

9



Looking Ahead

ROBERT BOROFSKY

ALAN HOWARD

THE hallmark of good research is that it generates new questions. No matter what one's concern with Polynesian ethnology, the work of the past few decades has opened the door for a wide range of new projects. For purposes of discussion, we divide our remarks into four sections, each reflecting a set of related issues: prehistory and the reconstruction of early contact sociocultural systems, historical change, contemporary Polynesian society and culture, and comparative analysis.

Prehistory and Reconstruction

Recent evidence on changing island environments has greatly altered perspectives on archaeological thinking. The old view of static environments has given way to a view of islands that have been in a state of dynamic change. Some previous shorelines, for example, have subsided while others have uplifted. This means one has to be extremely cautious in evaluating the likely location of early settlement sites. This realization suggests that we must treat with caution our data on earliest settlements and must view present scenarios of settlement sequence as tentative at best.

Furthermore, the massive increase in archaeological data has muddied the picture in several ways. In western Polynesia the once neat image of a settlement sequence from Fiji to Tonga to Samoa no longer seems quite so clear. The same is true with the outliers. The relatively early settlement dates for Tikopia, Anuta, and Taumako suggest the pattern is not as simple as previously conceived. And as Kirch (chapter 2, p. 25) notes for eastern Polynesia, in light of the similar datings of early Hawaiian and Marquesan sites, the "orthodox scenario for the

dispersal of Polynesians through eastern Polynesia is in need of rethinking." Recent archaeological research has created a great deal of room for imaginative projects aimed at refining our understandings of settlement sequences and inter-island contact. There is need for more intense settlement studies in all the archipelagoes and for a clearer delineation of range and variation in settlement over time.

Kirch lists several topics that require further analysis: paleodemography; production systems; human impact on ecosystems; space, settlements, and society; and development of social complexity. In each case there is a need for greater clarification of the developmental processes occurring in specific environments. Recent research in paleodemography, for example, raises questions regarding population variation in relation to processes of sociocultural transformation. Although results have been encouraging, what is now needed is a finer-grained analysis of local demographic sequences.

Much significant work has been accomplished in the area of production systems by focusing on faunal materials as well as extractive and exploitative technology. But successes in this area have raised the need for greater clarification of the particular processes involved in development. Prehistorians have made considerable progress by widening their analyses to include topics not directly falling under the rubric of production, such as craft specialization, trade systems, and support for elaborate ceremonial structures. By analyzing intensification in terms of changing relations between labor and the means of production they have raised new and exciting analytical possibilities. In regard to ecological considerations, hierarchies of constraint, environmental opportunity, and nature-culture interaction have replaced simple determinism as models for analysis. But we still need to know more about how adapting to changing environments stimulated transformations in Polynesian societies.

The development of social complexity remains one of the continuing concerns of Polynesian prehistory. We have moved from the broad suggestions of Sahlins and Goldman to detailed analyses of particular archipelagoes at particular times. But the degree to which one factor or another played a role in an archipelago's development remains to be determined. Kirch is correct in stressing the need for multicausal analyses and reliance on a tripartite approach involving ethnography, linguistics, and archaeology.

Attempts to reconstruct traditional Polynesian systems have enjoyed a renaissance in recent years, as several of the chapters in this book make clear. Important efforts such as Oliver's (1974) work on Tahiti and Valeri's (1985a) book on Hawaiian sacrifice demonstrate what can be accomplished with patient, cautious scholarship on the one hand, and theoretical daring on the other. Along with Sahlins' stimulating

theoretical forays into reconstruction (mainly on Hawaii and Fiji), Oliver and Valeri show just how rich the available sources are.

In his chapter (5) on *mana* and *tabu*, Shore suggests certain directions for exploration that arise out of his analysis. One is a testing of his synthesis against the ethnographic record. "The conception of *mana*, and its subsidiary notions of *tapu* and *noa*, as developed in these pages," he notes, "are useful to the extent that they illuminate heretofore obscure corners of Polynesian ethnology" (p. 166). The goal is to "make sense of practices that until now have eluded our understanding" (p. 166). Shore provides a clear analysis that others can take as a frame of reference both for interpreting disparate data, from tattooing to sacred maids to menstrual taboos, as well as for developing new analyses.

