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ABSTRACT

A frequently-remarked feature of Melanesian societies is the persistence of core cultural institutions in conjunction with profound environmental change. Nowhere is this more evident than among the Tolai people of Papua New Guinea, who, despite more than a century of intense Western influence, still maintain so much of their rich cultural heritage. Mere co-existence of separate spheres of cultural reality is unexceptional, but the Tolai experience presents a greater incentive for analysis in that, from the earliest times of interaction, there is evidence of a propensity to incorporate their own and the introduced culture into a genuinely pluralist order. No such accommodation was available under the intruding colonial regime, which offered only subordination of the indigenous to the Western culture. The expectation that indigenous cultures would ultimately be subsumed under a Western-style legal order is as far from realisation as ever. Given a commitment to legal pluralism articulated at independence in Papua New Guinea's Constitution, the thesis examines the Tolai capacity for cultural incorporation, and the potential for its development.

Focusing this examination on land tenure is no more than a reflection of its centrality to indigenous and Western cultures alike. Colonisation entailed the alienation of much Tolai land, and the imposition of Western land tenure concepts. More trenchant, however, was the general impact of Western governmental processes, concepts of the individual's position in a society, and capitalist economic relations, on Tolai attitudes and institutions. Yet, in reviewing change in the Tolai community - in their social structure, settlement patterns, religious beliefs, and political and economic life - under a century of environmental transformation, the persistence of their cultural institutions is emphatic. Inherently flexible, their culture affords wide scope for the exercise of initiative in response to challenge, enabling Tolai to incorporate in their legal order those aspects of the Western culture which they value. By its flexibility, the integrity of their culture has survived.
Following the historical dichotomy of land tenure, change is examined first as a spontaneous process of adjustment to the tenure in customary land, and then in its prescriptive guise, as the legislative process for introducing an alternative tenure regime to land alienated from customary tenure. In the Tolai village, land interests are adjusted in response to the needs of an increasing population with rising expectations, as well as to the impact of more general social, economic and political developments in the wider society. Customary tenure is revealed as dynamic, enabling the continual redistribution of land, and its most advantageous use by village residents subject only to the constraints consequent on the State's refusal to accord it formal recognition. On alienated land, however, the imported legal order offers no potential for adaptation to changing needs, and constant tension between the two legal cultures is evident. Distribution of alienated land allows no accommodation for the increasing Tolai population, the land is seriously under-utilised, and titleholders depend on increasing State support.

The marked superiority of customary tenures, when contrasted with the expense, unresponsiveness to social change and economic inefficiency of the introduced tenures, demands a reversal of the inherited official attitudes to land tenure. The Tolai experience indicates that Melanesian societies will continue to resist the imposition of tenures under a foreign legal culture, and to respond to the challenges of the future by utilising their inherent capacity for spontaneous cultural incorporation. The State should concentrate on facilitating and, if necessary, guiding this natural process, instead of wasting scarce resources on promoting ineffective - and, often, even counterproductive - alternative measures.
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My first experience of the Tolai area was in 1970. The Territory of New Guinea was still being administered by Australia under a United Nations trusteeship, and the same year mounting Tolai discontent prompted a visit to Rabaul by Gough Whitlam, then Leader of the Opposition in the Australian Parliament, followed by the then Australian Prime Minister, John Gorton. This first-hand experience by the Australian political leadership proved crucial in bringing forward Papua New Guinea's independence — a fitting testimonial to the pivotal influence of the Tolai throughout the era of colonial administration.

A principal object of the Tolai discontent was alienated land. On the eve of independence, in 1970 the Australian Administration was still proceeding with confirmation of its title to lands acquired during the last century. As a lawyer in the Public Solicitor's Office I represented Tolai in opposing claims for registration of titles to alienated land, but Tolai expectations of a judicial solution to their grievances were usually disappointed, as the scope for successful opposition to such claims had been progressively narrowed by legislative enactment and judicial determination. In July 1971 the Full Supreme Court decided that a Tolai claim of right to land deriving from uninterrupted possession from "time immemorial" could not be entertained against a registered title (In Re Vunapaladig and Japaplik Land [1971-72] P.N.G.L.R. 229), so the prospect of judicial settlement of Tolai grievances was authoritatively dismissed. The following month the East New Britain District Commissioner was killed while leading a police party attempting to remove a large group of Tolai occupying an expatriate-owned plantation. In January 1972 a Commission of Inquiry was appointed to investigate Tolai claims to another occupied plantation (Nganalaka), to which I acted as counsel for the Tolai claimants.

Election of the first Somare Government in 1972 led to the appointment in 1973 of the Commission of Inquiry into Land Matters, with directions to investigate "the major land questions with which
Papua New Guinea is faced today", and to recommend solutions (Papua New Guinea 1973:3-6). I was its research officer, and at its direction investigated Tolai attitudes relevant to the question of formal recognition of customary tenure. In 1974 a Policy and Research Branch was established in Lands Department with the immediate function of bringing forward the Report of the Commission of Inquiry into Land Matters for Government consideration and implementation. I was initially seconded to the branch, and in February 1976 was appointed Assistant Director (Policy and Research) in the Department. In 1978 I conducted a research programme involving fieldwork in five Provinces (including East New Britain), part of which (research in the Oro and Eastern Highlands Provinces) was written up in my Master of Laws thesis (Fingleton 1980). I ceased my employment in Papua New Guinea at the end of 1978.

My varying experience in land matters - first as the legal representative of Papua New Guinean claimants in land litigation, next as a member of a body charged with recommending comprehensive reforms in land policy, legislation and administrative practice, then as the officer responsible for seeing those reforms through the executive and legislative processes, and finally in conducting research through fieldwork at village level - formed two strong impressions in my mind. The first was an awareness of how little had been achieved under the colonial development philosophy of replacing indigenous social, economic and political institutions with the "advanced" Western values, laws and bureaucratic processes. A natural focus of this social Darwinism was land tenure, and measures had been introduced with a view to converting customary tenures into Western-style titles, seen as a necessary precursor to economic growth. My experience suggested that these measures had made a minimal contribution to economic development, and often at considerable social cost. Furthermore, there was general evidence that the removal of land from the customary domain, although a legal fact, was in actuality a fiction. The second impression was a corollary of the first. As I became aware of the resilience of indigenous institutions in the face of attempts at prescriptive change, at the same time I was increasingly impressed by the Melanesian capacity for spontaneous cultural incorporation in response to their changing social, political and economic environment. The comprehensiveness and flexibility of their cultural institutions had facilitated adaptation to new demands
on land, suggesting that colonial policy dismissing customary tenures as inherently unsuitable for emerging needs was misconceived. It was these twin impressions, and the wish to test them, which inspired the present thesis.

I began the doctoral thesis in May 1980. My original intention had been to conduct a comparative study of land tenure reform in three Melanesian countries - Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. Twelve months into my course I was obliged to abandon this comparative treatment when (contrary to all indications given to me by that stage) the Vanuatu Government advised that research on land tenure was confined to its own citizens. The present thesis topic was then adopted. I spent two weeks conducting preparatory fieldwork in the Tolai area in September and October 1981, and carried out my major fieldwork from July until October 1982. Two weeks' documentary research was done in Port Moresby in August 1984, where I also was joined by two of my main Tolai informants. It will be apparent that before my fieldwork began I had already built up a familiarity with the Tolai area, and in conducting my research I was able to draw on a wide network of contacts among Government officials in Rabaul, and in many villages. My main fieldwork was conducted at Rakunat (where I had first worked in 1978), but my investigations took me over the length and breadth of the Tolai area, producing over 1,000 pages of typed, (translated) verbatim records of interviews for systematic processing and analysis.

A number of matters regarding data collection and thesis presentation need mention. Interviews with Tolai informants were conducted in Tok Pisin - the main lingua franca of Papua New Guinea. Although the status of Tok Pisin as a language is undeniable, some non-Tolai commentators have claimed that it is held in low esteem by Tolai (see, e.g., Mosel 1979: 163; Bradley 1982: 143, fn 10). While it is natural that Tolai might regard Tok Pisin as inferior to their own language (Kuanua), I have never experienced any Tolai reluctance to converse in Tok Pisin (see also Bell 1977:676), at least from Tolai males. I do not deny that Kuanua is a better medium for

---

1 Bradley claims that "many [Tolai] village women do not speak Pidgin." (1982:214.) Some female informants spoke directly to me in Tok Pisin, while others preferred to communicate through a male translator - though whether because of lack of fluency or reluctance was not apparent.
communication with Tolai villagers (and knowledge of some Kuanua terms is highly desirable for discussing land tenure and associated matters), but I do claim that, in communication between Tolai and non-Tolai, use of Tok Pisin in which both parties are fluent is superior to use of English or Kuanua in which one or other party is not. I began learning Tok Pisin in 1970, and in 1978, to verify my proficiency, I gained a certificate from the Professor of Language at the University of Papua New Guinea stating that I had passed an examination in Tok Pisin, and was "deemed...competent to conduct research in that language."

Regarding orthography and pronunciation, I have rendered personal names and names of vunatarai phonetically as I heard them, but for place names I have generally employed those used in the 1980 National Population Census and associated maps. In some areas b and d are pre-nasalised (thus tambu, instead of tabu), and v is generally pronounced much like the English w, although the lips are not rounded. To is the most common prefix for names of men, and Ia for names of women, but for euphony in certain names the prefixes are replaced by Ta, Te, Ti or Tu, and Ie or Io respectively.

Certain usages in the text need explanation:

Administration/Government: "Administration" refers to the Australian Administration of the Territory of New Guinea, and of the combined Territory of Papua (and) New Guinea, while "Government" is used for the period after Self-government on 1 December 1973.

big-man: leader with prominence above vunatarai level.

didiman: field officer of the Department of Agriculture, Stock and Fisheries, now the Department of Primary Industry.

District, Sub-District: After introduction of Provincial Government in 1975, former Districts became Provinces, and former Sub-Districts became Districts.

districts, Sub-districts: Formerly a single administrative district, the island of New Britain was divided into the Districts (now Provinces) of East and West New Britain in 1966. The Gazelle Peninsula comprises the northern part of East New Britain Province, but the term is often used in referring only to its populous north-eastern corner. I have avoided this sometimes-misleading usage, but when discussing areas of Tolai occupation I differentiate between the offshore islands of the Peninsula and "the Peninsula mainland". Within this Tolai-occupied area of the Peninsula mainland another geographical unit - the Crater Peninsula - is identified.
kiap: field officer of the Department of District Services and Native Affairs, and its successors.

LTC: Land Titles Commission.

legislation: Ordinances still in force at Self-government were renamed Acts.

monetary symbols: Australian pounds were replaced by Australian dollars (one pound to $2) in 1966, which were replaced by Kina (K) in 1975 at parity. In April 1985 K1 was worth just under $AUS 1:50.

Papua New Guinea: Except where the historical context requires a precise reference to the status of either of the two former territories, the term "Papua New Guinea" is used throughout to denote what became the state of Papua New Guinea at independence.

Papua New Guinean: The term had no legal meaning until independence. The word "native" was used in legislation, defined to mean "an aboriginal inhabitant" of Papua New Guinea, but, unless quoting directly, the term "Papua New Guinean" is used in its place throughout.

Many people assisted my research in different ways. Ronald ToVue, the Premier of East New Britain Province, and Onias ToMano, the Deputy Premier, welcomed me back to the Province and provided practical assistance. Karipe Pitzz, the Secretary of Lands Department, allowed me access to official information, in which I was assisted by his executive officer Benson ToNiaring. Norm Oliver of the LTC was, as usual, extremely helpful. At Rabaul I was assisted by Sailas Peril, the Provincial Lands Officer, and Oskar Daniel and Emori Robinson from his staff. The Tolai anthropologist, Jacob Simet, a fellow student at the Australian National University, helped me in many ways, and in their special areas I was assisted by the following members of the university: Chris Gregory from Anthropology, Bryant Allen and Michael Bourke from Human Geography, Tom Dutton, Rod Lacey and Malcolm Ross from Linguistics, and Wal Ambrose from Prehistory. Jim Specht from the Australian Museum and Wally Johnson from the Bureau of Mineral Resources also deserve my thanks. For his kind assistance in fieldwork arrangements I am grateful to Hosea John, the university's manager in Port Moresby. Without the scholarship and field research funds provided by the Australian National University, this research, of course, could not have been undertaken, but indispensable support was provided by my parents, Philippa and Jack Fingleton. Ken Granger made his land tenure and land use maps of the
Tolai area available to me, and Theo Baumann, Keith Mitchell and Suzie Jeffcoat of the Cartography Laboratory drew maps and diagrams for me. Roger Keesing graciously lent me a room in Anthropology Department, in which I finished my writing-up.

I could not have produced this thesis without the generous assistance I received in the Tolai area. In particular I am most grateful to my friend Michael Manning and his wife Relly (IaMarkapa), who accommodated me and helped in countless other ways. At Rakunat village Dimain ToKurapa was a constant source of guidance and assistance, and major contributions were also made by Daniel ToWaai, Amos Tamti (now deceased), Ronal ToVule, Robin ToMonongia, Isimel ToWalaka, ToPeu and ToPuipui, and IaMonika IeVilau, IaParaide, Hilda IaPailingan and Naomi IaMar. Elsewhere I received valuable assistance from ToLaku Epinson (now deceased), Meriba ToMakala, Tamian, Raphael Turnamur, Melly Paivu, Melly Gaius, Andrew Berik, IaNis, Apelis Kepas, Poe Apelis, Barnabus ToLingling, Daniel ToKot, Enos Titi, Gerson Tati, Joe ToGuan Logo, John Walia, IaKiritina, Mesulam Tarakai, Peter Urami, ToRoli Anet, Wesli ToWaninara, Christine Bradley, Trevor Clarke, John Hewitt, John Perkins, Alex Subramaniam and Lester Symons. My supervisor through this thesis, Peter Sack, brought his towering intellect to bear in challenging me to refine my conclusions, and provided insights from his wealth of knowledge of the Tolai and the area's history. He also gave me access to relevant parts of his fieldwork notes, and his unpublished papers. When my research took a distinct anthropological bent Martha Macintyre kindly consented to become a joint supervisor, and, apart from providing much-needed encouragement, steered me around the perils of my disciplinary trespass. I am deeply grateful to them both. The most gratitude of all I owe to my family, Janet and Jessie, for sharing the burdens of a research student, and in Janet's case, for painstakingly wrestling the text into a perverse computer system. The demands of this latter effort were enormous.
INTRODUCTION

The Tolai are an ethnic group, large by Melanesian standards, whose present population probably exceeds 90,000. Some 70,000 Tolai live in almost 200 villages (the largest having less than 800 residents) which are scattered across their traditional territory at the north-eastern corner of the Gazelle Peninsula and offshore islands. Other Tolai live in Rabaul, the main town within their territory, in Kokopo and Kerevat, at schools and other Government institutions, on settlement schemes and at small commercial centres, but a large number live outside the Tolai territory, mainly for employment reasons in the cities, towns and Government stations throughout Papua New Guinea.

A long-time German resident among the Tolai wrote in 1939 that "they are all in all a hard-working people" (Meier 1939: 108, fn 48), whose thinking is characterised by "intelligence, common sense, mental adroitness, shrewdness, and logic" (ibid., 126). In 1961 A.L. Epstein said of them that they are "commonly regarded as the wealthiest and most sophisticated [indigenous people) in New Guinea" (1961: 492), with "an awareness of the outside world to a degree unusual at the time amongst people of their level of social development." (Ibid., 493.) Other commentators at the time wrote that the Tolai "are probably the largest politically advanced group" in Papua New Guinea (Champness et al. 1963/64: 67), and in 1971 Epstein claimed they had good reason to view themselves "as an indigenous occupational elite," (1971: 440.) While the fruits of post-war education programmes, and policies aimed at equalising economic opportunities and evening-out regional representation in the public service, have checked Tolai prominence in the new nation's political and economic environment, their history of Western cultural penetration has endowed them with an experience of change unsurpassed in its duration and intensity by that of any other Melanesian people.

In remarking a post-European contact history of "fluctuation and disturbance" which has "constituted a considerable attack on the
traditional fabric of Tolai social life", Epstein joined many others in asserting that the Tolai have, nevertheless, "maintained a way of life that remains, in many important respects, recognizably traditional." (1963: 182-83.) It is this theme, which the same author terms "continuity and change" (ibid., 182), that forms the leitmotiv of my thesis. In analysing changes in the tenure to Tolai land since Western influence began just over a century ago, my goal is to identify those features of Tolai culture which have enabled its adaptation to changing social, political and economic conditions, reflected in the new demands being made on land. By demonstrating both the durability and inherent adaptability of indigenous cultural institutions, and their capacity to promote the most advantageous use of land, I hope the thesis will encourage policy-makers in Papua New Guinea to relinquish the inherited colonial strategy of prescriptive social change, and realise the constitutional commitment to promote development primarily through the use of Melanesian forms of social and political organisation.

Analysis of change is especially problematic where historical reconstruction depends for the version of insiders on indigenous oral history, and where all contemporary literary sources represent outsiders' interpretations. I have been at pains, therefore, to avoid a facile (and probably fallacious) reconstruction of "traditional Tolai society", and have tried instead to identify the trends of continuity and change from what evidence is available, without a preconceived pre-contact status quo. While as an exercise in historical reconstruction this approach must be imperfect, I am encouraged nevertheless by my conviction that, for all practical purposes in present Tolai society, it is the current version of past events which is important. Pre-eminently, land tenure is the agency through which Tolai history and tradition are transmitted (see A.L. and T.S. Epstein 1962: 80-81); the transmission of knowledge (varvateten) is a vital Tolai concern (Epstein 1964/65: 22). While an essentially oral culture allows for the continual modification of knowledge, and even accommodates conflicting versions of the same events, I am acutely aware that by committing information to written form a flexibility vital to Tolai adaptation will be impaired. Record-keeping is, however, already well established among the Tolai - indeed, they value it - and I can only caution against acceptance of my data as immutable fact. Furthermore, although I was able to subject
most of my findings and interpretations to rigorous cross-checking, I cannot exclude entirely the possibility of mistakes in my reception of information.

The thesis is divided into three parts. Part I examines the Tolai experience of change from two perspectives, the first (in Chapter 1) offering an historical account of change in the general Tolai environment, and the second (in Chapter 2) looking at the impact of those environmental influences on Tolai cultural institutions. A student of the Tolai is confronted by an ethnographic literature of almost embarrassing proportions, dating from the earliest European settlement among them by missionaries and traders. Unfortunately, much of the material from German times remains untranslated into English, but a substantial body of information on the early post-contact period is available in publications by the missionaries Brown (1908; 1910), Danks (1887/88; 1933) and Meier (1929; 1938; 1939), and in particular by the planter Parkinson (1907). More recently three prominent anthropologists, A.L. and T.S. Epstein, and Richard Salisbury, conducted extensive fieldwork in the Tolai area, productive of a wealth of ethnographic information (in particular, see A.L. Epstein 1961; 1963; 1964/65; 1969; 1970/71; 1971; A.L. and T.S. Epstein 1962; T.S. Epstein 1968; Salisbury 1966; 1970; 1972), and in 1982 another anthropologist, Christine Bradley, produced a major work, *Tolai Women and Development*. The geographer Peter Irwin presented a thesis on land use in the Tolai area in 1965, and lawyers have also made important contributions, while writing either about land laws generally in New Guinea (Sack 1973, Bredmeyer 1981), or about particular aspects of Tolai culture and history (Sack 1974; 1976; 1982). Tolai themselves have recently begun contributing to their own literature (e.g., Kaputin 1978; Simet 1977).

In presenting an historical overview, again an extensive literature is available, rendering originality elusive. Both Sack (1973) and Firth (1982) have written about the German administration of New Guinea, and Rowley (1958) and Mair (1970) about parts of the Australian period. Fitzpatrick's recent *Law and State in Papua New Guinea* (1980) is a provocative historical analysis of the central role of law in mediating between indigenous and capitalist modes of production, thereby securing the coherence of a characteristic Third World nation state. My intention in Chapter 1 is to do no more than outline the environmental influences which have induced Tolai cultural
adaptation, for which purpose it was fitting to begin with a description of the physical environment - the landforms thrown up by volcanism, the soils laid down by successive eruptions, and the climatic conditions - whose properties make the area so attractive for agriculture and human occupation. This natural potential supported a Tolai population estimated at 20,000 in 1875, when permanent European settlement in the area began. Tolai origins, their connections and relations with neighbouring peoples in New Britain and New Ireland, and their response to the increasing European presence in their territory are next examined, and the chapter ends with an account of the major political, social and economic changes over the century or so since Western influence became such a prominent agent of cultural change. A natural thread running through this historical account is changes in official attitudes and policies on land in the Tolai area - a central concern to the intruding colonists and their host Tolai communities alike.

Chapter 2 investigates the impact of these influences within the changing Tolai environment on what I identify as core Tolai cultural institutions. In remarking trends of continuity and change in Tolai social structure and concepts of corporate identity, in kinship concepts and marriage practice, in their patterns of settlement and residence, in religious beliefs and practice, and in the political and economic life of the Tolai, I have drawn together material from many sources in the ethnographic literature, although this wealth of information is supplemented by my own perceptions gained from fieldwork. While a theme of cultural coherence runs through the chapter, for my purposes in analysing land tenure I have tended to an artificial differentiation between components of the Tolai culture. My approach, put simply, is that land tenure represents the interaction of core cultural institutions under the influence of environmental factors, and, on this approach, treatment at this stage of land tenure as an "institution" (or as a "system" - see Epstein 1969:110-37) is inappropriate. Thus while the special significance of Tolai cultural institutions in tenure matters is indicated in the chapter, my treatment leaves analysis of how their interaction is manifested in Tolai tenure until after the process of spontaneous land tenure change has been examined in Part II. A point related to my eschewing analysis of customary tenure as a system is that I have not resiled from using terms such as "land ownership", "land acquisition" and "land
disposition" - terms usually indicating a system based on commodity relations in land. As the thesis makes abundantly clear, land, for the Tolai, is not a commodity. I am no more concerned with semantics than the Tolai are in using the corresponding Tok Pisin terms bosim giraun (or papa bilong giraun), baiim giraun and salim giraun.

Based on the finding in Part I that Tolai cultural institutions have survived the far-reaching changes of the last century - intact, but modified in response to the changing Tolai environment - I proceed in Part II with my major case study of land tenure change in a Tolai village. Rakunat village, on the outer slopes of the Rabaul caldera facing St George's Channel, was chosen because, uniquely in Papua New Guinea, a formal record of land ownership within the area surrounding the village was completed in 1966, under legislation then in force for registering customary land. For the purpose of analysing land tenure change, from this factual starting-point I took three main historical phases: the period of original Tolai settlement of the Rakunat land (dealt with in Chapter 3); the following period up to formal declaration of Rakunat land tenure in 1966 (Chapter 4); and, finally, the period from 1966 until completion of fieldwork in 1982 (Chapter 5).

In tracing the emerging tenure pattern I embrace Tolai cultural concepts identified in Chapter 2 as central to land tenure matters. Foremost among these is the concept of "local identity" - the extent to which a group is identified with the locality in which it is settled. Through each historical phase, the impact on Rakunat land tenure of groups arriving in the area and settling with the local community is examined in accordance with this basic tenure criterion of each group's local identity. New settlement results from intergroup associations and the creation of kinship and affinal relationships. As these are developed and confirmed over time, adjustments are made to the tenure of land parcels to incorporate newly-settling groups within the community, and make provision for their livelihood needs. Changes occur in the membership strength of other locally-based groups, leading to further tenure adjustments. In each chapter of Part II I identify the intergroup and interpersonal connections mobilised in the process of securing access to Rakunat land.

The importance of the comprehensive treatment given to Tolai cultural institutions in Chapter 2 becomes apparent in this Part. No individual ever acts entirely independently in any sphere of Tolai
life. Just as kinship groups are identified with a particular locality, so also does a Tolai's tenure to land depend on the intensity with which he or she is identified with it. This identification derives from a history of connection with the land - both in a personal capacity and as a member of a kinship group. Relationships formed at both individual and group levels must be maintained, if a person's tenure is to remain secure. The changing political scene in the village - the influence of big-men, and of sorcerers - will suppress land claims, possibly for many decades. The land tenure status quo is constantly contingent on the political forces in the community, and on the continued maintenance of social relationships. This inherence of land tenure in affairs at village level necessitates the active participation by Tolai in ceremonial activities, and day-to-day social interaction.

The tenure to any parcel of Tolai land cannot be understood except within the historical framework of emerging social and political relationships. It was only after my return from fieldwork, and many months spent piecing together the separate statements of informants, my observations of parcel occupation, and all the relevant genealogical connections, that the comprehensive framework necessary to explain the process leading to the present tenure pattern emerged. Basic to appreciation of the developing tenure picture was a grasp of the flexibility of Tolai cultural institutions - a flexibility which I claim stems partly from the comprehensiveness of their institutions, and partly from the relativity of the underlying concepts. In proceeding through the three historical phases of land tenure change at Rakunat I demonstrate the interaction of these cultural institutions, and how they have been adapted to respond to the changing circumstances of the community. The pace of change has steadily increased, and not all adaptations attempted by this innovative people have survived. Modification of underlying cultural concepts in response to new demands is essentially an experimental process, and only time will tell what changes are accepted as part of the new order.

My treatment of land tenure adjustments since first settlement at Rakunat has, therefore, required a detailed exposition of the social and political context in which each transaction was effected. Transactions during each phase of settlement have been assembled under categories, according to the local identity of the groups whose
members were acquiring land. Within this framework, the particular circumstances of individual transactions are presented, so that in summarising tenure adjustments under each category the central features underlying the transactions can be identified. At the end of each chapter I discuss the factors causing land tenure change over the period under consideration, the process of that change, and the pattern of settlement which resulted.

In Part III I analyse the Tolai experience of changing land tenure in its two alternative manifestations, the first being tenure change as a spontaneous process (dealt with in Chapter 6), and the second being tenure reform by legislative intervention (in Chapter 7). From the findings on the Rakunat experience in Part II, I examine in Chapter 6 the general influences causing spontaneous change in customary land tenure, and the means by which that change is achieved. Based on the proven inherence of Tolai social organisation in their customary tenure, I finish the chapter by considering how change in Tolai social organisation has affected land tenure. Chapter 7 is concerned with the reverse causality - the effects of prescriptive changes in land tenure on the intergroup and interpersonal relationships identified as central to Tolai social organisation. The two main forms of title introduced during the colonial period as alternatives to customary tenure - the settlement scheme lease and the tenure-converted freehold - are analysed in terms of their policy objectives, and their social and economic consequences. Finally, the same analysis is given to the only significant tenure reform introduced since independence, the Plantation Redistribution Scheme. After considering the Tolai experience of each measure, I draw conclusions relevant to future policy formulation on land tenure, while the lessons to be learnt from their accumulated experience of both spontaneous and prescriptive tenure change are brought together in the Conclusion.
PART I

THE TOLAI SETTING
CHAPTER 1

THE CHANGING TOLAI ENVIRONMENT

1. THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Climate and volcanism together dominate the physical environment of the Tolai area. While Tolai share their climatic conditions with populations in many other lowland areas of Papua New Guinea, it is the physical and chemical properties of the soils which rank their area among the highest in agricultural potential in the country. These properties derive from volcanic activity, to which the area itself owes its very existence.

Located on the circum-Pacific volcanic zone, the north-eastern region of the Gazelle Peninsula is the easternmost point of an arc of volcanic activity, which begins near Manam Island off the north coast of the Papua New Guinea mainland (see Map 1). The New Britain section displays "the classical features of an island arc: a deep submarine trench to the south, an inclined seismic zone dipping northward, and a string of volcanoes on the side of the island opposite the trench." (Heming 1974:1253.) The island is one of the most active seismic regions in the world, with earthquakes originating in deep-seated earth movements along the junction between crustal plates. Through these areas of crustal weakness molten rock material gains access to the surface.1

The surface of the north-eastern region of the Gazelle Peninsula is almost entirely made up of volcanic products, although its submarine origins are evidenced by coral limestone, which forms the backbone of Reimber Range, and is exposed at Cape Gazelle to the east and beneath an overlay of volcanic material at Tavui Point at its northern extremity (see Map 2). The volcanic portion of the Gazelle Peninsula is divided from the Baining Mountains barrier to its

1 My account of the association between volcanism and plate tectonics is drawn mainly from Fisher 1939, Heming 1974 and Johnson 1976.
Map 1: Papua New Guinea
Map 2: North-eastern Gazelle Peninsula
south-west by a continuous low-lying area, formed by the valleys of the Warangoi River flowing eastwards into St George's Channel, and the Kerevat River flowing north into Ataliklikun Bay. These valleys marked the south-west hinterland of Tolai occupation of the Gazelle Peninsula, at the time of first European settlement.

