sentiments regarding the atoll’s history and status and therefore choose not to participate in Lumanaki (Patelesio, pers comm 6 Feb 2012). Further, Olohega currently falls under Congressman Faleomavaega’s jurisdiction as part of American Sāmoa, so his presence further added to the tension. Despite concerns that political cards might be played at this gathering—and subtle comments were indeed made about the Olohega situation—Lumanaki faced this potentially divisive situation and followed the opening prayer with a performance of five *pehe ma fātele*. 
FIGURE 4.2. Dancers display their costumes during Lumanaki’s performance at the Bishop Museum’s Pacific Hall opening. (Photo: C Steiner, Honolulu, Hawai‘i, 21 Sept 2013)


Analysis of the Tokelauan Textbooks

As an account of Lumanaki’s performance on 14 December 2011, the following analysis seeks to determine those elements that are essential to making a performance event complete and even outstanding. (See appendix A for details on the recordings used for this analysis.)

Te Tinifu Tokelau (The Children of Tokelau)

The first piece Lumanaki performed during the reception was “Te Tinifu Tokelau,” a tuku (end dance) (Thomas 1996, 151), composed by Ioane Teao. Ickes noted that this particular tuku “can also function as huiunu,¹ or transitional chant to move from one type of dance to another” (pers comm, 30 Jan 2012). For the Ulu’s reception, however, “Te Tinifu Tokelau” served as the opening number because of the meaning of its text. Ickes explained that while some Tokelauan songs have secondary layers of meaning, as is common in Polynesian texts (Deittrich, Moulin, and Webb 2011, 11), others, like this piece, are more direct (Ickes, pers comm 30 Jan 2012). “Te Tinifu Tokelau” is a call to the children of Tokelau to work toward a steadfast future:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Te Tinifu Tokelau</th>
<th>Children of Tokelau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call: Te tinifu e</td>
<td>Call: Children (of Tokelau)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: O</td>
<td>Response: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call: Te tinifu e</td>
<td>Call: Children (of Tokelau)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: O</td>
<td>Response: Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aue te tinifu Tokelau
Tō lumanaki, fau ke tū

Aue, kaea, kaea, sahi!
Kaea, kaea, sahi!
Kaea, kaea, sahi!
Kaea, kaea, sahi!

Oh, children of Tokelau
Your future, you must build it to withstand
Oh, of course, of course, sahi!
Of course, of course, sahi!
Of course, of course, sahi!
Of course, of course, sahi!

Text and translation courtesy of Betty Ickes.

The piece begins with an unaccompanied call-and-response between the pōkihi leader and the dancers. The pōkihi, apa, and pātē then join the singers as they deliver the
primary text, which begins with the line “Aue te tinifu Tokelau” (see appendix A). The male and female parts separate for the last four lines, as the males call out a syncopated “Si! Si! Si!,” and then the full text, excluding the call-and-response opening, repeats two more times. The dancers elaborate the text with hand and arm gestures throughout the piece, but lower-body movements change with each repetition. During the opening call-and-response and the first presentation of the primary text, the dancers’ lower bodies remain still, while in the second and third statements of the primary text, the dancers perform the gender-specific movements described in chapter 3, bending their knees further to achieve a progressively lower stance for each repetition. In addition to these movements, during the second and third statements, the dancers turn in place 90 degrees to their right every time the female dancers say the “-hi” in “Sahi!” By doing so, the dancers turn away from the audience and then return, which Thomas described as typical of tuku: “In the choreography of the tuku is seen one of its most interesting features. Movements may be included here which would not be seen in the fātele-proper, such as the dancers turning their backs on the audience and sticking their backsides out. In these movements is seen the ‘after-dance’ aspect of the tuku. It is a wilder dance, a complement to the fātele. Tuku means to finish or stop and the small dance provides a rousing end to the performance of a fātele” (1996, 151). While the Lumanaki dancers did not stick out their backsides during this particular performance, they did execute the choreographed turns that are characteristic of tuku.

In this tuku, the performers present the text as heightened speech, gliding between notes of indefinite pitch; Thomas noted that this “musical setting of the words in general maintains the pattern of accent of the spoken language” (1996, 67). Though the pitches are not exactly the same each time a word or phrase is repeated, the melodic shape is very important (Patelesio, pers comm, 6 Feb 2012). For example, the word “kaea” is consistently divided between two quarter notes—one per syllable, as the “ae” grouping forms a diphthong—with a considerable drop in pitch between the two (appendix A, measures 9–16, 23–30, 37–44). The higher pitch emphasizes the first syllable, and a large drop to the second syllable adds to the effect. In addition to the melodic shape, the vocal range in which it is delivered is also important. Patelesio explained that the singers must use a range above their normal speaking voice in order for their voices to carry; indeed,
Making the Gathering Complete

in some of the other pieces, the students’ voices become inaudible as they move to lower ranges (see, for example, appendix E, measures 14–16). More than random shouts, the vocal parts are intentionally crafted to reflect the nuances of the Tokelauan language, to emphasize certain syllables, and to interact with the rhythm of the pōkihi.

The rhythmic structure of this piece draws from the basic pōkihi rhythm introduced in chapter 3, but the meter creates a unique effect. During the delivery of the lines “Aue te tinifū Tokelau/Tō Lumanaki, fau ke tū,” the meter changes to $\frac{4}{4} + \frac{2}{4}$, creating a unique feel for those familiar with the basic pōkihi rhythm (see appendix A, measures 3–5, 17–21, 31–37). Choosing to represent the metric division this way in the transcription makes sense for three reasons: (1) the basic pōkihi rhythm, which consists of four beats, serves as a recognizable unit in Tokelauan songs; (2) the two extra beats allow for an emphasis of the text through an alignment of words and drum strokes on the quarter-note pulse; and (3) the meter remains in $\frac{4}{4}$ time during the delivery of the repeated line “Kaea, kaea, sahi” (see appendix A, measures 9–17, 23–31, 37–45). The pōkihi leads the group through these transitions, and the apa and pātel elaborates on the structural rhythm. In this particular piece, the apa sometimes plays a dotted-eighth-note–sixteenth-note pattern that mimics the longer pōkihi pattern, thus emphasizing this structure even further.

A very important icon of Tokelauan pehe ma fātele is an ever-increasing rhythm.

Thomas explained:

The acceleration . . . that the pōkihi leads is a controlled upward movement of tempo to two, three, or occasionally four times the opening speed. The attainment of speed per se is not a primary objective in this acceleration; what is valued is the release of excitement in the fātele, achieved by raising the pitch, increasing the volume, greater emphasis within the dance, and by accelerating tempo. (1996, 29)

Lumanaki’s performance of “Te Tinifu Toklau” at the Ulu’s reception did not quite double in tempo, as it only increased from approximately 160 to 225 beats per minute. This smaller increase is likely due to two factors. First, Lumanaki songs are much shorter than those performed in Tokelau and New Zealand because of the logistics involved in preparing a group of children and teenagers for performance.² By limiting the length of the pieces, the teachers ensure that the students know what to expect in terms of song length and that they do not tire before the end of the performance (Ickes, pers comm, 30
The students only get to practice together once a week at most, so it is difficult for them to learn extended performance techniques and to build their stamina. The second factor that likely contributed to the smaller tempo increase as well as the almost complete lack of excited calls from students during this first piece was the mixed company at the reception (Patelesio, pers comm, 6 Feb 2012). All but one of the calls came from the music directors, who were attempting to enliven the performance. As Patelesio expressed it, the performance was acceptable but not stunning, likely due at least in part to the political and social tensions that inevitably filled the air that evening (pers comm, 6 Feb 2012). As the performance continued, the energy noticeably increased, but not to the level that marks an outstanding performance.