Kaeppler's essay (chapter 7) also suggests possibilities for exploring interrelationships that have hitherto been neglected. She points out ways that ethnoaesthetics relate to social organization, and demonstrates the potential for inferring features of social formations from both archaeological materials and museum artifacts collected during the early period of contact. There are opportunities here that have barely been exploited.

Recent research into social organization has suggested ways to reinterpret earlier texts, including myths and legends. Given what we now know about the flexible, contextual nature of Polynesian social organization, we are in a much better position than our intellectual forefathers to understand how Polynesian social systems worked and were reproduced over time.

Historical Change

Issues of historical change have also been recast by Pacific historians and historically oriented anthropologists. The island-centered historians have developed new perspectives, and anthropologists such as Greg Denning and Marshall Sahlins have reframed issues of change in illuminating, innovative ways. Several of the authors in this book pose questions for research that reflect these new orientations.

Shore (chapter 5), for example, asks to what degree differences in indigenous cultural orders, as manifested in worldviews, can explain the differential impact of Western contact on particular archipelagoes? Shore is particularly interested in whether the dual organizations of western Polynesian societies made them more resilient to change than the monolithic power structures of eastern Polynesia. A related question is how Polynesian worldviews have altered over time. It would be quite valuable to explore, for instance, changes in the conception of *mana* during the postcontact period. What, for example, was the impact of Chris-

tianity on it? As Shore notes elsewhere (1982:248), *mana* today is almost exclusively used in relation to God in Samoa. Changes in the usage of other key concepts such as *tapu*, *noa*, *ali'i*, and *alofo* might also be revealing in this regard.

One cannot help wonder how the kingly/populist tension worked itself out in various Polynesian societies over time. Marcus' analysis (chapter 6) of an ossified hierarchy is suggestive for Tonga, but how did the kingly/populist tension evolve in Tahiti, especially after French intervention, or in New Zealand following the Maori Wars? And how did chieftainship respond to European intrusion on the atolls, where hierarchy was more limited? What we need is a better sense of the continuity and change through time of chiefly institutions in Polynesian society.

We might also ask to what degree modern expressions of chieftainship are Western creations? Given the role of Western missionaries and advisors in shaping missionary kingdoms, as well as Western administrators and scholars in fostering invented traditions, one might wonder to what degree and in what ways Polynesian cultures today represent a compromise between Western and Polynesian conceptions of the Polynesian past (see, e.g., France 1969, Hanson 1989, Simmons 1976).

Kaepler (chapter 7, p. 234) boldly states the case for studying aesthetic expression in historical perspective: "Within Polynesia, research on ethnoaesthetics and artistic grammars has just begun. Such studies are important to the future of Polynesian studies, not just because of what we have to learn about art and aesthetics, but for what they can teach us about the nature of Polynesian societies and the ways they have changed and are changing." Her chapter raises several issues concerning continuity and change in Polynesian aesthetics. For example, if we assume a traditional aesthetic of inequality in many Polynesian societies, then we need to ask how Polynesian aesthetics have altered as the structures of inequality have changed. Have aesthetic performances changed in ways that reflect new forms of inequality, or in some instances, movements toward equality? Other questions concern the ways in which the "grammar" of aesthetics is affected by changing technology (such innovations as steel tools, slack-key guitars, and videotaping).

In our chapter on early contact we stress certain issues that need further exploration. We noted that given most texts were written by and for Europeans, there is an essential bias to them (see, e.g., Dobyns 1988). Indigenous accounts have their biases as well. But the fact that European and indigenous biases were often different opens the way to a comparative dialogue, as suggested by Borofsky (1987). Comparing the two sets of biases, we can learn something about the processes that went into each's construction of events. It is important that a number of

scholars of Polynesian ancestry have joined the dialogue in recent years. Prominent in this regard are the works of Trask (1983) and Dorton (1986) in Hawaii and Awatere (1984), Kawharu (1975, 1977), Marsden (1975), S. Mead (1983, 1984), and Walker (1987) in New Zealand. Although their views cannot be seen as representative of Polynesians at the time of contact, by self-consciously taking an insider's view, their work is often laden with fresh insights.

We need to explore multiple ways to mine the existing material. Sahlins' brand of structural history is one possibility, although a reading of reviews of his work suggests that rather than resolving the major issues he has momentarily set them aside with the breathtaking sweep of his vision. Another possibility is the approach stressed in chapter 8, which analyzes interactions among specific groups over time and infers meaning from each's responses to the other's actions.

