

Trần was imprisoned until 1988, thirteen years after his return to Vietnam. Life was difficult for him and for others who had been repatriated; he did not see much of a future in Vietnam because the Communists “used force to keep us down” and employment was limited to menial labor (206). A year after his release, the United States began its Humanitarian Operation, which facilitated the immigration of repatriates held in reeducation camps. Trần applied for resettlement in the United States and departed Vietnam in December 1991. Once again motivated by love, he says, “we left not for ourselves, but so that our wives and children could look toward the future” (208).

Ship of Fate is a rare account told from the perspective not of a historian or scholar, but of a Vietnamese naval officer, husband, father, and leader—a man who lived and made history. His story is one that adds an important dimension to our understanding of the Vietnam War and of Vietnamese in Guam and the United States. While the setting for half of the book’s chapters is Guam, the island is merely a backdrop for this personal narrative. Trần’s interaction with residents outside the camps was limited, and his story is focused squarely on those actors and experiences germane to his return to Vietnam. He viewed the island as separate from the United States, referring to it as “this autonomous land,” and while Guam’s governor and people were supportive hosts, they were not essential to achieving repatriation. That part of Trần’s life was not lived in the present moment; his memories of that time were centered not on his temporary refuge but on

his homeland. Trần notes, “Whether bitter or sweet, all memories are worth remembering” (32). Indeed. Let us remember this story.

MARY THERESE PEREZ
HATTORI
Chaminade University

* * *

Uncovering Indigenous Models of Leadership: An Ethnographic Case Study of Samoa’s Talavou Clan, by Leiataua Robert Jon Peterson. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2018. ISBN cloth 978-1-4985-6824-1; e-book 978-1-4985-6825-8; v-x + 115 pages, bibliography, index. Cloth, US\$85.00; e-book, US\$80.00. Limited circulation available by request.

Across academic disciplines, native and indigenous scholarship concerned with politics and leadership models in the Pacific has proliferated since its emergence in the latter half of the twentieth century. For example, there is a growing body of literature written by Samoans about Samoan notions and models of power and leadership, some works focusing on the political machinations at the national level and others centering on village and family hierarchies. These studies have uncovered and employed alternative research approaches such as ethnographic case studies and the popular talanoa to flesh out insider voices and to critique the essentializing gaze of empirical studies. *Uncovering Indigenous Models of Leadership* by Susuga Leiataua Robert Jon Peterson (hereafter Leiataua in recognition of this chiefly title) appears to have added another alternative to the grow-

ing literature on Sāmoa's politics, power, and leadership.

Uncovering Indigenous Models of Leadership completes Leiataua's quest for doctoral credentials, and, more importantly, it defines and fills a sense of loss that plagued him while growing up a privileged "white" male in Minnesota (47, 100). His search for his ethnic Samoan roots and his discovery of his ties to the royal lines in Samoan society—the Talavou Clan—motivated him to engage his relatives in a case study about leadership in fa'asāmoa, or the Samoan Way. Leiataua's informants appear to have been mainly his immediate family—mother, stepfather, sisters, brother, and a couple of in-laws—and not all of them are matai, or chiefs. Curiously, they all have been assigned pseudonyms that are not Samoan, and not much is known about them aside from their relationship to the author, their status in the family, and their country of residency.

Thus, from twelve formal interviews and numerous informal conversations with relatives, what emerges in the book are the ingredients for the construction of a Samoan leadership model that Leiataua claims is missing from the existing literature. These ingredients include the "five introductory themes" ("geographic place, cultural practices, ancestry, family, and identity" [83]) and "four primary elements" ("*alofa*, belief in God and being humble, service to family, community/village, and country, and hustle or working hard and being on your grind" [85]). Leiataua is passionately convinced that his model, when revealed to the powers in the Global North, could be an alternative solu-

tion for stemming the socioeconomic problems of inequality, injustice, greed, and racism. He attributes these problems to a world system that is "dominated by capitalism and globalization" and that thrives on individualistic accumulations of wealth and power (85). Leiataua laments that in this status quo, 85 percent of the people in the world are merely surviving, while the top 15 percent in the Global North are thriving (8). Therefore, as he claims his model will demonstrate, this imbalance could be accommodated through leadership characterized by love, humility, service, a sense of place and identity, and a connection to the wisdom of ancestors and family. Through this "indigenous" matrix, the individual is part of the collective consciousness of the group, which, if applied or understood more globally, may allow for equality, justice, and security for all. This, Leiataua recommends, is the charge for native and indigenous scholars of the Global South; he concludes that "native, Indigenous, postcolonial scholars must continue to advance the Native and Indigenous social movement agendas across the Global South and deeply drive Native and Indigenous priorities into the core of the elite, mostly White, male, and cisgender belief systems present in the leadership of the Global North if all communities of people are to survive and thrive" (97).