Despite social tensions, the students satisfactorily executed the musical and choreographic techniques of “Te Tinifu Tokelau,” which are very closely related to those practiced in Tokelau and in the New Zealand diaspora. Through the physical production of sound and movement, the students learned about these elements of performance practice and connected to the larger Tokelauan community.

**Ko te Fatu (The Rock)**

The second *pehe ma fātele* selection for the evening was “Ko te Fatu,” a two-part piece consisting of an opening hymn-like section and a *fātele* section (see appendixes B and C). Ickes described the piece as “a collective *fātele* from Olohega initially sung by Tokelauans from Olohega in the Tuvalu language” (pers comm, 30 Jan 2012). While the term *fātele* refers to dance in general, in this case it refers to a specific type of dance characterized by accelerating tempo, pitch modulations, and increasingly intensified dancing. *Fātele* originally developed in Tuvalu and have since spread throughout what Thomas called “the *Fātele Region,*” which includes Kiribati, Rotuma, Tokelau, Tuvalu, and Wallis and Futuna, underscoring a history of intra-Pacific borrowing and exchange in the region (1996, 133–134). Bonnie and Mas Patelesio translated the text into Tokelauan, and the school performed the piece in the 2008 Tokelau Sports and Culture Tournament.

The introduction to “Ko te Fatu” is designed, as Ickes noted, “to set the tone of a hymn being sung in church, alluding to the religious nature of the song” (pers comm, 30 Jan 2012).
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Jan 2012). The text comprises three couplets, and the last lines of the second and third couplets are identical:

**Ko te Fatu (Introduction)**

Ko te Fatu nae hē amanakia  
E tufuga faufale

Kua kavea ma fatu  
Fatu tilumanu e pito ki luga

Kite Eheta na e tu mānumālo  
Fatu tulimanu e pito ki luga

---

**The Rock**

The rock that was ignored (discarded  
By the builders

Has become the rock  
That is now the cornerstone of the most high

To the victory of Easter  
The cornerstone of the most high

---

Text and translation courtesy of Betty Ickes.

As mentioned in chapter 2, Christianity is very important to the Lumanaki community, and religious texts such as this one feature prominently in the songs and dances that lie at the heart of Lumanaki’s activities. This is not unique to Lumanaki. As Huntsman and Hooper stated: “To be a Tokelau person is to be a Christian person. Christian rituals are part of everyday life: morning and evening devotions are held at home or in church, grace precedes any meal, meetings always open and usually close with prayer, speeches are larded with references to Christian homilies, and biblical passages inspire song. On the Sabbath, virtually everyone congregates in the churches morning and afternoon to worship. In accordance with the command of the Almighty, after six days of labor all Tokelau rests” (1996, 92). At the Ulu’s reception, someone noted that, indeed, should your ship arrive in the atolls on a Sunday, you will find yourself spending another night onboard because of the Sunday work restrictions. This strict adherence to the Christian faith—Catholicism on Nukunonu and Protestantism on Atafu and Fakaofo—dates back to the mid-nineteenth century when missionaries first introduced Christianity to the atolls and the Tokelauan people adopted it as their own (Hooper and Huntsman 1996, 92–93). Lumanaki’s emphasis on Christianity and Christian values therefore comes directly from a long history of devotion in the atolls. By teaching students pehe ma fātele like “Ko te Fatu,” Lumanaki ties students both to their heritage and to Tokelauan communities in the homeland and the diaspora. Each couplet of the text is set to an eight-measure, syllabic melodic phrase in the key of C Major (see appendix B). Though most syllables are...
delivered on the quarter-note pulse, the first two phrases begin with a half note, the last syllable of each phrase is typically delivered as a half note or longer, and eighth notes frequently occur on the third beat of a measure to add a rhythmic push toward the end of the phrase. Importantly, however, measures 13 and 21 do not follow this last convention. In measure 13, the first syllable of “fatu” (rock) is held for all three beats, which combines with the second syllable’s two beats to give this focal term signifying Jesus’s foundational role in Christianity the longest duration in the entire piece. In measure 21, the eighth-note pair occurs on the second instead of the third beat in order to accommodate the word “mānumālō.” An eighth-note pair on the third beat would have placed the stressed on “nu,” which, according to the macrons, should be the least stressed syllable in the word.

The melody of this piece, with a range from a to g⁴, is predominantly stepwise but does include skips at the beginning of each couplet, at the end of the first phrase in the first couplet, and near the end of the second phrase in the first couplet. The first phrase of each couplet begins on scale degree 3, drops to 1, skips up to 4, and then steps back down to 1. The second phrase of each couplet steps from scale degree 5, to 4, and then to 3, and in the second and third, the melody steps back up to scale degree 4 and then moves gradually back down to 1. This combination of skips followed by multiple steps downward creates a series of peaks and descents.

The overall harmonic form of the piece is AA’A’, which can be further broken down as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
A & A' & A' \\
\text{a: } & (V_7) & I & I_7 & IV & (V_7) & I & I_7 & IV & (V_7) & I & I_7 & IV \\
\text{b: } & V & V_7 & I & b': V & V_7 & V & V_7 & I & b': V & V_7 & V & V_7 & I \\
\end{array}
\]

In this particular performance of “Ko te Fatu,” the singers split into three parts: melody, sung by females; a high harmony, also sung by females; and a low harmony, sung by males. This vocal ensemble is accompanied by guitar, which plays open chords in a predominantly sixteenth-note pattern with muted notes on the second beat.³

Compared to that of other pieces in the school’s repertoire, the tempo of this introduction does not increase significantly, only changing by approximately four beats
per minute. The pātē marks the triple-meter pulse and elaborates the beat before each new line of text, while the powerful pōkihi and resonant apa are notably absent. Also significant, because of its contrast with other pieces in the school’s repertoire, is the fact that all of the dancers remain still throughout the introduction as though they truly are singing a hymn in church. These musical qualities and the dancers’ behavior abruptly change, however, for the presentation of the fātele section. The guitarist stops playing, and the pōkihi and apa join the pātē to form the powerful rhythmic pulse that is characteristic of Tokelauan pehe ma fātele. This pulse is indeed the life of the ensemble, pumping energy through the entire kauhiva as it pushes the fātele section of the piece to its quick-tempo, high-pitched, low-to-the-ground climax, a strong and effective contrast to the piece’s hymnlike introduction.

The fātele portion of the text is almost identical to that of the introduction, providing a primary link between the two sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ko te Fatu (Fātele)</th>
<th>The Rock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ko te Fatu</td>
<td>The rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nae hē amanakia</td>
<td>That was ignored (discarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E tufuga faufale</td>
<td>By the builders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kua kavea</td>
<td>Has become</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma fatu tulimanu</td>
<td>A cornerstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E pito, e pito ki luga</td>
<td>That is of the most high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Text and translation courtesy of Betty Ickes.