The dominant structure of the Tolai area is a volcanic caldera, 14km from north to south and 9km wide, breached to the sea in the south-east to admit Blanche Bay. The caldera is the sunken remnant of what was once a huge volcano, thought to have experienced at least two main phases of collapse, each accompanied by a major eruption. One of these took place 3,500 years ago, and the final collapse followed an eruption about the middle of the 6th century A.D.\(^2\) Beginning as a submarine volcano the ancestral cone rose to a height possibly exceeding 2,500m, with parasitic cones later forming on the flanks at Mt Tovanumbatir (North Daughter), Mt Kabiu (The Mother), and Mt Turanguna (South Daughter). "At this stage", Fisher says, "the district was probably exhibiting its maximum activity, the central vent and the parasitic cones all active, as well as possibly the adjacent smaller volcanoes of Watom Island and Mount Varzin [Vunakokor]" (1939:12). The caldera was formed after a tremendous eruption had blown most of the central volcano to fragments, leading to collapse around its outer rim. Since its formation there have been two major eruptions from vents presumed to be near the middle of the caldera, the later of which is thought to have resulted in the breach of its south-eastern wall (Walker et al. 1981). Volcanism following this last phase of caldera collapse has been confined to the formation of small marginal volcanoes around the narrow coastal flats inside the caldera. The brief recorded history includes relatively small outbursts in about 1850, in 1878, 1937, and 1941-43.

Rabaul township, with a 1980 population of nearly 15,000, lies round the northern shore of Simpson Harbour, within the caldera rim. Over 6,000 persons live in fifteen villages within the caldera, making a total of some 21,000 who are directly at risk from any renewed volcanic activity. Just over 500 persons were killed in the Vulcan eruption of 1937, and Rabaul itself was damaged by ash-falls and

\(^2\)Volcanologists now seem generally agreed that these are the limiting caldera-forming dates – see in particular Heming 1974, Almond 1981, Emeleus 1981 and Walker et al. 1981.
flooding. Since the early 1970s there has been a major increase in seismic activity, in a zone outlining a rising area located centrally in the caldera to the south of Matupit Island.\textsuperscript{3} Volcanologists at the Rabaul Observatory agree that an eruption is inevitable, but prediction of its arrival and extent is rendered highly problematical by the number of variable geological factors involved. Timing an evacuation in advance of the eruption, with the consequent economic costs and social dislocation, is agonisingly difficult.

If the Tolai are presently at risk from the multiple hazards of an eruption, it is the rich volcanic soils covering their territory which were largely responsible for their concentrated occupation of such a vulnerable area.\textsuperscript{4} The last major eruption about 1,400 years ago is likely to have devastated the entire north-eastern region of the Gazelle Peninsula, leaving a continuous blanket of pumice ash over the whole Tolai territory up to half a metre thick 25km from the caldera rim. Much of the perimeter of the caldera itself is a steep escarpment up to 400m above sea level, draped by pumice, which has washed down to form flats along the internal shoreline. Outside the rim the country slopes away gently, corresponding to the earlier profile of the huge volcano. Beyond this main volcanic area a central elevated plateau, heavily eroded into steep-sided gullies, stretches towards a ridge of higher country which flanks the broad valleys of the Warangoi and Kerevat Rivers.

The soils of the area, sharing their volcanic origins, are comparatively uniform, the main differences being associated with local relief, vegetation cover and proximity to the main volcanic area.\textsuperscript{5} Generally rich in available chemical nutrients, the exchange complex of the soils is heavily dependent on the organic matter content, which is deficient in areas close to the active volcanic centres, and in the extensive kunai grasslands and regrowth areas which followed closer human settlement (see below). Early recorded observations show that the indigenous lowland rain forest had already been largely eliminated north of the ridge above the Warangoi and

\textsuperscript{3}Matupit is sometimes rendered Matupi, particularly when used as an adjective (see Epstein 1969:2 fn 1).

\textsuperscript{4}The area today contains the highest population densities in Papua New Guinea (Allen 1983: 9).

\textsuperscript{5}My account of soils and vegetation is drawn mainly from Irwin 1965, and Bleeker and Freyne 1981.
Kerevat valleys by the late 1800s. These valleys, however, were little affected by recent volcanic eruptions, and, having retained their forest cover, the combination of volcanic nutrients and high organic content makes their soils the most fertile in the Tolai territory. Elsewhere, accumulations of alluvium on gully floors afforded local pockets of highly fertile soil.

Volcanism, therefore, not only created and modified the landforms of the Tolai territory, but also provided the basic properties of its soils. Their fertility has been influenced by human factors, in particular deforestation, but a major consideration in realising the potential of the soils is climate, the other dominant feature of the Tolai's physical environment. The Tolai area is an equatorial lowland, whose main climatic influence is a seasonal reversal of surface winds, producing the north-west wet monsoon (a labur) from November to April and the south-east trade winds (a taubar) from May to October. Of the climatic elements, maximum temperatures remain uniformly high during the year (around 30°C), as does relative humidity, but rainfall in contrast is highly variable, both in monthly and yearly totals, and is therefore the key climatic variable influencing plant growth. The volcanic area around the caldera has a median annual rainfall of some 2,000mm, but inland from the coast, and particularly in the valleys of the Warangoi and Kerevat Rivers, the rainfall is appreciably higher. Although two or three weeks seldom go by without any rain, dry spells can occur in any month, and moisture deficiency may be experienced in either season. With such a high variability of rainfall, plant growth is strongly influenced by the moisture-holding capacity of the pumice soils, which is poor in the vicinity of the caldera. In the Warangoi and Kerevat valleys the pumice soils are more moisture-retentive, and this factor, combined with the high organic content of the surface soil and an increased annual rainfall, makes these locations the most productive in the Tolai territory.

---

6 My account of climate is drawn mainly from Irwin 1965, and McAlpine et al. 1983.
2. THE HUMAN ELEMENT

The interaction of people with this physical environment is today apparent in all parts of the Tolai territory. Scientific research into the prehistory of the area has so far been limited, and for absolute dating purposes any account of human occupation is largely dependent upon the volcanic events which devastated the north-eastern region, thereby setting limits on the range of possible occupation periods. The first such event raised the region from the sea-bed, and climaxed about 3,500 years ago in an eruption which would certainly have extinguished any human life in the area. The last such life-excluding eruption was probably that dated around 1,400 years ago. Between these two dates there was another major eruption within the caldera, but the dispersal fan of its products was concentrated to the west (Walker et al. 1981: 190), to which direction its destructive effects would have been confined. Specht has identified a community living on Watom Island from at least 500 B.C., which was distinctive for its Lapita style of decorated pottery (1968). This pottery tradition extended from Papua New Guinea to Tonga and Western Samoa, is possibly related to pottery from South-east Asia and South China, and may represent the earliest arrival of humans in the South-west Pacific Islands (ibid., 117-18). Whether these people occupied the adjacent Gazelle Peninsula mainland, and the date and cause of their disappearance from the region, is unknown.7 The Watom sites only provide evidence of their presence up to some uncertain date before a volcanic eruption in the vicinity deposited a thick layer of ash over the island. The eruption responsible may well have been the last major eruption within the caldera, about 1,400 years ago. No pottery has been found above this ash layer, but by about 1250 A.D. the site was reoccupied by people who apparently lacked pottery (ibid., 125). The Tolai have no pottery tradition, and there is no present evidence of any technological continuity with the Lapita pottery-makers in the Tolai neighbourhood (Specht 1984, pers.comm.).

The identity of the people who first reoccupied the north-eastern region of the Gazelle Peninsula when it again became inhabitable has not yet been established. Despite its destructive effects, comparable

---

7At the time of writing a major research expedition into the Lapita people's colonisation of the Bismarck Archipelago was under way, which may shed light on some of these questions.
evidence suggests that much of the area laid waste by the eruption
1,400 years ago would soon have been revegetated, and occupation
could have been resumed by any communities living in the vicinity
within a few decades. The most likely candidates appear to be the
Bainings, an autochthonous people, whose more ancient origins in New
Britain than their Austronesian language-speaking neighbours is
attested to by the fact that they form one of the few non-Austronesian
language isolates in the island. The Baining territory is the
mountainous remainder of the Gazelle Peninsula, south and west of the
Warangoi and Kerevat valleys, where they moved in small groups through
the dense forest. Never very numerous, their population at first
European contact was probably only a few thousand. Two other small
autochthonous groups, the Taulil and Butam, members of the same
non-Austronesian language family as the Bainings (Wurm 1975:789), were
found at first contact inhabiting a buffer zone between the Bainings
and the Tolai, on the low-lying country of the Warangoi and Kerevat
valleys. Still heavily timbered at the time, parts of this Tolai
hinterland were also occupied by the Baining forest-dwellers.

If lack of scientific evidence precludes certain identification
of the people who reoccupied the north-eastern region, Tolai
themselves seem satisfied that the Bainings were the main group they
displaced in their progressive settlement of the area. Informants from
even the north-eastern extremity, in the Tavui villages and at
Rakunat, have oral traditions of pre-Tolai occupation of that area by
Bainings, and they name living Tolai as having Baining ancestry.
Authorities seem generally agreed that Baining occupation of the
region pre-dated Tolai. Given that Tolai agriculture is more
land-intensive than Baining, and their settlement pattern much more

---

8 See Blong 1982:185-87. Mt Lamington in the Oro Province, which
erupted with devastating effect in 1951, had dense thickets and grass
stands along its spurs by the end of 1952 (ibid., 186).

9 A third non-Austronesian group, the Sulka, is sometimes mentioned
in the literature as also being autochthones in this area (see, e.g.,
Epstein 1969:12 fn 1; Bradley 1982:28), but they had in fact been
resettled from the isthmus of the Gazelle Peninsula to a large reserve
at the mouth of the Warangoi River by the German administration about
the turn of the century.

10 Sack (1975) has recorded similar stories of Tolai displacement of
Bainings from the present Tolai territory.

11 Salisbury, however, apparently wants to preserve the possibility
that the Tolai occupied a vacant environment (1972:83).
sedentary, such a version does not preclude the possibility of a period of contemporaneous occupation of the region by the two essentially compatible cultures. There are many accounts in the literature of Tolai-Baining interaction, usually hostile (see, e.g., Parkinson 1907:159; Meier 1939:115, fn 82), although on occasions it seems that alliances were formed (see Danks 1933:218,261-62). In the wake of battles and Tolai raids Baining women were taken for "concubines" (Meier 1938:27,fn 41) and men for "slaves". The Taulil and Butam peoples also suffered from Tolai depredations (Parkinson 1907:173), and by the arrival of the Europeans it seems that the more numerous and vigorous Tolai had confined all other occupation of the region south beyond the transverse ridge flanking the Warangoi and Kerevat valleys. By then Tolai occupation had left little rain forest - the Bainings' natural habitat - standing on the volcanic plateau north of that ridge.

Tolai entry to the Gazelle Peninsula across St George's Channel from New Ireland is supported by linguistic and cultural evidence, and their own oral tradition. The inhabitants of New Ireland Province, from the narrow isthmus at Namatanai south, speak Austronesian languages which can all be subsumed under a discrete South New Ireland language group, one sub-group of which comprises three sets of closely-related languages, all of which are represented in the Tolai territory. The set with the largest number of speakers comprises Patpatar spoken in the Namatanai region, Tolai (or Kuanua, as it is now more commonly known) spoken over the great majority of the Tolai

---

12 Although Brown says of the region, "There was no slavery in the general acceptance of the term" (1910:331), this is the term generally applied in the literature, both early (e.g., Parkinson 1907:159) and recent (e.g., Salisbury 1970:30), to the status of Bainings kept by the Tolai. Meier says the Tolai "despised" the Bainings, whom they regarded as "'born slaves'" - an inference they drew from the lack of a Baining practice to establish a child's paternity at birth (1939:115, fn 82).

13 Early German ethnographic records suggest another remote migration to the Tolai area from the Nakanai region of West New Britain (Peter Sack 1984, pers. comm.). As with much of the literature from this period the records remain untranslated from German, and I am unable to assess this version or its relevance to the composition of the present Tolai people.

14 Ross 1984:27. I am grateful to the author for information he provided, which modifies that contained in the most authoritative language atlas (Wurm and Hattori 1981), and on which this account is based.
territory on the mainland of the Gazelle Peninsula, on the north of the Duke of York Islands, and on Watom Island, and Minigir, an archaic form, whose use was confined to the tip of Cape Livuan, the small Urara Island offshore, and a section of the mainland west of Ataliklikun Bay (see Map 2). A second set in the sub-group comprises Label, spoken at two locations on the New Ireland coast facing Cape Gazelle on the easternmost tip of the Peninsula mainland, and Bilur, spoken on the mainland just south of Cape Gazelle. The final set comprises Kandas, whose speakers separate the two Label representatives on New Ireland, and Duke of Yorks, the main language of that island group located midway between the Peninsula mainland and New Ireland. This language pattern shows not only the distinct New Ireland origins of the three main indigenous languages - Kuanua, Bilur and Duke of Yorks - spoken in the Tolai area, but also that the cultural group known as the Tolai, indigenous to the north-eastern region of the Gazelle Peninsula and offshore islands, in fact comprises representatives of three separate language sets, each of which is linguistically more closely related to its parent language on New Ireland than it is to the others, although they all share a common language ancestry, and are reasonably mutually intelligible.

A cultural continuum from southern New Ireland across the Duke of York Islands to the Tolai territory on the Peninsula mainland is further evidenced by the common presence of key cultural institutions - in particular dual organisation into exogamous moieties, shellwealth, and secret societies - although significant differences in their mode of operation between and even within these three localities are found. The moiety system obtains through the larger part of New Ireland (Jessep 1977:48) and in many other parts of Melanesia, but not among the Tolai's southern neighbours on New Britain (Trevitt 1940:355). The particular form of shellwealth which the Tolai call tabu may have originated on the Peninsula mainland, but its use on the Duke of Yorks and the neighbouring New Ireland area (where in common it is called divara) was documented soon after first European settlement (Danks 1887/1888: 305). In both latter localities alternative forms of shellwealth were also found (ibid., 305-06). The secret society of the tubuan and dukduk is reckoned in one oral tradition to have originated inland from the present township of Kokopo (Parkinson 1907:510-11), whence it spread to other mainland areas, and through the Duke of Yorks to communities on the Crater
Peninsula of the mainland and the adjacent New Ireland coast (ibid.). So, while modern Tolai constitute a group of peoples which entered its present territory migrating generally westwards from southern New Ireland, certain cultural influences seem to have made the return journey, and diverse Tolai origins, together with the differential adoption of common cultural institutions, have resulted in a group essentially homogeneous, but manifesting a wide range of cultural variation.

So far as oral tradition is concerned, my own experience in the Nodup area, confirmed by Sack's in the same locality (1975) and Epstein's at Matupit (1969:13), is that many Tolai from villages on the Crater Peninsula believe their ancestors came from New Ireland. Parkinson says that, in addition to people from this locality, those living on the coastline of St George's Channel south of Cape Gazelle also regarded themselves as related to communities on the opposite New Ireland coast (1907:56). Salisbury has pieced together from several informants an account that the first Tolai settlement on the Peninsula was just south of Cape Gazelle, again having been mounted from New Ireland (1972: 80). From there a further migration by some of the new-comers right around the northern tip of the Peninsula to a landing near the mouth of the Kerevat River was undertaken (ibid.). The remainder of the Tolai territory was populated from these two primary sources (ibid., 80-81). Relating this account to his understanding of the volcanic history of the region, and using demographic theory on population increase, Salisbury proposed a dating for Tolai arrival on the Peninsula at the 13th century A.D. (ibid., 82-83). More recent volcanological research, however, upsets his dating of the last devastating eruption (now accepted as being in the 6th century A.D., see above), and, while Salisbury's earlier view of a pre-1700 A.D. arrival (1970:110, fn 3) still seems reliably based, even approximate dating of that arrival remains conjectural.

The Tolai practised a garden agriculture with bush fallow, and used fire for clearing and hunting. It is evident that by the late 1800s Tolai settlement extended right along the coastline of the north-eastern region of the Peninsula mainland,15 from near the mouth

15. This account of the extent of Tolai settlement is drawn mainly from the observations of early European residents (in particular Brown 1908, Danks 1933 and Parkinson 1907), but these records are supplemented by information from my own Tolai informants.
of the Warangoi River south of Cape Gazelle round into Blanche Bay, along the Crater Peninsula and around the northern tip of the mainland to the northern coastline, and west around Cape Livuan into Ataliklikun Bay (see Map 2). From the mouth of the Kerevat River a swampy area extends westward along the bay where malaria apparently caused a break in the habitation, but it resumed on the western side of the bay, and continued for a short distance along the coastline towards Lassul Bay, which probably marked the western extremity of Tolai occupation. Offshore the Tolai were settled on Watom Island, an extinct volcanic cone off the north coast, the small Urara Island a short distance from Cape Livuan, and on the tiny islet Masikonapuka west of Ataliklikun Bay, an important staging-post in their long maritime expeditions down to the Nakanai area of central New Britain to collect tabu. The Duke of York Islands were also extensively occupied by Tolai, although Brown reports seeing two "slaves" in 1875, who were said to be members of a group from the interior of the islands (1908:90), possibly a remnant of the autochthonous inhabitants. The Pigeon Islands, midway between the Duke of Yorks and the Peninsula mainland, were apparently not permanently inhabited (ibid., 119).

Inland from the coast, while patches of rain forest survived on the steep walls of the caldera, up the slopes of the volcanic cones and in the deep gullies which relieve the landscape of the plateau country, early European observations show that Tolai garden and hunting practices had displaced the natural forest cover over much of the country above the depression of the Warangoi and Kerevat valleys. The remaining forest patches were of major cultural importance to the Tolai, and there were substantial areas of forest regrowth and bush, but much of the landscape both of the coastal slopes and the broken inland plateau consisted of fire-induced kunai grasslands. The natural rain forest boundary at the south-west of the Tolai territory was culturally determined. Consolidated in this upland north-eastern region, by the late 1800s Tolai settlement had extended over the ridge and down the hilly country towards the headwaters of the Warangoi and Kerevat Rivers, where early European visitors remarked their clashes

---

16 Some grasslands in the Tolai area may have been natural, but Bryant Allen says that those on the plateau were "almost certainly man-induced" (1984 pers.comm.).
with the Bainings, Taulil and Butam peoples (e.g., Parkinson 1907:57,173). There is no suggestion that these depradations on their neighbours were motivated by Tolai expansionism, although the Butam were in consequence exterminated, and the Taulil population seriously reduced. Although they occupied their territory extensively, total Tolai population over an area of some 1,100 square kilometres is estimated at only 20,000 in 1875 (Salisbury 1972:83), and Salisbury has concluded that only recently before European arrivals did the Tolai begin to fill their ecological niche (ibid.). In that filling process Europeans and their influence have been instrumental, and it is to their arrival in the area that this treatment of the Tolai setting now turns.

The British naval officer William Dampier, travelling in 1700 down the eastern coast of New Ireland and then in a south-westerly direction, gave the name New Britain to the land he viewed, not realising that a channel separated two main islands. That refinement was added to the charts in 1767 by Carteret, who named New Ireland, but the name New Britain was still being used collectively for the group comprising the two main land masses and their offshore islands over a century later (see e.g., Brown 1908:97).\footnote{Care must be taken to distinguish the New Britain island group from the island of New Britain in interpreting early European records. Brown's account, for example, of numerous dialects being found in the mission districts of New Britain (1908:101-02), must, in its context, be taken as referring to the New Britain group (including New Ireland), not to the Tolai area of New Britain island, as Bradley has interpreted it (1982:251).} Proceeding through St George's Channel, Carteret named the Duke of York Islands and the three volcanic cones on the eastern wall of the caldera - The Mother, and North and South Daughters. Following the naming pattern of his British predecessors, he gave Watom Island the name Isle of Man. Over the next century European traffic through the channel increased, but contact with the local populations was infrequent and cursory, and lasting impact of these visits is largely confined to the European names given to natural features, symbolic of their "discovery". Thus Blanche Bay and Simpson Harbour acquired their titles in the survey by Captain Simpson in HMS Blanche in 1872, and the peninsula was named for the ship Gazelle, in which a German naval expedition visited in 1875.

From the mid-1800s an increasing commercial interest in the St
George's Channel locality became evident. American whalers worked the waters of the channel, and laid up in harbours in the Duke of Yorks and at the south end of New Ireland. "Blackbirders" in the latter decades of the century removed young men to the coconut plantations of Samoa and the cane-fields of Fiji and Queensland, and knowledge of the potential of the region - not just in human resources but in shells, other sea products and especially coconuts - soon attracted the attention of traders. Representatives of a German firm based at Samoa attempted the first permanent European settlement in 1873, but they were driven off, and that distinction belongs to George Brown, a Methodist missionary with many years' experience in Samoa, who arrived at Port Hunter in the Duke of York Islands on 15 August 1875 with eight Fijian and two Samoan mission teachers.

Primary sources indicating the influences of early European activities in the Tolai territory can be found in the diaries of missionaries and the memoirs of traders and adventurers, and the events leading up to the first claims by the German Government to the area in 1884 are well covered in academic literature (see, in particular, Salisbury 1970: 21-28; Sack 1973:63-78; Firth 1982: 7-20). For present purposes, the main relevance of this decade of private colonisation lies in what it presaged - the era of political colonisation, and the systematic incorporation of the area into the capitalist economies of its successive metropolitan powers. The two main agents of this induction process were the trader and the missionary, who both entered the region with quite different motives, but whose activities were, in practice, often complementary.

From its headquarters established at Port Hunter in the Duke of Yorks in 1875, the Methodist Mission had by the end of 1878 set up a network of stations on that island group, and eleven more in the Tolai area of the Gazelle Peninsula. Catholic missionisation began shortly after, and by the end of 1884 there were stations at four separate locations on the peninsula.18 Despite the missionaries' efforts to make their difference from the traders clear, the host communities would have had difficulty in distinguishing the purposes of the outsiders. Early traders had been met with hostility, but they soon realised the value of the mission's contacts with the people, and by 1877 the area in which the two main German firms - Godeffroy and

18Although in that year two of the stations were temporarily vacant.
Hernsheim — were active "corresponded largely with that of mission activities." (Sack 1973:66-67.) From this earliest period, however, there is evidence of Tolai entrepreneurial talent, and an ability to convert the interests of the foreigners to their own ends.

Coconut palms grew in abundance along the coastal fringe of the Gazelle Peninsula and in scattered groves across the inland Tolai territory, and Salisbury states that during the rapid growth of the copra trade in the mid-1870s three populous locations — Nodup, Matupit and Kinigunan 19 — were "competing for the maritime supremacy of the whole Tolai area, mainly by attempting to monopolize relations with traders." (1970:21-22.) The nuts were exchanged for trade goods (including fire-arms), but the traders, fearful of attack, confined their operations to the coast, where local big-men were engaged as intermediaries in acquiring nuts from inland settlements, down a chain of local markets (see Chapter 2). An illustration of the community of interest within the white group of traders and missionaries, and of the Tolai ability to turn that interest to their account, is afforded by the consequences of a serious incident during 1878.

By that date the Methodists had a mission station at Kabakada on the North Coast, in an area dominated by a notorious fight-leader, Talili, who had till then controlled the trade with the inland settlements. Anxious to extend their proselytising to the interior, in April of that year a party of four Fijian missionaries set out across country from Kabakada for Blanche Bay, but they were ambushed and killed on the way, at the present Taliligap on the caldera rim. The killing was apparently master-minded by Talili, 20 and the conspiracy embraced people from Kabakada through to Karavia on Blanche Bay. The bodies were cut up and distributed for eating among nearby villages, including Karavia, Davaon, Barawon and Raluana on the bay. Fearing a general uprising against them the small white community banded together, and a punitive expedition led by the missionary Brown burnt down many villages, exacting tabu compensation in a "sealing of the peace". Willing participants in the retaliation were big-men from Malaguna, Matupit and Nodup, and its effect was to break Talili's hold over the inland area, allowing direct access there to the traders.

19 Kinigunan was the name given to Vunamami in many early records.
20 Taliligap is a contracted form of "Talili shed the blood" (Threlfall 1975:44).
Brown himself was shrewd enough to suspect that Talili "was jealous of the teachers going inland, as he feared that by their means articles of trade would be carried to the people in the inland villages, who had hitherto been able to obtain them only from him." (1908:256.) Talili had only recently before raided Nodup (see Danks 1933: 22), the first missionised village on the mainland, and no doubt the big-men from there, and from Malaguna and Matupit, had their own reasons for joining in the rout of such a powerful enemy.

The coconuts acquired by the traders were processed into copra for export at depots along the coast. One such depot was established at Ralum, on Blanche Bay adjacent to the present township of Kokopo, by the part-Samoan Emma Forsyth - "Queen Emma", of some notoriety (see Robson 1965). Between 1882 and 1885, in a series of seventeen transactions, Queen Emma purported to purchase there a composite area of 4,867 hectares (Bredmeyer 1981: 195-97). Clearly the days of the trader were about to give way to a much more intrusive foreign presence. A period of intense diplomatic manoeuvring for acquisition of territory in the South-west Pacific and the protection of commercial interests, in which Britain and the new German Reich were the main protagonists, culminated in the British proclamation of a protectorate over the south coast of mainland New Guinea in 1884 (later, the Territory of Papua), and hoisting of the German flag along the north coast of the mainland and on locations in the islands (including at Matupit on 3 November 1884) soon after. For the Tolai almost a century of colonial rule was beginning, and the changes in their environment over this period were so pronounced that they may most appropriately be dealt with under the next heading.

3. CHANGES IN THE ENVIRONMENT

So far in this account of the Tolai setting the two main elements - people, and their environment - have largely been dealt with separately. The physical setting, with its landforms thrown up by volcanism, its soils laid down by successive eruptions, and the vegetation those soils sustain, forms the natural environment which, with its climatic conditions, supported human settlement in the area. Volcanism not only supplied the area with its potential for occupation, but also was liable at times to interrupt that occupation - a capacity which it still retains. If not continuously, the area has at least for long been settled, and the arriving Europeans were only
the latest migrants to an area which had been receiving population for over two thousand years. The Tolai, the group they found in occupation, had migrated from southern New Ireland, probably displacing the autochthonous Bainings, who were found together with other minority groups along the south-west frontier of the Tolai territory. Tolai garden and hunting practices, together with a high dispersion of settlement, had a major impact on the physical environment, and deforestation and the creation of kunai grasslands have been mentioned. The beginning of colonial rule introduced a period of transformation in the Tolai environment. Under expanding commercial agriculture and the spread of subsistence gardening a great proportion of their land would be cleared for crops, but the greatest change for the Tolai would occur in their social and political environment. For an appreciation of the comprehensive impact of Western culture, it is appropriate to abandon the artificial separation of people and environment used in the foregoing description of the pre-colonial Tolai condition.

The purpose of this section is to present an historical overview of change in the Tolai condition during the last century, consequent on the imposition of a new political order and the ever-increasing penetration of a foreign culture. Without necessarily suggesting either a continuity or a discontinuity in change, in chronological terms the last one hundred years may be divided into three main periods - the thirty years of German administration from 1885 to 1914; the sixty-odd years of Australian administration till independence in 1975; and the last period of almost a decade of independent government. The German period may itself be subdivided almost equally into one phase under an Imperial charter granted to the Neu Guinea Kompagnie which continued to 1899, and a second under Imperial administration until the outbreak of the First World War. The status of Australian administration also varied, though more in consequence

21 There are many such "historical overviews", both of change in Papua New Guinea as a whole and in the Tolai area particularly, and for the latter either over the whole historical period or of parts of that period, under different colonial administrations. Although authorities have adopted different analytical approaches, there is by now a reasonably common version of the country's and the Tolai area's history, and in the following account I have drawn without specific attribution on the following texts in particular: Rowley 1958; Irwin 1965; Epstein 1969; Mair 1970; Salisbury 1970; Sack 1973; Fitzpatrick 1980; Firth 1982; Bradley 1982.
of international events than metropolitan policy. From 1914 to 1921
German New Guinea was held under military occupation, although the
operation of the German laws was largely retained. Between 1921 and
the Japanese invasion in January 1942 the territory was administered
by Australia under a League of Nations mandate. During the Second
World War the Tolai area became a vast Japanese military garrison, but
at the conclusion of the war Australian administration was resumed,
first under a military administration (the Australian New Guinea
Administrative Unit - Angau), then under a provisional civil
administration, and finally from July 1949 under a United Nations
trusteeship. On 16 September 1975 the Trust Territory of New Guinea,
with the Australian Territory of Papua (with which New Guinea
had been jointly administered since the war), became independent.