Conspicuously underrepresented in the field of Polynesian history are studies from a Marxist perspective. Christine Gailey's recent publication (1987) relating changes in the status of Tongan women to infrastructural changes following European intrusion is a notable exception. Although her analysis has been criticized for distorting the evidence (see James 1988), it nevertheless suggests a number of key issues that require more attention than thus far received.

Most of the historical work in Polynesia has focused on sequences of events in particular societies. Important exceptions are Maude's (1981) work on the Peruvian labor trade and Ralston's (1978) study of beach communities in the nineteenth century, both of which take a comparative perspective. In our chapter on early contact we attempt to provide a stimulus to comparative history by constructing a model to account for patterns of violence in early Polynesian-European encounters. We grant that it may not fit all cases in all respects during the early contact period. But its aim is to be suggestive, to challenge others to develop more suitable frameworks.

There are many other topics that require comparable exploration. To what degree, for example, can the rise and decline of indigenous paramounts be attributed to internal versus external factors? Certainly Western firearms and technical expertise played a role in the rise of Kamehameha, Pomare, and Taufa'ahau. But one must be cautious in overestimating Western influence. In Tahiti and Samoa it appears that competing factions both gained access to Western weapons, thereby negating the advantage possessed by one or the other side. Much more needs to be done regarding the factors behind the indigenous consolidation of power on Polynesian islands following contact, especially once we set aside some of the more simplistic formulations and biases regarding the role of Europeans.

The reduction of the paramounts' powers and the rise of alternative power brokers in their place has not generally received the attention dedicated to the paramounts' initial consolidation of authority. Yet it is equally important. In its dynamics one can perceive the seeds of modern Polynesia's economic and political dependency. At least three factors seem to have been involved. Part of it likely can be traced to the traditional political cycle of Polynesian polities. The rise and decline of paramounts was a pattern common to many island groups. The alliance between paramounts and various Europeans, which had played a role in the rise of particular paramounts to power, also seems to have unraveled to some degree as the two groups each sought to dominate the other. Finally, there is the whole issue of indirect imperialism that framed the process (see, for example, Robinson 1972). Polynesian kingdoms were encouraged to become more Western in order to maintain their political independence. But in assuming Western political structures some weakened their traditional bases of power, making them more vulnerable to Western control. In this regard one would like to know more about how Western dominance was maintained in Polynesia through symbolic manipulation. Why was a limited degree of force sufficient to impose Western dictates in particular archipelagoes?

There is also the question of religious transitions. The overthrow of the Hawaiian *kapu* system in 1819 has been analyzed and reanalyzed. But it still remains to insert related events on many archipelagoes within "a coherent structural-historical process," as Sahlins phrased it (1981a: 75). We need a better understanding of the dynamics of Polynesian religions and the ways religious and political concerns were intertwined on many archipelagoes. "The present national religion," the missionary Davies observed for Tahiti, "is so blended with the civil concerns or the privileges and authority of the chiefs, that they have no conception the one can stand without the other" (cited in Newbury 1980:32). Religious change, especially conversion to Christianity, must be examined within this context.

In addition, there is the issue of economic transitions. Initially, Westerners were dependent on Polynesians for supplies, and Polynesians were often able to dictate the terms of trade during the early contact period. But increased contact bred increased dependency on Western traders in many archipelagoes. One of the critical issues that needs to be analyzed is the inability of Polynesians to establish themselves as economic middlemen and traders. Even more significant is the issue of land: How did indigenous tenure change during the nineteenth century? By what means did Europeans progressively increase their control over land through time? One of the more interesting considerations, given the tensions surrounding land tenure, is that land itself was often of ambiguous value to Westerners in many archipelagoes. Land often

needed extra-archipelago supporting conditions, such as a world cotton shortage or special trade concessions relating to sugar, for Westerners to realize the profit they sought from controlling land. The significance of land was not simply in the economic control Westerners sought over it, but also in the political involvement in indigenous affairs they then came to desire as a result of owning it (Ralston 1978:165).