The fātele section begins, like the introduction, in the key of C Major and ranges from g to g¹. The three couplets are delivered as call-and-response between adult males and the rest of the performers. In the first two couplets, adult males deliver the first line in unison, with the melody beginning on g, and then the rest of the group responds in unison. In the third couplet, however, the adult males join the rest of the group to sing the phrase “E pito, e pito ki luga” in two-part harmony. A stepwise melody—beginning on scale degree 1, moving up to 5 for the second “pito,” and ending on 3—gradually pushes the text up (ki luga) to melodically emphasize the word pito, which in this case is the superlative “most” (Office of Tokelau Affairs 1986, 270). This is the highest pitch in the
piece, and it only appears one other time during the second line of the second couplet. While the call-and-response phrases favor quarter notes and eighth notes, this final phrase consists almost entirely of half notes, drawing further attention to the text (example 4.1).

**EXAMPLE 4.1. Musical Setting of “E pito, e pito ki luga”**

Because this final line ends on scale degree 3 and not on 1, the section sounds unresolved. After a repeat of the text in the same key, the singers pause for a nine-measure segment during which the young males call out “Si! Si! Si!” The unresolved melody and the rhythmic calls from the young males push the piece forward as the tempo quickly increases and the key modulates up a minor third to E♭ Major. The singers then present the full text twice, skip the “Si!” section, modulate up another minor third to the key of G♭ Major, and then present an energetic 18-measure “Si!” section before the percussion ensemble concludes the piece.

An important feature of Tokelauan fātele occurs in measures 15–16, 39–40, and 71–72 (appendix C). In these measures, one or more adult males create bridges between song segments by either continuing to sing between text repetitions or beginning to sing the repeat of the verse over a measure before the other singers. According to Thomas, these “melodic connections between one line and the next are an indispensable feature of fātele singing. This improvised vocal ornament [leads] from the final note of one phrase to the first note of the following one in the initial slow section of the fātele. . . . Melodic connection ‘keeps the fātele alive’ by making continuous the four line verse” (1996, 83). In this particular fātele, the bridges occur between repetitions of the full text rather than between individual lines.4

The tempo increase explained above is a major characteristic of Tokelauan fātele. In this particular piece, the tempo more than doubles, increasing from approximately 118 to 280 beats per minute. Further, the acceleration during the first text presentation is
significantly less than the acceleration that occurs during the last. Compare the first segment’s change of approximately 12 beats per minute over 16 measures to the last segments change of approximately 70 beats per minute over 32 measures. Taking into account the fact that the last segment comprises twice as many measures as the first, the acceleration difference between the two is approximately 23 beats per minute. This difference reveals the building excitement that is one of the most prominent characteristics of fātele (Thomas 1996, 31). Indeed, the final measures of “Si!” account for the greatest tempo increase in the entire piece.

This tempo acceleration is driven by the pōkihi, as the entire percussion group injects energy into the performance. The pōkihi leads with its basic rhythm, the apa elaborates with variations on the rhythm presented in chapter 3, and the pātē, from what can be heard on this recording, elaborates with at least an eighth-note pattern on the second through third beats of each measure during the faster segments. Each instrument improvises rhythms throughout the piece, but the most common places for improvisation are (1) the measures in which the phrase “Ma fatu tulimanu” begins (first two segments only; see appendix C, measures 24, 48); (2) the third, fifth, and seventh measures of the “Si!” sections (see appendix C, measures 32–40, 88–102); (3) the measures in which the phrase “E pito, e pito ki luga” occurs (third and fourth segments only; see appendix C, measures 52–54, 67–71); and (4) the second-to-last measure of the piece (see appendix C, measure 103). In most cases, the improvisations emphasize the text, and rhythmic density generally increases throughout the piece.

Once again, the students joined the adult community members in a skillful performance of a Tokelauan pehe ma fātele. In addition to this musicological and choreographic connection to the homeland, the students also delivered and engaged with the meaning of a text that ties them to the history of Christianity in the atolls and its importance to Tokelauans to this day.

Tautai o te Moana o Tokelau (Fishermen of the Seas of Tokelau)

The third piece that Lumanaki performed for the Ulu’s reception was “Tautai o te Moana o Tokelau” by Lumanaki’s own Johnathan Pedro (see appendix D). Ickes explained that
“this tafooe [dance with paddle implements] compares a regular fisherman with a skilled fisherman who has passed the rigors of the Kaukumete curriculum of Tinilau—one of Tokelau’s beloved figures of legendary repute. Its lesson for Tokelauans is to become the best and most skilled at anything you want to be; by doing that, the foundation of your actions [will be] firm and unshaken” (pers comm, 30 Jan 2012). The choice of fishing as a theme for this pehe ma fātele is not arbitrary. Huntsman and Hooper very clearly expressed just how important fishing is in Tokelau culture:

In Tokelau, everyone is interested, if not obsessed, with fishing, from children just old enough to play in shallows around the village overturning rocks to collect gobies and other small fish, right through to the oldest and most infirm men—repositories, many of them, of arcane knowledge and fishing lore—who totter to the shore to welcome fishing parties and hear the latest fishing news. . . . Fish are important food in Tokelau, perhaps even the staple food. Fish also figure prominently in folklore and hospitality; fishing is central to male prowess and accomplishment and the focus of a good deal of customary etiquette; and, overwhelmingly, it is the constant topic in the ongoing discourse of village life. (1996, 22–23)

“Tautai o te Moana o Tokelau” fits into this picture of a culture deeply involved in fishing activity and its related discourse. As is typical of pehe ma fātele, the use of fishing imagery in the text conveys a deeper message about improving oneself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tautai o te Moana o Tokelau</th>
<th>Fishermen of the Seas of Tokelau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tautai o te moana o Tokelau</td>
<td>Fishermen of the seas of Tokelau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ika o te moana e fakanau</td>
<td>The fish of the sea multiply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuku atu e hē tau</td>
<td>(When you) put it out there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ko ona lago e hē tau</td>
<td>Its placement is not sturdy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuku atu e hē tau</td>
<td>(When you) put it out there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ko ona lago e hē tau</td>
<td>Its placement is not sturdy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tautai fakatafaga o Tokelau</td>
<td>Master Fishermen of the seas of Tokelau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malamala Kaukumete o Tinilau</td>
<td>Who have accomplished the Kaukumete rigors of Tinilau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tōkai atu kua tau</td>
<td>(When you) put it out there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ko ona lago kua mau</td>
<td>The placement (of your fishing tools) is firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tōkai atu kua mau</td>
<td>(When you) put it out there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ko ona lago kua mau</td>
<td>The placement (of your fishing tools) is firm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Text and translation courtesy of Betty Ickes.
In terms of cultural education, pieces like this one connect Lumanaki students to their homeland through culture-specific themes and details. Many of the students have never been to Tokelau, so they do not have firsthand experience of the intense devotion to fishing that Huntsman and Hooper described. Instead, they learn *pehe ma fātele* like this piece, with their teachers bridging the gap between the Tokelauan experience in the atolls and the students’ lives in Hawai‘i through detailed explanations of texts and dance gestures. This often leads to a discussion of Tokelau’s geography and fishing techniques, a lesson that is far less painful than language drills and homework because of the students’ love of performing (Ickes, pers comm, 30 Jan 2012).