Despite legitimate claims that the Constitution adopted by Papua
New Guinea at independence is "autochthonous" (see Lynch 1980), it
remains true that in many senses the state which became independent
was a colonial construct, and the emphasis on political development at
state level in the foregoing historical outline is appropriate in that
by those processes the state itself was constituted. From this
imposed superstructure the main changes in the Tolai condition to be
considered in this section follow, and, in keeping with the centrality
of state formation, political, legal and administrative change will
receive the first attention. Such priority of treatment is not
intended to assert a self-sustaining state apparatus, or to deny the
essential interaction between "government" and the other social and
economic elements of the Tolai environment, change in which makes up
the remaining areas for treatment in this section.

In 1885 the Neu Guinea Kompagnie received its charter from the
German Government over the German part of the New Guinea mainland and
the Bismarck Archipelago, whereupon the company "carefully prepared
itself to open the way for settlement and commerce and to attract and
promote private enterprise." (Sack 1973: 79.) In its charter the
company undertook to establish and maintain administrative
institutions for promoting trade and land development, and "for
establishing and strengthening peaceful relations with the natives and
for civilising them" (ibid., 78). In return the company was granted

As a matter of international law, the mandate continued through to
1949.
"the corresponding rights of local sovereignty" and the exclusive right to acquire land, subject to the supervision of the German Government which would "enact regulations necessary to protect previously acquired legitimate rights of ownership and the natives." (Ibid.) This original commitment to the contrasting, if not conflicting, objectives of promoting European economic development and protecting the indigenous communities obtained throughout the colonial era, and government during this period may be seen as a succession of measures aimed at mediating between the simultaneous goals of exploitation and protection, in accordance with changing strategies of development.

Within a few years the Neu Guinea Kompagnie began negotiations with the German Government to hand back its powers of political administration. The characteristic style of colonial government began to appear after 1899, when German New Guinea was brought under direct Imperial administration. With limited resources, government by "indirect rule" was adopted, following precedents in colonial Africa. The German practice was developed in the Tolai area, where Kokopo had been established as the administrative headquarters for German New Guinea. Presumed seats of power in the indigenous community were co-opted as local chiefs (lualua) and "native magistrates" (luluai). In keeping with this strategy of subsumption, the introduced legal system, though supreme, afforded recognition to "native custom", subject to the conventional qualification that it not be repugnant to the dictates of the civilising mission. Indigenous systems of authority and law were, therefore, posited for the purposes of colonial administration, but their formal source lay in the imposed institutions, on which they were made dependent for existence, which prescribed their identity, and to which they were subordinated. Such a legal system can, of course, as a matter of form claim universal application to its subjects, but its duality, differential application (as between the colonist and the colonised), and fundamental subordination of one of its component parts to the other, are equally apparent.

This unequal duality in government remained in its essential

---

23 See Salisbury 1970: 32; 35. How inappropriate these indigenous titles were for the authority created in their name will appear when Tolai leadership is considered, in the next chapter.
features until the demise of the colonial system which inspired it.

Moderating changes were introduced in the form of colonial legislatures. During the German colonial period there was no local legislature, and laws were introduced to the colony by the German Government, mainly by Imperial Ordinances which either prescribed substantive law or applied German domestic law (see Sack 1973: 127-36; 176-86; Sack 1975: ix-xii). The first legislature for New Guinea was established in 1933, a Legislative Council comprised of officials and a minority of appointed non-officials. In 1951 a Legislative Council for the combined Territories of Papua and New Guinea was installed, again with a majority of officials, but for the first time with provision for "native" members among the appointed non-officials, and for the election of some (non-native) members. Successive changes reduced the "official" component and extended democratic representation. After 1964 the legislature, now called the House of Assembly, had a majority Papua New Guinean membership. Until independence, however, the Australian Government held a power of veto over any legislation passed.

Originally by metropolitan enactment, and then increasingly through the colonial legislatures, the infrastructure of the metropolitan style of government was imported and progressively elaborated. Western-style courts were introduced, together with Western concepts of an individual's position in a society, private property and economic relations. Cultural subordination in the unequal duality of government took a more explicit form in the provision of an inferior system of indigenous government, by way of native regulations, native courts administered by low-level European field officers (kiaps), and, later, native local government councils. A centralised and exceptionally bureaucratic system of administration was developed, with executive power vested in a local Administrator advised by an Executive Council comprising official and non-official members of the legislature, but in the last resort executive power

24Lynch (1969) has detailed political developments to 1968, Bayne and Colebatch (1973) cover the 1968-1973 period, and Goldring (1978), drawing on these earlier sources, carries through to the post-independence period. I have draw on all three sources in outlining political change.

25Both the Neu Guinea Kompagnie and later the local Governor did, however, have subsidiary law-making powers, and the latter was assisted by an Advisory Council which included non-official members.
resided in the Australian Cabinet, with the role of the administrative machine in Papua New Guinea being "largely instrumental" (Ballard 1981:10).

Until the Second World War colonial development policies were principally concerned with promoting the economic interests of the European settlers. Plantation agriculture soon became the most important part of the colonial economy, and government efforts were directed to the exploration and assessment of the commercial potential of the territory, "pacification" and the extension of administrative control, and the release of land and labour to plantation interests. In the Tolai area during the German period, after a few years of hostile resistance and punitive reprisals, people accepted the foreign presence as inevitable. When the new township of Rabaul (to which the administrative headquarters had been transferred from Kokopo in 1910) became the commercial centre of the Bismarck Archipelago, a communications network was laid down which facilitated the concentrated exploitation of the area's resources. At the head of the deep and sheltered Simpson Harbour, Rabaul was the point of export for plantation produce, brought in by a regular coastal shipping service. While the caldera gave the port its suitability, its steep sides and the highly erodible volcanic material which blanket the Tolai area made roadwork difficult. Using local corvée labour, the Germans nevertheless built a rural road network which is still the most comprehensive in the country.

German planters in the Tolai area experimented with a wide variety of crops, but it was coconuts - the cause of their attraction to the area, originally in a trading capacity - which, with an improving market in Europe for vegetable oils, became the paramount plantation crop on which the colonial economy came to depend "almost entirely" (Sack 1973:100). A staple crop of the Tolai, coconuts grew prolifically in the well-drained volcanic soils, and their cultivation and processing into copra, although demanding on man-power, required almost no skill. The two requirements for plantation production, therefore, were large areas of land and a large unskilled work-force. For most of the colonial period supplying these two inputs was arguably the principal concern of successive administrations.

The charter granted to the Neu Guinea Kompagnie provided that land rights already acquired by Europeans were to be protected, while it granted the company a monopoly on future acquisitions. One of the
first laws enacted by the German Government for the colony set out procedures for land acquisitions and the registration of acquired land (including land acquired before the charter was granted) in the Ground Book - a German land register (see Sack 1975). The company, in exercise of its "local sovereignty", issued Directions setting out procedures for the acquisition of land by its agents and General Conditions for the transfer of acquired land (either outright or under lease) to settlers upon their application (ibid.). Another Imperial enactment applied German domestic law to the acquired land, but not to other land (ibid.). The pattern which prevailed throughout the colonial period was now set. For all legal and administrative purposes there were two distinct regimes of land tenure, one applying to land acquired by the colonial authority, which embodied the Western legal culture both by the reception of metropolitan law and by colonial enactment, and the other applying to the remainder of the land, predicated as being the customs of the indigenous people in occupation.

The enduring developmental philosophy of the colonial period was the need to convert land from the customary to the Western tenurial regime. The alienation of Tolai land from custom had probably reached its peak by 1900. The great majority of the acquisitions had been effected either by European individuals or firms before the charter was granted to the Neu Guinea Kompagnie, or by that company under its monopoly. Acquisition methods consisted of private negotiation for purchase from the presumed land owners under custom, immediate occupation of land apparently unclaimed, and confiscation, usually as punishment for Tolai acts of violence against Europeans (see Sack 1973; 1975). In 1902 Albert Hahl, who had been the Imperial Judge, was appointed Governor, and a more restrictive approach to land alienations, combined with Hahl's negotiation of the excision of reserves from areas already acquired, served to reverse the depletion of Tolai land somewhat. By the First World War, however, European settlement extended inland to the limits of the Tolai territory, and on the Peninsula mainland an estimated 40% of their land had been alienated (Irwin 1965: 130). The elevated inland

---

26 In many cases Tolai communities had been in occupation of the land when it was acquired. The reserves, to which with clearing operations they were progressively confined, merely enabled their continued occupation, but under the title of the colonial administration.
plateau, with its broken terrain, was largely unaffected by these early acquisitions, which were concentrated on the coastal slopes, and included a great tract of land stretching from Kokopo to beyond the Warangoi River (see Map 3). The basic land tenure pattern of alienated and customary land which exists to the present day had been set during this first twenty years of European settlement.

The large areas acquired proved to be far in excess of what could be cleared and planted in these early decades, the "major limiting factor" being the difficulty of obtaining labour (Irwin 1965:108). While Tolai had been recruited from the late 1870s to work on plantations in Samoa and were among the first labourers on the new plantations in their own area (Bradley 1982:143 fn 9), they soon showed a reluctance to engage, and gained a reputation as "an undesirable class of labourers" (see Irwin 1965: 92). Perhaps the sense of adventure had been satisfied, and no doubt individuals' experience of the harsh labour conditions acted as a deterrent to others (see Panoff 1979), but a further explanation is that the Tolai were soon "able to make an adequate living from sales of coconuts from the palms that they had planted under the stimulus of the new market opportunities provided by Europeans." (Bradley 1982: 143.) They would engage as casual labour and as overseers, and even assisted recruiters by exchanging captured Bainings for trade goods (Panoff 1979:24-25), but historically most labour supplied on plantations in their area has been non-Tolai, and today is almost exclusively so. It is indicative of Tolai attitudes that they have disdained to work in lowly employment, and have preferred to engage in business ventures on their own account.

The Tolai had developed an extensive trading network, between inland areas and the coast, to off-shore islands and along the north side of New Britain to the Nakanai area, with the main articles of exchange being food-stuffs and varieties of shellwealth. An early European observer remarked of the late 1870s that large markets were held at various places and on a regular basis (Danks 1933:95). The new European settlers, with their demand for copra and food for their large labour forces, presented market opportunities of which the Tolai quickly took advantage, and they soon distinguished themselves in the eyes of the colonists from other Melanesians for their greater keeness to trade their produce (Epstein 1969:20-21). New planting of coconuts was undertaken in response to the demand, with the trade element of
Native reserves
Alienated land.

Source: Sack and Clark 1979: 375, modified

Map 3: North-eastern Gazelle Peninsula: Land Alienations, 1907
the colonial economy becoming so substantial that the German administration deemed it necessary to intervene with a view to regulating it along more acceptable commercial lines. Initially the coconuts had been exchanged for trade goods, but as the demand for these became satisfied the Tolai began to insist on payment in tabu (ibid., 21). Not only did this present the traders with a novel difficulty in securing tabu themselves for payment, but it also stifled growth of a local market for Western goods, as the tabu passed irretrievably into the Tolai exchange system. The Tolai were subordinating the aims of the introduced economy to their own, so in 1901 by German regulation the use of tabu instead of money as a medium of exchange between Europeans and Tolai was prohibited. A regulation introduced the preceding year prohibited the purchase of whole coconuts from the Tolai, the intent on this occasion being to quell a disinclination to undertake the laborious preparation of copra - perceived apparently as a characteristic of the natives, but not of their colonial masters.

This mixture of prescription and paternalism typified the colonial measures dealing with indigenous involvement in commercial agriculture. The overall impression is of an official attitude of abiding ambivalence. On the one hand measures intended to promote village plantations, provide an agricultural advisory service and credit facilities, and improve crop processing and the quality of the product seem motivated by a concern to establish viable commercial operations. However, many aspects of colonial policy and practice militated against that result. The interests of European (and, later, Chinese) operators27 were always paramount: they held the largest plantations on the most accessible and fertile land, received the best planting material from government nurseries, and were issued with the most profitable processing and marketing licences. When high prices after the Second World War engendered a renewed interest in cocoa, the opposition of European planters together with intense administrative regulation served to suppress Tolai involvement in this highly profitable crop. Village plantings were officially promoted on a

27 Under 1920 legislation German-owned plantations were expropriated, and allocated to Australian ex-servicemen (see Bredmeyer 1981:53-56), although, with default in loan repayments, many ended up the hands of the two large Australian trading companies - Burns Philp and Carpenters.
 communal basis which disregarded Tolai land tenure practice and social organisation, and were discouraging failures, as were most other forms of co-operative business. The agricultural officers were at loggerheads with the kiaps in the Department of Native Affairs, and co-ordination of administrative effort was conspicuously absent. Crop processing requirements were the subject of detailed regulation, with the result that most Tolai producers were excluded from the most profitable phase of cocoa marketing. Powerful groups within the plantation industry, together with government controls, seemed to act in concert to defeat all Tolai initiative.

Although the Tolai sphere of commercial operation was restricted, subordinate and precarious, the steadily increasing wealth of the area presented opportunities to a few well-placed individuals, and led to a general improvement in services. Big-men in local communities, who had profited in the early stages from the growing copra trade, arranged the communal planting of customary land with coconuts and later cocoa. Those who managed to gain the support of sympathetic field officers were sometimes able to surmount the general regime of containment, and become relatively wealthy. Others took employment as domestic servants and policemen, and many of the older prominent Tolai of today gained their start in business by manipulating close associations formed with Europeans in such a manner. With a readiness to accept cultural innovations which has often been remarked, incomes from cash cropping and employment were used to meet a growing demand for aspects of the Western life-style, and by the Second World War cars, trucks and European-type houses began to appear in the villages (Epstein 1969: 31).

The Second World War was a devastating time for the Tolai and their environment. The Japanese invaded in January 1942, built up an occupation garrison of 100,000 troops, and only surrendered three and a half years later after heavy and sustained Allied bombing. Bradley has summarised the effects:

Food gardens were destroyed, crops confiscated, young men were forced to work as carriers or to plant rice-fields for the troops, and those who resisted were shot or publicly beheaded. Many people died through malnutrition and lack of medicines and hundreds were killed by Allied Bombs [sic]. Rabaul itself was totally destroyed.... (1982:34-35.)

Coconut plantations were extensively damaged, and in areas near Rabaul palms were cut down for roofing on the major defensive tunnel network installed by the Japanese. Stocks of tabu were destroyed, or
seriously depleted in the purchase of food from outlying areas (Epstein 1969:32). Government records at Rabaul (including the Register Book containing all certificates of title to alienated land) were lost forever.

Until 1950 the main priorities, first under Angau's military administration and then under civil administration, were rehabilitation of the plantation economy and the restoration of basic services, but after Australia's acceptance of the United Nations trusteeship over New Guinea in 1949 a much more positive commitment to promote indigenous development than had ever been observed under the previous League of Nations mandate began to appear. The long reign of Hasluck as Australian Minister for Territories, from 1951 until 1963, brought major changes in development policy, law and the quality of services. Policy-making was firmly based in Canberra, and for the first ten years of Hasluck's administration was aimed at gradual development and the evening-out of regional inequalities. The Tolai area, long to the fore in overall wealth and level of services, was to be restrained, while the new Highlands districts and the less-developed Papuan region caught up. The Tolai, however, having been abandoned to their fate during the war, were in no mind to accept a return to the pre-war status quo (ibid.), and their enthusiasm for business, encouraged by the rapid development of plantation cocoa, was irrepressible. Aided by a handful of pro-Tolai officers, economic and political developments gained such momentum in the early 1950s that their official recognition could not be withheld.

Three names from the 1950s are recalled by older Tolai with a fondness that attests to their exceptional contribution to the realisation of Tolai ambitions. One is Francis Xavier Ryan, a didiman (agricultural officer) appointed to the area in 1949 with a brief to establish an independent sphere of operations for the reviving Department of Agriculture, and resist the centralisation of authority in the District Commissioner (Ryan 1983, pers.comm.). While his Department's motives perhaps had more to do with its long-term power struggle with the Department of District Services and Native Affairs, and Ryan faced constant obstruction from within his own Department (ibid.), he nevertheless supervised with his Tolai staff the planting and maintenance of thousands of hectares of cocoa, scattered in groves throughout the Tolai territory on the Peninsula mainland. Through his field-days and demonstration techniques Ryan performed not only an
agricultural but also a valuable social service, and he is, by popular opinion, credited with having "introduced Tolai to Tolai". A second conspicuous official from this period was David Fenbury,28 a member of a small section in the Department of District Services and Native Affairs charged with responsibility for the establishment of local government. Fenbury was an advocate of the council system and, in recognition of their relatively advanced state, he concentrated on the Tolai area in promoting its acceptance. In 1950 five councils were set up to cover most of the Tolai mainland area - the first ones in Papua New Guinea.

The third member of this celebrated trio was Sydney Smith, a former District Officer, who was appointed as Native Land Commissioner to Kokopo in 1956. Aware of the Fijian precedent for the Native Land Registration Ordinance 1952 under which he operated, Smith corresponded with the Fijian Native Lands Commission, and adopted their practice of using the indigenous territorial and social units for purposes of recording land ownership (Smith 1983, pers. comm.). On the advice of Tolai authorities he first identified the boundaries of the major land units they recognised, being paparagunan ("districts") and pakanagunan ("sub-districts"),29 and then, starting east of Kokopo, he systematically recorded the names of the "communities or matrilineages" which owned the remaining parcels of unalienated land right across to the coastline on St George's Channel. By 1960, the ownership of some 6,750 hectares had been recorded in this manner.30

While these initiatives were highly valued by the Tolai, and were of undoubted social, political and economic benefit, a lack of co-ordination between officials, no doubt partly at least a product of intense rivalry between Departments, impaired their overall effect. When largely as a result of Ryan's efforts the volume of Tolai cocoa beans began a rapid rise in the mid-1950s, the Administration perceived a need to regulate processing to ensure a high quality and reliable product. Ryan, from Agriculture, had begun setting up fermenting facilities in areas of greatest production, but in 1955 the Administration decided that local government councils, under the

28 Originally, Fienberg.
29 These terms will be explained more fully in the next chapter.
30 The decisions related to forty-seven parcels, ranging in area from just over 2 to 578 hectares. The landholdings of groups in each parcel (as many as twenty-six groups) were not differentiated.
authority of Native Affairs, were to be the bodies through which Tolai cocoa was exclusively processed and marketed, and the Tolai Cocoa Project was introduced. This concentration on councils was based more on political considerations than economic rationality. The Native Affairs officers regarded councils as having a prime responsibility to foster economic development, and saw a spread of small fermentaries under council control as being of social and educational value, while engendering trust in the Administration (Irwin 1965: 272, 274, 275-76). By tying processing facilities to councils, however, no service was provided outside council areas, and this disadvantaged the producers in the Raluana and Navuneram districts (who had refused to join the councils), and also the Tolai leaseholders on the new land settlement schemes being established from the early 1950s on the frontier areas of the Tolai territory. A further, and striking, illustration of lack of co-ordination between arms of government is the fact that Ryan, the didiman who was so active for a decade in promoting Tolai cocoa planting, and Smith (a former Native Affairs kiap), who saw his task as recording land ownership in advance of the problems he anticipated would arise from cocoa planting, never once met in the course of their employment (Ryan 1983, pers.comm.).

From the early 1960s, in the latter years of Hasluck's administration, a period of accelerated development began, and "law, land policy, and extension services were increasingly oriented towards economic individualism." (Ballard 1981: 10.) Under United Nations pressure for decolonisation, administrative effort was concentrated on the areas of highest economic potential with a view to building up a base for eventual independence, while the "progressive farmer" was now to be actively promoted (see Fitzpatrick 1980: 110). To underpin this new development strategy a major land law reform was put through the colonial legislature, the guiding principles of which were laid down by Hasluck in a seminal statement on the intended future for Papua New Guinean land tenure made to the Australian Parliament in 1960. Having dismissed customary tenures as unsuitable for cash-cropping, but maintaining that no change in customary tenure would take place without the consent of the people holding land under that tenure, he stated as the main "principle":

The ultimate and long-term objective in Papua and New Guinea is to introduce throughout the Territory a single system of land holding regulated by the central Government by statute, administered by the Department of Lands of the
central Government, and providing for secure individual registered titles after the pattern of the Australian system. (Australia 1960:1020-21.)

A scheme of legislation to implement the reform was progressively brought into operation during 1963 and 1964, providing among other things for a Land Titles Commission with exclusive jurisdiction to hear disputes over customary land and determine claims to its ownership, and a system for the systematic registration of titles to customary land and for the conversion of customary land to registered individual freehold titles. A World Bank mission to Papua New Guinea in 1964 gave authoritative support to the strategy of replacing customary tenures with individual titles (see Fingleton 1984: 158). Another of its recommendations led to the establishment of the Papua and New Guinea Development Bank in 1965, with the function of providing credit to the private sector for, among other things, primary production.

In 1959 it is estimated that the Tolai were producing 8,300 tons of copra and some 1,500 tons of dry cocoa (T.S. Epstein 1968:50), earning about twice as much from the former than the latter (ibid., 51, Table 3). Contemporary commentators described them as "more advanced than any other New Guinea community" (McAuley 1954:880), having "an economic status far in excess of other indigenous groups." (Irwin 1965:238.) It is not surprising, therefore, with the new policy of concentrating administrative resources where prospective returns were highest, that attention again focused on the Tolai area, to a degree possibly not seen since the German period. The new land laws were comprehensively applied to Tolai customary land, and Tolai experience of them is examined in the chapters which follow. Accelerated development was not, however, to be achieved solely by promoting indigenous agricultural production, for a second requirement of the strategy was for parallel development. Throughout his long administration Hasluck was pressured to facilitate the expansion of European settlement, but from an early stage he had insisted that "measures for the advancement of native agriculture had to go side by side with and keep pace with measures for European settlement." (Hasluck 1976: 125.) With nearly half the Tolai's land already held by Europeans, and that the most economically valuable, a policy of

31 I have considered this scheme of legislation in detail elsewhere (1980:39-75).
parallel development could only entrench economic inequality more deeply, and increasingly the focus of Tolai political expression in the decade leading up to independence was foreign ownership of their land.

The year 1971 was one of crisis in the Tolai area, as pressures which had been building up throughout the colonial period erupted in a major confrontation with Administration authority. Their genesis can be traced back to the earliest land acquisitions, effected in ways which engendered a resentment borne down through successive generations of Tolai. As a result of alienations little more than half the Tolai's original land was available to support their population (see Table 1.1), which during the 1950s began to grow at "an explosive pace" (A.L. and T.S. Epstein 1962:77). Calculation of Tolai population totals over the last century is rendered difficult, during the early period because German censuses only achieved partial coverage as control was still being extended, and later because of the impact of a large resident indigenous labour force drawn from other areas of the country, and the growing number of Tolai in employment outside their home area. Salisbury estimates their 1875 total at 20,000 (1972:83), but T.S. Epstein puts their 1883 figure at only 15,000 (1968:51, Table 4). All figures must, therefore, be treated as estimates, and the growth curve in Diagram 1.1 is drawn from a number of sources, themselves based on census figures and official estimates. It shows that after fairly steady growth during the first decades of this century an increase began in the years before the Second World War, arrested by a temporary drop caused by the fatalities in the 1937 eruption of Vulcan. During the war years the population declined sharply, but then renewed its upward trend in the 1950s when, with the post-war improvement of health services in general and maternity and infant welfare services in particular, it grew dramatically at a rate exceeding 8% per annum (Granger 1970:64). Between 1960 and 1971 the population doubled, and only in recent years has any sign of an easing in growth rate appeared.

Educational facilities, previously left largely to the missions to provide, also improved greatly after the war, and during the 1960s large numbers of young adults trained mainly for junior public service positions joined a growing pool seeking employment. For many this could only be gained outside their home area. The Tolai became something of an educated elite, filling positions such as clerks,
Table 1.1 Land Tenure in the Tolai Area*, 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Area (has.)</th>
<th>%-age of whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alienated land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freehold</td>
<td>21,023</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold</td>
<td>8,686</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration #</td>
<td>21,938</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51,647</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customary</td>
<td>56,592</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>3,033</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59,625</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111,272</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
* The table does not include the offshore islands in the Tolai area, for which I have no 1970 statistics.
# Of Administration land, some 17,670 hectares (80%) was the Kerevat Forest Reserve.
Source: Granger 1970: 165, Table IV: x, modified.
Diagram 1.1: Tolai Population, 1900-1980
Sources: (see text)
teachers and nurses in all parts of Papua New Guinea. The Administration was the major employer, however, and with the bureaucracy heavily concentrated in Port Moresby, and expatriates still occupying all but the bottom-level positions, most school-leavers returned to the village, to some extent disaffected with village life and alienated from their own communities. Many Tolai leaders, who had enjoyed a growing prosperity in business and been active in local government, accepted the Administration dictating the pace of change, but a body of younger well-educated men began organising and articulating an increasing opposition to the authority of the Administration and its Tolai adherents. The opposition stemmed from the Administration's failure to address the issue of alienated land and the consequent land shortage, its maladroit imposition of non-Tolai membership on the two institutions by then widely regarded by the Tolai as their own (the Tolai Cocoa Project and local government councils), and, in general, its exclusion of Tolai from any significant involvement in the running of their own affairs.

In 1967 the Administration arbitrarily re-organised the management of the Tolai Cocoa Project, introducing a new system of payment for cocoa, and setting the project up as a public company under European management. For many Tolai their identification with the Project was destroyed, and their equity in its assets lost without any compensation. Also in 1967 the Administration began moves to amalgamate the four remaining Local Government Councils together with the Rabaul Town management into one "multi-racial" council, proclaimed early in 1969. Opposition to this body was expressed in the formation of an alternative organisation, the Mataungan Association, which raised support in villages throughout the Tolai territory, set up its own authorities to deal with village matters (Varkurai ni Gunan), started markets in opposition to the Council-run markets, and began raising tax. Later its own business arm, the New Guinea Development Corporation, was established, in opposition to the New Guinea Islands Produce Company - the successor of the Tolai Cocoa Project. In open defiance of the land laws and their registered titles, villagers

---

32 The Project had originally been arranged along the lines of a producers' co-operative, with members receiving an advance payment on delivery of wet beans, and a second payment upon sale of the processed cocoa, after deduction of a levy to cover bank loans raised to finance the establishment of the Project.
adjoining plantations moved into occupation of uncultivated areas, but they were forcibly evicted by police riot squads. Events climaxed in August 1971, when the District Commissioner, leading a police party summoned to remove a large group of Tolai occupying Kabaira Plantation, was murdered. As if to heighten the drama, during the year volcanic activity in the Rabaul caldera began to intensify, and a series of violent earthquakes and associated tidal waves caused property damage, local flooding and widespread consternation.

The tensions which built up over this troubled period did not ease until the eve of independence. The divisions created in the Tolai community - in almost every village and frequently among close relatives - are still remembered, although much of the bitterness has now gone. In the 1972 general elections Mataungan Association leaders - Oscar Tammur, John Kaputin and Damien Kereku - took out three of the four East New Britain seats, the fourth going to Matthias ToLiman, a prominent politician since 1964. Michael Somare as Chief Minister formed a coalition government, ToLiman became Leader of the Opposition, but Tammur, Kaputin and Kereku sat on the cross-benches. Late in 1972 the Government adopted a development strategy based on the Faber Report (see Voutas 1981: 36), which stressed increased Papua New Guinean participation in the economy, more equal distribution of services and economic opportunities, greater emphasis on rural development, and less dependence on foreign investment. In anticipation of early independence a Constitutional Planning Committee was appointed in September 1972, and, with wide terms of reference to recommend on land policies, laws and administration, a Commission of Inquiry into Land Matters was set up in February 1973, and reported in the following October (Papua New Guinea 1973). Self-government was achieved on 1 December 1973. By then the three Mataungan Association members had given their support to the Government, with Kaputin being appointed Minister for Justice in July 1973. He was also a member of the Constitutional Planning Committee, and, with moves to decentralise government, and a legislative scheme to recover plantation land passed in August 1974, the main grievances of the Tolai were at last moving towards a solution.

