ers would argue with—but it is unfortunate that the valid findings of Watson's fieldwork should be obscured by a faulty theoretical introduction.

Wari Iamo's contribution, "One of the Things That Brings Good Name is Betel: A Keakalo Conception of Betel Use," links the production theme of Watson's work to the prestige ideology of the Keakalo people. The use of production controls such as taboo markers and gender prohibitions similar to those described by Knauft for kava is discussed. Successful betel production among the Keakalo has become an avenue to prestige within the community.

Although it may be easy reading for the seasoned anthropologist, Fitz John Porter Poole's essay is as ponderous and dense as his title: "Ritual Rank, the Self, and Ancestral Power: Liturgy and Substance in a Papua New Guinea Society." His discussion of ginger and mushroom intoxication among the Bimin-Kuskusmin adds some drugs to round out the anthology but is probably of interest only to Papua New Guinea specialists or professors intent on torturing their graduate students with ethnographic jargon.

A return to easier reading and broader relevance is achieved in the two following contributions, William Wormsley's "Beer and Power in Enga" and Bruce Larson's short piece, "Marijuana in Truk." Both demonstrate how introduced drugs have been assimilated into local cultures—marijuana changing the socializing patterns of Trukese youth, and beer being taken into the political and economic power systems of Enga.

The summary essay of the volume has a clever title as well as an important message: "When drugs pass between persons, they alter the currency of interaction . . . in short, they affect the nature of sociability" (234). Marilyn Strathern's "Relations Without Substance" reminds me of some of Sahlins' work—one has the first impression that it must be quite profound, but it takes several readings to confirm the suspicion. Her essay is a thoughtful and fitting end to an anthology that has been much needed and that opens for the uninitiated a topic that is of increasing importance to Pacific peoples.

Scott Whitney
Government of American Samoa

* * *


Issues of gender and the transformation of gender roles have gained currency in recent discussions in Polynesian studies. Many Marxist anthropologists espouse the view that gender relations were primarily egalitarian in preclass societies and that current aspects of male dominance are the result of colonialism and class and state formation. While this genre of ethnohistorical argument can be very illuminating, it is often the case that the theoretical argument can obscure an accurate depiction of the society in
question. In *Kinship to Kingship*, Christine Ward Gailey's intent seems to be to convince us that European colonialism and state formation invariably lead to commodity production and an altered division of labor, rather than to increase our understanding of gender relations in the historical process of Tonga.

Based on her PhD dissertation ("*Our History is Written . . . in Our Mats*: State Formation and the Status of Women in Tonga, 1981), the work is divided into three parts: a general summary of anthropological approaches to gender relations, a reconstruction of Tongan gender relations in the precontact period, and the transformation of these relations through the process of state formation. While the volume may have merit as a theoretical study of gender hierarchy and state formation, it is considerably lacking as an ethnohistorical analysis of Tonga.

Gailey contends that, unlike other schools of anthropological thought, most Marxist anthropologists (and I presume Gailey sees herself in this group) do not emphasize the societal elite, but rather that the "cosmologies and ideologies promoted by the state or state classes are compared and contrasted with local 'traditions' that emerge alongside and in opposition to them" (40). The promises of such an approach are great, especially with regard to the highly stratified nature of Tongan society and its historically encompassing chiefly tradition. Unfortunately, Gailey does not live up to her promises, and the work contains disappointingly little in the way of Tongan oral tradition. The work would have benefited from her own advice.

Instead, Gailey's almost exclusive use of published, secondary sources does little to inspire confidence in her work. As well, she has a tendency to collapse historical time by uncritically mixing data from early explorers, missionaries, and recent anthropological researchers. Although Gailey argues theoretically for historical change to be analyzed as a process (ix), the overall effect of her ethnohistorical reconstruction is one of a deceptively homogenous Tongan past—the classic anthropological "ethnographic present" projected backward in time.

It is difficult to ascertain why Gailey avoided major manuscript collections (the Bott papers at the University of Auckland, New Zealand; the Methodist missionary papers at the Mitchell Library, Australia, or the Gifford papers at the Bishop Museum, Hawai‘i, to name a few), in favor of derivative secondary sources. For example, instead of consulting the voluminous writings of missionary John Thomas on Tonga (manuscripts at the School of Oriental and African studies, London), she draws uncritically from Sarah Farmer's *Tonga and the Friendly Islands* (1853), which was written by a woman whose only contact with Tonga was that she met Thomas in England. It is hardly surprising that Gailey finds much of the missionary material negative on indigenous custom (170–193; see also 159). Most of the books published by the missionaries or based on their experiences (including Farmer's history) were produced as fund-raising exercises in England, where it was financially prudent to extol the virtues of "civilizing" the native converts. Although these books were not
published as academic accounts of Tongan culture or history, Gailey often uses their material as if they were, while criticizing their viewpoint. The missionary manuscripts would have provided her with a more descriptive, substantial, and illuminating source of material—on both Tonga and the missionaries.