The text is divided into two sections, the first addressing the inexperienced fisherman and the second addressing the fisherman who has devoted his life to the rigors of training. Each section contains three couplets. The entire group sings the first couplet in unison on a single pitch and then splits into two groups—the young males and everyone else—to deliver the last two couplets as heightened speech in call-and-response form, with the young males responding to the larger group’s calls. As with the other pieces, the entire text is presented multiple times, in this case four times (appendix D, measures 68–96). For the first two presentations, the sung pitch is b. After the group finishes this section, the music stops, and the male dancers raise their *foe* above their heads as the entire group calls out “*Tafoe o!*” The piece then resumes for the final two repetitions, this time with a sung pitch of d¹, indicating an upward modulation of a minor third. The heightened speech segments form descending lines when they begin directly on beat three and arcs when they begin on the pickup to beat three (appendix E, measures 8–17, 25–33, 43–51, and 59–67; see example 4.2). These melodic shapes typically span about an octave and do not significantly differ over the course of the piece.

The rhythmic structure of the piece, set in common time, is once again based on the basic *pōkihi* rhythm, and in my recording, it sounds as though the *apa* follows the *pōkihi*’s rhythm fairly closely. The *pāte*’s detailed rhythm stands out from the other percussive sounds for the first time, and one can hear its sixteenth- and eighth-note elaborations clearly in measures 25–32 and 60–94 (see appendix D). Though not all of the *pāte*’s activity is audible, the transcription of these measures provides an idea of the instrument’s role in the percussion trio. The improvisation of rhythmic patterns discussed
in the previous analysis returns in this piece, and once again, the patterns of different rhythmic parts align at times. For instance, the piece’s tempo increases throughout the performance from approximately 112 to 287 beats per minute; just before measure 51, the pōkihi and apa join together to emphasize the tempo burst leading into the next presentation of the text (see appendix D). In measure 63, they align once more to mark the progression from the second to the third couplet. Additionally, after the final delivery of the text, the dance intensifies during a 29-measure rhythmic section that concludes the piece, and the syncopated rhythm in the male calls seen and heard in the previous piece during the concluding section (appendix C, measures 88–102) appears again during the male dancers’ repeated rhythmic calls of “Si!” (see appendix D, measures 85–92).

As a tafe, “Tautai o te Moana o Tokelau” is a male-only dance; the female dancers sit on the floor behind the young men. Thomas described this type of dance as “a distinctive dance of the old tradition in which the paddle is used in certain drill movements which do not appear to illustrate the song text” (1996, 123). During the final rhythmic section, the young men perform some of their most active dance movements, including quick 90-degree turns to the left and then to the right and a series of movements in which they turn to face the side of the performance space, point their fo'e to their left and toward the floor at approximately 45-degree angles, act as though tapping their fo'e on the floor three times, and then jump in the air, pulling their right knees upward to waist level or higher. During practice, the teachers drill the young men in this last move,
as the students sometimes have trouble jumping and lifting their knees high enough. The
dance mastery required for a seamless performance of this tafe is reminiscent of the
rigorous training described in the text.

**Te Moana (The Sea)**

Unlike the rigorous “Tautai o te Moana o Tokelau,” the final piece Lumanaki performed
during the opening presentation that evening was the playful tuku “Te Moana” (see
appendix E). A Lumanaki favorite, this piece’s lightheartedness and easy-to-learn
choreography make it fun for anyone to try, so the group frequently invites audience
members to the stage to perform alongside Lumanaki dancers in a “Te Moana” finale
(Ickes, pers comm 30 Jan 2012; see figure 4.3). The song’s text taunts deep-sea fish to
come to the surface and bite (Ickes, pers comm, 30 Jan 2012):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Te Moana</th>
<th>The Sea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Te moana</td>
<td>The sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te moana, te moana, te moana e</td>
<td>The sea, the sea, the sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te moana, te moana, te moana e</td>
<td>The sea, the sea, the sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka tiu tiu te matau i lalo o te moana e</td>
<td>I lower my hook and explore the depths of the sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aue</td>
<td>Oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai la, kai la, kai la ka ika o te moana e</td>
<td>Bite, bite, bite oh fish of the sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aue</td>
<td>Oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai la, kai la, kai la ka ika o te moana e</td>
<td>Bite, bite, bite oh fish of the sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuku:</td>
<td>Finale:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aue hī te atu atu</td>
<td>Oh, pull the atu (skipjack tuna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hau hau mate</td>
<td>Come, come, here is your ending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Text and translation courtesy of Betty Ickes.

The singers deliver the text in heightened speech and in two distinct sections (the main
section of the piece and the finale). The first section, set in common time, includes three
presentations of the text, while the second section alternates between 5/4 and 4/4 meter and
includes four presentations of its respective text. The overall shape of the heightened
speech delivery is once again very important, and several patterns emerge. The phrase “te moana” frequently forms a more or less stepwise, downward progression; the line “Ka tiu tiu te matau i lalo o te moana e” mostly descends as the fisherman in the song lowers his matau (hook) into the ocean to explore its depths; and the phrase “kai la” always involves a quick downward skip, like a fish biting down on the matau (see examples 4.3–4.5).

Similarly, the word “hī” in the tuku section lasts two whole beats, the longest note duration in the piece. This setting musically illustrates the effort of pulling in a catch and is consistent with the vowel lengthening indicated by the macron.

In the first section of the piece, adult males introduce the text each time, calling out “Te moana!” and sustaining the call until at least two beats after the group has begun the next line. For the “Kai la” lines, the males and females split from one another, and the females deliver the text while the males provide the usual syncopated “Si!” Additionally, in this particular performance, the music directors and another adult male occasionally
contributed syncopated calls of “Io!” to the vocal and rhythmic texture, and female performers cheered and cried out “Saia!” in anticipation of each new repetition of the text. These energetic contributions and the accelerating tempo to which they are frequently a response, in this case nearly doubling in speed throughout the course of the entire piece, are indicative of the enthusiasm felt during the song as well as the extent to which the group’s excitement increased between “Te Tinifu Tokelau,” the first piece of the evening, and “Te Moana.”

In the first section the pōkihi and apa parts very much resemble those heard in the other pieces, following the basic pōkihi rhythm with occasional pattern changes that emphasize the text and line breaks (see, for example, appendix E, measures 38, 46–48). The instruments’ activity in the second section, however, is much more complex. Right
away, the meter alternates every two measures between $\frac{5}{4}$ and $\frac{4}{4}$. The regular pōkihi pattern is present, but it is no longer the most prominent rhythmic unit. Instead, a quarter-note pulse played by all percussion instruments stands out and highlights the line “Hau hau mate,” which invites the fish to its “end.” Though other metric divisions might make sense in terms of the rhythmic pattern, I have chosen this particular division because it makes the most sense with the element Tokelauans privilege in all pehe ma fātele—the text.