33 I have dealt with the background of the Commission of Inquiry into Land Matters, the conduct of its inquiry, and the reforms which followed its recommendations, elsewhere (1981).
In almost a decade since independence on 16 September 1975, change in the Tolai condition has been more a matter of emotional satisfaction at the passing of foreign dominance than of positive action to overcome the pressing problems associated with a rising population, and an ever-increasing demand for land access, employment opportunities, material welfare and public services. While the dramatic change of mood can be attributed to a general feeling that Tolai are now "running their own affairs", the truth is that for many reasons this ambition is a long way from realisation. A major reason stems from unavoidable political difficulties involved in consolidation of the new nation state. With overtones from the early Hasluck policies for regional equity, the national Constitution set goals for equalising opportunities and the spread of government services through the country. Political demands from less-developed regions again imposed restraints on the provision of facilities appropriate to the circumstances of more-advanced groups, such as (pre-eminently) the Tolai. So, although the national Government responded to the intense pressure from neighbouring Bougainville (whose newly-acquired copper wealth had given it increased economic importance) by proceeding with the general introduction of Provincial Governments, the devolution of powers to the Provincial Assemblies was rapidly reined in by the national Government, when those Provinces lacking in managerial resources ran into financial difficulties. In national terms equality of treatment between the Provinces is obviously necessary, but for the Tolai, with the longest experience of political participation in the country and a staff of highly-trained administrators, lack of significant power is intensely frustrating.34

A corresponding sense of futility is commonly expressed at the third level of government, where the thirteen Community Governments in the Tolai area, although they are important forums for ventilating village opinion, have no real authority to respond to demands.

While with political devolution the attempt was made to achieve a greater responsiveness by the bureaucracy to local requirements, the

34 In October 1984 it was reported that the Premier of East New Britain Province, Ronald ToVue, was "masterminding" a threat by the five Provinces in the New Guinea Islands Region to secede, in response to the national Government's proposal to hold a referendum on the future of provincial government (Papua New Guinea Post Courier, October 23 and 26, 1984).
overall decisions on allocation of administrative resources are still made in Port Moresby, and no effective machinery exists to resolve the inevitable conflicts between what the national Government regards as priorities, and provincial priorities. It cannot be said that Provincial Governments have any real influence over policy on land, agricultural extension services, or rural credit, yet these are major issues over which they are constantly being confronted by their constituents. The old, exasperating excuse of "waiting for a pas (letter) from Moresby" is still all that can be offered, but where the administration-wise kiaps and didimen of the past employed great ingenuity in circumventing rules and red tape, the less-experienced national officers become demoralised, and succumb to complacency. A yearning for the old days is all too commonly heard, reflecting much more than simple nostalgia for a past uncritically remembered. Services in rural areas have declined dramatically, and many Tolai are questioning the value to them of independence.

By being tied to the pace of political development elsewhere in the country and being subject to central control, the Tolai dream for local autonomy remains for the moment dependent upon external factors. Furthermore, an unavoidable liability to outside influence on their affairs stems from their heavy involvement in cash-cropping, and the notorious unreliability of the world commodities markets. While it is doubtful that any Tolai is solely dependent on cash-cropping for a livelihood, it would also be difficult to find able-bodied adult Tolai resident in their home area - even those in full-time employment - who do not engage in the cultivation of coconuts and cocoa, and at least on occasions sell their produce when the prices are sufficiently attractive. The production of copra for sale seems highly susceptible to price, and whereas nuts may be left where they fall over long periods, a rise in price of only a few kina a tonne will suddenly produce long queues of loaded trucks outside the Copra Marketing Board depots (Michael Manning 1982, pers. comm.). Cocoa on the other hand, being solely a cash crop, is the major regular source of income for many villagers, who might tend only a few dozen trees for petty cash to supply their small luxuries. Diagram 1.2 shows that in the years to 1980 roughly half of the copra and cocoa produced in the East New Britain Province (predominantly in the Tolai area) came from the plantation sector, although village production has tended to overtake plantation production in copra since 1972-73, and in cocoa since 1978.
Diagram 1.2: Cash Crop Production, East New Britain Province, 1970/71-1980

Source: Annual Rural Industries Bulletins, Bureau of Statistics, Port Moresby

Cocoa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000 tonnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% PNG(1)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocoa</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallholdings</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largeholdings</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copra

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000 tonnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% PNG(1)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copra</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largeholdings</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallholdings</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the same decade copra production in the Province rose by 27%, and as a share of national production from 24.7% to 28.0%, while cocoa production declined by nearly 40%, and from 47.3% of national production to 28.6%.\(^{35}\)

A variety of reasons is available to account for the declining importance of the plantation sector, and the differential performance in copra and cocoa production. Increasing labour costs have reduced the profit margin in plantation production, and, with a period of uncertainty over their future in the years around independence, many planters failed to replant ageing trees and maintain existing plantings.\(^{36}\) The Government's Plantation Redistribution Scheme,\(^{37}\) introduced in 1974 to acquire plantations particularly in densely-populated areas, has had a major impact in the Tolai territory, and undoubtedly added to the planters' insecurity. Prices for both copra and cocoa hit a high point in 1977, but although they have remained reasonably good for copra they have declined since then for cocoa, and in the Tolai area climatic conditions, including dry spells and inopportune winds and rain, have contributed to the drop in production. Meanwhile, business activity in general has seriously decreased under the threat presented by renewed volcanic activity. Once again Tolai affinity with their volatile environment is being affirmed.

---

\(^{35}\)Part of the decline in the Province's share of national cocoa production is attributable to a major increase in production from other areas, particularly in the North Solomons Province.

\(^{36}\)Gregory provides figures which show a dramatic withdrawal to Australia of redevelopment funds by the two biggest plantation companies, Burns Philp and Carpenters, in 1972 (1982:135-39).

\(^{37}\)The Tolai experience of the Plantation Redistribution Scheme is dealt with in Chapter 7.
CHAPTER 2
THE TOLAI AND CHANGE

1. THE TOLAI SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND CORPORATE IDENTITY

In the preceding chapter we saw that the cultural group now known as the Tolai migrated to the north-east section of the Gazelle Peninsula and offshore islands from diverse origins in southern New Ireland, with which area many linguistic and cultural elements are still shared. The records of early European residents "abound with references to the atmosphere of hostility and aggression prevailing among the Tolai" (Bradley 1982:250), and it is unlikely that any sense of Tolai solidarity existed in the circumstances then prevailing. The name "Tolai" itself is of recent origin, for as late as 1940 it was said of them that they had no common name for themselves (Trevitt 1940:350). Early German missionaries used the Tolai term Gunantuna (true inhabitant of the place) for them, and the Methodists used Kuanua, a Duke of Yorks' vernacular term meaning "over there", now generally confined to the name of the Tolai language. The term "Tolai" is an expression of greeting, apparently first used as a group designation in the 1930s (Irwin 1965:61; Epstein 1969:13). It has for some time now been well established as their common name, in both Tolai and non-Tolai usage. Contemporary Tolai are very conscious of their own distinct identity.2

Although the ethnic distinctiveness of the Tolai from the

1 There is some conflict over the meaning of the term Kuanua. Epstein (1969:13, fn 2) and Bradley (1982:29) say it means "over there", Fry (1977:865) says it means "from across the sea", and Trevitt (1940:350) defined it as the "the folk over there", a meaning which tends to suggest differentiation in cultural as well as geographic terms.

2 Epstein remarks that Tolai contact with the outside world "fostered the aware[n]ess of their common bonds, and this in turn has helped to shape the growing sense of a shared experience following the imposition of alien rule." (1971:439-40.)
neighbouring peoples on the Gazelle Peninsula is pronounced, the existence of a cultural continuum from west to east across the Duke of Yorks with southern New Ireland presents difficulties in defining the limits of Tolai identity in that direction. Before European contact, and probably for some time thereafter, links were maintained with communities on southern New Ireland (Parkinson 1907:55, Trevitt 1940:355; Epstein 1969:8), but such ties, from the Peninsula mainland at least, now appear to have dissolved. In 1940, however, Trevitt reported being assured that the same dual organisation system extended from the Tolai area as far north as the eastern central coastline of New Ireland between Namatanai and Lesu (near Konos), and that persons going from one area to another would be placed in their proper moiety (1940:355). In 1977 Jessep found that in the Barck district on the central New Ireland coast the corresponding Tolai moieties were known, and observed for exogamy purposes (1977:49-50). Jessep also claims Barck recognition of "many aspects of Tolai magic and sorcery" (ibid., 42). Marriages between Tolai and New Irelanders are still common, and cultural differentiation is clearly a matter of degree, but with the increased importance of administrative boundaries it is clear that the present Tolai from East New Britain Province regard themselves as a group discrete from their related New Ireland neighbours.

Indicative of this relativity of cultural differentiation is the ambiguous status of the Duke of York Islands people. Situated midway between the Gazelle Peninsula and southern New Ireland, the islands group was a staging-post in one route of Tolai settlement of the Peninsula, and its present occupants are ethnically very similar to Tolai on the mainland. At the same time they intermarry with people from the neighbouring New Ireland coast and maintain social connections there, and, as they have been found to "differ significantly" from mainland Tolai in their practice of common cultural institutions (Errington 1974:15), some ethnographers treat Duke of York Islanders as non-Tolai (see ibid.; Bradley 1982: 28, fn 4). They have, on the other hand, for long been included administratively as Tolai (for example, in 1960 they joined the Vunamami Local Government Council - see Salisbury 1970:326), other ethnographers treat them as Tolai (e.g., Salisbury 1970:306), and, as many mainland Tolai trace their antecedents to the Duke of Yorks and identify with their inhabitants more closely than with Tolai from other locations on the Peninsula, my own inclination is to treat them
as Tolai. In doing so I acknowledge that many Tolai might regard them as "different", but, with considerable linguistic and cultural variation even among the mainland Tolai, difference between areas is frequently asserted, and does not by itself detract from a common feeling of identity.

Calculating from the 1980 National Census figures, the village population of the Duke of York Islands in that year was some 6,000, and for the Tolai living on the Gazelle Peninsula mainland and other offshore islands about 61,000, making a total Tolai rural population of approximately 67,000. Adding the Tolai living in the three towns on the Peninsula — Rabaul, Kokopo and Kerevat — and those working elsewhere in Papua New Guinea, would probably bring the total Tolai population at 1960 to about 86,000. On these figures 22% of Tolai live outside the rural area, but most of them, especially those in the three towns in the Tolai area, maintain regular contact with their home villages, and non-resident Tolai in general express the intention of returning to their village upon retirement from wage employment (see, e.g., Epstein 1971:430).

The Tolai population is divided into two exogamous matrimeoieties. Various methods are used to refer to these two moieties, the most common in Tolai usage among themselves being the simple "of us" and "of them" dichotomy (ta vevet and ta diat, respectively). In some districts early European observers recorded myths explaining the origin of the two moieties (e.g., Meier 1929:2-3), and members of each moiety were said to be identifiable by a variety of physical characteristics (e.g., lines on the palm of the hana, which foot was first advanced in walking). In central and southern New Ireland the two corresponding moieties are associated with totem birds (Jessep 1977: 49-50), and on the Duke of York islands with both birds (Errington 1974:23) and totem insects (Parkinson 1907: 545; Brown 1910: 27-28), but before European contact the totem names were apparently not used extensively among Tolai on the Peninsula mainland (Parkinson 1907: 545). Trevitt, in 1940, found some villages on the mainland where the names Minigulai (large hawk) and Taragau (small hawk) were used, and others where the corresponding bird names from

---

3I have relied on Bradley's figures based on the National Census (1982:28), adding to them my own calculation for Duke of York Islands villagers, which she excludes (ibid., fn 4).
the Duke of Yorks, Marmar and Pikalaba, had been adopted. In most
villages, however, he found these names to be unknown (1940: 355-56).
Where the names Marmar and Pikalaba had been adopted on the mainland
they lacked any totemic significance, and Trevitt concluded that the
names "are almost certainly a modern innovation introduced by
government officers for their convenience." (Ibid., 356.) This
naming practice has gradually been extended, in particular by
officials of the Land Titles Commission in recording Tolai
genealogies, so that, in the Rabaul and Kokopo localities at least,
the names are now well known (although not, according to one recent
source, by many young people - Bradley 1982:164).

If naming practice may still be variable, no Tolai villager is in
any doubt as to who in the local community belongs to his or her
moiety, and who belongs to the opposite moiety. The two moieties are
dispersed throughout the Tolai territory, and they lack internal
organisation: "its main function", Epstein says, "was to define the
unit of exogamy within which, in former times, marriage was strictly
prohibited on pain of death." (1964/65:4.) Moiety affiliation is the
crucial determinant in kinship classification (see below). Because
the Tolai's involvement in social, ceremonial and supernatural life
hinges on classificatory relationships, the moiety division may be
regarded as the critical factor in Tolai social organisation. The
greatly-increased social mobility of recent times may present
difficulties in identifying the moiety of people remote from their
home villages (see Bradley 1982: 164), but the centrality of moiety
affiliation has not diminished to any significant degree. Even in the
case of young adults working in Port Moresby effective methods are
used to establish the eligibility of a prospective spouse.5

The following chapters will reveal that the moiety dichotomy is
also highly relevant as an underlying factor in all matters of access
to land, and thus is central to the economic life of the Tolai
villager. Indeed, from early records it appears that the division was

4Trevitt, in fact, wrongly transposed the corresponding names, as my
own research, and Smith and Salisbury 1961:2, indicates.

5A Rakunat informant, Dimain ToKurapa, described how when his
adopted son (of the opposite moiety) wished to marry a woman from
Nanga Nanga whom he had met in Port Moresby, Dimain wrote telling him
to find out from her the name of a big-man from her moiety at Nanga
Nanga. As the name given, Nason ToKiala, was well known to Dimain, and
was of his moiety, the proposed marriage was approved.
formerly reflected in the pattern of settlement. Both Parkinson (1907: 62-63) and Meier (1939: 90, 103-04, 107) indicate that Tolai settlements they observed consisted of a grouping of males of the same moiety, together with their wives and non-adult children (of the opposite moiety). Meier even claims that there was "antipathy" towards persons of the other moiety (ibid., 99), who were treated as "strangers" (ibid., 79, fn 21; 1938: 15, fn 20). My own research at Rakunat indicates that groups originally settling there congregated along moiety lines (see Part II), but even Meier concedes (although without, in my view, sufficient recognition of its importance) that moiety exogamy and matrilineal descent militated against moiety exclusiveness in settlement (1939:90; cf. 1939: 104). If antipathy did formerly exist, there is no evidence of it nowadays. Strong relationships and, particularly in the more recent context, political and economic ties transcend the moiety division (see below), although the basic differentiation remains intact.

It is apparent that, for all the centrality to the Tolai of moiety affiliation, the moiety is not itself a solidary unit. In the preceding discussion I claimed that Tolai identity is a relative concept - that their discreteness is a matter of degree, dependent on the context in which a question of identity arises. Even the differentiation between Tolai and their southern New Ireland neighbours is not absolute, and perceptions vary over whether Duke of York Islanders are Tolai or not. Furthermore, even if a distinctive and exclusive Tolai people can be identified, for most purposes in daily life Tolai corporate identity is experienced within much smaller social units which differentiate the Tolai people internally. Thus while Tolai will identify with other Tolai in their relations with non-Tolai, among themselves they will align along kinship, village, locality or moiety lines, or some combination of these factors, as the particular context may require. This contextual relativity of the social concepts - one not of kind but of degree - obtains for all elements of Tolai social structure.

Epstein, writing on Tolai local organisation, noted from accounts of comparable Melanesian matrilineal societies "the difficulties of classifying different structural types" (1964/65:2), and he emphasised

6The interaction of these factors is discussed in the section on settlement and residence in this chapter.
the factor of change and adaptation to new social conditions, and the "political struggles" which accompany this process, in explaining variations in the composition of local Tolai groups (ibid., 3, 23). Just as changed social and political circumstances under Western influence promoted the growth of a Tolai identity, it is possible that these changes have also helped to reinforce moiety affiliation, by greatly extending the range of social contact in Tolai cultural life. Thus while the moiety is not a corporate group with its own sphere of action, Tolai feel a sense of solidarity with other members of their moiety, which is expressed when and in the manner that a particular context requires it. For most Tolai, social contact is most common in their own and the adjacent villages of their paparagunan (see below), and it is at this level that moiety affiliation is a factor constantly invoked in social, ceremonial and economic activities. The collective term for members of the same moiety is bar niuruna. At the highest level the term may be understood as connoting all persons belonging to the same moiety (see Meier 1929:47, fn 52), but it also has the narrow meaning of all a person's matrilineal kin, and is further used in the intermediate sense of members of the same moiety settled in a locality who have associated together over time, and participated jointly in ceremonial activities.

The central corporate unit in Tolai society is the vunatarai, comprising all persons who trace their matrilineal descent from a single known common ancestress or, more usually, from a number of known ancestresses whose common descent is assumed but cannot necessarily be demonstrated. During fieldwork I recorded many instances of associations having been maintained over time in a

---

7 For example, at the 1984 funeral of a Matupit big-man, Daniel ToKaputin, guests attended from villages on the whole Crater Peninsula, the North Coast, the whole Blanche Bay coastline as far as Kabakaul, inland around Navuneram, and the Duke of York Islands, and deposited tabu with their respective moiety's tubuan, one ToKaputin's and the other his children's (Jacob Simet 1984, pers.comm.).

8 Bar is the plural particle, used (only) with words expressing relationship.

9 The term is a compound of vuna (base, source, origin) and tarai (men, folk, people). As with the term "Tolai" and moiety names, its present generalised use seems to be a fairly recent phenomenon. The definition which follows shows that the term may be glossed as "clan", although, as will emerge, the Tolai usage is imprecise, and I have therefore preferred to use the Kuanua term throughout, as importing that qualification.
locality between a number of vunatarai of the same moiety, but though, as has been mentioned, the term bar niuruna is used to designate the membership of such groupings, associated vunatarai are not separate entities. The following chapters will show, however, that such ties are frequently manipulated for purposes of gaining access to land.

An individual acquires the membership of his or her mother's vunatarai by birth, from which factor a Tolai's moiety, status with respect to vunatarai of the same or opposite moiety, and kinship and potential affinal relations necessarily follow. Until recently at least the great majority of Tolai gained access to land mainly by virtue of their vunatarai membership. There are other well-established ways of gaining land access which have become more prominent in recent decades, but all Tolais' tenure remains most secure in their own vunatarai's landholdings. Members of a vunatarai acknowledge a common leader (lualua, discussed more fully below), and identify themselves by reference to their madapai - the place of their original settlement in the locality, where ancestors are buried and where the members meet for ceremonial activities conducted by the vunatarai. Although moiety affiliation is the critical factor in social organisation, for the Tolai the vunatarai is the social unit where group corporateness is most keenly felt. At the same time, the term vunatarai is used by Tolai with a flexibility of meaning which again illustrates the relativity of their social concepts. The range of factors which are significant to corporate identity is indicated by the varying Tolai practice in naming their vunatarai.

Between late 1962 and early 1965 Tolai staff of the Land Titles Commission systematically compiled genealogies for a total of 307 vunatarai settled within the Rabaul locality (see Map 4), recording in the process current membership, ancestors, and spouses to a depth of six or more generations. The undertaking was enormous, and, while my own research indicates that the collection is not completely exhaustive of all vunatarai settled in the locality, the degree of

10 It has been suggested to me that the term "phratry" could be applied to such associated vunatarai (Ann Chowning 1984, pers.comm.).

11 I use "status" in the sense of social location, not to connote a hierarchy of social ranking (see below in the text, where I say the Tolai have no strict hierarchy of social segmentation).

12 The LTC in fact came into being in May 1963, but there was a continuity of operations from the previous Native Land Commission, whose staff were transferred to the LTC.
Map 4: Rabaul Locality

comprehensiveness achieved is impressive. In the process each vunatarai was officially named, apparently on the advice of the Tolai informants including in most cases the vunatarai's current lualua. The naming practice was far from uniform, some apparently being named by reference to the founding ancestor, and many others by the name of their madapai. Some of my informants, through their involvement with officialdom, were familiar with the "official" name of their vunatarai, but, those persons aside, most individuals when asked, "What is your vunatarai?" responded either with one of the moiety names Marmar or Pikalaba, or with the name of the present lualua. This latter response was frequently given even when referring to a vunatarai in the context of its distant past. On other occasions the name of their madapai was given (which usually corresponded to the vunatarai's official name), or, the name of the vunatarai's apical ancestress. Correspondence in usage between vunatarai and moiety names was not confined to cases where individuals identified their vunatarai by naming their moiety, for the term vunatarai was also frequently used as a synonym for moiety in the collective sense. Thus it was common for people to refer to a member of a different vunatarai from theirs, but of the same moiety, as "a member of my vunatarai".

Although this flexibility of meaning presented the potential for confusion, it should not be taken as suggesting that Tolai were incapable of drawing the distinction between moiety and vunatarai if the context required it, as my further interrogation in the individual cases proved. What the correspondence in usage does show, however, is that the vunatarai concept can embrace groups at different levels in the Tolai social structure. The term vunatarai is applicable from the highest unit for which membership is recruited by descent - the moiety - through to the localised descent group - the matrilineage, and any intermediate stage in the combination of common descent (from fictitious to demonstrated biological) and physical proximity (from widely dispersed to localised) may be denoted by the term if the need or the desire presents itself. Given this capacity for conceptual extension, it will come as no surprise that the term sometimes used for a segment of a vunatarai, apiktarai, is also on occasions used interchangeably with the term vunatarai.

The term apiktarai is a compound of apik (hand of bananas) and tarai (men, folk, people), and so makes "an analogy with hands of bananas unified by their attachment to a single stem" (Bradley
1982:58). Some authorities suggest that all vunatarai are subdivided into apiktarai (e.g., Smith and Salisbury 1961:2; Bradley 1982:58). This may be so in some localities, but my own experience bears out Epstein's remark that the term apiktarai "does not refer to a specific type of group or to one at a particular level of segmentation." (1969:124-25.) On many occasions during fieldwork the term apiktarai was used to signify two or more vunatarai of the same moiety (the original extension here being of vunatarai to signify moiety, so that apiktarai - segments of the moiety - are, by extension, actual vunatarai), and on other occasions informants, having first given a moiety name in response to the request for their vunatarai, then supplied their vunatarai name when asked to nominate their apiktarai. As for the opposite correspondence, my impression is that the term vunatarai was only used to signify apiktarai in circumstances where it was apparent that an original vunatarai was in the final stages of fission, so that indeed not a vunatarai segment but an emerging vunatarai was being signified. Such cases serve to make the vital point that the relativity of Tolai social concepts has a temporal aspect: not only do the concepts overlap groupings at different levels of social organisation, but a grouping recognised at one level may over time convert to a recognised grouping at a higher level. Because of structural ideology, transformations of this nature may only occur at the bottom levels of social segmentation, and a grouping may only rise, not fall, in corporate status. No corporate entity superior to a vunatarai exists to which a grouping may ascend in the kinship structure, nor may a subordinate grouping exist without kinship derivation from a grouping at a higher level.

From the foregoing it is apparent that all corporate units within the Tolai social structure are based on matrilineal descent. Before finally appraising group corporateness mention will be made of a variety of new groupings which have appeared in response to the changing Tolai environment. For the sake of completeness, however, one final level of descent group identified by some authorities (e.g., Sack 1975, Simet n.d.), the kakang, should be considered. The concept also derives from the stem of bananas analogy, a kakang being a half-row. Thus just as the vunatarai may conceptually be seen as a matriclan which consists of a number of apiktarai or matrilineages, so the apiktarai may also comprise a number of kakang or sub-lineages.

In Chapter 1 we saw that changes in the Tolai environment over
the last century produced new forms of political and economic organisation. Notable innovations since the Second World War were local government councils (replaced by community governments after independence) and such agencies as the Tolai Cocoa Project, which was converted into the New Guinea Islands Produce Company, and its rival Tolai company the New Guinea Development Corporation. All these bodies operate above village level, with their membership cutting across descent units. Under colonial administration the village gained increasing prominence as a political unit, and Salisbury has convincingly demonstrated the link between political consolidation among the Tolai and successful economic change (1970:338-49). Developments since the 1960s have produced successive changes in the higher units of political organisation, but villages have meanwhile remained the focal point of Tolai social and political organisation. Recent developments suggest that the village unit may play an increasing role in economic matters in the future (see Chapter 7). Village composition will be examined below in the section on settlement, but for the moment it should be noted that village membership cuts across descent groups, and descent group membership overlaps village boundaries.

I also mentioned in Chapter 1 that, in response to new economic opportunities, Tolai big-men arranged the communal planting of coconuts and cocoa. Such arrangements usually involved the mobilisation of persons belonging to the same or associated vunatarai. The Tolai called these associations attached to a big-man for a business enterprise tinur guvai (also turquvai, see Epstein 1969:126) - literally, a standing together. Salisbury records that the name kivung (strictly, a meeting, but here in the extended sense of an association) was used in the Kokopo area for the same kind of business associations (see 1970:239), and he describes their operations in a wide range of economic activity (ibid., Chapter 7 passim). So long as business associations of this nature survive they possess a degree of corporate identity, but in the Tolai experience those transcending small groupings of close kin have not remained active for long. Salisbury attributes their failure to various factors, including a lack of confidence in their leadership (partly fostered by official attitudes which sought to free entrepreneurial individuals from their kinship obligations), the absence of recognition of ties wider than among fellow kin, and lack of avenues for productive investment at village level (ibid.,270-76).
One social unit which has enjoyed an increase in importance in the changing Tolai environment that shows no signs of abating is the nuclear or conjugal family. This unit, incorporating a married couple and their children, clearly cuts across both moiety and *vunatarai* lines. As I will show in the section on kinship and marriage, strong bonds have always existed between spouses, and particularly between a father and his children, but Bradley is probably correct in stating, "Before the arrival of Europeans, the nuclear family had little significance for the Tolai as a social or symbolic unit." (1982:191.) She notes that until relatively recently "there appeared to be no Kuanua word to denote the unit of father, mother and child" (ibid.), and she continues:

The word which has now taken on that meaning is the term for the relationship of father and child - *bartamana*. [Footnote in the original: Bar denotes a pair or group of people who stand in some relationship to each other, as indicated by the qualifier. Tamana = his/her father.] This can include the relationship between classificatory fathers and children and, by extension, everyone in ego's father's *vunatarai*, whether male or female. Nowadays its most common usage is to denote the unit of father, mother and children - the nuclear family. (Ibid., 191-92.)

Bradley joins many other authorities in observing that "the Tolai have gradually moved closer to the model of family relationships introduced to them by contact with Europeans." (Ibid., 194.) In listing many of the influences (ibid., 194-99) she remarks their conflict with Tolai concepts and practice, concluding that "the European-style image of the nuclear family under the headship of the husband/father that is conveyed in the legal system, the media, in teaching materials in schools and colleges and by the Christian churches is reinforced by the growing economic dependence of wives and children on the husband/father as provider." (Ibid., 200.) The increased importance of this social unit has major implications for land tenure, as will appear in the chapters which follow.

In the next section I analyse the Tolai individual's kinship and affinal relations, but I will conclude this section by confirming the main points which have emerged in the foregoing treatment of corporate identity. A crucial conclusion is that units in the Tolai social structure are essentially relative concepts. While each unit has its minimal defining features, a conceptual continuum affords a range of possible meanings for all corporate terms, from which the actual unit signified may generally be gathered from the particular context in
which a term is employed. Care must, therefore, be taken to avoid classifying social units in conformity with a strict hierarchy of social segmentation. Yet for the Tolai individual a hierarchy in modes of recruitment does exist, generally dependent upon the two variables of closeness of kinship connection and degree of physical proximity, with the relative importance of either variable depending on the context in which a question of community of interests is put at issue. Furthermore that context can itself depend on a whole range of social, political and economic variables, and will, of course, change over time. This relativity of social concepts affords great flexibility to Tolai notions of corporate identity: from an individual's point of view associations may be activated with a wide range of persons with whom a sense of solidarity is felt; in terms of social units the ideology allows corporate identity to be asserted at almost any level in the social structure. Although official usage of the Kuanua terms tends to suggest (and even promote) a standardisation of meaning, it is manifestly clear that it matters little to a Tolai that what he or she calls vunatarai is technically a moiety, or an apiktarai. What does matter is that a person can tell with whom to associate in any particular context.