The issue of gender relations needs more careful examination as well. The nature of sexual relations between Polynesian women and European men during the early contact period, barely touched upon in our analysis, remains at a highly speculative level, and would benefit from an intensive comparative analysis. Changes in gender relations in the postcontact period have been the subject of major works by Gailey (1987) on Tonga and Linnekin (1988) on Hawaii. In addition, Ralston and Thomas (1987) have edited an issue of the *Journal of Pacific History* on gender relations. But much remains to be done to clarify the ways in which gender relations were altered by various changes during the post-contact period, and how contemporary gender relations reflect themes of continuity and change with the past.

Another topic of interest, which reverses the traditional focus of study, is the impact Polynesia made on Western societies. We know that eighteenth-century explorers' accounts of Polynesia took Europe by storm. Between 1770 and 1800, more than 100 editions or impressions were published regarding Cook's journeys. Accounts by early explorers often provided the basis for commentaries on Europe. The "noble savage" different writers depicted as residing on one or more Polynesian islands became a vehicle for criticizing shortcomings in European society as well as constituting a means for exploring Europe's ancestral roots.

Smith suggests the exploration of the Pacific stimulated the development of new intellectual perspectives in Europe. He states: "the wealth of new material which arrived from the Pacific during the last two decades of the [eighteenth] century was one of the factors which led to the collapse in scientific circles of the chain of being as an acceptable explanation of universal nature" (B. Smith 1960:123). Elsewhere he asserts, "the opening of the Pacific is . . . to be numbered among those factors contributing to the triumph of romanticism and science in the nineteenth-century world of values" (B. Smith 1960:1). Moreover, Polynesia had an impact on European fashions. Europeans manufactured "Tahitian" toys and jewelry. " 'Tahitian' verandas were designed for country houses; 'Polynesian' wallpaper [became] fashionable" (Daws 1980:11). Fitting with their own cultural concerns, Europeans created technological and artistic imitations of Polynesia as they perceived it.

In contrast to the powerful impact of romanticized imagery, the eco-

nomie impact of Polynesia on the West was relatively minor. The ports of trade for Polynesia were mainly Valparaiso, Sydney, and San Francisco. One might cogently argue that trade with the Far East and the Americas contributed to the economic development of Europe, but one would be hard pressed to make such an argument for Polynesia. Perhaps there is a relationship here—one of Braudel's structures of the *longue durée*—between the significant cultural, and minor economic, impact Polynesia had on the West. Certainly part of the explanation for Polynesia's initial intellectual impact was timing. The first indepth contact occurred during the Enlightenment. But perhaps part of it was due to the region's limited resources and distance from Europe. European perceptions of Polynesia remained positive far longer than they did of China or North America, where European economic penetration was more extensive. We know that once-positive views of Australian aborigines and North American Indians turned negative as economic development in both regions increased (see, e.g., B. Smith 1960:202; Pearce 1988). In any case, much remains to be done to clarify the mutual impact of Polynesian and European cultures on one another.

Contemporary Polynesian Society and Culture

Following World War II the pace of change in Oceania dramatically quickened. Modern medicines brought death rates down to low levels, and since birth rates remained high, populations increased at an unprecedented pace. This encouraged outmigration to urban areas, which were seen as places of employment and educational opportunities. An increasing proportion of people took advantage of opportunities to migrate to industrialized areas in New Zealand, Australia, Hawaii, and the mainland United States, where they formed Polynesian enclaves. In an important sense Polynesian communities are no longer bounded by beaches and reefs as they once were. Samoan communities now extend beyond Apia and Pago Pago to Auckland, Honolulu, and San Francisco. Not only do goods and money circulate freely among these localities, but people do as well. To draw a social boundary around one village or one island now seems arbitrary and unrealistic.

Political changes have been equally dramatic. Prior to World War II, Tonga was the only independent state. Since then Western Samoa, Fiji, and Tuvalu have become nation-states, and the Cook Islands has become self-governing (although still associated with New Zealand). In addition, previously docile Polynesian populations in Hawaii, New Zealand, and French Polynesia have turned militant and become political forces to be reckoned with.

The processes of urbanization and modernization have touched every

part of Polynesia, albeit differentially and in differing degrees. The result is that Polynesian communities are much more varied than ever before in regard to education, wealth, and diet. Life has become more complex even on the most remote atolls. No Polynesian group has remained untouched.