“Te Moana” concluded Lumanaki’s performance at the reception, and the group called out to the audience, “O fanatu e,” which means “We have given, now we pass it to you” (Ickes, pers comm, 30 Jan 2012). According to Ickes, “In a po hiva [night of dance competition], when one group is done performing, they declare this by passing the opportunity to the next kauhiva” (pers comm, 30 Jan 2012). Thus, Lumanaki indicated the end of the performance and welcomed the next part of the evening’s proceedings.

**Mānaia te Fakatahiga Nei (Beautiful, this Gathering)**

Lumanaki’s performance ended with “Te Moana,” but it was not the last piece performed that night. After the Ulu’s four-hour presentation on Tokelau’s current affairs and the subsequent question-and-answer section, Lumanaki invited everyone in attendance that evening to perform a closing fātele. In Ickes’s spoken introduction to the piece, “Mānaia te Fakatahiga Nei” (see appendix F), she connected comments made during the reception with the performance: “So we’re gonna get together. . . . I know [one of the attendees] said that in . . . Seattle he felt really wonderful to be with Tokelauans there and to sing and dance Tokelau. So . . . that’s what we’re gonna do right now as a farewell. . . . [If] we can all get up please. And now Bonnie and Mas . . . are gonna lead us in a song” (field recording, 14 Dec 2011). Gathered together for a Tokelauan purpose, and despite the tensions mentioned above, everyone united at the end of the night to express their unity and identity through a Tokelauan pehe ma fātele whose text very directly expresses the sentiments that many participants felt as they “sang and danced Tokelau” (Ickes, pers comm, 30 Jan 2012; Patelesio, pers comm, 6 Feb 2012).
Making the Gathering Complete

Mānaia te Fakatahiga Nei

Mānaia, mānaia
Te fakatahiga nei

Mānaia, mānaia
Te fakatahiga nei

Tiale ka matala e
Makohi ko te ata
E taina fakalava e

Tiale ka matala e
Makohi ko te ata
E taina fakalava e

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mānaia te Fakatahiga Nei</th>
<th>Beautiful, this Gathering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mānaia, mānaia</td>
<td>Beautiful, beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te fakatahiga nei</td>
<td>This fellowship (or gathering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mānaia, mānaia</td>
<td>Beautiful, beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te fakatahiga nei</td>
<td>This fellowship (or gathering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiale ka matala e</td>
<td>Buds are coming into flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makohi ko te ata</td>
<td>The picture is becoming clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E taina fakalava e</td>
<td>Oh, my beloved, because of you, this (fellowship/gathering) is complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiale ka matala e</td>
<td>Buds are coming into flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makohi ko te ata</td>
<td>The picture is becoming clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E taina fakalava e</td>
<td>Oh, my beloved, because of you, this (fellowship/gathering) is complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Text and translation courtesy of Betty Ickes.

The piece began slowly as everyone in the room moved into place in a circle around the room and eased into the song. Lumanaki, now dressed in casual bottoms and black Lumanaki T-shirts, led the entire assembly in both song and dance, and the room filled with sound and swelling energy.

The melody of this fātele, beginning in the key of C Major, has a narrower range than the previous songs, from g to e¹, and mostly consists of half notes and pairs of dotted quarter and eighth notes. This combination of narrow range and varied note durations allows the melody to follow speech patterns, such as the lengthening of the first vowel in “mānaia” (example 4.6) and normative emphasis in “tiale” (example 4.7).

EXAMPLE 4.6. Lengthening of First Syllable in “Mānaia”

Example 4.6. Lengthening of First Syllable in “Mānaia”

EXAMPLE 4.7. Normative Emphasis Pattern in “Tiale”

Example 4.7. Normative Emphasis Pattern in “Tiale”
The piece has an AABB form, which can be broken down harmonically by measure as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
A: & \quad I \quad I \quad I \quad I \quad V \quad V \quad I \quad I (V) \\
B: & \quad I \quad I \quad I \quad I \quad I \quad V \quad V \quad V \quad I (V)
\end{align*}
\]

I have chosen a measure-by-measure rather than a phrase-by-phrase breakdown because of the uneven lengths of the two sections. As in the other pieces, the singers connected the lines of text, once again realizing a standard in Tokelauan performance practice. In this particular performance, the group sang in a three-part homophonic texture, each person choosing a part based on his or her vocal preference. This resulted in the following primary parts: the melody; a high female part, called the \textit{uhu}; and a low male harmony, called the \textit{malū}, which predominantly provides the root of each chord. Only one or two women sang the \textit{uhu} part, which eventually faded into the vocal texture as the group’s volume increased (see appendix F, measures 2–34). Alternatively, the singers may have had to move to the lower melody part once the piece modulated upward to the next key. One singer’s voice stood out through most of the performance, so I have transcribed his part to show how an experienced performer might negotiate vocal parts as well as how a male performer might contribute to a piece with specific rhythmic calls (see appendix F, “Foreground Voice”).

After one presentation of the AABB form, in measure 36 the piece modulated up a major second to the key of D Major, the tempo acceleration momentarily intensified, and the second of four presentations of the AABB structure began. By far the longest piece of the evening, “Mānaia te Fakatahiga Nei” continued through two more upward modulations of a major second, from D Major to E Major and from E Major to F♯ Major. The tempo accelerated from approximately 98 to 240 beats per minute, more than doubling, and female cheers and calls of “Saia!” accompanied the bursts of acceleration that preceded each presentation of the AABB structure in a new key. To indicate the end of the piece, the \textit{pōkihi} led everyone into a closing section that lasted nine measures and concluded with a quick call from the singers, and Lumanaki members yet again called out “O fanatu e.”
Even though many of the structural features of this *pehe ma fātele* resemble those in the previous five pieces, and even though Lumanaki members are not the sole performers, I have included “Mānaia te Fakatahiga Nei” in this paper because of what it reveals in terms of Lumanaki students’ ability to lead others in a truly meaningful performance. Both Ickes and Patelesio shared how moving this multi-community collaboration through song was to them (pers comm, 30 Jan 2012; pers comm, 6 Feb 2012), and the energy captured in the recording supports their assertions. The very first thing apparent in listening to all of the recordings from that evening is that this particular song was the loudest of all. Tokelauan performances are already very difficult to record in terms of volume level because the dynamic range of any given piece can vary just as much as the tempo, and there is no way of knowing just how loud the group might get, especially if participants experience *matagia*. In this final performance on 14 December, the group got very loud, and the recording clipped because the recording device could not handle the signal. Rather than a mere technical flaw, however, this distortion is an indicator of the sheer power of the performance.

Contributing to this impressive volume were the many calls and cheers that filled the performance. Compared to the other pieces, this performance was filled with expressions of excitement, of *matagia*, particularly as the group introduced each new statement of the AABB structure. In “Te Tinifu Tokelau,” there was only one “Saia!” from a student, in addition to encouraging calls from the music directors, but in “Mānaia te Fakatahiga Nei,” there were well over thirty-five calls total from the entire group (see appendix F, “Calls”). The transcription shows full notation of the rhythmic calls, mostly male contributions, but due to the nature of the female calls, I transcribed only the locations where these calls take place. At times, there were so many simultaneous female calls and cheers—and at such a loud volume—that it was impossible to discern the number of sources. Once again, this phenomenon reveals the sheer energy and resonance of the performance as it swelled toward its climax.