2. KINSHIP AND MARRIAGE

Anthropologists have given close attention to many aspects of Tolai society, and it is surprising, therefore, that little systematic analysis of kinship and affinal relations is available to assist the untrained outsider in attempting to come to terms with the complexities of Tolai relationships.13 Their treatments do, of course, recognise the main relationships where they arise in considering such matters as exogamy and incest taboos, but one is left with the impression that Tolai society is comprehensible in terms of the corporate units I have considered in the previous section, and that individual relationships are only of subordinate importance, and do not deserve separate treatment. Analysis of kinship and affinal relations has largely been the province of a few highly-motivated missionaries, two of whom provide the best accounts in English to

13It is possible that anthropologists, having themselves internalised their learning of the relationships, found it unnecessary to expound them.
date. The German Sacred Heart priest Joseph Meier, in a series of articles on Tolai adoption (1929), illegitimacy (1938) and orphanhood (1939), provided detailed information on relationship terminology (although unsystematically, and almost entirely in footnotes), and the Methodist minister Jack Trevitt in 1940 presented two rudimentary tables showing the terminology for close kinship and affinal relations (1940: 354,355).

No discussion on the occupation of a parcel of Tolai land can be undertaken without immediately being confronted by an elaborate array of relationships. For the knowledge essential to understand the basis of Tolai tenure, it therefore became necessary to conduct the systematic analysis which has hitherto been largely absent from the literature. The results of this analysis are set out in Appendix A, and in this section the treatment of relationships will be confined to drawing general conclusions from these results. Any shortfalls in the analysis may be excusable in view of Meier's remarks that the Tolai themselves "are apt to make mistakes in the use of the terms of relationship, because these terms are one of the most difficult things in their language", and that only Tolai "advanced in age and well versed in their own idiom know all the intricacies of kinship terminology." (1929:93.)

My analysis of kinship terminology confirms that the moiety division, already recognised as the critical factor in Tolai corporate identity, maintains its central significance in Tolai kinship classification. The defining features of each kinship term are a combination of moiety and generation referents, with in the case of some terms a sex referent as well, and the terms were seen to have a classificatory dimension which furnished a kinship term for the relationship between all Tolai individuals in accordance with these three referents. Because the kinship terms are all-embracing, they are partly overlapped by the terms for affinal relationships. The extensions in meaning of the affinal terms are, however, limited in scope by the actual marriage through which they are created, so the terms are only used between persons related by kin to either marriage partner. Although understandably the Tok Pisin terms are not as comprehensive as the Kuanua terms, the consistency in correspondence between the terms used in the two languages and the relationships denoted demonstrates the cultural constraints inherent in Tolai kinship terminology.
In the preceding section I concluded that corporate identity is a relative concept, and, in using a term like *vunatarai*, in the range of its meanings from moiety to localised matrilineage the precise denotation depends on the context in which a question of community of interests is put at issue. In classificatory terms, a moiety can be regarded as a classificatory *vunatarai*, but just as Tolai are perfectly capable of distinguishing between moiety and localised matrilineage, so also in the case of kinship terminology do they draw a distinction between actual and classificatory kin. Where the distinction is important, a biological relationship is signified by the adjective *tuna* (real, true), so that, for example, where *nagu* is used to refer to a mother, *nagu tuna* refers to the real mother. Bearing in mind this relativity of both corporate and relationship terminology, I turn now to the correlations between Tolai terminology and social structure which emerge from the findings and analysis in Appendix A.

At the moiety level, despite the centrality of the moiety division and the sense of solidarity Tolai feel with other members of their moiety, the analysis shows that it would be mistaken to conclude that this division represents an actual cleavage in Tolai society. The range of a person's relationships is the same either side of the moiety division, and indeed in the case of the term *tubugu* (grandparent/grandchild), it is used for relationships in either moiety without discrimination. Far from representing cleavage, it is arguable that dual organisation is the factor which unites Tolai society, for the whole Tolai people are embraced by the notion that every person is a member of either one's own or one's "fathering" *vunatarai*. Furthermore, although the treatment in Appendix A tended to concentrate on the structural aspects of relationships, there was evidence that behavioral precepts are also an important factor in some relationships. Avoidance or deference behaviour and "jovial" or "serious" relationships can cut across moiety lines, as we will see when examining the key structural relationships.

Self-reciprocity was seen to be a feature of all Tolai relationship terms, with the single exception of the terms for parent and child.¹⁴ For the Tolai, then, in most cases it is the

¹⁴A further, minor, exception is the Tok Pisin terms for spouse, which are non-reciprocal.
relationship which is important, rather than an individual's relative position in the relationship. To the extent that ordination between generations and sexes exists in Tolai society, therefore, it is a product of factors external to kinship terminology (i.e., the authority structure, valorisation of women, etc.). Within the relationships connoted by each kinship term Tolai would feel a sense of solidarity with each other, but it is only where close kinship connection exists that a relationship can be recognised as a solidary unit. Nevertheless, the relationship classifications are available to be invoked if the occasion presents itself, and something approaching solidary units formed on classificatory lines can arise for special purposes. Examples would be groupings of male age-cohorts of the same moiety (classificatory brothers) for initiation ceremonies, or, more recently, associations for business purposes formed along moiety lines (bar niuruna) or among affines (bar tamana). From these manifestations it is apparent that classificatory relationships can merge with corporate entities in the social structure, emphasising once again its essential coherence.

In Appendix A I remarked a deep division among authorities on the sociological significance of kinship terminology. Thus far, examination of the correlations between Tolai terminology and social structure has been limited to drawing conclusions from classificatory relationships of more relevance to group identity than to interpersonal relations. Such a priority is warranted, for the latter can only be understood in the context of the former, but to extend the treatment to examine correlations between Tolai terminology and interpersonal relations it is necessary to return to the egocentric approach originally adopted in Appendix A, and also to inform the discussion by introducing ethnographic aspects from the Tolai social reality. The key events in kinship and affinity are, obviously, birth and marriage, although, to complete the life cycle, the relevance of death may also be considered. The interpersonal relations created by birth and marriage and terminated by death will now be examined.

From birth a Tolai's moiety affiliation, vunatarai membership, status\textsuperscript{15} with respect to vunatarai of the same and opposite moiety, and kinship and potential affinal relations necessarily follow. All

\textsuperscript{15}See my earlier qualification on the meaning of this term in the Tolai context.
these factors are in the realm of group identity and, as descent is unequivocally matrilineal, the impression may be gained that a child's father and patrilateral kin have only a marginal relationship with the child. Tolai recognition of the male role in procreation predates European contact, Meier recording the usage a gapugu (my blood, or in this context semen) by a father with reference to his son (1939: 75-76, fn 17). At the same time the mother's procreative role was regarded as more important than the father's (ibid.), and Meier wrote of the Tolai conviction "that the mother plays a greater role in the propagation of the race than does the father, who performs but a transitory act in the procreation of children." (1929:8.) The father and the patrilateral relatives are, nevertheless, involved in prestations at the time of birth and in associated ceremonies for some time thereafter. Early authorities record their giving and receiving tabu and other gifts (Parkinson 1907:74-76; Meier 1939: 115, fn 83), by which acts Meier says the father "claims the child as his own" (ibid.). Parkinson states that the father names the child (1907:76), and that during the four to six months after birth a first-born child "is supplied by the father's relatives with every possible delicacy" (ibid.). The authorities agree that the more elaborate ceremonies are reserved for a first-born child, whether boy or girl, and that subsequent births attract less ceremony (ibid.; Meier 1938:44). From my own experience these procedures at birth, particularly with respect to exchanges of tabu, are still observed, although Bradley has remarked of the Pila Pila neighbourhood, "Now that virtually all children are born in hospital, the subsequent rituals are often omitted." (1982: 193.)

I have intentionally emphasised the role of the father and the patrilateral kin in order to correct any impression that their role is marginal, but this should not be taken to detract from the importance of the mother and the child's matrilateral kin at birth and in the months thereafter. They, too, give and receive tabu, some of the exchanges taking place between the child's matrilateral kin and its father (Parkinson 1907:75), but there is an essential qualitative difference not just between the roles of mother and father but between the significance of their respective kin groups to the child, in that

16 As emerges in the text, the term "role" should not be understood as connoting strict stereotypes in interpersonal relationships.
the child is a member of its mothers' matrilineal descent group, but not of its father's. The distinction is not between the significance of the mother's kin group and the father's kin group to the child, but between that of the child's kin group and its father's kin group. The relative importance of the two groups of kin will vary with circumstance and over time, and may often depend on individual inclination. With such a wide range of possible variation I am loath to generalise, but perhaps the qualitative difference may appropriately be summed up by saying that within Tolai ideology relations within one's own kin group are inherent, whereas relations with one's father's kin group are essentially derivative or contingent. 17

The feature of bifurcate merging, seen in Appendix A to be a characteristic of Tolai kinship terminology, serves to distinguish between children's close kin in their own and close kin in their father's vunatarai. Meier was informed that the "closest and most intimate" relationship existed between siblings (1929:93), and he records that parents would even employ the sibling terms as "terms of endearment" in addressing their children, and vice versa, for no other kinship term connotes the same degree of affection (ibid., 45-47, fn 50, 51). Same-sex siblings, according to Meier, are considered to be "a unit", and are referred to by others as such by use of the dual personal pronoun dir (they two)(1939:82, fn 26). Such usage, he says, "denotes group solidarity or the close union of certain relationships."(Ibid., 83, fn 26.) Demanding avoidance and deference behaviour was formerly observed by sisters towards brothers (Bradley 1982:66), but such behavioural precepts are gradually falling into disuse (ibid.). Tolai terminology merges siblings with parallel cousins, who are from the same moiety and, in the case of matrilateral parallel cousins, from the same vunatarai. Patrilateral parallel cousins of the same sex are distinguished by the suffix -kava, which

17Indicative of the risks involved in generalisation are the consequences of the merging back and forth of Tolai kin between the moieties at different generations. Thus while Tolai would feel a sense of solidarity with their paternal grandfather - a same-moiety member but from their father's kin group, they would not so regard their maternal grandfather - a member of their own kin group but from the opposite moiety.
also denotes a "jovial" relationship.\textsuperscript{18} In contrast, the relationships between siblings and between matrilateral parallel cousins are always "serious", as is the relationship between opposite sexes, which accounts for the fact that the suffix -\textit{kava} is not employed between patrilateral parallel cousins of opposite sexes.

Cross-cousins, who are from opposite moieties, are designated by a different term (\textit{nauvagu}). The relationship between them is "very serious", and strict avoidance behaviour was observed between opposite-sex cross-cousins in the past (see Meier 1938:28), reinforced by an incest taboo (Meier 1929:6). Marriages between cross-cousins do sometimes occur nowadays (see below, in the discussion of marriage), but the practice is still strongly deprecated. The merging in the terminology of siblings with parallel cousins, and the differential terminology for them and for cross-cousins, demonstrates the crucial importance of the moiety division not just in terms of corporate identity but also for interpersonal relations. Same-sex siblings and parallel cousins behave in a "relaxed" way towards each other, but the relationship between same-sex cross-cousins is "very tense". The relationship between opposite-sex kin of the same generation, whether siblings, parallel cousins or cross-cousins, is always "serious", and this behaviour precept crosses over the moiety division.

Bifurcate merging also serves to distinguish children's relationships with kin in their parents' generation, where in the terminology the mother's sister is merged with the mother (\textit{nagu}), and the father's brother is merged with the father (\textit{tamagu}). Again the moiety's centrality is apparent - a child's mothers are all in the child's moiety, and a child's fathers are all in the opposite moiety. Relationships with the other kin at this generation - the mother's brothers and the father's sisters - are designated by the terms \textit{matuagu} and \textit{vivigu} respectively, the terms once more being moiety-specific. In a child's own moiety, therefore, at the parents' generation the female kin are all mothers and the male kin are all

\textsuperscript{18}As in Appendix A, I have adopted here the terms used by Jacob Simet, one of my main informants on Tolai relationship terminology. I understood Simet to use "jovial" and "serious" in contrasting the degrees of sociability, and "relaxed" and "tense" in contrasting the potentiality for conflict of interest. As appears from the text, some behavioural precepts are falling into disuse, and authorities disagree on others. I do not claim to have fully appreciated these highly subjective phenomena.
mother's brothers, and in the opposite moiety the male kin are all fathers and the female kin are all father's sisters. Despite this merging, it should be recalled that, where in the context it is important to do so, Tolai can and do distinguish the real relationship from its extended usage.

The dual personal pronoun dir (they two), use of which for same-sex siblings has already been noted, is, according to Meier, also used to refer to the relationships of mother and child and father and child (1939:82, fn 26), with the same denotation of group solidarity and close union between them. At the generation of a child's parents, the roles to be compared are those of mother and mother's brother in the same moiety as the child, and father and father's sister in the opposite moiety, and those of mother in the child's moiety and father's sister in the opposite moiety, and mother's brother and father, again in the same and opposite moiety respectively.

The child's mother and mother's brother, being siblings, are themselves the most closely and intimately related of all Tolai kin (see above), and the intensity of their relationship is reflected in their roles with respect to the child. A child's real mother is the female member of the child's kin at this generation with whom the child is most intimately connected from birth until puberty, the closeness of affection between them surviving until death. It is upon her that the day-to-day work of supporting the young child falls (Bradley 1982: 193), but, while this responsibility is hers, it may be shared in its performance with her sisters (also the child's mothers), depending on individual circumstances. The mother's eldest brother is the male member of the child's kin group at this generation who plays the most important role in the child's life until adulthood. Reviewing the early authorities, Bradley writes:

In earlier times, children lived with their parents only until puberty, when they moved to the household of their mother's brother.... The mother's brother arranged the marriages of his nieces and nephews, paid the initiation fees for his nephews, sponsored their ritual preparations for marriage, paid bridewealth on their behalf and assigned land for their wives to garden on. (Ibid.)

To a large extent this summary of the mother's brother's role remains applicable today, although fathers have always assumed aspects of that role in the case of eldest daughters, and are in general becoming increasingly involved in some of these responsibilities towards their children in recent times. The above comparison suggests that a
mother's role is mainly to provide sustenance, and that ceremonial responsibilities are more the domain of the mother's brother. Today no such clear-cut definition of roles obtains, however, for the mother's brother may assist in the material support of the child, and the mother - and, indeed, all members the child's kin group - will participate in ceremonial activities involving the child. What has been said above relates particularly to the role of the mother's eldest brother, but her other brothers are not excluded, and, as with the mother's sisters, they may undertake or share in the responsibilities of the role.

The child's father and father's sister are also, as siblings, most intimately and closely related, but whereas the father and child are considered to be a unit, neither common vunatarai nor common moiety membership admit the same emotional and practical association between the father's sister and the child as exists between the mother's brother and the child. The father's sister's relationship with the child is largely derivative (through the father), and her role may be compared with that of the mother's brother's wife (a classificatory father's sister), whose importance is also mainly derivative. The father's sister is, nevertheless, a member of the child's "fathering" vunatarai, and would participate in ceremonial activities involving the child as a member of its father's kin group.

Singled out for special treatment by the Tolai is the role of a father with respect to his eldest daughter. The Tolai regard the first daughter as a "gift" by the mother to the father, but the "gift" has no effect on the daughter's vunatarai membership or moiety affiliation. The practice, which is said to be of long standing, is seen as a recognition of the father's role in providing for his children during their dependency. The father is entitled to receive his first daughter's bridewealth at her marriage (see below), and he thereby accepts the reciprocal obligation to acquire land for her. Investigation during fieldwork at Rakunat showed that this practice has a dimension beyond the simple father-first daughter relationship, for the daughter's siblings also share occupation of the land acquired for her by their father - a reflection of the fact that the practice

---

19 Informants used the Tok Pisin verb givim, or the English "gift", during interviews. In view of the reciprocity aspect mentioned in the text, the Kuanua term is probably vartabar, the prefix var- incorporating reciprocity.
recognises the father's role in providing for all his children. A recent innovation, apparently, is the practice of a father providing the bridewealth for his eldest son. This responsibility usually rests with the son's kin group and is discussed more fully below.

It is apparent, then, that the roles of mother and father's sister differ sharply in their importance, but there is overlap between the roles of father and mother's brother. Meier remarked in 1938, "The spheres of the father and of the maternal uncle are entirely distinct" (1938:2, fn 2), and he contrasted the father's importance as determining the "public status of the child as far as such status depends upon his birth or extraction" with the maternal uncle's concern "to take care of the puberty-ceremonies, the initiation into secret societies, the marriage, and so on, of his sister's children." (Ibid., 2, and at fn 2.) But elsewhere Meier recognised that the father is "not completely eclipsed" by the maternal uncle (1929:27), and that the father "concurs in all the major affairs concerning his children, such as puberty-ceremonies, magical rites, initiation into the secret societies, marriage, and burial." (Ibid.) In the preceding section I mentioned the increasing importance of the nuclear family in contemporary Tolai society. Associated with this trend a father's continued interest in his children's lives, while evident in the past, is much more pronounced today. The implications of this development for Tolai land tenure will appear in the following chapters, but whether it has led to a corresponding reduction in importance of the mother's brother's role (as some commentators have claimed) is in my view debatable. Consideration of this question must await completion of the treatment of land tenure.

The special position of the maternal uncle in Tolai society is further manifested at the level of generation above the child's parents. Grandparents are not distinguished in kinship terminology, the single term tubugu being used for both maternal and paternal grandparents, and applying to either sex and in both moieties. One person at this generation is, however, identified by a special term - the maternal uncle of the child's mother, referred to by the child as kakugu. Thus at the grandparents' generation all female kin are simply merged under the term tubugu, while in the case of males the mother's maternal uncles are specially identified as kakugu, all other male kin being merged as tubugu. Turning to the actual interpersonal
relations, because seniority was found to be an important factor in ascribing roles at the parents' generation, it is tempting to generalise that the eldest of the mother's maternal uncles is the most important male member of a child's kin group in its grandparents' generation. This temptation must be resisted, however, for at this degree of generational distance factors such as loss of kin through death and authority within the child's vunatarai may be more important considerations than the direct kinship connection. My impression is that the most senior male member at this generation (who would probably be the lualua of the child's vunatarai, at least when the child had reached adulthood) would be of greater importance to the child's life than its mother's actual eldest maternal uncle, although they may indeed be one and the same person, and both would be termed kakugu.

These, then, are the interpersonal relationships into which a child is born. The deterministic influence of Tolai kinship ideology is demonstrated by the manner in which a child is incorporated into these relationships in the exceptional cases of orphanhood, illegitimacy and, especially, adoption. Meier wrote at length on these three matters (1929; 1938; 1939), and the following account is largely derived from that authority, though supplemented by my experience during fieldwork. As an orphan he includes only a child who is bereft early in life of one or both parents (1939: 63). Although he deals separately with the "legal status" of a motherless half-orphan, a fatherless half-orphan, and a full orphan, and records differential treatment between male and female orphans, he summarises that "it is the chiefly duty of the 'close maternal kin' to provide for children bereft either of mother or father or both." (Ibid., 127.) The main problem presented by orphanhood during infancy is the practical one of supporting the child. Whatever arrangements are made, however, the full range of interpersonal relationships available to a child with both parents living remains substantially intact for the Tolai orphan, because of the extension of the parent concepts beyond the child's real father and mother. In contrast to societies where the nuclear family is central, a Tolai child is relatively unrelent upon the survival of its biological parents.

The position with an illegitimate child, at least in earlier times, was very different. Meier records that illegitimate birth brought disgrace upon the child (1938: 10-15), the mother (ibid.,
15-33), and their kin (ibid., 33-34), and that illegitimate children were regularly disposed of by the mother, either by abortion, or by neglect or other indirect measures after birth (ibid., 35-43). Although the child's relationships in its kin group remain intact, the usual roles relatives would perform for the child (e.g., in initiation, and at marriage) would be neglected (ibid., 44-49), and the child would occupy an inferior position in society, being "despised, doomed to remain poor and to lead an obscure life." (Ibid., 49.) The child, of course, has no paternal kin to turn to for the roles they would usually perform towards a child. Bradley's remark that at Pila Pila in recent years the incidence of illegitimate birth "has increased markedly" (1982:196) probably has more general application, but my impression is that illegitimacy no longer attracts the stigma of former times. For the child there is still the problem of absence of paternal kin, but this can, in part at least, be resolved by the mother's subsequent marriage, and her husband's de facto adoption of the illegitimate child (see below).

Adoption, Meier says, is an institution "deeply embedded" in Tolai culture (1929:95). In his analysis of such matters as motives for adoption, the exchange of tabu for the adopted child, the new relationships arising from adoption, and attitudes to the child, Meier provides a wealth of detail pertaining to the practice, but his explanations are heavily functionalist, and his concern to identify "principles" governing adoption is redolent of an era of more simplistic anthropological analysis. Adoption was, in his observation, highly and strictly structured, and many aspects of the practice which he records (e.g., the secrecy surrounding adoption - ibid., 34-39) cannot be recognised today. One such aspect, however, which he terms a "principle", is never in my experience departed from, and that is that adoption practice always follows moiety affiliation (ibid., 96).20 Tolai value having children very highly, and the motives of a couple who are childless, or who have children of only one sex, identified by Meier as the main reasons for adoption (ibid., 39-48), remain equally forceful today. With improved maternity and infant welfare services, however, these circumstances for adoption do

20 In fact, I have conflated two of Meier's "principles", one, that Tolai never change their moiety affiliation, and the other, that an adopted child belongs to the same moiety as its adoptive mother, not is adoptive father.
not arise so often. Apart from childlessness, or lack of a son or daughter, other motives for adoption mentioned during fieldwork were access for the child to schooling, lack of adult male members in a vunatarai to perform ceremonial functions, and absence of female members in a vunatarai to take over the vunatarai land. In some of these cases the adoption was only temporary to deal with an exigency (e.g., the temporary lack of adult male members in a vunatarai), while in others the adoption was not complete (e.g., the absence of female members in a vunatarai), in that the child's real parents retained an interest in, and responsibility towards, the child.

Meier records that men will adopt children in circumstances where they have no close matrilineal kin in the next succeeding generation (ibid., 46-47; 70-76), but the responsibilities of rearing the child belong to the man's sister (ibid., 47). The relationships formed by adoption in such circumstances (which correspond to the cases of lack of male or female vunatarai members mentioned above) are indicative of the cultural constraints of group identity and kinship concepts inherent in Tolai social organisation. In the first place, as adoption in these cases is motivated by the need to meet some deficiency in the membership of the adopting male's vunatarai, only a child of the same moiety as the adopting male is eligible for adoption. Kinship ideology places all a child's "fathers" in the opposite moiety, and Meier records that Tolai "indignantly reject even the mere imputation of paternal relations existing between [a man] and a child belonging to his own moiety." (Ibid., 70.) Formation of the father-child relationship is, therefore, excluded by the moiety division, but no such constraint militates against the adopting male becoming the child's maternal uncle - the other relationship with a male available at this generation. My own view is that a male adopting a young child into his vunatarai would, indeed, become the

---

21 Rakunat was close to one of the earliest government schools opened in the Tolai area - the Waterhouse Memorial School at Nodup - and in the case in point a male youth had been adopted by a Rakunat woman from matrilineal kinfolk in the Duke of York Islands.
child's maternal uncle, but Meier's experience was to the contrary.\textsuperscript{22} What is agreed, however, is that the adopting male does not become the child's father. That status is ascribed to the husband of the child's adoptive mother - the woman in the adopting male's vunatarai who takes over the rearing of the child. Being from the opposite moiety to the child, his status as the child's adoptive father complies with the moiety division. Thus the comprehensiveness of Tolai relationships enables an adoption to be undertaken for particular purposes, and provides all the kin normally available without offending kinship ideology.

In the majority of cases, however, adoption is resorted to in circumstances of childlessness (of both or either sex), and the married couple adopt the child together in the capacity of parents. In conformity with the moiety division the adopted child will always be a member of its adoptive mother's moiety, and, in my own experience (and apparently also in Meier's - see ibid., 56-60), frequently a close matrilineal relative of the adoptive mother at the next inferior generation. In classificatory terms, the woman is already the child's mother regardless of kinship connection, and her spouse is the child's father. No difficulty is, therefore, presented, and the adoption simply develops classificatory relationships into the reality of interpersonal relations. The roles of the various kin towards a real child are observed in the same way by the other adoptive relatives, who again all correspond in classificatory terms to the child's real relatives, and who will in fact in many cases be those real relatives of the child. Where real and adoptive relatives do not correspond there may be some overlap in performance of a role between the two, for, although Meier claims that adoption is irrevocable (ibid., 64), and that Tolai distinguish between the real parents of a child and its adoptive parents (ibid., 69, fn 70), my impression is that the

\textsuperscript{22}Meier recognised the maternal uncle option as "theoretically" possible (1929:71), but he says that the actual relationship invoked is that between siblings - i.e., brother-brother if the adopted child is male, and brother-sister if a female (ibid.). His explanation indicates that this usage is employed to connote the closeness of the relationship between siblings - "closer by one degree than that between 'maternal uncle and nephew and niece'." (Ibid.) His cases supporting the sibling-term usage, however, import special circumstances, e.g., that the adopted person is already adult (ibid., 56), and thus of the same generation as the adopting male.
institution is much more flexible than he allows, at least in its present practice.

Finally, although Meier is at pains to distinguish the position of an adopted child from that of an orphan (1939:96) or an illegitimate child (1938:5), he does recognise that orphanhood may prompt an adoption (1939:82), and my impression is that, both in cases of fatherless half-orphans and illegitimate children, upon the subsequent marriage of the child's mother her husband would fulfil the role of father to the child, and probably through him the child would gain other paternal kin. It may be largely a matter of personal inclination, but certainly nothing in the concepts of social structure and kinship would exclude formation of such relationships.

The other set of a Tolai's interpersonal relations is created by marriage. Moiety exogamy prescribes that a spouse be taken from the opposite moiety, but other limitations are imposed on marriage choice. Marriage is almost always undertaken between persons of the same generation, so a Tolai's spouse will usually be his or her classificatory cross-cousin (see Appendix A). Certain relatives are, however, regarded as too close to be considered for marriage, and these include real cross-cousins, and the children of real cross-cousins. The incest taboos prohibiting intra-moiety marriage and inter-moiety marriage between persons of too close proximity were formerly strictly observed, and any transgression was allegedly sanctioned by a ritual execution of the offending parties.\(^{23}\) Intra-moiety incest was particularly detestable (Meier 1929:6-8; 1938:23), and brought disgrace on the moiety members which could only be expunged by death. Either form of incest is still strongly deprecated, although increased social mobility and freedom in choice of marriage partner has led to marriages in breach of both forms of incest taboo. During fieldwork I encountered one instance of a marriage between real cross-cousins, one of an intra-moiety marriage, and another of the even more offensive marriage within a vunatarai, between a man and his sister's daughter. Strong opprobrium attached to

\(^{23}\) Execution did not automatically follow in all incest cases, and as mentioned below in the text, flight or expulsion were alternatives adopted by the offending couple or the offended group in some cases. Accounts by early European residents indicate that on occasions offenders were, in fact, executed (see Epstein 1969: 203), and I received a brief account of the ritual involved.
all three marriages (the implications of which, for land tenure, will be considered in Part II), and, in general, incest taboos retain their force in limiting choice of marriage partners.

Polygamy by big-men was formerly common (Bradley 1982:31), and to some extent the practice has survived, although not in the sense of multiple wives sharing a husband's household. While monogamy is the accepted marriage ideal, both males and females often have more than one spouse during their lives. Remarriage would normally indicate that a subsisting marriage had terminated. Celibacy is most uncommon, and even older Tolai men and women, if left spouseless by a death or divorce, will remarry. The incidence of divorce, though reckoned by some to be relatively infrequent (e.g. Epstein 1969: 228-29), does appear to be increasing (see Bradley 1982: 190-91). If this is so a corresponding increase in remarriages is probably occurring. The remarriage of either spouse and birth of further children can lead to complications for land tenure, as will be seen in Part II.