Gailey’s use of contemporary sources is also deficient because she ignores relevant anthropological and historical works on Tongan gender relations that were published after the submission of her thesis. Those she would have profited from include Elizabeth Bott and Tavi’s Tongan Society at the Time of Captain Cook’s Visits (1982), based on extensive interviews with Queen Salote, as well as Elizabeth Wood Ellem’s excellent thesis “Queen Salote Tupou II and Tungi Mailefihi” (1981), on the symbolic political relationship between the queen and her consort. In addition, Gailey has passed over the work of Garth Rogers, whose article “The Father’s Sister is Black” (JPS 1977), on the position of the father’s sister (mehikitanga) in Tonga, I am sure she would have found enlightening.

There are many factual errors in the work. Some of these simply represent careless scholarship or proofreading, for example: (1) She renders the name of the Spanish explorer Francisco Mourelle as Morella (146). (2) She contends that “after 1800, several escaped convicts from New South Wales and Botany Bay” came to Tonga (146). All of the convicts came from the penal colony established at Botany Bay, which is in New South Wales, and the convicts she speaks of were present in Tonga in 1797. Gailey herself appears to be aware of the correct date elsewhere in the volume (174). (3) She frequently omits from Tongan words glottals and macrons that are considered proper Tongan spellings (Tukuaho for Tuku‘aho; Salote instead of Salote). (4) She confuses the identity of Tu‘i Tonga Fuanunuia with his son Tu‘i Tonga Laufilitonga (178). (5) She identifies the Fijian term for barkcloth (masi) as being Tongan (98, 288).

Gailey makes other errors, however, that are more significant. In attempting to document the emerging state, she is overzealous in selectively adapting the evidence to fit her theory. Many of her arguments of transformation due to European intervention and domination are more meaningful when examined in terms of Tongan ideology and custom. A few that can be concisely addressed include: (1) The identification of the hau as the “highest-ranking titled chief” (56). The hau was not a sacred, high-ranking chief, but was the most politically powerful individual who had usually gained power through conquest. (2) Gailey states that the moheofo was a “title taken from the name of the administrative paramount’s ‘house’ ” (73). There is no indigenous evidence of this. Rather it seems that the reverse was true and that the designation “Ha’a Moheofo” for the Ha’a Ngata was simply an additional appellation because the moheofo usually came from that lineage. (3) Gailey claims that the moheofo (principal wife of the sacred ruler of Tonga) “shared her title” with her fokonofo (136), but gives no supporting evidence. The assertion contradicts the Tongan explanation, which suggests
that the kau fokonofo came as support for their high-ranking relative who was moheofo, but that there was a distinct difference in rank attribution between the two, especially when it came to their sons' succession.

Gailey quite rightly points out (10) that role definition within the life cycle is crucial to understanding the division of labor, but she does not succeed in convincing the reader that she has grasped what that means for Tonga. (See Kerry James, "O, Lead Us Not into 'Commoditisation' . . ." [JPS 1988], for an excellent analysis of the problematic nature of Gailey's analysis of the division of labor, koloa, and commodity production in Tonga.) While much is said about the position of "wife" as introduced by the Wesleyan missionaries and how the Christian model contributed to the overall degradation of the status of women, almost nothing is mentioned about traditional Tongan marriage. More discussion and some analysis of the chiefly practice of polygamy, especially the moheofo/fokonofo relationships of the Tu'i Tonga, would have been welcome, as would some attention to the unions of the tu'a (non-elite or "commoner" in current parlance), which were not, unlike their elite counterparts, given the status of "marriages."

In conclusion, while Kinship to Kingship may tell us something about the theoretical state of a feminist Marxist approach, it adds very little to our understanding of gender relations in Tonga in the precontact period and the nineteenth century. Eleanor Leacock proclaims on the book's jacket that the volume is "one that will doubtless become a classic in its area." A classic it may be in Marxist theory, but it is but a poor showing in Tongan studies, and one may have to question the approach if a "classic" exemplifies itself in a flawed case study.

PHYLLIS HERDA  
Victoria University of Wellington


Judith Bennett's comprehensive and splendidly researched economic and social history of the Solomons is a landmark in recent Pacific scholarship. It will be immensely useful both to scholars and to those engaging the problems and challenges of this ten-year-old country's present and future. Solomon Islanders steeped in colonial and mission ideologies will find many myths about their recent past systematically dismantled and corrected.

As a reference book, the volume is essential, giving everything from annual copra prices to the names and dates of service of prewar district officers. But it is much more than a collection of data. I found the arguments and interpretations compelling and valuable in a number of ways, of which I can enumerate only a few.

First, the superbly documented picture of the early whaling and trading period should dispel widely held misconceptions that most Solomons societies were little changed by Western