*Matagia* is difficult to measure, as it is felt and heard, not seen. The “noising” of the dance that I captured both inadvertently in the recording and intentionally in the transcription, however, gives clues to the presence of *matagia*. The contrast between the earlier performance and the final song of the evening indicates that there is much more to
eliciting feelings of *matagia* than the *pehe ma fātele* themselves. Performers must be able to combine technical skill with cultural understanding in order to initiate and sustain meaningful communication among all participants.

*Connecting to the Community*

Composers, musicians, and dancers intentionally manipulate certain features of Tokelauan *pehe ma fātele* in order to increase the likelihood of experiences of *matagia*, but they cannot ensure them. Instead, it is the extramusical life of the performance that combines with these composed and choreographed elements to send individuals and groups into a heightened state of spontaneous joy and exhilaration. Ickes and Patelesio agree, for example, that there is something about being with other Tokelauans and sharing Tokelauan songs and dances with the community that gives people goose bumps, inspires enhanced performance, and fills individuals with pride in themselves and their culture (Ickes pers comm, 30 Jan 2012; Patelesio, pers comm, 6 Feb 2012).

Without some understanding of what it means to be a part of this Tokelauan community, the students cannot fully communicate in such a gathering. Therefore, they must pull together all of their skills and knowledge—all of the performance techniques, cultural information, and social values that they learn at Lumanaki—in order to effectively communicate as Tokelauans and succeed in performance. They must learn that there is no such thing as a bad audience, only a performer’s inability to effectively engage others in the moment (Ickes, pers comm, 30 Jan 2012; Patelesio, pers comm, 6 Feb 2012). The first five songs that Lumanaki performed at the Ulu’s reception showed the kinds of *pehe ma fātele* that the students have learned and the information that these “textbooks” contain, but the last piece showed how this education comes together and serves the students as Tokelau community members. Both Ickes and Patelesio stressed that experiences like this community performance of “Mānaia te Fakatahiga Nei” are “what it’s all about” (pers comm, 30 Jan 2012; pers comm, 6 Feb 2012). They are the students’ final proof that they have attained mastery of every aspect of the materials covered by the *pehe ma fātele* “textbooks” as part of the school’s curriculum as well as
evidence of their ability to bring this mastery to a solid performance and meaningful communication with others. To Patelesio, these are abilities that the teachers can both see and feel, especially when the students show feelings of *matagia* and elicit them in fellow performers and audience members. To Ickes, the successful production of *matagia* earns students an A+++ (pers comm, 30 Jan 2012). Though the students had difficulty establishing the preferred level of excitement during the first part of the evening, Patelesio felt that, given their ability to persevere in an uncomfortable performance setting and their success in turning the situation around by providing a solid foundation for the *matagia*-filled community finale, the students did an outstanding job on their 14 December “examination” (pers comm, 6 Feb 2012).
Chapter 5
Conclusions

As a snapshot in time with an eye to the past of a school named “the future,” this paper has moved from Tokelau to the diaspora, the classroom, and then the stage in order to understand the role of Tokelauan pehe ma fātele in Lumanaki’s culture and language education efforts. I have employed approaches from both Pacific Islands studies and ethnomusicology in order to present a sensitive yet rigorous analysis of Pacific Island ways of knowing and learning in the diasporic classroom. I hope that this paper provides not only an academic contribution in terms of Pacific Islands ethnomusicological research but also something of value to the community from which these words have developed. As increased migration continues in the Pacific Islands region and around the world, and as the negative effects of climate change intensify and raise questions of population displacement, research such as this documents and makes available existing models for cultural sustainability in the diaspora. In this regard, the results have become more critical than ever before.

The families that migrated from Olohega to American Sāmoa and then to Hawai’i responded to issues of displacement and questions of identity formation by organizing themselves into a community. Shortly thereafter, the community established Lumanaki and began developing a curriculum based on Tokelauan history, culture, and language. The administration of the school and the implementation of the curriculum are not without problems, however. Like other culture and language schools in the United States and the Pacific Islands region, Lumanaki faces time and money shortages and difficulties connecting the curriculum to students whose life experiences are far removed from those in the homeland from which many of the school’s lessons emerge. Lumanaki is fortunate, however, in its Pacific location where the surrounding community understands and values
the school’s purpose and activities; this has led to financial and social support that enables the school to succeed. Further, Hawai‘i and New Zealand both offer culture and language school models based on Pacific Island ways of knowing and learning that highlight the importance and effectiveness of tools like Pacific Island arts in shaping and reinforcing students’ cultural and linguistic education. Lumanaki looks to these models for ideas of how to successfully and meaningfully engage students in the school’s curriculum.

Pacific Island arts serve as vessels that carry Pacific Island knowledge to far shores and are a means of learning and expressing Islander identities. Songs and dances are not only an integral part of Pacific knowledge but also physical representations of it. To Tokelauans, song is the paper of Tokelau, a permanent and legitimate documentation of the past (Thomas, Tuia, and Huntsman 1990, 11). Similarly, dance is a form of physical information that is collected in Islander bodies over time and place—information that is known through the action of movement (Teaiwa 2012, 75; Sklar 2001, 31). Composers and choreographers thus embed cultural information and meaning in songs and dances. Through the performance of these pieces, performers and witnesses physically experience the history, culture, and values of the society in which the songs and dances developed. Just as the book creates a physical artifact of knowledge, Lumanaki’s pehe ma fātele become an equivalent type of physical knowledge, danced and sung over generations.

As my analysis of the six pieces performed at the Ulu o Tokelau’s reception shows, Lumanaki’s pehe ma fātele move beyond the songs and dances themselves to also convey information about Tokelauan performance practice and culture. The final assessment of student’s absorption and understanding of this material takes place during the performance event, in which students show their level of mastery of the technical skills required to join the adult performers in executing the pehe ma fātele features designed to elicit feelings of matagia. Characteristic tempo increases, key modulations, bridging techniques, and cultural aesthetics of volume, projection, and intensifying dance movements tie Lumanaki’s performances to those of the homeland and the Tokelauan diaspora in New Zealand. On a cultural level, the emphasis in the texts on Christianity, fishing, and community reveals features of Tokelauan life that Lumanaki teachers choose to share with their students in the diaspora. All of these links to Tokelauan culture
become part of the students’ endeavor to elicit in themselves and others feelings of joy, pride, and inspiration. Through performance, students demonstrate not only their skills in song and dance but also their ability to employ a synthesis of the lessons and knowledge contained in the “textbooks” in order to effectively and meaningfully communicate with the other people involved in the community activity and to contribute to this sense of community by evoking feelings of matagia.