Early commentators described elaborate ceremonies surrounding marriage (e.g., Parkinson 1907: 68-71; Brown 1910: 112-18), and, if today a church wedding may have taken the place of much of the former ceremonial (see Bradley 1982: 167), payment of bridewealth remains the crucial event in a Tolai marriage (ibid., 166-67). Unlike many other Melanesian societies where cash has largely replaced traditional valuables in marital exchange, for the Tolai a proper marriage requires the payment of tabu (Epstein 1969: 216; Bradley 1982:167). Although when speaking in Tok Pisin Tolai use the expressions baiim meri (buy a wife) and braid prais (bride price), their opposition to cash being substituted for tabu has been attributed to their contempt for such reduction of marriage to a purely commercial transaction (Epstein 1969: 216). Noting that the ceremony at which bridewealth is presented is called a varkukul, Bradley states that the prefix var- has the function of making the verb kukul (to buy) reciprocal, denoting the mutual transaction or exchange implicit in the marriage ceremony (1982: 174).

Apart from the prospective marriage partners, the principal parties in the marital exchange are members of the vunatarai of both sets of parents (Epstein 1969:217). Regarding the source and destination of the bridewealth, there is evidence in the Rabaul locality at least of differential practice between first-born sons and daughters, and the children born later. Bradley reports that in the
Pila Pila area, "The responsibility for providing bridewealth is said to fall nowadays on the father for the oldest boy in the family and on the mother for the others" (1982: 168), although usually contributions are made by other relatives of the boy in the expectation of reciprocity (ibid.). She continues:

The bridewealth is handed over by the boy's father or maternal uncle and is received by the girl's maternal uncle, or her father if she is the eldest daughter. However, the public recipient of the bridewealth does not necessarily have any further rights over it. The question of whether the recipient has the right to control and dispose of (kure) the bridewealth or whether he merely looks after (balauru) it on behalf of the girl is one on which there is no general consensus among Pila Pilans. (Ibid.)

She notes a strong tendency nowadays for women to claim the bridewealth as their own (ibid., 169).

Of the interpersonal relations created by marriage, obviously the relationship obtaining between the spouses is closest (the couple being considered a unit, denoted by the dual personal pronoun dir - Meier 1939: 82, fn 26). Tensions between the moieties and between the sexes militate against closeness in most other affinal relationships. Strict avoidance behaviour was practised between all in-laws in the past (Parkinson 1907:72), and, though observance of such precepts as the prohibition on men and their mothers-in-law seeing each other is no longer enforced, the "seriousness" of their relationship is still manifested in the strict avoidance of use of personal names. A man will refer to both his wife's mother and father as nimugu (or nimuan), but whereas he could socialise with her father (who is a member of his moiety, and a classificatory maternal uncle), his relations with her mother would be very "serious". On the other hand, although a woman refers to both her husband's mother and father as enagu, her mother-in-law is in the opposite moiety (a classificatory father's sister), and relations with either parent-in-law, therefore, would probably not be close. Similarly, relations between siblings-in-law (always of the opposite moiety, and classificatory cross-cousins) are likely to be regarded as "serious", especially where they are of opposite sexes.

Epstein recognised marriage as one of the "countervailing tendencies" which in former times of "intense parochialism" allowed the creation of bonds between otherwise hostile communities (1969: 14). The dual organisation common to the Tolai area not only allowed a stranger (e.g., a Tolai woman captured in warfare) to be
incorporated into a community for marriage purposes, but also enabled
the appropriate moiety to be ascribed to a non-Tolai marrying in to a
community. In former times captured Baining women (and their
children) thereby gained their moiety affiliation, and today a Papua
New Guinean from elsewhere in the country or a European contemplating
marriage to a Tolai is accorded the opposite moiety affiliation for
the purpose of the marriage, and can take up the interpersonal
relations ensuing from that moiety membership. In-marriage, therefore,
either by a Tolai from a distant area or by a non-Tolai, presents no
necessary difficulty for social organisation, although it has major
implications for land tenure where the in-marrying person is a female.

The former parochialism led to a high degree of local endogamy,
even, in some localities, approaching a pattern of exchange between
vunatarai of their members in marriage (see Epstein 1969:215). Local
endogamy remains a feature of contemporary marriage patterns, and
Bradley noted at Pila Pila "the marked tendency for women to marry to
a place where they already have clan links." (1982:166.) The practical
importance of such local endogamy for purposes of land access is
obvious, and I would only add from my own experience that men are also
influenced in their marriage choice by such practical considerations.
I was advised at Rakunat village that young women who are members of
vunatarai which originally settled at Rakunat, but who have grown up
outside Rakunat (their mothers having married out from the locality
and resided virilocally), are sought out as wives for young Rakunat
men. Thus, despite an increased freedom of choice, local solidarity
and relationships between groups within a locality remain important
factors in marriage.

Death is an event of great significance to the Tolai, who needed
no Christian influence to be persuaded that life is but a preparation
for death and the thereafter. Early records show that Tolai had a
highly-developed view of the after-life (see, e.g., Parkinson
1907:81-82; Brown 1910:190-202), and according to Meier their sole
purpose in life was to prepare their funeral (1929: 46, fn 50).

\[^{24}\] In the following section I discuss Tolai settlement patterns and
residence practice, and I enlarge on what is meant by a "locality" and
a "local community". For the moment, therefore, terms like
"parochialism" and "local endogamy" will only convey imprecise
impressions, and their later refinement must be anticipated in these
final remarks on marriage choice.
Elaborate mortuary ceremonies follow for some time after death, and procedures described by Parkinson at the turn of the century for the burial of a big-man (1907:78-81) can be observed identically today, only modified by the additional participation of a member of the church. A major element of any mortuary ceremony is the distribution of tabu (kutu tabu); it has been justly claimed that the "primary aim" of the Tolai is to accumulate tabu towards their own death, or the death of near kin (Epstein 1961:495). Meier records that Tolai had a dread of not being buried (1939:117), and a major motive for adoption was to have a male relative to take charge of the mortuary ceremonies (Meier 1929:45).

The ceremonies which follow death are not only a matter of increasing concern to Tolai individuals in their old age, but they are also of intense importance to the kin groups of the deceased. "The scale of the funerary ceremonies", Bradley says, "is dependent on the social status of the dead person" (1982:94), and she also notes that the distribution of tabu provides an important opportunity "for individuals and kin groups to monitor the strength of their relationships and to take part in the life of the community through giving or receiving tambu." (Ibid., 96.) She provides a graphic description of the practice at a kutu tabu - the crowd which assembles (up to several thousand people), the display of tabu coils on a decorated scaffold, and then the distribution of tabu among those present by the deceased's siblings, spouse, children, nephews and nieces, grandchildren, spouses of these persons, and other relatives and affines (ibid., 94-95). For all the "careless nonchalance" of both the distributors and recipients, in reality "everyone present is deeply concerned about what is going on and is tense with the effort of trying to see exactly who is giving how much to whom, without appearing to do so", and the ceremony is followed by endless discussion among the guests "about how the deceased's clan members acquitted themselves both individually and as a group" (ibid., 95). Apart from the deceased's close relatives other persons may choose to distribute tabu in the deceased's honour, or in recognition of a friendship or association, and the recipients will be expected to reciprocate in kind on the occasion of the donor's death. Although the main distribution takes place on or shortly after the deceased's funeral, on one occasion in my experience an aspiring successor to a deceased lualua of a vunatarai continued to distribute tabu in the
area where he resided for months after the funeral, in recognition and assertion of his prominence in the community.\textsuperscript{25}

Death, therefore, while it physically removes an individual from the network of relationships already described, also provides an important opportunity for the expression of group solidarity, and for existing relationships between groups and individuals to be confirmed and new relationships formed. A person, especially a prominent leader, is remembered long after death, and large commemorative feasts (\textit{balaguan}) will be held in their honour decades later. As genealogical knowledge affords potency to assertions of authority (see Epstein 1964/65: 22) and is constantly invoked in establishing tenure to land, the names of distant ancestors have a day-to-day currency which belies the remoteness of their mortal existence.

3. SETTLEMENT AND RESIDENCE

The traders arriving in the Tolai area between 1870 and 1875, Salisbury says, "found one of the densest populations of Melanesia - over one hundred per square mile even then." (1970:19.) Early European observations indicate considerable variation in population density and the pattern of settlement between localities, but an understandable paucity of statistics, and the indifferent usage of such terms as "district" and "sub-district", "village", and "hamlet", make accurate reconstruction and reliable comparison difficult today. When the missionary Brown arrived in 1875, Salisbury continues, "Three coastal areas with large populations stood out" - Nodup, Matupit and Kinigunan (ibid., 21), the latter area now known as Kokopo. Of the three, it is likely that the densest population would have been observed at Matupit, where settlement was concentrated on the tiny flat islet of about a square kilometre, separated from the Crater Peninsula by a narrow tidal flat (see Map 2). Epstein estimates its population around the turn of the century at about 800 (1969:35), but the villagers cultivated much of the neighbouring area on the mainland (as they do to this day), so the effective population density would have been much lower than the figure suggests.

\textsuperscript{25}The man, Meriba ToMakala, a highly successful businessman and one of the most prominent of the older Tolai, lives in the Kokopo area, although his \textit{vunatarai} is based at Rabuana in the Rabaul locality. The deceased \textit{lualua} of his \textit{vunatarai} was ToLaku Epinson, whose funeral at Baai in 1982 I attended.
At face value, the early missionaries' accounts suggest their arrivals were met by crowds of almost Messianic proportions. Brown, for example, talks of "such a crowd" being present at his first visit to Nodup on 2 September 1875 (1908:94), and on his second visit ten days later of being met by "a great crowd on the beach" (ibid., 112). On this latter occasion he accompanied "one of the principal chiefs" to his village inland from Tavui Point, and "talked to him, and to the crowd which gathered round us" (ibid., 113). On 13 October 1875 he made his initial voyage along the western shores of Blanche Bay, where between Malaguna and Davaon he passed "several large villages" (ibid., 118), "a large number of natives came out in canoes to meet us" (ibid., 117), and "the natives came in crowds" (ibid., 118). On a rare occasion that figures are mentioned, he states that on his first visit to Matupit "during the greater part of the day there were at least from ninety to a hundred canoes alongside, with an average crew of six men in each." (ibid., 92.) In walking around the island he saw "plenty of women and children" (ibid., 93-94).

These observations give the impression that this north-eastern part of the Tolai territory was generally heavily settled at the time, and indeed Brown concluded that the Blanche Bay villages were "populous" (ibid., 119), that Matupit was a "very populous island" (ibid., 114), and that "there must be a considerable population" in the Nodup vicinity (ibid., 113). A sense of proportion is, however, introduced by the first official census figures in the year 1904, when the Matupit "district" is shown as having a population of 954, Nodup "district" had 599, and the whole 20km coastline from Talwat to Tavui Point inclusive (embracing five "districts") had only 1,738.

Of greater utility are the early observations on pattern of settlement. Parkinson, largely on the basis of his experience in the Kokopo area, says that the whole Tolai "district" on the Peninsula

---

26 It seems reasonable to expect that most inhabitants of an area would have assembled to witness the first European visit, for which, being from the sea, there would have been plenty of notice.

27 Epstein notes that the explorer Powell reported of a trip in the late 1870s from Nodup to Blanche Bay "that the land they passed through was nearly all cultivated, with large crops of bananas, yams, and taro all around" (1969:9-10). The report may not be entirely reliable, for Sack has remarked "Powell's annoying habit of over-dramatizing the landscapes he encounters which in turn tends to undermine the reader's confidence in the reliability of his other observations." (1976:46.)
mainland was divided into named "sub-districts", within each of which individual settlements (which he terms gunan, discussed below) of up to ten houses were located (1907:62). A sub-district usually contained only one such gunan, whose residents were members of a "family, in the narrow sense." (Ibid., 62-63. 28) Further north on the mainland, Brown contrasted the settlement pattern in 1875 at Nodup, where he found "no large villages" but only scattered "family" enclosures containing five or six houses (1908:114), with the position at Matupit and along the Blanche Bay coastline from Malaguna to Davaon, where the "several large villages" passed "seemed to be built on a different plan to those we saw at Nodup, as the houses were built all in one place ... instead of in separate enclosures." (Ibid., 118.) As noted earlier, Meier's observations in the early 1900s at Rakunai on the inland plateau suggest that settlements consisted of a group of males of the same moiety together with their wives and non-adult children (1939:90, 103-04,107). This variation in observed settlement indicates that no single type was preferred, and in the range from small isolated communities associating along matrilineal kinship lines, to kinship groups dispersed through an area, to large clusters of co-resident lineages approaching the conventional village in nature, a pattern of settlement seems to have developed in each area suited to such requirements as ease of access to gardens, the need for defence, the economic activities of the community (including fishing in the coastal areas), and the local geography.

Defence considerations do not appear to have been as important an influence on pattern of settlement for the Tolai as for many other Melanesian communities, yet early accounts suggest that, before the advent of the European's "civilising" influence and ultimate "pacification" of the area just after the turn of the century (Epstein 1969: 20), Tolai communities subsisted in an atmosphere of mutual aggression and suspicion. Brown claims that "all the villages lived in a state of constant enmity with each other" (1910:152), Parkinson says, "Short quarrels and long wars are the order of the day" (1907:121), and, according to Meier, in former times "warfare ... raged between the different districts." (1929:80.) Raids are often

28 Barry's translation of Parkinson renders this "a family, strictly speaking", but Sack prefers the translation here given (1984, pers. comm.). Neither translation assists in identifying precisely what Parkinson had in mind as the "family".
mentioned in the early literature, with the preparations for fighting, the weapons and the tactics used being described in detail (see, e.g., Brown 1910: 152-58 passim; Parkinson 1907: 121-30). Yet apart from the "warlike expeditions" against the neighbouring Baining, Taulil and Butam peoples that Parkinson describes (1907:159, 172-74), where killing and capture were major objectives, intra-Tolai fighting appears to have been small in scale, with few deaths (ibid., 121; Brown 1910: 153). Brown acknowledges that hostilities between communities were not always active (1910: 152). Steps could be taken to prevent an outbreak of fighting (Parkinson 1907:65, 122-23), and, when it did occur, intermediaries would negotiate to bring about a peace, which was usually sealed by an exchange of tabu (ibid., 123-25).

While noting the "intense parochialism" of pre-contact Tolai social life engendered by the constant threat of attack, Epstein recognises "countervailing tendencies equally deep-rooted in the culture", in particular the bonds formed by marriage links between otherwise hostile communities, and the intense interest of the Tolai in trading (1969: 14). Danks, who served as a missionary in the area from 1878 to 1886, provides evidence of fairly extensive communication over wide areas when he wrote:

Markets were held every third day at various places, and as each district had its own third day, the people were continually buying and selling. I have seen as many as two or three thousand people in a single market. (1933:95.)

Close analysis of Brown's diary accounts (1908) of the attitudes of his Tolai guides and interpreters, the movements of individual Tolai, and relations between communities, tends to show considerable internal movement within large areas and communication over long distances. It is apparent, for example, that the Port Hunter community had their traditional allies and enemies in the Duke of Yorks group, and on the neighbouring coastlines of New Ireland and the New Britain mainland. People from the Nodup area communicated freely all along their north-eastern coast, and across the rim of the Rabaul caldera with the villages of Matupit and Malaguna. They also visited parts of the Duke of Yorks, but they warred with other parts, and probably would have been on hostile terms in the event of contact with the villages along

---

29 Danks also notes that there were occasional moments of high tension and apprehension during these gatherings (1933:96).
Blanche Bay from Kinigunan to Karavia, and with Talili's inland network of villagers (see Chapter 1). Evidence is available of such relations between many other communities, and the impression is gained not of random hostility, but of a fairly well-established pattern in which allies and safe areas, and enemies in areas where attack would be likely, were readily recognisable. Alliances changed, and with them the area of safety. From Brown's accounts (ibid.) big-men clearly moved about with considerable freedom, but for most Tolai there was probably no motive to travel away from their home area, except on the regular short trading trips.

Apart from organised warfare and raiding between communities, internal quarrels also seem to have been common. Parkinson claims, without elaborating, that the most frequent cause of all fighting was women (1907: 122). There is more to this than a simple cherchez la femme implication, for the movement of women in consequence of conflict was in former times a principal factor in creating links between distant communities, and in the following chapters we will see that the resulting female in-marriages retain a major relevance for contemporary settlement patterns and land tenure. There were two main ways in which a woman moved as a result of fighting, of which one was the capture of women by raiding parties. If this was not the motivation for an attack by members of one community on another it was frequently its consequence, and during fieldwork at Rakunat I was told that in former times most in-marriages from beyond the Nodup area resulted from the capture of women. The second main way a woman moved to another locality was by flight, to avoid retribution following adultery or incest. Adultery was apparently not uncommon, and if it involved a married woman the offending male was obliged to compensate the husband's kin, and return of the woman's bridewealth was demanded (see Meier 1929: 50, fn 54; Bradley 1982: 175). If compensation was not promptly paid the offended husband's kin destroyed property belonging to the adulterous male and his kin, in a procedure known as a kamara (Meier 1929: 50 fn 54). 30 Incest (pulu), however, was a far more serious matter, desecrating the name of the moiety to which the two offenders belonged, and leading so it is said to their ceremonial

30 Epstein notes conflicting versions of the kamara circumstances (1970/71: 159-60), although the one mentioned here accords with his view that it expresses a principle of self-help (ibid., 160, fn 3).
execution. In the event of either adultery or incest an alternative was flight to a distant area. In Part II we will see that the presence of a major matriline segment at Rakunat is attributable to just such an incest at Pila Pila in the last century.

Tolai territorial units are best understood not by employing European terms (such as "district" or "parish") with their imported connotations, but by using the Tolai's own terminology, which centres round the concept of the gunan. At the beginning of this chapter I mentioned the early usage of the Tolai term Gunantuna - true inhabitant of the place - for the Tolai. As with so many aspects of Tolai culture (including corporate identity and kinship, already discussed), the gunan is a relative concept. Salisbury says:

It strictly means "an inhabited place" in contrast to the term pui or "the bush". Thus it may refer to an inhabited plot of ground or hamlet, to a group of plots or a ward, or to the group of wards that make up a village. (1970:68.)

Some standardisation of usage was introduced in the 1950s by the naming practice first adopted for the Kokopo locality by Sydney Smith, a Commissioner with the Native Lands Commission. Relying on the advice of local authorities, he identified the largest residential unit among the Tolai as the paparagunan (papar = a district; thus "the district round an inhabited place"). The paparagunan have clearly defined boundaries, and in the Kokopo locality they commonly coincide with the official administrative divisions into villages (Smith and Salisbury 1961:1). Paparagunan are sub-divided into named pakanagunan (pakana = a piece; thus "a piece of an inhabited place"), again, areas with clearly defined boundaries (ibid.). When the naming practice was later extended to the Rabaul locality, the term pakanagunan, on local advice, was applied to the area around individual villages, and paparagunan was applied to the larger units of adjoining villages.

31 My Rakunat informants used the term nila in referring to such intra-moiety incest. Strictly, nila means "destruction" or "destruction in war", but Meier distinguishes a nila as "a real warfare" in which persons belonging to the other moiety were killed [my emphasis] from a kamara, in which the destruction was confined within the same moiety, as in the above example (1929: 50 fn 54).
which had traditionally been associated. The smallest territorial unit is the *pakana pia*, simply, a plot of land, which may vary in size from a few square metres in heavily-settled areas to over one hundred hectares in kunai grasslands, or primary bush country which has never been permanently cultivated (ibid.). Tolai, therefore, identify all land within their territory as individual *pakana pia*, each of which is named—usually by reference to some natural feature of the land, or to an event that occurred there (Salisbury 1970: 67)—and for each of which the boundary features (ridges, creeks, rocks, trees, etc.) are known by the adult members of the community. Without a knowledge of these plot names, Salisbury says, "one is lost." (Ibid.)

It will already be apparent that Tolai have well-developed notions of territory, allowing for increasing degrees of specificity depending on the social unit whose territory is being defined. To relate Tolai spatial concepts to their social structure it is now necessary to enlarge upon the concepts of "locality" and "community", and to indicate how units in the social structure are identified with the different territorial units. In the following chapters it will emerge that a crucial factor affecting a Tolai's security of tenure to a parcel of land is the intensity with which that person is identified with it. Identification will invariably derive from a history of connection with the land—both in a personal capacity and as a member of a group. Since colonisation villages have emerged as important focal points of social and political organisation, but, although the modern importance of a person's village as a focus of identity is undeniable, the concepts of "locality" and "community" are best understood by looking first at the units of current Tolai social structure which survive from pre-colonial times.

Early records suggest that what are now known as *pakanagunan* were once the territory of single matrilineages (e.g., Parkinson 1907: 62),

---

32 There is evidence to support an actual variation in settlement patterns between the Kokopo and Rabaul localities which this differential usage of the terms for territorial units suggests (Peter Sack 1985, pers.comm.). I am not yet sufficiently familiar with the Kokopo locality to establish whether there is indeed a regional variation, or that the differential usage arose from an incomplete understanding of the territorial units in that locality. Further comparative study may also shed light on the distinctiveness of *paparagunan*, but as presently informed I can only offer the description in the text, without explaining why the adjoining villages had "traditionally been associated".
but a confusion between moiety and matrilineage cannot be excluded, and from my own research there is evidence that groups originally settling in an area congregated along moiety lines. Whatever the former position (and the probability of regional variation in settlement patterns has already been acknowledged), for a long time now the membership of matrilinages has been dispersed beyond the boundaries of pakanagunan, and even extends across paparagunan boundaries in many cases. Thus today there will be found residing within a pakanagunan members of numerous vunatarai, and other members of the same vunatarai will reside in neighbouring pakanagunan, or even at localities far distant in the Tolai territory. As will appear in Part II, although in the past spontaneous migration by small groups, sometimes over long distances and probably as a result of local conflict, led to settlement of matrilineage segments in new areas, the most important cause of matrilineage dispersion, both historically and increasingly in more recent times, has been the out-marriage of women to another locality.

In discussing corporate identity I mentioned that vunatarai members identify themselves by reference to their madapai - the place where their founding ancestors originally settled in the locality. The madapai has deep spiritual significance for the Tolai. It contains the graves of the ancestors, whose spirits are believed to linger in the vicinity (Bradley 1982:54), and commemorative feasts (balaguan) in their honour are held there. Sacred stones (pal a vat) which hold the supernatural powers of the secret tubuan society are buried there, and within its confines the enclosure is erected in which meetings of the society's initiates are held (the taraiu). Also within the madapai is the maravot (or moramore) - the sacred place of the iniet society whose magical powers are greatly feared. If to some extent the supernatural aspects of the madapai's significance have been reduced (see below), its importance as the focus of the

33In coastal areas, a place of only marginally less importance than a vunatarai's madapai is its matanoi (also pronounced matenoi, motenoi and matanioi) - the site on the shore where its ancestors first landed. The matanoi has economic importance as a base for fishing activities, but in spiritual significance it is overshadowed by the madapai, where the vunatarai's settlement in the area was consolidated soon after arrival. Meier indicates that the term is also used in inland areas in referring to a piece of land where those in a "real blood-relationship" come together (1939:116 fnn 86, 87).
vunatarai's identity, and as the basis for the integrity of members' residence in an area, remains undiminished. The land tenure of a vunatarai with a madapai in an area is paramount, and the tenure of other resident groups who cannot claim such intense identification with the area is essentially subordinate, and remains liable to challenge for so long as the secondary nature of their settlement is remembered. Over time, a matrilineage segment long resident in an area remote from their place of origin may be accepted by the host community as permanent members, with the place where they originally settled there being treated by all as their new madapai, but the following account of land tenure at Rakunat shows that recollection of the "foreign" antecedents of such migrant groups can last for well over a century, and members will be reminded of their lack of authenticity should they become involved in conflict over local politics or land.

All vunatarai, therefore, are identified with a characteristic piece of land - their madapai. Because the vunatarai is the central corporate unit in Tolai society, through their vunatarai membership all Tolai are identified with the locality where their madapai is situated. The greatest intensity of identification is felt with the madapai itself, but Tolai will identify with the village nearest to their madapai, the pakanagunan in which it is situated (with which, in the Rabaul locality at least, the village unit is usually merged), and, in the widest sense, with the paparagunan which contains their village or pakanagunan. In a particular case the actual territorial unit or "locality" designated will depend on the context in which the question of identity is raised. Where tenure to a parcel of land is in issue, for example, only the members of those vunatarai with madapai in the same pakanagunan might be regarded as sufficiently identified with the land to take part in the discussion. Such members would be included even if they were residing remote from their pakanagunan, while residents within the pakanagunan who could not claim such identification with the land would be excluded. In another

34The establishment of towns, mission stations, hospitals, etc., has led to the adoption of their names (e.g., Rabaul, Vunapope, Nonga) to designate localities. I attach no special significance to this new usage (except, perhaps, where it is used to signify an urban-rural distinction), for I believe that such names are only used where minimum particularity is required. As can be seen, I too have adopted this usage where appropriate.
context the operative locality might be the paparagunan, so that only members of vunatarai with madapai in its component pakanagunan would possess the local identity necessary for involvement in the matter in hand. It follows that "community" is also a relative concept, comprising the group of people identified with the particular locality designated by the substance of the matter raised.

The concept of an individual's local identity pervades the Tolai culture. At group level it is possible for a matriline segment to resettle in an area remote from its place of origin, gaining over many decades its own identity distinct from its parent vunatarai and establishing a new madapai. Individuals, however, regardless of their place of residence, remain identified with the locality where their vunatarai is based. It follows from the foregoing that it is only after a matriline segment has gained its own local identity in a new area in the manner I have mentioned that its members will be identified with that locality. The process is gradual, and in the meantime members of the segment, by continued residence, and the formation and consolidation of intergroup and interpersonal relationships (especially by marriage, and participation in ceremonial activities), will increase their identification with their new area of settlement. For the Tolai, then, "parochialism" means people's concentration on the affairs and interests of the territorial unit with which they are identified - in wider concerns, their paparagunan, and in more local matters their pakanagunan or village. Similarly, "local endogamy" means marriage to a person who is also identified with the same territorial unit - in wider terms, a person from the same paparagunan, or in narrow terms a person from the same pakanagunan.

Tolai distinguish a person whose vunatarai is based in a different paparagunan from theirs as an "outsider" (vaira, literally "stranger"), regardless of how long that person's ancestors may have lived among them. Marriage to such a female is marriage to an outsider, and children of the marriage are likewise outsiders. No such distinction is drawn in a marriage between members of vunatarai based in the same paparagunan, even if the spouses' vunatarai are based in different pakanagunan. In the following treatment, while I have confined the terms "local endogamy" and "local exogamy" to marriages between persons identified with the same and different paparagunan respectively, I use the terms "in-marriage" and
"out-marriage" mainly when focusing on a pakanagunan. It follows that a marriage between persons identified with different pakanagunan of the same paparagunan is an out-marriage from each pakanagunan, although the couple are still marrying endogamously. It also follows that a marriage between persons identified with the same paparagunan is always locally endogamous, even if one or both spouses are resident outside the paparagunan.

It remains to examine how the village unit fits in with these concepts of locality and community. The term "village" was commonly used in early European descriptions of Tolai settlement, apparently to embrace a wide variety of settlement patterns (see above). Even today use of the term may cause confusion, but from the preceding analysis I feel that some refinement of the concept in the current Tolai context is possible. Two main causes of confusion over the concept are a tendency to merge villages with their surrounding pakanagunan (which, in the Rabaul locality at least, frequently have one and the same names), and the official practice of equating village membership with village residence. The combined effect of these two factors is to suggest that a village resident is necessarily identified with the pakanagunan which bears the village name.

