

I found few errors, typographical or otherwise, but the following should be noted: Belep comprises not one, but two islands (24, 78); "Melanesia 2000," (not "Melanesian") (64); *Paicî* and *Cèmuhî* are separate languages, rather than a single language (154); the massacre of 5 December 1985 occurred in the Hienghène valley, not the Tiendanite valley (176); "colonnade" pines should be "columnar" (179); Jacques Chirac was not "President of France" (212).

The Kanak struggle for independence during the 1980s has spawned numerous books, many by journalists. Helen Fraser's personal account makes fewer pretensions than most to definitiveness and political objectivity, and is all the more convincing for it.

BRONWEN DOUGLAS  
La Trobe University

\* \* \*

*Disentangling: Conflict Discourse in Pacific Societies*, edited by Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo and Geoffrey M. White. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990. ISBN 0-8047-1692-7, xiii + 505 pp, figures, appendixes, notes, bibliography, index. Cloth, US\$47.50.

This recent publication from Stanford University Press is remarkable for the tight focus and integration of the contributions. Each of the ten ethnographic papers analyzes a "disentangling" activity that occurs within a Pacific community, and despite the considerable variation between these activities the authors' focus on discourse and context allows considerable scope for comparison. This is further

facilitated by the common theoretical perspective of the contributions, which seek to integrate contemporary linguistic and psychological anthropology. Indeed, the introductory chapter is for the most part a detailed comparison of the various disentangling events, first in terms of the shared ethnopsychological understandings of persons and emotion that frame them, and second in terms of the social structural forces that produce and are reproduced by disentangling activities, particularly in relation to power and social hierarchy. The authors of the ethnographic case studies are also careful to refer to one another's papers, and other relevant publications, to maintain this focus on regional comparison.

The editors explain that they prefer the metaphoric term "disentangling" to "conflict resolution" or "dispute management" because it "points to elements of local meaning that organize and guide the activities we examine" (35n1). "Disentangling", like "straightening"—another metaphor that recurs in these studies—is concerned with the process rather than the outcome of these activities. Outcomes are of course considered in these studies, but the main focus is on the activities themselves and in particular on the "situated conflict talk" that occurs at disentangling events (4). All but one paper are based on transcripts of recorded discourse, and eight of the ten ethnographic papers provide partial transcripts as appendixes. Half provide vernacular transcriptions with the English translations, while the others give only the English version.

After the introductory chapter that constitutes Part 1, Part 2 contains four

chapters centered on the issue of “Mind, Emotion, and Therapeutic Discourse.” White’s paper on disentangling meetings in Santa Isabel in the Solomon Islands, and Brenneis’ paper on the Fiji Indian *Pancayat* both examine “public” events precipitated by interpersonal conflicts within the community. In contrast, the events analyzed by Boggs and Chun for Hawai‘i, and Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo for the Kwara‘ae of Malaita in the Solomons are intrafamilial. To varying extents, all of these papers address the therapeutic role of these forms of disentangling compared to Western psychotherapy. Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo raise a number of points of contrast—the role of the counselor, the focus and goal of counseling, the relationship between participants in counseling, and so on—that can usefully be applied to the other contributions to this volume. One feature shared by the various forms of disentangling is that emotional catharsis is very much a secondary goal, in contrast to Western psychotherapies. As White and Watson-Gegeo point out, disentangling events involve “a culturally elaborated discourse of emotion” aimed at reestablishing social and emotional ties between people rather than producing cathartic release for individuals (12).

Part 3 is entitled “Conflict, Ambiguity, and the Rhetoric of Indirection.” Arno’s paper on Fijian joking debates, Besnier’s on gossip about conflict situations on Nukulaelae (Tuvalu), and McKellin’s on allegorical rhetoric in Managalase negotiations, all highlight the ambiguous, indirect nature of conflict discourse. Even the “direct” talk of the disentangling events analyzed in

Part 4 is shown to be ambiguous and open to negotiation in order to achieve consensus. The papers in this section on “Tangled Disputes and Straight Talk” are Lindstrom’s on public debates on Tanna, Vanuatu; Hutchins’ on land litigation in Trobriands village courts; and Duranti’s on one form of the *fono* in Samoa.

As well as detailing the disentangling event itself (in terms of the setting, the participants and their interactions, the forms and organization of discourse employed, and so on), each paper attempts to outline variation within the form described, and to situate it within the broader contextual features of the community involved. As Keesing points out in his brief epilogue, the communities studied are somewhat “disentangled” from their own wider contexts for the purposes of the analyses (497). Keesing hints that more consideration of these contexts would have been beneficial—for example by examining conflict situations between community members and “powerful outsiders” (498). One of the inherent problems of such a collection is that to remain so neatly integrated and coherent the scope of each paper must be narrow. Inevitably readers will be left with numerous unanswered questions, though some questions could have been addressed without losing the focus of the collection. Besnier, in his paper on Nukulaelae gossip, states his intention to examine “What type of situation is recognised as an interpersonal conflict?” (290). He does not do so in sufficient detail, nor is this question adequately addressed in other papers.

It is unfortunate that in all of the

"conflict talk" in this volume women's voices are seldom heard. In some of the communities studied women are excluded from participation in disentangling sessions, or play a very limited role (for example, as witnesses). In others they can participate—particularly in the intrafamilial events—and in the Kwara'ae case can act as co-leaders in family disentangling sessions. In some cases the authors do not clarify women's position in relation to the type of event described. Except in the paper by Boggs and Chun on Hawaiian *ho'oponopono*, the question of conflict between females is ignored. Since one of the recurring themes the editors claim for this volume is that of the "relationship of sociopolitical organization to disentangling processes" (21), this silencing of women is of some concern.

HELEN KAVAPALU

*Australian National University*

\* \* \*

*Native Hawaiian Rights Handbook*, edited by Melody Kapilialoha MacKenzie. Honolulu: Native Hawaiian Legal Corporation and Office of Hawaiian Affairs, 1991. ISBN 0-8248-1374-X, xii + 320 pp, tables, figures, glossary, notes, index. US\$25.

Legal rights as debated and sanctioned under Hawaiian and American constitutional and statutory law are considered in the context of the Native Hawaiian who must balance precariously on the cliffside trails of choice known as self-determination and assimilation. A sometimes perplexing flurry of cases argued and adjudicated from kingdom through statehood eras

serves as the evidentiary base for editor MacKenzie and her contributing authors to discuss and analyze the rights of Native Hawaiians. One of the central questions in assessing the merits and shortcomings of this text is whether discussion and analysis are foundational enough approaches to employ in the composition of a rights handbook. Another pertains to the framing of the Native Hawaiian rights thesis—is it sufficient to remain largely within the ironic historical parameters of American jurisprudence when the matter of self-determination is considered?

The handbook consists of sixteen chapters divided into five parts: Native Hawaiian Lands and Sovereignty, Securing Individual Hawaiian Land Titles, Natural Resource Rights, Traditional and Customary Rights, and Resources Benefiting Native Hawaiians. Part 5 is a listing of federal programs and privately endowed trusts of Hawaiian chiefs that provide various social and educational services. It describes what is available as tangible assistance, unlike parts 1 through 4, which rely on heaping citations of case law to illustrate given areas of the rights spectrum. The tone of the first four parts resonates decidedly with the legalese that editorial eyes sought to at least minimize. Attorneys wrote the handbook, and despite well-intentioned attempts, the chapters are often strewn with legalisms, impeding the reader who has no background in law.

Reasonable and dispassionate though the writers try to be throughout the text, some topics defy even-handed treatment. The trust breached by state and federal authorities with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act