As a documentation of Lumanaki’s history, activities, and culture and language education methods, this paper contributes to the fields of diasporic studies, second-language education, ethnomusicology, and Pacific Islands studies. At this point in time, ethnomusicological research on Tokelauan culture, especially in the diaspora, is unfortunately sparse and incomplete. This paper serves as a first step toward expanding this scant body of knowledge. Further research is imperative in order for scholars to develop useful ideas regarding Tokelauan culture—ideas that are useful to academia, but also, more important, to Tokelauan communities. This paper presents one particular performance of six pieces, but more extensive studies are still needed. For instance, no research exists that systematically explores the pehe ma faitele and related practices of Tokelauans in Tokelau, New Zealand, and the United States. Lumanaki’s award for “Best Overall Performance” at the Easter Tournament in Wellington, New Zealand, indicates that something special is taking place in Hawai‘i and New Zealand communities. This paper makes a contribution toward this goal and opens paths to further research that looks at a broader diasporic experience in order to more fully understand connections to and interactions with the homeland.

In addition to its contribution to literature on Pacific Islands ethnomusicology, this paper demonstrates an interdisciplinary approach to Pacific Islands–related research. The rigorous ethnomusicological analysis provides an example of one way in which scholars can engage directly with Pacific Islands knowledge in order to better understand the performing arts and cultures that produce and promote them. In the context of ethnomusicological research, the consideration in this paper of decolonizing methodologies like giving back to the community and privileging indigenous ways of knowing and learning is key.
The reciprocity that is an integral commitment in contemporary Pacific research begins—but does not end—at the completion of a paper, thesis, article, or book, and this particular work gains additional significance for what it contributes to Lumanaki and to other communities who are or will soon be looking for cultural sustainability models on which to base their culture and language schools. Because of the rigors involved in running such a school, Lumanaki administrators, teachers, parents, students, and other members simply do not have the time to extensively document their activities and progress. It is not so much this written document that proves valuable to Lumanaki—though it will contribute to the school’s archive—as it is the discussions that arise from the research. As is typical of communities in the diaspora, Lumanaki members pull from all available resources to reach their goals and are already weaving this research into their story. This story, now documented, can circulate and make its way to other communities that, as chapter 2 revealed, often struggle with Western education models. From it, they can see that there are other valid and viable models from which to choose.

Lumanaki has developed over the past several years from informal beginnings into a thriving culture and language school that is known on O’ahu, in Tokelau, and in New Zealand for its outstanding pehe ma fātele performances. Far more than just entertainment, these pehe ma fātele make up a comprehensive pedagogical approach that Lumanaki teachers use to teach the school’s Tokelauan culture and language curriculum. The final assessment of students’ success in learning the material embedded in these “textbooks” takes place during performances, when teachers can see, hear, and feel students’ ability to combine cultural knowledge, technical skills, and Tokelauan values in a meaningful communication with each other and with audiences around the Pacific.
Appendix A

Notes on Transcriptions

The following six appendices are transcriptions of my own field recordings from the *Ulu o Tokelau*’s reception on 14 December 2011 at Leeward Community College in Pearl City, Hawai‘i. I have taken several steps to ensure a thorough representation of Lumanaki’s performance that evening. With this in mind, there are a few general things to note regarding the recordings and transcriptions.

First, because many aspects of Tokelauan performances are improvisatory, these transcriptions show how each piece might be played rather than how it must be played each time. Even the starting pitches and keys vary from performance to performance, as the directors choose ranges that are comfortable for the *kauhiva* at the time. With this in mind, I have transposed the transcription for “Manaia te Fakatahiga Nei” (appendix G) up a half step in order to better show the consistent upward modulations of a major second throughout the piece.

Second, there are places in the recordings where vocal parts become inaudible and details become unclear because of the ambience of the venue in which the performance took place; the resonance and volume of the percussion instruments, particularly the *apa*; or the distance between the performers and the recording equipment, which was dictated by the space and the evening’s proceedings. I have done my best to capture discernable details, but some things are not represented in the transcriptions. The most notable absence is that of the *pātē*. Though its timber emerges from the percussion ensemble at times, it is audible only in part. One can hear its strong marking of structural beats, but a few fleeting moments during the *fātele* portion of “*Ko te Fatu*” and during “*Tautai o te Moana o Tokelau*” reveal that, in fact, it has a much more elaborative role than the aural document indicates (see appendixes D and E). After discussing this issue
with Bonnie Patelesio, we decided that it would be best not to notate the partial rhythm for each piece because it gives a false impression of the *pātē*’s role in the ensemble. I include the patterns that appear in the transcriptions of “Ko te Fatu” and “Tautai o te Moana o Tokelau” as examples of what one might listen for in the other recordings.

Third, the transcriptions provide a detailed account of one particular performance, but many aspects of the songs are improvisatory. In addition to variations in vocal delivery, which I discuss in the analysis of each individual song, the rhythms of the percussion ensemble are improvised to create “new” performances each time. The transcriptions, therefore, provide examples of what the *pōkihi* and *apa* might do during a particular performance, rather than what they must do every single time.

Finally, the transcriptions do not always begin with the first material audible on the recordings. According to Patelesio, many of the introductory as well as concluding elements are not considered part of the songs they frame (pers comm, 6 Feb 2012), so I have left them out of the transcriptions but discuss them in their respective analyses. Where I include calls that do not follow the meter or tempo of a particular piece—such as the composed group call of “*Tafoe o!*” in “Tautai o te Moana o Tokelau” and the female dancers’ spontaneous and excited cries of “*Saia!*” in most pieces (see appendixes B–G)—I have done so by adding text either above or below the staff in the measures during which the calls occur. Other calls are purposefully rhythmic and add to the overall rhythmic structure of each piece, so I have fully notated them in terms of both rhythm and pitch. For instances of heightened speech, I have used x note heads to indicate indefinite pitch and arrows to indicate glides from one syllable to the next. I address other recording and transcription features during the respective analyses, which appear in the order performed.
Appendix B

Te Tinifu Tokelau

“The Children of Tokelau”

Type: Tuku

Composer: Ioane Teao
Appendix C

Ko te Fatu (Introduction)

“The Rock”

Type: Fātele Introduction

Composer: Anonymous
Duration: 00:01:19
Composer: Anonymous

Females
Ko te Lu a!  O Ko te fa - tu nae

Males
G7  C  G7  C

Acoustic Guitar
Duration: 00:01:19
Composer: Anonymous

Appendix C
Appendix D

Ko te Fatu (Fātele)

“The Rock”

Type: Fātele

Composer: Anonymous
Females and Non-dancing Males
(Males sing 8vb)

Dancing Males

Calls

Pātē
Apa
Pōkihi

Duration: 00:02:15
Composer: Johnathan Pedro

F, NDM

DM

C

Pātē
Apa
Pōkihi

Appendix D
Ko te Fatu (Fātele)

\[ q = 125-136 \]

Solo male shout

Solo male

Io! Io! Io! Io!