Except for extreme cases, all current Tolai villages comprise both an area of concentrated settlement (usually around a church, school and other amenities) and a surrounding area of scattered settlement, which, with increasing population, has usually been extended to the boundaries of the pakanagunan in which the village is situated. This extensive pattern of settlement readily accounts for the merging of villages and pakanagunan as territorial units. On the other hand, the consequential merging of social concepts - village residence, and identification with the pakanagunan - runs contrary to the Tolai concept of an individual's local identity. According to this concept, there are three basic categories of village residents: members of vunatarai with madapai in the pakanagunan surrounding the village, who are identified most closely with the village; members of vunatarai with madapai in the other pakanagunan of the paparagunan in

35At one extreme might be the Matupit villages, where settlement covers virtually the whole of Matupit Island, and agriculture is largely confined to the adjacent mainland where there is little housing. At the other extreme might be villages on the outskirts of the Tolai territory, where almost all settlement is scattered.
which the village is situated, whose identification with the village is of a lower order; and the remaining residents - the outsiders, who are not identified with the village in Tolai terms at all. Outsiders may be non-Tolai, but if Tolai, then they continue to be identified with the village (i.e., pakanaganan) where they originated. In the following treatment of Tolai land tenure at village level I employ this basic Tolai concept of identifying units in their social structure with their territorial units. On a few obvious occasions, however, where I deal with actual village residence, the official connotation is adopted.

In the previous section I noted that local endogamy is an enduring feature of Tolai marriage. With the limited mobility of earlier times most marriages were locally endogamous, entered into between persons from the same pakanaganan, or from the same paparagunan - the largest territorial unit within which relations were generally amicable. While such concentrations are still evident today, increased mobility has produced a higher incidence of out-marriages from these two territorial units. This has led to the increasing dispersion of matriline segments, the land tenure implications of which form a major theme of the discussion in Part II. The crucial factor in this dispersion is Tolai precepts of residence after marriage. "The Tolai expressions for marriage", Bradley notes, "contain the notion of the bride's movement to her husband's place" (1982:177): of a Pila Pila woman marrying a Matupit man it is said taulai uro Matupit (she married over to Matupit), the preposition uro expressing movement towards a place (ibid.). In former times a husband's place would generally be on his vunatarai land, where the couple would set up their household and raise their children. So, where a woman in-married to another locality, she and her children would live on her husband's vunatarai land, usually some distance from their own vunatarai land. At puberty the practice was for both boys and girls to move to live with their senior maternal uncle (matuagu), who would later make arrangements for their marriage. The males would then be allocated vunatarai land for the support of their new family, and the females would again move to their husband's place.

As we will see, the general precepts of an adult male living on his own vunatarai land and an adult married female living virilocally are far from universally observed, and in more recent times men often remain on their father's vunatarai land both before and after marriage.
Furthermore, a practice of women remaining after marriage on their own vunatarai land with their husbands (i.e., who reside uxorilocally) has become evident. Epstein has remarked the difficulty in the Tolai situation of applying the terminology used by anthropologists to classify types of residence, and he stresses the need to distinguish the general pattern of residence in a society and the residence of individual couples (1969:95). For the latter purpose he identifies an "important distinction" between residence defined in terms of the individual's link with another person, and that which is based upon a link with a group (ibid., 96). This distinction is not always recognised in the Tolai literature, although Epstein acknowledges that both kinds of link can exist simultaneously (ibid., 96-97), and, as will emerge, identification of the basis of residence can present difficulties in analysis of the changing pattern of Tolai settlement and land tenure.

I shall discuss factors which have influenced the pattern of residence in Chapter 6, after my examination of a century of land tenure change in a Tolai village. Before concluding this section, however, a number of trends in the general pattern of settlement should be mentioned, for these have also influenced the choice of residence by individuals. Bradley notes that when the European colonisers began to set up churches, schools, trading posts and medical aid posts, the Tolai found it advantageous to move closer to the roads that linked them (1982:60). This trend was promoted after the Second World War, when the Australian Administration "encouraged the Tolai to form nucleated and accessible villages to facilitate the introduction of Local Government." (Ibid.) Nowhere was this more pronounced than at Pila Pila, where an influential big-man "worked tirelessly to persuade the people to move down from their dispersed hamlets in the high inland ridges and establish permanent villages along the coast road." (Ibid., 39.) Greatly increased population has, of course, produced a higher overall population density, while influences such as those just mentioned have generally led to greater

36 Bradley, for example, styles the residence of a married couple living on the husband's vunatarai land as avuncuvirilocal (1982:178). In terms of personal links, if indeed the couple are living with the husband's maternal uncle, then the wife may be said to be resident avuncuvirilocally, but, more accurately, the husband is living on his own vunatarai land, and the wife is living virilocally.
concentration of settlement, but the effects have not been uniform. In 1965, for example, Irwin contrasted the agglomerated settlements of the Pila Pila area with "the dispersed hamlets which were typical of early contact times and which still persist in villages such as Nodup and Rabuana." (1965: 349.) Even today at Rakunat in this latter area - equally subject to the peri-urban influences of Rabaul as Pila Pila - although there is a concentration of housing around the only church, inland from the coastal road, the majority of its residents live in small clusters of houses scattered across all but the steepest areas. The term "village" can only be applied to such a mode of settlement if given an extended meaning.

4. RELIGIOUS BELIEFS AND PRACTICE

With a detailed knowledge of many aspects of Tolai religious beliefs, Sack wrote of general problems in the formal recognition of Melanesian custom that, unlike Western law which "consists of abstract rules arranged in a logical framework ... custom instead forms an organism dominated by very concrete ideals which are loosely held together by a metaphysical concept of the world." (1973a:173.) He recently wrote that "magic was, perhaps, the most intellectualised aspect of traditional Tolai culture" (1982:11), and that "magic, certainly in Tolai society, is closely linked with creativity and dynamism." (Ibid., 20.) The religious beliefs and practice of the Tolai have for long intrigued non-Tolai commentators, who could not help but be impressed by the pervasive influence of magic and sorcery, secret societies, and spirits and superstitions on their lives. More recently younger educated Tolai have shed light on these influences (e.g., Simet 1977; Kaputin 1978), but one such commentator acknowledged the unavoidable superficiality of descriptions and explanations by persons not initiated into the processes involved (Kaputin 1978:1). Opposition from an early stage both by missions and under colonial policy has muted many of the influences, but belief in magic "is still strong and widespread" (Sack 1982:0), and secret societies whose activities were long discouraged are currently enjoying a revival.

Descriptions by early European observers show that Tolai had well-developed notions of culture-heroes - both good and evil - whose legendary conflicts served to instruct them on required behaviour standards (see, e.g., Meier 1938: 39-41). One such, ToKabinana,
installed the moiety system (Meier 1929:3), while another, ToKarvuvu, is held responsible for the introduction of cannibalism (Meier 1938:39). In describing Tolai beliefs in a soul, the nature of life after death, and punishment in the next world for breaches of etiquette and custom, Brown was at pains to stress that his information had not been influenced by ideas borrowed from Christianity (1910:190-95). Parkinson claimed that a Tolai's life is "tormented with worry", that superstition is "the greatest anxiety of his life", and that "as soon as the slightest trouble or smallest mishap occurs, this is deemed, without the faintest doubt, to be due to the influence of some evilly disposed spirit or person." (1907:116,117). Brown catalogues many different kinds of spirits, "some good and some bad, kind to friends, hostile to enemies," (1910:198-200), noting that spirits are believed to enter into certain objects, especially those in the possession of the secret societies (ibid., 197). The maravot meeting place of the iniet society was greatly feared for its spiritual connections, and certain caves, pools and creeks were avoided as the abodes of dangerous tabaran spirits.

The secret society of the tubuan and dukduk is commonly regarded by European commentators as having been the main institution for internal government among the Tolai (see, e.g., Salisbury 1966:126, fn 9). Early accounts stressed its "judicial and administrative functions" (e.g., Parkinson 1907:503), the imposition of tabu fines and other punishments by its members (ibid., 522: Brown 1910:69), and its role in the maintenance of social order and custom (Parkinson 1907:522-23). Some missionaries anathematised it (e.g., Danks, see 1933:281-82), but it clearly captured the imagination of others (e.g., Brown, see 1910:60-72), while Parkinson thought the European opposition short-sighted (1907:504), seeing many positive aspects in the institution which could be turned to advantage (ibid., 505). Despite church and official discouragement the institution has survived, Epstein commenting in 1971 that the tubuan "provides one of the supreme symbols of the Tolai way of life" (1971:438). The society is exclusively male, and is a major avenue for acquisition of tabu by

\[37\] Thought originally by European observers to be two separate societies, they are in fact a single society, the dukduk being the "child" of the tubuan. Sack has pointed out, however, that some tubuan have no dukduk, and on the Duke of York Islands the dukduk is more important than the tubuan (1984, pers.comm.).
its members through initiation fees (nidok), payment for performance of the masked figures at dances and funerals, fines, and so forth (see Simet 1977:9-13). Each vunatarai usually has its own tubuan (physically, a masked conical head-dress), which is ceremonially "raised" each year in sequence through an area. During this period members gather in the enclosed privacy of the taraiu (see previous section), where matters of consequence to vunatarai and village are discussed, and new members initiated. Elaborate procedures govern initiation into a tubuan, the manner of their acquisition and management, the collection and control of its tabu and the circumstances in which the tubuan is raised (see ibid.). The tubuan never "dies", an elderly manager passing on the secret knowledge of its magic and ritual performances to an understudy (ibid., 5). The society served as "an important training ground for leaders as well as a source of power and wealth" (Bradley 1982:204), and, though it is said to be dying out in many areas (ibid., 106), my own impression is that it is currently enjoying a revival.38

The other secret society, which has been more successfully suppressed, is the iniet. Parkinson says that it was of "considerably more importance" for the Tolai than the tubuan (1907: 530), and his descriptions of the main kinds of iniet, the procedures at meetings, the taboos, secret formulas, spirits which could be invoked, and the deadly magical powers of its senior members (ibid., 531-44) attest to the dread in which this institution must have been held in former times. It was proscribed by the German authorities, but according to Bradley "many Tolai believe that secret gatherings of the iniet still take place." (1982:260.) I have no such information on the continued existence of the iniet as a society, but maravot land associated with its former activities is still avoided, and the sorcery powers its members exercised are regarded as still prevalent.

Bradley claims that magic for both good and evil purposes is still "taken seriously" by the Tolai (ibid., 261), and that benevolent magic - such as healing, working of love charms (malira), gardening

38I was so advised by Tolai informants, and fieldwork at Rakunat in 1982 had to be suspended for six weeks while a tubuan was in progress there. One vunatarai from the Rakunat area acquired a new tubuan about 1981. Bradley herself acknowledged a general revival in tubuan activities after completion of her fieldwork in 1978 (1982: 260, fn 6).
and marketing magic - can be performed by women as well as men, as it is "not too dangerous" for them to use (ibid.). Malevolent magic is certainly taken seriously, and fear of sorcery can be a major constraint on access to land, as we will see. It might be doubted that the former attribution of all death through illness to sorcery (see Parkinson 1907:113) still applies in these "enlightened" times, yet during fieldwork at Rakunat many historical deaths and the few which occurred during my time there and about which I inquired were put down to sorcery. While a normal mortality rate may limit the opportunities for such proof positive of the sorcerer's powers, in no wise is a sorcerer's day-to-day influence thereby diminished, for Tolai will take steps on all occasions to avoid offending a known sorcerer. Sack (1974:1982) and Kaputin (1978) have dealt in detail with a number of forms of sorcery and magic, the methods used to kill or injure a victim, and protective and counter-magic which may be invoked in the attempt to ward off the sorcerer's powers. As is the case elsewhere in Melanesia, fear of sorcery is an effective inducement to conformity, and Tolai are wary of inciting jealousy by conspicuous success in business, or by divulging the extent of tabu wealth (see Bradley 1982:95).

The essential congruity between Tolai religious beliefs and Christianity no doubt facilitated the process of evangelism, and it is reckoned that today roughly half the population are United Church adherents and half Catholic, with a small representation of Seventh Day Adventists (ibid., 30). Tolai perceive no incompatibility between their membership of secret societies and their Christian allegiances, although on Bradley's evidence it appears that non-initiates may not share this view (ibid., 107). Despite the persistent efforts of missions and officials to expose sorcery as a mischievous sham, its influence is recognised generally, and Kaputin records that Tolai magistrates and police, and even ministers of religion, acknowledge "the existence and effect of sorcery as a reality." (1978:1.) More positive results were achieved in the inculcation of patriarchal family relationships by Christian ideology (Bradley 1982:194), and the new emphasis on a father's authority over his children and his responsibility towards them has had major implications for land tenure.

It is appropriate to conclude this section with a discussion of shellwealth, for, despite its functions as a currency, it is the
enormous symbolic significance of tabu which endows it with its unique qualities as a medium "for the expression of intergroup and interpersonal relationships, in secular as well as in ceremonial contexts." (Bradley 1982:84.) No visitor to the Tolai area can fail to be struck by the ubiquitous presence of tabu, and Parkinson's comments at the turn of the century, that "the whole of the manners and customs of these natives have for their aim the acquisition of tabu" (1907:91), are reflected in Bradley's observations in 1982 that tabu "acts as a measure of personal worth" (1982:84), and "remains intrinsic to Tolai identity." (Ibid.) A person without tabu, she says "cannot maintain day-to-day relationships in the proper way, let alone participate in ceremonial and ritual, or acquire any lasting position of power or influence." (Ibid.) In dealing earlier with death it was said that the Tolai's primary aim in life was to accumulate tabu for distribution at their death, and even the missionary Brown recognised a spiritual association in these circumstances between the tabu and the dead person (1910:192). Perhaps no better illustration of the tenacious grip the institution has on the Tolai imagination can be provided than the recent words of a Tolai Catholic priest, who, after describing its "sacredness", its role in marriage, death, sorcery and secret societies, concludes:

Tambu is the true traditional religion of the Tolais and as long as it continues to prevail in our society, I do not think Christianity will ever be a pure way of life for our people. There will always be a mixture of both ways of life in the society. (ToVaninara 1979:44.)

Non-Tolai observers have shown a corresponding fascination by the persistence of tabu in the face of early attempts to discourage its use, of the Tolai's long exposure to the cash economy, and of their ready acceptance of so many aspects of the Western life-style. A great deal has been written about its origins and manufacture, its qualities and uses, its role as finance, tabu acquisition as an area of Tolai entrepreneurship, and the differential male and female access to tabu.39 Its necessity in the ceremonials celebrating birth, marriage and death has already been mentioned, as has its association with secret societies, and its use in atonement for wrongdoing and in

39 The main commentators of recent times are T.S. Epstein (1968), Salisbury (1970) and Bradley (1982). Jacob Simet, a Tolai anthropologist, is concentrating on tabu in his forthcoming doctoral thesis.
the termination of hostilities. Later chapters will examine its centrality in land transactions, particularly under the custom of *ikulia* - the major method of securing the secondary settlement of land. In discussing its role in social interaction Bradley notes that *tabu* exchanges "mark the sealing of personal or group bargains and the conclusion of arrangements for a range of activities" (1982:91), and she continues:

A gift of *tambu* should accompany any formal communication of information, or invitation to participate in a ceremony. Witnesses at a ceremonial or public event are expected to show their appreciation with a gift of *tambu* (*a nidok*). Small contributions of *tambu* are required from participants in many village activities, not only ceremonials... All village residents are required to donate *tambu* to the village fund from time to time, so that land may be purchased for use by the whole village, or so that the fund may be put towards some other community purpose. A person who buys a car, completes the building of a house, acquires a copra-drier or trade-store, or whose child graduates from high school may invite friends, neighbours and relatives to *warlapang* (welcome) the occasion with a gift of *tambu*. Many people organise these events in the name of a small son or daughter, and guests may present *tambu* on behalf of their children as well as themselves. Thus children grow up into a network of debts and credits from which they will find it difficult to disentangle themselves in later life (T.S. Epstein 1968:96) [reference in the original]. (Ibid., 91–92.)

Individuals acquire *tabu* by exchange, by payment for services (including performance of magic), and, especially in the case of women, by the petty-marketing of foodstuffs and small luxury items (see ibid., 102–18). In recent times access to the untreated shells at their traditional source in the Nakanai area of West New Britain has been facilitated by air transport, and flights are even undertaken to neighbouring Solomon Islands districts for their purchase, but the heavy investment of labour in *tabu* manufacture together with the great increase in Tolai population has militated against over-supply, and no major inflation is evident in the payments of bridewealth (see ibid., 171–72), or for land (see Chapter 6). Bradley notes that, despite "the enormous range" of observable exchange rates between *tabu* and cash, Tolai speak "as if there were a fixed equivalence between them" of one fathom of *tabu* to two *kina* (ibid., 90). Cash purchases of *tabu* are rare, but many goods may be bought with either, and the main

---

40 The compound term *ikulia* derives from the verb *kul* (to buy or pay), of which the noun form is *kunukul* (a buying or payment).
method of converting cash to tabu is by buying with the former and selling for the latter (ibid., 89-90). Strictly speaking, tabu is not heritable, for, as Bradley observes:

Because the ultimate reason for accumulating tabu is to distribute it at one's own death or at the death of clan members, to contribute to the bridewealth of a relative or to sponsor clan ceremonials, there is a sense in which every individual's tabu constitutes part of the vunatarai fund. (Ibid., 115.)

Anthropologists have remarked the Tolai's "overruling passion for accumulation" of tabu (T.S. Epstein 1968:27), their enthusiastic saving, and their ingrained habits of thrift (Bradley 1982:131). In the early 1960s Epstein identified a decline in the importance of tabu at peri-urban Matupit in the face of increasing demands for cash (1969:311), but Bradley noted in the late 1970s at Pila Pila - a village similarly influenced by proximity to Rabaul - that tabu "continues to flourish undaunted alongside cash" (1982: 112), a fact she attributed to the convertibility of the two currencies:

In choosing to concentrate firstly on earning cash the Tolai do not have to forsake tabu. On the contrary, the more cash they have, the more tabu they can acquire with it. (Ibid.)

The Tolai preoccupation with accumulating tabu for the constant needs of social interaction, and ultimately to die respectfully, is still a prime motive force in their lives.

5. POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE

"The Tolai are by tradition essentially garden cultivators", A.L. and T.S. Epstein wrote; "Through the system of land-ownership by kinship groups, land was ... intimately associated with the social structure." (1962:80.) In the preceding sections of this chapter I maintained that the moiety dichotomy is the critical factor in Tolai social structure, and that through the manifestation of moiety affiliation at local level in vunatarai membership Tolai gain their most important access to land. Vunatarai members were seen to identify themselves by reference to their current leader (lualua), but the particular focus of their corporate and personal identity is their madapai - a place of deep spiritual significance, and the basis for the integrity of their residence in an area and their participation in local affairs. Religious beliefs were seen to have a cohesive and regulatory effect on Tolai society, and to act as an inducement to
conformity. Secret societies are an important training ground for leaders, and a source of power and wealth, and intergroup and interpersonal relationships are constantly being established and confirmed by the exchange of tabu - the "true traditional religion" of the Tolai. A recurring theme has been the persistence of core cultural institutions to which the Tolai have "clung with remarkable tenacity" (Epstein 1961:494-95), despite a century of transformation in their environment. Before beginning the treatment of change in Tolai land tenure over this period, I shall offer some concluding remarks on their contemporary political and economic life.

While individual Tolai allegiances lie within a local network of relationships based primarily on descent, the common settlement of kinship groups in a locality leads over time to close associations being formed between vunatarai, and such alliances are frequently invoked by individuals for political and economic purposes. Although politically "egalitarian" (Bradley 1982:203), and lacking formal power structures and permanent positions of authority (ibid.), leadership is a well-developed feature of Tolai political organisation. The term "chief" occurs frequently in early European accounts, although usually with acknowledgment that the authority thereby connoted is qualified in the Tolai case (see, e.g., Brown 1908: 136). There are references to leadership in warfare being vested in distinguished warriors, or luluai (e.g., Parkinson 1907:64), but those designated "chiefs" were in most cases the ngala ("the great one"), that is, local big-men who had "built up personal followings through control of land, shell money, sorcery, and the secret male cults of the tubuan and dukduk." (Bradley 1982: 31.) Although different roles were recognised, it is apparent that under such a system of achieved leadership there was no strict differentiation of authority, and "not infrequently" a ngala was also the local community's luluai in warfare (Parkinson 1907:64). By virtue of the many avenues open to them for accumulating tabu, in time a ngala or a luluai could become an uviana - a wealthy person, destined to achieve the consummate Tolai ambition of an extravagant burial (see ibid., 78-84). Within the localised descent groups authority was also recognised, usually in the person of

41 Brown even used the term "king", exclaiming about how many kings there were in the Port Hunter area (1908: 149). Having ascribed the term himself, the jibe seems misdirected.
the genealogically senior male member of the vunatarai, its lualua. An ascribed leader, he was charged in particular with responsibility for preserving the vunatarai's landholdings and satisfying from them the land needs of its members.

In Chapter 1 I noted that from an early stage colonial administrators sought to co-opt presumed seats of Tolai authority, and thereby govern by "indirect rule". Apparently indifferent to the various roles and fluidity of Tolai leadership, luluai were appointed as magistrates at village level, with a higher tier of Paramount Luluai being added later to exercise authority over districts comprising a number of associated villages, and subordinate functionaries, tultul (literally, a messenger), being installed as assistants to the luluai. The matrilineage lualua were co-opted as local chiefs, to act as agents in the passing out of official's orders and the communication of requests from the village (Salisbury 1970:32). Being authorised to act as intermediaries between the colonial government and the village, the holders of these positions could exercise an influence far in excess of what their followers might otherwise have accepted, although "in villages other than their own they were often regarded as upstart rivals and not as superiors." (Ibid.,49.) The system of appointed village officials was largely replaced with the introduction of local government councils in 1950, and formal political leadership is now exercised within a hierarchy of elected Community Government, Provincial Assembly and National Parliament members. It has been claimed that a trend towards individualisation of land tenure has eroded the main power base of the vunatarai, and that the lualua's authority has correspondingly been reduced (Bradley 1982: 49). I doubt that this is so, but consideration of this question must await the treatment of changing land tenure at village level. It should be remarked, however, that while Tolai may gain prominence through elective office or success in business, they will continue to aspire to leadership of their vunatarai, in order to secure their status in the eyes of other Tolai.

Again we see the now familiar accretion of an introduced institution to its Tolai counterpart: formal political authority is vested in the new bodies of elected representatives, but at village level the authority exercised within kinship groups retains a day-to-day importance. Since 1972 the three members of the National Parliament from electorates in the Tolai area, and the member for the
East New Britain Provincial electorate, have all been Tolai—all males, and mostly from the younger, well-educated generation. Prominent big-men have stood unsuccessfully in the last three elections, so there is little overlap between traditional and modern spheres of authority at this level. Big-men have been more successful in Provincial Government elections, while at the Community Government level my impression is that there is considerable overlap between the two spheres of authority. At this level there is, of course, a greater degree of correspondence between the constitutency and electorate boundaries and the traditional territorial units. Local big-men can exercise a dual role at this level, for "community" concerns frequently correspond with village and vunatarai concerns. The functions of Community Governments are, however, largely confined to local matters (e.g., road and school maintenance) so these bodies have little capacity to mediate the impact on their communities of changes occurring in the wider Tolai environment.

In association with the increasing prominence of the village as a focus of social and political organisation, remarked above, there has been an elaboration of the concept and functions of another social unit within the village—the urur, sometimes referred to as a "division" of the village (see, e.g., Epstein 1969: 92). Some of Epstein's Matupit informants claimed that urur were a pre-contact Tolai phenomenon (ibid.), but he concludes that "the formal organisation characteristic of the urur today is a recent development." (Ibid.) The units are generally recognisable territorial subdivisions of the village area, so that most members of an urur are close neighbours (ibid., 93), but no strict correspondence between urur membership and territorial units is entailed. The urur seems to be a more highly developed concept in the larger Tolai villages, where in general greater definition has been given to village subdivisional units (see re Matupit, ibid., 92-94; re Pila Pila, Bradley 1982: 47-48), so local variation in the territorial unit signified, its composition and its functions is likely. In the Rabaul locality urur have elected leaders (local big-men) and committees, and meet regularly to discuss their corporate affairs and settle minor disputes among their members (ibid., 47). Two important functions of urur are contribution to the upkeep of the local church and other village amenities, and provision of work parties for village projects or to assist some undertaking by an urur member. This latter service (for
which a small fee is paid into the urur's common fund) provides a valuable economic benefit, for urur members can thereby take advantage of a communal labour pool in clearing their coconut plantations, maintaining and harvesting their cocoa trees, and house-building.

The foregoing suggests that leadership is the exclusive preserve of males, and indeed early accounts remark "the extreme subservience of Tolai women and the dominance and arrogance of the men." (Ibid., 32.) Drawing on indigenous arrangements the previous system of appointed village officials allowed no scope for the exercise of authority by women, but the extension of elective representation has promoted their participation in the formal political sphere. Bradley's Tolai Women and Development (1982) is a major study of relations between the sexes, and she concludes that of the "considerable changes" over the last century some "appear to have had beneficial effects for women", while in other respects "detrimental changes have occurred" (ibid., 274). While Tolai (and New Ireland) women "are generally regarded as the most politically and economically advanced" in Papua New Guinea (ibid., 38), she notes that "sexual asymmetry of Tolai responses to development is related to particular material and ideological asymmetries of male-female relations in indigenous Tolai society, as well as to the brand of sexual asymmetry imported by the colonisers." (Ibid.) With the ever-increasing demand for cash, the inferior position of women, Bradley says, has meant that they have access to smaller and less accessible plots of vunatarai land for cash-cropping than male members (ibid., 65-66). They are expected to labour on their husband's vunatarai land with no guarantee that they will enjoy the benefits after his death (ibid., 79), and cultural constraints on their behaviour secure greater control for their husband over all cash crop proceeds (ibid., 77).

Although expansion of petty-trading has allowed women to increase their wealth in tabu (ibid., 108-11), Bradley claims that a corresponding alteration in the balance of power between the sexes has been counteracted by a replacement of tabu by cash as the most important "power token" (ibid., 120-21). Wives are, in any event, expected to raise a tabu coil for their husbands (ibid., 275). Although the former sharp demarcation of male and female spheres of activity has been relaxed (ibid., 203-05), "customs and beliefs restricting women's public involvement have by no means disappeared" (ibid., 205). If a wife participates with her husband in a business it
is "only in a subordinate capacity" (ibid., 136); if on her own account, her scope for entrepreneurial activity has been limited by the Tolai perception of her home-making role (ibid.), and by a tendency "to concentrate on the more typically 'female' kinds of enterprise" (ibid., 138) and to avoid direct competition with men (ibid., 135). Surplus cash from any source (including wage employment) is, in any case, controlled by the husband (ibid., 159). Promotion of the nuclear family has installed men in the role of breadwinner, and their greater involvement in the cash economy "puts most women in a position of financial dependence" (ibid., 159-60).

In the wider political arena, women "lag far behind men" in "education, familiarity with government procedure, knowledge of the world beyond the Gazelle, powers of oratory, work experience and business success." (Ibid., 124.) Bradley says:

> There is a great deal of vocal opposition to women's involvement in the public sphere, except as regards areas of traditional "feminine" concern. The consequence of this attitude has been the creation of a separate domestic sub-sphere for women within the wider public sphere. (Ibid., 230.)

Women's representatives are appointed to the Provincial Government and each community government from women's institutions, which are co-ordinated under the Provincial Council of Women - the successor to the Nilai ra Warden Association set up in 1970 (see ibid., 216-25). They are, however, "token representatives", whose role is largely confined to giving advice on issues relating to family welfare and providing certain "female" services such as preparing food for public occasions (ibid., 230). Bradley identifies a "real danger" that the system of separate organisations and special representation for women "will be more effective in perpetuating the distinction between male and female spheres than in remedying it." (Ibid., 231.)