These changes raise a multitude of questions and have stimulated new forms of research. Much of the work now being done has, either directly or indirectly, an applied aspect to it. This is perhaps most obvious with studies of health behavior and education, but it also holds in the areas of politics and economics. It has become increasingly difficult to distinguish pure ethnological studies from applied ones, and indeed, government reports often provide excellent data. As more Polynesians have become sophisticated scholars, their observations and studies have taken an important place in the overall picture. The publications of the University of the South Pacific, mostly authored by indigenous islanders, constitute a landmark in this regard.

Although none of the chapters in this book deal directly with this applied orientation, several of the essays raise relevant issues. Howard and Kirkpatrick's discussion of social organization in chapter 3, for example, raises questions regarding the degree to which underlying structural principles have been adapted to new community contexts. How, for example, are the principles of seniority and gender expressed among Polynesians in different types of communities? To what extent have changes in education and occupation affected the application of these principles? And how are traditional kinship groupings being redefined today, with potential members residing in distant and culturally distinct locations?

In chapter 4, the Ritchies offer a number of suggestions for exploration. They point to a need for research on contemporary Polynesian conceptions of socialization. There is also a need to explore the effects of exposure to new socialization models on Polynesians and how childrearing is affected by significant changes in parental activity patterns. The Ritchies face the issue of applying anthropological insights to existing social problems head-on. It is important, they point out, to find new ways to help Polynesians cope with the stresses of urbanization. A low level of parental interaction with children may have worked well in community-oriented environments where others took up the slack, but in settings where the nuclear family constitutes the main socializing agent serious problems can arise. The Ritchies alert us to the problem of major discontinuities among expectations in Polynesian homes and Western urban communities. They suggest that although punishment is expected to be swift and harsh in the home when community standards are violated, procedures within the larger legal system of Western cities are much more protracted, capricious, and unpredictable. Problems

such as these need to be better understood if we are to translate our academic insights regarding Polynesian life into effective practical advice.

Shore (chapter 5) and Marcus (chapter 6) raise questions concerning principles of status and prerogative in modern Polynesian communities. How are the legacies of *mana* and status rivalry played out in modern political contexts? And what has happened to the concept of *tapu*? Drivers along Hawaii's highways see *kapu* signs in various places. In what sense is this an elaboration or transformation of the concept discussed by Shore? Marcus' concern with political economy, especially when connected to issues relating to the invention of tradition, raises intriguing questions. To what degree, for example, are modern expressions of chieftainship an attempt to retain a symbolic identity among economically peripheral groups? And to what degree are indigenous movements, such as *Maoritanga* and the Hawaiian Renaissance, shaped by Polynesian efforts to come to terms with new economic, political, and social pressures of the past several decades (see, e.g., Linnekin 1983, Ogan 1984, Hanson 1989)? We need a better understanding of how the principles of hierarchy operate in modern Polynesian communities. It seems quite natural to focus on chieftainship in Samoa, Tonga, and Fiji, where the institution remains strong. But how do the principles of status now operate among Hawaiians, Tahitians, Rarotongans, and Maori?

Kaepler's chapter (7) on art and aesthetics likewise raises a number of issues concerning the adaptation of traditional forms to modern contexts. Not only does she draw our attention to the development of "airport art," which is geared for the tourist industry, but her essay raises questions concerning the place of art within the modern political arena. To what extent, for example, have particular artifacts and performances become political symbols for expressing identity and mobilizing sentiment? And, more generally, what is the role of art and aesthetics within modern Polynesian contexts? The ethnographic data bearing on these issues are surprisingly thin.

On the whole, the quality of ethnographic research being done today is impressive. But although excellent studies of particular institutions exist for various archipelagoes, the record remains somewhat uneven and shows significant gaps. This makes it difficult to gain a holistic understanding of particular societies—of how various detailed studies all fit together. As a result, cross-cultural comparisons are hampered. Patchwork data on one group are compared with patchwork data on another.

Another problem concerns the dimension of time. Many fine ethnographies were done decades ago on particular communities. Their very quality calls for restudy, so we can gain a perspective on how they have changed through time, and how they have responded to intensified relations with the larger world economic system. Better yet would be long-

term monitoring of societies. The project conducted by Huntsman and Hooper in the Tokelaus, which has involved ongoing contact over a period of two decades, might serve as a model in this regard. The value of longitudinal research is that it helps avoid the pitfall of perceiving Polynesian societies as static structures and provides a much better basis for grasping the nature of dynamic social processes characteristic of these societies.