Leiataua's model mirrors some of the values and practices in Sāmoa's respect system (*vafealoa'i*), chiefly system (*fa'amatai*), and Samoan Way, yet he posits that no one has produced a leadership model for Sāmoa. While his identification of the adverse effects of capitalism and globalization is conven-

tional wisdom, his claim that there has been no research on Samoan notions of leadership is unfounded. This work's bibliography reflects anything but an exhaustive review of the literature on leadership in Sāmoa or the Pacific, revealing a seeming ignorance of the growing number of studies and publications by Samoans examining various aspects of their traditional and modern systems of governance at the family, village, and national levels. The bibliography lists three Samoan sources, including one each by Mālama Meleiseā, Dan McMullin, and Cluny and La'avasa Macpherson. The rest are by outsider researchers whose studies are quite dated. The glaring absence of key indigenous scholars from Leiataua's work, and a seeming overreliance on nonindigenous voices, contradicts his adamancy for the critical importance of native and indigenous participation on the global stage. His exclusion of studies by Samoans whose lived experiences would have richly informed his model is frustrating to say the least. At worst, it is cynical and hypocritical.

Moreover, the work frustratingly fails to provide historical context, particularly for the Talavou Clan, which spans wide and deep generationally, geographically, and professionally. Such failure leaves one wondering why Leiataua has failed to explain the Talavou Clan in its historical and political significance, if not magnificence, in the country's political evolution from a kingdom ruled by Malietoa Vainu'upo to an independent state, with his uncle Malietoa Tanumafili II being one of the two heads of state at the time of independence in 1962. In addition to this lack

of historical background, there is a presumption that readers will understand the language of world systems and development discourses, such as Global North and South, native and indigenous, and, in Sāmoa, fa'amatai and fa'asāmoa. Methodologically, Leiataua talks about a triangulation of data from formal interviews, conversations with clan members, and photographs; however, an example of such a triangulation would have clarified for a lay audience the range between generalizability in the empirical sense of the word and naturalistic generalizations, which I interpret as untested assumptions or presumptions—a contradiction that this study cannot break away from. Perhaps what also frustrates this reviewer is the marginalized position of the Talavou Clan in this study. Leiataua as participant observer had a chance to experience life as a resident of Sāmoa, albeit briefly, and he hints at meeting many relatives, yet none of the most famous members of the clan made the list of informants. For example, he makes no mention of Le Tagaloa Sauafatu Leota Pita Alailima and his late wife Aiono Dr Fanaafi Le Tagaloa, who were parliamentarians in the 1980s and cofounders of the Indigenous University of Samoa (Iunivesite o le Amosa o Savavau), where the curriculum is delivered in the Samoan language. Not surprisingly, the text greatly falls short of mirroring the collective erudition of the clan.

In this sense as well, I feel that he has shortchanged his claim to indigeneity by not fully explaining how he, someone who grew up privileged in the first world, can genuinely be indigenous. This begs ongoing

dialogues among native scholars about the meanings of the adjectives “native” and “indigenous.” Being a native by birth is the conventional wisdom; does that automatically make one indigenous regardless of upbringing? What may raise a few more eyebrows is the fact that, for a text that urges a penetration of white, male dominated systems of power by indigenous models, it ironically begins with discussions of Durkheim, Blumer, and Bourdieu, all white males with theories, paradigms, world systems analyses, and modernistic jargon like the Global North and Global South.

The inclusion of Linda Tuhiwai-Smith’s *Decolonizing Methodologies* (1999), which has been cited abundantly over the last thirty years, spares the author somewhat, although it is fair to wonder why, after a generation or two has passed since the emergence and proliferation of native and indigenous scholarship, Leiataua could find only one model of decolonizing such scholarship.

LUAFATA SIMANU-KLUTZ
University of Hawai‘i–Mānoa

* * *