Solo male

Io! Io! Io! Io!
Ko te Fatu (Fātele)

Solo male shout

Solo female shout

Solo female shout
Appendix D

\[ j = 195-213 \]

F, NDM

Tau - ta - i fa - ka - ta - fa - go o To - ke - la - -

DM

ta - u Tau - ta - i fa - ka - ta - fa - go o To - ke - la - -

Solo female shout

Solo male

\[ j = 195-213 \]

Pātē

Apa

Pōkihi

\[ j = 195-213 \]

F, NDM

u Ma - la - ma - la Kan - ku - me - to o Ti - m - la - - - u Tō - ka

DM

u Ma - la - ma - la Kan - ku - me - to o Ti - m - la - - - u

C

\[ j = 195-213 \]

Pātē

Apa

Pōkihi

\[ j = 195-213 \]

F, NDM

Ka u - na la - go

DM

Ku - a ta - u

C

Pātē

Apa

Pōkihi

\[ j = 195-213 \]
Ko te Fatu (Fātele)

Si! Si! Si! Si! Si! Si! Si!

Solo female choir

Drum roll.

Tahoe O!
Appendix E

Tautai o te Moana o Tokelau

“Fishermen of the Seas of Tokelau”

Type: Tafoe

Composer: Johnathan Pedro
Females and Non-dancing Males
(Males sing 8vb)

Dancing Males

Calls

Duration: 00:02:15
Composer: Johnathan Pedro

Appendix E
Appendix E
F, NDM

Tō kai a tu
Ko o ma

DM

mā u
kua ta a

C

Pātē
Apa
Pōkihi

F, NDM

Tautai o te Moana o Tokelau

DM

70

Solo female shouts
Solo male
Female cheers

C

Pātē
Apa
Pōkihi

F, NDM

Tautai o te Moana o Tokelau

DM

60

Solo female shouts
Solo male
Female cheers

C

Pātē
Apa
Pōkihi

F, NDM

105

Tautai o te Moana o Tokelau
Tautai o te Moana o Tokelau

Si! Si! Si! Si! Si! Si!

Solo female cheer

Drum roll.

Tahoe O!

Solo female cheer

Drum roll.
Appendix F

Te Moana

“The Sea”

Type: Tuku

Composer: Anonymous
Appendix G

Mānaia te Fakatahiga Nei

“Beautiful, this Gathering”

Type: Fātele

Composer: Anonymous

Transcription begins at 00:00:30
Ma ko hi ko te a ta

Part becomes inaudible after this point in recording, though it possibly continues following a similar pattern.
Mānaia te Fakatahiga Nei

Solo male: Saia!

Solo female: Saia!

Hi a!

Te fa ka ta hi ga ne

Ma ko hi ko te a ta

Ma ko hi ko te a ta

Hi a!
Solo female call
Multiple female cheers; Saia!
Mostly rejoins group texture, switching among the melody, his own harmony, and the low male harmony to suit his vocal capabilities.

Multiple female cheers

Multiple males

Mānaia te Fakatahiga Nei
Solo female Saia!

Multiple female calls and cheers
Multiple female calls and cheers
Notes

Chapter 1: Building a Future

1. To create *Matagi Tokelau*, committees from each atoll collected and compiled local accounts of Tokelau’s history and culture. As a result, no primary author or editor is recognized. According to the preface, “Because the writing was done co-operatively, most of the resulting accounts are considered to be correct” (Hooper and Huntsman 1991, xii).

Chapter 2: A Bud Flowering in the Pacific

1. *Tīpulaga* are people of the same generation (Office of Tokelau Affairs 1986, 411).
2. In the spring of 2011, the architectural firm WATG (Wimberly, Allison, Tong, & Goo) volunteered many work hours to Te Taki for the development of community center designs. After many meetings between the two groups, the community decided on three designs—one small, one medium, and one large—that serve different budget scenarios.
3. Married individuals name their spouses and children before their parents and other elders, and many individuals trace their families back many generations during introductions. Additionally, these introductions may include siblings and any other information, such as important past residences, that would help others locate the individual speaking.
4. For further research on the role of language in Lumanaki’s educational activities and in the surrounding community, see Glenn 2012.
Chapter 3: Embracing Pacific Island Ways of Knowing and Learning

1. This comment came in response to Huntsman’s use of pen and paper to remember the details of the interview.
2. According to Thomas, instead of corrugated metal, “empty cabin bread tins or kerosene tins may be incorporated [inside the box]. This makes the inside more resonant, and also adds a jangle to the sound” (1996, 23).

Chapter 4: Making the Gathering Complete

1. Thomas presented this term as hui-unu (1996, 151).
2. As noted in chapter 3, children and teenagers do not usually dance as part of kauhiva in Tokelau and New Zealand. Groups composed of small children are starting to become popular in New Zealand now, but the aesthetic is more cuteness than skill (Ickes, pers comm, 30 Jan 2012).
3. I have opted to include guitar chord symbols in this particular transcription so that community members who are not familiar with Western staff notation can still make use of it.
4. The bridging technique returns, however, in the last piece of the evening, which I will describe later, and during that fātele it follows Thomas’s description more closely.
5. According to the collective authors of Matagi Tokelau, “The Kaukumete is a traditional Tokelau ceremony honouring a young man of a family. It involves a tautai or ‘master-fisherman’ of the island granting him permission to command a canoe and be himself called a tautai. The young man may then assume the responsibility for looking after a family, provisioning its members from the open sea, the reef, the lagoon, and plantation lands” (Hooper and Huntsman 1991, 177–178).
6. In order to better show the consistent upward modulation of a major second, I have transposed the entire transcription up a half step from B Major to C Major. Lumanaki’s artistic directors regularly adjust the starting keys of songs to better suit the kauhiva, so this change does not affect the integrity of the transcription or analysis. As with the other
transcriptions, this is an example of how the *kauhiva* might perform the piece, not how it must be performed every time.

7. I was not able to adjust recording levels because I left my seat and equipment in order to join everyone else in the circle. The audio recording was not my primary focus that evening. Instead, I was participating as a Lumanaki community member and recording a video of the Ulu’s presentation for the school archives.
Glossary

This glossary is based on interviews and literature on Tokelau. Gloss and source presented with first appearance of each term throughout this manuscript.

apa: tin drum played with two sticks
faleaitu: improvised skit
fano ki lalo: to lower oneself
fātele: dance; specific dance that originated in Tuvalu
fau: lei; neck garland
foe: canoe paddle
hei: head adornment worn in the hair, usually a flower
hikaki: representation of a kofe (fishing pole)
huiu: transitional chant
inati: customary distribution system
kahoa: necklace
kāmata: start
kauhiva: dance troupe
kie: wrap-around cloth worn as a skirt
kofu: clothing; girls’ dresses worn during performance
lalo: low
lua: two
malaga: visitors
malū: low male vocal part
maopoopo: to gather together; connotes consensus and participation
matagi: wind; connotes memories and news
matagia: feelings of joy, pride, inspiration, exhilaration experienced during performance
pale: head adornment that surrounds the head and is made of natural fibers, such as pandanus or coconut leaves
pātē: small wooden slit drum played with two sticks
pehe: song, to sing
pehe ma fātele: song and dance
pō hiva: night of dance competition
pōkihi: box, box drum
tafoe: dance with paddle implements
tahi: one
taulima: arm adornments
tauvae: ankle adornments
tīfa: mother-of-pearl centerpiece for kaho
	iti: grass skirt made from bark of kanava tree or leaves of laufala plant
tuku: end dance
tulou: respectful announcement of intentions
unu múa: front line of kauhiva
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