We might add here that the way is open for considerable innovation in the recording of ethnographic information, given recent technological advances. The possibility now exists for doing ethnographies in hypermedia (see A. Howard 1988), allowing readers to explore the ethnographic record in innovative ways, and to add to it where appropriate. Perhaps it will become appropriate to talk about on-line data bases in the future, rather than ethnographies. Accounts may be open, rather than restricted, and people from targeted communities may have the option of adding to and correcting an accumulative account regarding themselves. What one would then have would be an ongoing, growing record of Polynesian groups, evolving out of a dialogue among indigenous as well as outside observers.

Comparative Analysis

Polynesia has often been touted as a laboratory for comparative studies, and indeed some of the best scholarly work in the region has taken advantage of this opportunity.

We believe the goals of comparisons should be three-fold: (1) they should aim at illuminating underlying structural patterns shared among Polynesian groups as well as explaining variations on common themes; (2) they should strive to illuminate key variables that have facilitated continuity and change through time; and (3) they should look for similarities and differences between Polynesia and other areas within Oceania and beyond. Within this rubric of goals two types of comparisons are needed.

The first is controlled comparisons of island groups with similar institutions. One such example is Kirch's "comparative note" regarding Hawaii and Tonga. He points out that "Hawai'i and Tonga are two of the most elaborated Polynesian chiefdoms, and convergences in their respective evolutionary pathways are of particular interest, since (given the great isolation between the two societies) these must have arisen from the commonly inherited structural base, and from similar evolutionary conditions and constraints" (Kirch 1984a:262). Hanson's (1973) comparative analysis of political change in Tahiti and Samoa illuminates similarities and differences in the ways these archipelagoes

responded to European intrusion. Feinberg's (1988) analysis of differences in chieftainship on the outliers of Anuta and Nukumanu provides another example. In this instance it is the contrast between a high island (small as it may be) and an atoll that is of central interest.

Marcus uses the method of controlled comparison in the section of his chapter called "The Chief's Two Bodies in Tonga and Samoa." He sees chieftainship in the two archipelagoes as representing opposite poles of the kingly/populist continuum. One might ask how this contrast evolved. Given accounts of prehistoric relations between the two groups, might a pattern of schizmogogenesis have developed? Or do these differences derive from differences in the postcontact period?

The second set of comparisons is broader in nature. They follow the pattern set by Williamson (1924, 1933), Burrows (1939b), Sahlins (1958), and Goldman (1970), and explore general patterns and processes within Polynesia as a whole.

Shore's analysis is a particularly good example of the insights that can be drawn from such an approach. As Shore states in chapter 5 (p. 164): "no coherent vision of local variation in Polynesia is possible without a prior clarification of what common characteristics make it a real culture area." Certainly one must exercise caution interpreting prehistoric and early historic Polynesian worldview, given the limited nature of the sources. But it is clear that such generalizations prove immensely valuable for interpreting individual cases. Shore's analysis of *mana* provides a framework for comprehending the concept in Pukapuka as well as Hawaii, and it reveals important possibilities for reflecting on how the concept was incorporated into Christianity. His analysis of variations between western and eastern Polynesia is particularly suggestive. It creates a framework for further exploration of variations in kinship, political organization, and responses to change within and between these subregions.

The Ritchies' (chapter 4) analysis of cultural targets for child training provides another example of the insights gained from bold pan-Polynesian comparisons. The importance of context, relatedness and kinship, status and respect, sharing and caring, and unity through consensus are important themes in every Polynesian society, though their specific manifestations may vary. Also pervasive are the importance of communities as primary contexts for socialization and of peers as socialization agents. Within this general framework, one can explore the conditions under which social reproduction occurs in different societies. Why do societies that are as different as Pukapuka and Hawaii possess so many similarities in childrearing? And how are these reproduced through time in such markedly different social environments? What specific variables might help explain the difference in social character that has developed among different groups of Polynesians? How, for

example, can we account for differences in violence among Polynesian communities? Why does Samoa have high rates of violence while in Rotuma and Pukapuka violence is relatively rare? Why do some Polynesians adapt easily to the demands of an urban environment while others experience much difficulty? These are only a few of the questions one might subject to comparative analysis.

The Ritchies also raise important questions regarding styles of learning. Much has been written on the contrast between Western competitive and Polynesian cooperative learning styles. It has been "verified" with various tests and statistics. But such formulations are clearly an oversimplification. Polynesians can also be highly competitive, and it would be surprising if this fact were not reflected in their learning styles. That Western researchers should focus on cooperative aspects at the expense of competitive aspects of Polynesian learning indicates something about Western images of Polynesians. We need to move away from global distinctions toward a more sensitive appraisal of subtleties. Certainly significant variations exist among Polynesian groups. It would be valuable to know what these are and why they exist. We must, in brief, pay more attention to learning as a process and how it varies in different contexts and among different groups. The arbitrary, oversimplified analyses of us versus them will no longer do.

The possibilities for broad comparison are almost endless and cross-cut all of the dimensions dealt with in this volume. We need to re-examine old issues, such as how cultural and ecological factors have interacted in different environments to generate variations upon a common cultural base (note Roscoe 1988). And we need to explore new ones, such as how notions of tradition are being used to validate and justify contemporary actions. Related to this issue is the question of how concepts of cultural identity are being reshaped to meet modern conditions. In this regard, one might compare the modern adaptations of various Polynesian groups to different urban settings, for example, to Auckland, Los Angeles, and Sydney.

We also would like to draw attention to the possibilities for broader comparisons between Polynesia and other parts of Oceania. The series sponsored by the Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania provides examples of what can be accomplished when multiple authors contribute toward a comparative understanding of important issues. Topics such as adoption (Carroll, ed. 1970; Brady, ed. 1976), land tenure (Lundsgaarde 1974; see also Crocombe 1971), resettlement (Lieber 1977), and siblinship (Marshall 1981), have all benefitted from this type of interregional comparison.

Focused comparisons between Polynesia and Melanesia, and Polynesia and Micronesia, would also be beneficial. One of the better known attempts in this direction is Sahlins' (1963) bigman/chief article. In

response to Sahlins' analysis, a number of scholars have pointed out that it is not an either/or situation for either region. There are ambiguities and gradients that exist with respect to leadership in both Melanesia and Polynesia. But it might be valuable to ask again, building on Sahlins' insights and with the new ethnographic data at hand, how and why the regions differ in their political organization. The issue of trade networks would also benefit from interregional comparisons. In both Melanesia and Polynesia, exchange is often multi-stranded and constitutive of social groups. In what ways do the processes work differently in the two regions, and how do they relate to differences in political organization? And given differing conceptions of gender between the two regions, can one arrive at credible generalizations regarding the factors involved?

Another set of interesting comparisons one might draw between Melanesia and Polynesia concerns their responses to Western contact (and Western responses to them). In a seminal article, Valentine (1963) compares Western colonization of Polynesia with that of Melanesia. He suggests that differences between the two regions regarding colonization and indigenous responses to it derive from the fit (or non-fit) of indigenous institutions with European ones.

With regard to Micronesia, a natural basis for comparison would be the atolls in both regions. Although Alkire (1978) and Mason (1959) provided an important start in that direction, much remains to be done in examining the interaction of cultural factors with the ecological constraints of atoll environments. Robert Levy (1972) and Alan Howard (1979) saw fit to include Micronesia and Polynesia under the same umbrella for discussing psychological and psychiatric phenomena, but little has been done to compare and contrast social institutions between the two regions.

Moving beyond Oceania, Marcus (chapter 6) notes important similarities between certain Polynesian and Southeast Asian polities. He finds Goldman's notion of status lineage relevant to both regions. And several Japanese scholars who have read Shore's analyses on Samoa are intrigued by the parallels between the two cultures in respect to dual organization. Polynesia's cultural commitment to an ideology of hierarchy and divine chieftainship certainly makes it ripe for comparison with other regions marked by institutions of kingship, as A. M. Hocart (1927) recognized long ago. There is also much room for comparing Polynesia and other regions of the world in respect to issues of decolonization, the impact of the world economic system, and the effects of modernization on health and well-being.

To summarize, the main goal of this book has been to frame questions for exploration. To do this, each author in his or her own way provided a retrospective account of earlier work in a particular specialty. They

then described new possibilities for research. What we hope readers will end with is a sense of the rich possibilities for analysis that exist in the region. The words written by the explorer Louis de Bougainville in 1772 remain as appropriate today as they were then.

"Who can give an account of the manner in which they were conveyed hither, what communications they have with other beings, and what becomes of them when they multiply on an isle."