That an indigenous sexual asymmetry has been reinforced by introduced values, processes and institutions is undeniable, but in my view Bradley tends to overrate the mutuality of Tolai and Western factors in producing the current situation of sexual inequality, thereby passing over an important potential for its improvement. I observed no discrimination in access to vunatarai land,^{42} my

^{42}That is, for female members whose access to vunatarai land is practicable. A consequence of virilocal residential practice is that many female members live remote from their vunatarai land, but a recent increase in uxorilocal residence (i.e., the married couple living on the wife's vunatarai land) is remarked in following chapters.
impression is that women have their own cash savings and gain status in the eyes of Tolai males by accumulating tabu, and ambitious, wealthy women sometimes sponsor the acquisition of a new tubuan (Peter Sack 1984, pers.comm.), albeit that the society is exclusively male. The introduced political institutions, the cash economy and emphasis on the patriarchal nuclear family have promoted the containment of women to a subordinate sphere of activity, but within indigenous institutions there is evidence that female participation may well be increasing. Bradley herself acknowledged that at village level there is "most flexibility" in women's involvement in decision-making (ibid., 230), while within kinship groups the aversion to female leadership that is suggested by women's failure to gain elective office in the formal political sphere is less noticeable. Whereas previously vunatarai leadership was ascribed to the most senior male member, seniority by itself has apparently been accepted as qualifying a female member for leadership in the absence of senior male members. Of the vunatarai genealogies compiled in the Rabaul locality by the LTC during the early 1960s, in 289 cases the leadership was nominated. For thirty-four vunatarai (almost 12%) the nominated lualua was a woman. While my impression from fieldwork is that female leadership was only tolerated by the male members in these circumstances until one of them gained sufficient influence to challenge her, it was apparent that female leaders resisted an automatic hand-over of their authority. The prospects for reducing sexual inequality seem to be greater in the indigenous political sphere than within Western institutions.

A final aspect of political life to consider is relations between the generations. Writing in the early 1960s, A.L. and T.S. Epstein said:

For the present, political authority amongst the Tolai still rests effectively with the lineage elders in each community. While these leaders have frequently shown themselves to be alive to the possibilities of innovation and advance in the economic sphere, they are essentially a conservative element in the population, representing the traditional values of Tolai society. But their influence is markedly lessening, and their days are numbered.... The elders ... are dying off and being replaced not by those made in their own social image, but by a new generation of more educated men holding widely different sets of values and attitudes. (1962: 81.)

Tensions between the generations - often partly a consequence of the long-term absence of younger Tolai in employment outside the Gazelle -
can be detected in the frequent complaints of older villagers that their children do not bother to gain essential knowledge of kinship connection and land tenure history, and that they lack respect and fail to observe customary etiquette on their infrequent returns to the village. Lack of outlets for the gratifying occupation of youth in the village - partly a result of formal education but also a consequence of land shortage and limited economic opportunities - is an alienating factor that disturbs young and old alike. On the other hand, it must be remarked that many Tolai in employment elsewhere in Papua New Guinea maintain contacts with the village, visit on holidays, and plan to return there upon retirement. The emergence of a generation gap, while it may be a recent phenomenon for the Tolai, is, of course, a trend in many other societies. The demise of the village life-style and Tolai cultural institutions, often predicted in the past, seems far from inevitable. In this respect, it is noteworthy that perhaps the two most prominent Tolai business innovators in their respective age groups - Meriba ToMakala who is now 60, and Melly Paivu who is almost 50 - are extremely conscious of their kinship and village responsibilities, and are active participants in the exchange and accumulation of tabu. As they grow older, Tolai show an increasing susceptibility to pressures for cultural conformity.

Although in earlier times they shunned indentured labour on plantations, the Tolai appetite for improved living standards has meant an ever-increasing demand for cash. In Chapter 1 their long-time prominence in cash-cropping and wage employment was mentioned, but Irwin's observation based on research in the early 1960s that the Tolai are conspicuous in Papua New Guinea for their combination of heavy involvement in the cash economy and retention of subsistence gardening (1965:182) remains valid today. Even at peri-urban Pila Pila, Bradley remarked in the late 1970s that while "by far the largest proportion of village income comes from wages and salaries", at the same time most villagers "are involved in working the land to some extent, whether their own or someone else's, for cash crops or for food, full-time or as a weekend relaxation." (1982:45.) Gardening is supplemented in coastal areas by fishing, the Matupit residents have access to wildfowl egg-grounds, and in bush areas occasional hunting for game is still practised, with any surplus beyond domestic needs being marketed for cash or tabu. Many villagers have worked at one time or another in a trade, and will take casual employment in
house-building, vehicle repairs, etc., as the opportunity arises. Older villagers regularly receive small sums from their children or other relatives in employment outside the Gazelle. By being able to supplement their subsistence crops with the purchase of food supplies Tolai are cushioned from the effects of increasing land pressure and the vagaries of seasonal climatic conditions. At the same time, garden production insulates them from fluctuations in the labour market and commodity prices, and through the agency of their land tenure a vital link with the village and the rich culture of their ceremonial life is preserved.
PART II

LAND TENURE CHANGE IN A TOLAI VILLAGE
CHAPTER 3
RAKUNAT ORIGINS AND THE PROCESS OF SETTLEMENT

1. RAKUNAT VILLAGE

Travelling from Rabaul across to the north-east coast of Crater Peninsula the road winds up the steep caldera wall through forest patches and past cleared gardens, over the rim at the small Government housing settlement on Namanula Hill, then down the outside slope to the sea, where it forks along the coastline of St George's Channel (see Map 4). Turning north, at less than a kilometre's distance the road passes the entrance to Boisen High School. Between this short stretch of coastal road and the caldera rim at Namanula live the some 300 residents of Rakunat village. The neighbouring housing concentrations of Nodup, Matalau and Rabuana villages are readily visible from the road but the site of Rakunat "proper" is a kilometre inland at the end of a rough access track from the coast. The majority of its residents live in about a score of scattered housing clusters which, from the air, show up as flashes of corrugated iron in bare patches on the green mantle of crowning coconut palms. On 19 December 1963 the surrounding area of 160 hectares settled by this small community was declared one of the first two Adjudication Areas in Papua New Guinea under the provisions of the new Land Titles Commission Act 1962,¹ and on 14 October 1966 they achieved a unique distinction in presenting the only completed Adjudication Record in the whole country.

Preparation of the Adjudication Record, which is examined more fully in the next chapter, involved the Rakunat residents in a lengthy process of demarcating the boundaries of all plots of land (pakana pia) in the Adjudication Area, and identifying the ownership under customary tenure of each plot. The records of these proceedings, the

¹The Act came into operation on 23 May 1963. The other Adjudication Area declared on that date was Matupit Island.
adjudication of contested claims, and the final Record with its details of the basis of plot ownership, afford a unique opportunity for examining not just the land tenure regime of a village community as it was perceived in 1966, but also the process of tenure change over the long intervening period from their original settlement of the area. Furthermore, we can examine the impact of such a definitive declaration of land ownership on tenure developments in the area in the period since adjudication.

Information on current village composition, and the standards of formal education and occupations of its residents can only be drawn from sources which have different population bases, but sufficient correspondence exists for reliable impressions to be gained. In compiling data for the 1980 National Census a total of 321 persons was recorded as resident in Rakunat, and 33 more were entered as "absentees". Of the 321 residents, 166 were male and 155 female. Table 3.1 shows that a large proportion of the residents (57.6%) were under 18 years of age, and only some 11% were aged 46 and over. A preliminary and only partial count in 1979 showed that, of the non-infant residents, 90% were either at school or had attended school, and almost all of these claimed some literacy in English, Kuanua or Tok Pisin. The best available details on occupation are contained in the Electoral Roll of 1976, where of the 142 enrolled electors 36 are entered as "subsistence farmers" (all male), and of the 76 females, 66 are simply recorded as performing "home duties" - most inadequate descriptions in both cases, for all able-bodied adult residents usually engage to some extent at least in both subsistence farming and cash-cropping. Eight voters were students, and the remaining 32 (just over 20%) were in wage or salary employment, either as clerks (15), teachers or nurses (7), or as carpenters, mechanics, drivers or crop-sprayers (10).

Rakunat is one of ten villages comprising the constituency of Kabi'u Community Government, which covers all the eastern and southern

---

2 The final census figure was, in fact, 303. In Chapter 2 I mentioned that Tolai distinguish village membership from actual residence in the village, so that at any time many members are absent from their village, while many residents in the village are regarded as non-members. The criteria used by census officers in recording "absentees" are not apparent.

3 More often (but incorrectly, according to Rakunat residents) rendered "Kombiu".
Table 3.1

Population of Rakunat, by age and sex, 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46+</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Provincial Data System Summary (1979), National Statistical Office, Newtown, Port Moresby.
part of Crater Peninsula beyond Rabaul's town boundary (see Map 4). Of a total 1980 village population for the area of 5,460, some 2,000 resided on the populous Matupit Island. Although Rakunat has the lowest population of the ten villages, its members have long been prominent in the area's political affairs. Amos Tanti and Dimain ToKurapa had served as Presidents of Rabaul Local Government Council, Isimel ToWalaka is a former Vice-President and was an unsuccessful candidate in the 1968 national elections (see Chowning et al. 1971:64-65), and Daniel ToWaai was elected the inaugural President of Kabiu Community Government in 1978. In the 1930s the Administration's most successful pre-war school operated on the village boundary at Nodup (now known as Waterhouse Memorial School), so the area's residents enjoyed an access to formal education and gained a familiarity with government officials and procedures in advance of most other Tolai. Their close proximity to Rabaul has sustained a high degree of participation in the varied social and economic activities the region offers.

These opportunities have come at a high cost, however, for over the last century approximately two-thirds of the land formerly available to the village community has been alienated from customary tenure. Most of this depletion was in consequence of the establishment of Rabaul in the early 1900s as the principal administrative and commercial centre of the New Guinea Islands region, but education and church requirements have made other inroads on their land. In recent decades the Rakunat residents have had to exercise considerable versatility in accommodating the mounting population pressure on their finite land resources. This part of the thesis will trace their land tenure adjustments made in response to the changing Tolai environment. The story must begin with an account of the original Tolai settlement of the area, for only from such a reconstruction can the present tenure pattern and the history of its emergence be understood.

The village of Rakunat, located centrally in the Adjudication Area which bears its name, is of recent origin. Maps from the German period make no mention of it, showing only Nodup and Rabuana in the vicinity, and indeed, although a collection of "huts" (as opposed to a "village") at its present site is shown on a World War II topographic map, it seems that only in the late 1950s did the name "Rakunat" first appear on official maps. In Chapter 2 I said that the term "village"
must be given an extended meaning in the Tolai context, and even today there are few examples in the Tolai area of the agglomerated housing generally understood as being a village. Nevertheless it is apparent that, by whatever criteria such status was ascribed in the past, the concentration of settlement at Rakunat was less than that found at neighbouring Nodup and Rabuana. The relatively recent Tolai population of the village area which this suggests is borne out by oral tradition of their original settlement, by the pattern of that settlement, and by the records of first European contact with the area.

Most of the few Tolai personalities named in the earliest written records of the locality can be found in vunatarai genealogies compiled by the LTC in the early 1960s. Apart from infrequent visits by American whalers in the mid-nineteenth century, first European associations with the Nodup locality were in 1875. On 12 October Brown responded to a visit to his new mission station on the Duke of Yorks by ToBola, a Nodup leader, by installing two Fijian missionaries at a site named "Matalau" (Threlfall 1975:35). ToBola, whom Brown described as "the chief" of Nodup (1908: 112), appears at the sixth generation in depth on the genealogy of Tabururuk vunatarai, compiled at Matalau, the village which grew up around the mission station. ToKurapa, described as ToBola's "brother" (ibid., 113) and a "chief" of Rabuana (ibid., 129), also figures in the historical record as having welcomed the Fijian missionaries to the area (ibid., 113, 132). Although not included in its genealogy, he was a member of Vuvule vunatarai (of the same moiety as Tabururuk, and hence ToBola's "brother"), which vunatarai "fathered" his namesake Dimain ToKurapa, the present lualua of Rakunat vunatarai.

In the early 1880s Catholic missionaries followed the Methodists into the area, and the names of two other prominent Tolai receive mention. Fromm, who had travelled overland from Matupit, described meeting "King" ToLitur, "the chief" of Nodup, who "amicably offered us his black hand" (see Sack 1976: 44). The missionaries claimed to have been "somewhat disappointed":

Because we had heard so much about ToLitur we had expected to meet a powerful king with a courtly entourage and now we saw just an old savage such as we had seen a number of times on the way. (Ibid., 45)

On the genealogy of Ratungliu vunatarai compiled at Baai, ToLitur appears as the husband of a female member at six generation's depth.
He is there said to belong to Palagumgum vunatarai. No genealogy was recorded under this name in the 1960s, but Sack was told in 1975 that ToLitur's vunatarai came from the Duke of Yorks and settled at Takakap in the Nodup area (ibid., 79), which corresponds with my own information that he was a member of Takakap vunatarai.4

If the rather outré expectations of some missionaries were disappointed, there is evidence that the Tolai too soon came to alter their impressions of this new presence among them. In 1881 the French priest Lannuzel had established himself in the Nodup area, following abandonment of the Marquis de Rays' colonisation debacle on southern New Ireland (see Laracy 1972: 1000-01). Lannuzel was driven out of Nodup in 1883, apparently being regarded as indirectly responsible for the killing at Watom Island of one of two Nodup men taken there as interpreters by the labour recruiter Captain Wawn (Sack 1976:92). In his account of the incident Wawn names the victim "Tokkolula" (see ibid., 83-85), but he is known in Nodup tradition as ToVarkoroi, a fight leader of the area,5 and it is said that when Lannuzel fled for his life his house was plundered and burnt (ibid., 82). ToVarkoroi appears at five generations' depth on the genealogy of Rakunat vunatarai. Dimain ToKurapa, its current lualua, claims that the land "ToTuruna" at Rakunat was taken by the Catholic Mission in retribution for this pillage.

The concentration of housing shown on official maps as the site of Rakunat village is located on and around the plot of land of the same name, which is the madapai of Rakunat vunatarai (see Map 5). Its members claim their ancestors were among the first Tolai to settle within the land embraced by the Adjudication Area, migrating from the Duke of Yorks and landing at "ToTuruna", the matanoi of the vunatarai, whence further settlement inland was undertaken. Simultaneous occupation of the area by other Tolai was also proceeding, some from the neighbouring Nodup and Rabuana localities, some like the Rakunat forebears across the channel from the Duke of Yorks, and others from west around the northern shores of Simpson Harbour. Yet others came from further abroad, originating, so it is recalled in tradition, from

4The LTC compiled a genealogy for this vunatarai at Nodup, but it was not available for checking during preparation of the thesis.

5ToVarkoroi, which implies a man with many followers, was ToKolula's familiar name.
Map 5: Rakunat: Original Settlement by Rakunat-based Vunatarai
localities beyond Cape Livuan to the west and Cape Gazelle to the south-east (see Map 2), both areas approaching the extremities of contemporary Tolai settlement on the Peninsula. In discussing Tolai settlement precepts in the preceding chapter I mentioned that the land tenure of those vunatarai with their madapai in a settled area is paramount, and that the madapai is the basis for the integrity of vunatarai members' settlement in the area. While examining Rakunat origins it is timely, therefore, to establish the basis for settlement of those vunatarai whose members have long been resident there (and who, together, make up a large part of the current Rakunat village population), so far as this can be reconstructed from oral tradition and the written record. In accordance with Tolai precepts, priority will be given to those vunatarai with a madapai in the Adjudication Area, that is, the vunatarai regarded as "based" at Rakunat.

2. SETTLEMENT BY VUNATARAI BASED IN RAKUNAT PAKANAGUNAN

In declaring Rakunat Adjudication Area the LTC adopted the territorial units employed by Tolai in identifying areas of settlement, by which Rakunat was one of six pakanagunan in the Nodup paparagunan (see Map 4). The declaration excised that part of Rakunat pakanagunan which had been alienated from customary tenure in land acquisitions for the establishment of Rabaul - some two-thirds of its original area - leaving about 160 hectares for which ownership under customary tenure was to be established. In the Adjudication Record of 1966 twenty-two vunatarai were named as owning land in this remaining area, of which only eight are regarded as actually based at Rakunat (see Table 3.2). Most of these eight have traditions of pre-Rakunat origins, but they were together responsible for first settlement of the great majority of the Adjudication Area land, and they all have madapai, and in two cases matanoi, there. The settlement history of these eight vunatarai will be first considered.

(i) Rakunat vunatarai

As already mentioned, the vunatarai which gave its name to the

6In fact, twenty-three vunatarai are named, but one, Vunalubalubal, is a segment of another, Tinganabalbal (see below in the text).
### Table 3:2 Vunarara originally settling Rakunat
#### Adjudication Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vunarara</th>
<th>Moiety</th>
<th>Pakanagunan</th>
<th>Paparagunan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rakunat</td>
<td>Pikalaba</td>
<td>Rakunat</td>
<td>Nodup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rakunai</td>
<td>Pikalaba</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tinganabalbal</td>
<td>Marmar</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vunatoboai</td>
<td>Marmar</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rakalikel</td>
<td>Pikalaba</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nequpia</td>
<td>Marmar</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Palakuka</td>
<td>Marmar</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ToKiliu</td>
<td>Pikalaba</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Rakalikel*</td>
<td>Marmar</td>
<td>Rabuana</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Buringa</td>
<td>Marmar</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Vunavar</td>
<td>Pikalaba</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Tiratira</td>
<td>Pikalaba</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Rarara</td>
<td>Pikalaba</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Vunatutukadek*</td>
<td>Pikalaba</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Kurapitil</td>
<td>Pikalaba</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Vunaologomata</td>
<td>Pikalaba</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Rakiki</td>
<td>Marmar</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Kabagia</td>
<td>Marmar</td>
<td>Matalau</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Livuan</td>
<td>Marmar</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. ToKubo</td>
<td>Pikalaba</td>
<td>Nodup</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Vunaimuli</td>
<td>Pikalaba</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nereus apiktarai)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Vunakokor*</td>
<td>Marmar</td>
<td>Ratavl</td>
<td>Pila Pila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Vunatabun</td>
<td>Marmar</td>
<td>Pila Pila</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Ramaravot</td>
<td>Marmar</td>
<td>Talwat</td>
<td>Matupit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Bauvik</td>
<td>Pikalaba</td>
<td>Tavui</td>
<td>Tavui</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

* The three vunarara so marked no longer owned land in the Adjudication Area by 1966, when the Adjudication Record was completed (see text). The other twenty-two vunarara were all recorded as owning land in 1966.
village established around its madapai, and hence to the Adjudication Area, migrated to Rakunat from the Duke of Yorks, landing at "ToTuruna", its matanoi. During demarcation in the early 1960s the land concerned was identified as Blocks 7,8 and 108 (see Map 5). From their beach-head at "ToTuruna" they explored the surrounding area, and established a place of permanent settlement on a ridge inland at "Rakunat" within Block 90, the madapai of the vunatarai. As appears from Map 5, the vunatarai's original landholdings were concentrated in two large areas around its matanoi and madapai. In addition it occupied part of the "Reserved Land" in Block 76 on the north-west corner of the Adjudication Area and land adjacent to and beneath the northern sections of present-day Rabaul, within the walls of the caldera.

At some stage in this westward extension of occupation another beach-head was gained near what is now Malaguna 2 village (see Map 4), on the western shore of Simpson Harbour. A new madapai was established, the area permanently settled, and over time this segment of the original vunatarai achieved its own distinct status, being entered in the LTC genealogies in 1963 as Vunavavavunatarai. Despite the fact that the genealogies of Rakunat and Vunavavavunatarai, although of seven generations' depth, show no common ancestry, there can be no doubting their former single identity. In the first place ToKurapa, the present lualua of Rakunat vunatarai,

7For reference purposes in this treatment the block numbers allocated during demarcation proceedings to all plots in the Adjudication Area will be employed, despite the anachronism apparent in such usage for the preceding period. I am assured that boundaries of pakana pia have not altered since first settlement, although as will be seen there may be argument over the precise location of a boundary, and in the course of more intensive settlement it became convenient to identify subdivisions of pakana pia as separate plots, allocated their own block numbers during demarcation.

8Twelve vunatarai were recorded in 1966 as owning land parcels in this large block, but their landholdings were left undifferentiated (see Chapter 4). In the Adjudication Record Block 76 is called "Reserved Land of Rakunat Village", but, being under customary tenure, its legal status is, of course, quite different from that of the "Native Reserves" established on alienated land. Hereafter in the text Block 76 is referred to as "Rakunat Reserve".

9Seven of the eight Rakunat-based vunatarai claim former ownership of land comprising about half the northern part of Rabaul, the only non-claimant being ToKiliu vunatarai. In the early 1960s Administration officers prepared a map showing the areas claimed by each vunatarai.
proclaims their common ancestry, and regards Vunavavar as an apiktarai of Rakunat. Secondly, the two vunatarai participate jointly in ceremonial activities. Thirdly and crucially, there are many instances of each vunatarai being involved in the land affairs of the other: ToKurapa could name the madapai and other significant plots of Vunavavar land at Malaguna 2, and the present male and female elders; he is summoned there to assist in the resolution of any disputes involving Vunavavar land or members; Rakunat members had coconut plantings on Vunavavar land, and vice versa (one female Vunavavar member, having back-married to Rakunat, resides today on Rakunat vunatarai land, where she has food gardens and cocoa trees); the leadership of each vunatarai is consulted in the event of a transaction involving the other's land; and on one occasion a payment for Rakunat vunatarai land was received by the Vunavavar lualua. Finally, there is the circumstantial evidence that on the genealogy of a Rakunat-based vunatarai (Tinganabalbal) a female member is shown as married to a man from Rakunat vunatarai, whereas he was a Vunavavar member resident at Rakunat, and the fact that a junior member of Vunavavar bears the name ToKurapa.

The genealogies of the two vunatarai show that Rakunat members were marrying spouses from the Nodup locality at least two generations back from the oldest living member, a woman now in her eighties, and Vunavavar members were marrying Malaguna spouses three generations back from their present oldest member, a person somewhat younger. From such indications I infer that the genealogical split which resulted in the two distinct vunatarai occurred at least 120 years ago, thereby placing Rakunat vunatarai's arrival at Rakunat some time in the more remote past than 1860.  

(ii) Rakunai vunatarai

According to Rakunat village tradition a vunatarai named Darairat arrived there at the same time as Rakunat vunatarai, also travelling from the Duke of York Islands. No vunatarai of this name appears in the LTC genealogies, but the evidence is clear that Rakunai vunatarai, whose genealogy was compiled at Rabuana, is a remnant (probably the

---

10 On oral tradition he collected, Sack in fact dates their arrival around 1850-60 (1975: 28, 29).
only surviving remnant) of this line of first settlers. Darairat established itself first around its matanoi "Toirik", within Block 3, on the coastal strip where its landholdings adjoined those of Rakunat vunatarai (see Map 5). Both belonging to Pikalaba moiety, these two vunatarai have maintained a close association which may well date from their origins on the Duke of Yorks. Their members also extended their settlement inland, and the fact of a connection between Darairat and the present Rakunai vunatarai is manifested by the names of two pakana pia within Block 92. The whole block was recorded in 1966 as owned by Rakunai vunatarai, and one of the four pakana pia within the block bears the name "Rakunai", being that vunatarai's madapai. Another is named "Darairat", being the madapai established by the ancestral vunatarai of which Rakunai is the surviving segment. The indications are that, possibly in consequence of a conflict within the group formerly known as Darairat, at some stage after settlement at Block 92 a segment with its own separate identity emerged, taking its name from pakana pia "Rakunai", adjacent to the original madapai.

I was not able to establish the precise connection between the two named groups, or the circumstances of their separation, for informants used the two names ambiguously. On occasions Darairat and Rakunai were spoken of as one and the same vunatarai, while at other times they were said to be "very close", but distinct. Thus they are said to participate together (and in association with other vunatarai of Pikalaba moiety) in ceremonies, and on one occasion a disputed plot was said to have been forcibly recovered "by Rakunai, and this other vunatarai - Darairat". But then the present lualua of Rakunai is also said to be a member and the lualua of Darairat, and when asked for members of the latter names appearing on the former's genealogy were given, one of whom was said to be looking after Darairat land at Rabuana and others were said to be living at Baai. Darairat is spoken of as still having land at Rakunat, which until recently was visited by the membership resident at Baai, but in 1966 these plots were recorded as Rakunai owned. Following the death a few years ago of a male member of the group resident at Baai (strongly suspected of having been "poisoned" by a person from the Rakunat membership), these Baai residents abandoned their Rakunat gardens and cash crops, and all so-called Darairat land at Rakunat is now under the control of the Rakunai lualua.

The reputed sorcerer is still alive, so discussions about Rakunai
and its landholdings, in particular their status vis-à-vis Darairat, are tense and convoluted. For this consideration of Rakunat's origins, however, it seems valid to treat the present Rakunai membership as successors of the Darairat migrants, who first settled on the beach-front with the forebears of Rakunat vunatarai at least 120 years ago. As was the case with the latter, the original landholdings of Darairat were also concentrated in two large areas, one around its matanoi in Block 3, and the other around its madapai in Block 92. It also has land within the Rakunat Reserve (Block 76), but its later expansion appears to have been more to the north along the eastern slopes of Mt Tovanumbatir, and it has today a considerable landholding in the Rabuana pakanagunan.

(iii) Tinganabalbal

This large vunatarai, comprising 117 living members when its genealogy was compiled in 1963, is today represented not only quite substantially in the Rakunat population, but also in every village along the coastline from Eaaia in the south-east to the Tavui villages on the northern tip of Crater Peninsula. It has its madapai in Rakunat, in Block 33 (see Map 5), but no matanoi there. The vunatarai's pre-Rakunat origins cannot be determined with certainty from my data. One version has it that the group entered the Nodup locality overland across the caldera rim, but according to other informants this vunatarai also migrated directly from the Duke of Yorks, arriving near the site of the present Waterhouse Memorial School at Nodup where its members were taken in by the forebears of Nekupia vunatarai (see below), who have their matanoi there. This latter version seems preferable, for present-day Tinganabalbal members maintain contacts with extended kin on the Duke of Yorks. Tinganabalbal and Nekupia are both Marmar moiety vunatarai, and they have long been closely associated together in the Rakunat area. Probably invoking this association Tinganabalbal settlement is said to

---

11 In official records and during interviews various names were used for this vunatarai - Tinganabalbal (Tinganabalubal), Vunabalbal (Vunabalubal) and Kurabalbal (Kurakurabalubal). Although a common concept is apparent - balbal is the coral tree, and tingana-, vuna- and kura- are all prefixes connoting in this context "a clump of" - the potential for confusion given such variety is equally apparent.
have gone inland on the Natalau side of Rakunat, whence they entered Rakunat from the south-west. Large as this vunatarai is, until quite recently it was even larger, for some thirty years ago a segment of the original Tinganabalbal vunatarai broke away forming a separate entity which was entered in the 1963 genealogies as Vunatoboai, the vunatarai next dealt with.

From Map 5 it is apparent that the original Rakunat landholdings of this combined Tinganabalbal-Vunatoboai group are consistent with the account of their entry to Rakunat from the western side. The interstitial nature of their landholdings and those of Rakunat and Rakunai (formerly Darairat) suggest that their settlement from the south-west coincided with the Rakunat and Rakunai extension of settlement from the eastern coast towards the central and then western side of Rakunat. Since establishing this foothold in the area this prolific vunatarai has spread both ways along the coast, acquiring further land in the process. Tinganabalbal, even after the Vunatoboai break-away, has continued to suffer internal stress. The death in the 1970s of Rusiat Tuat, a powerful lualua whose leadership was generally accepted, has left three sisters as the eldest members of the vunatarai, but a number of senior males have for long been trying to assert authority. There are today at least four identifiable segments, three based in Rakunat but with land interests stretching from Baai to Korere, and a fourth based at Tavui 3. The vunatarai is also a participant in the Rakunat Reserve landholding, and claims areas within the Rabaul Town boundary.

(iv) Vunatoboai vunatarai

This major break-away group from Tinganabalbal vunatarai (comprising 87 living members when its genealogy was compiled in 1963) shares its origins in the Rakunat area with the parent vunatarai, but upon separation laid claim to its own share of the Tinganabalbal landholdings. During the 1966 inquiry by the LJC into the draft Demarcation Plan the ownership of two parcels which had been recorded in the name of Tinganabalbal was contested by IeTieve, the then lualua of Vunatoboai. In giving evidence she said that the two vunatarai had originally been one, but that in the 1950s at her initiative the then leaders had decided to divide the vunatarai, resulting in Tinganabalbal of which Tuat was lualua and Vunatoboai of which she was
The landholdings of the original vunatarai were, she said, divided between the two new vunatarai.

The fission of this vunatarai and division of its landholdings has left a legacy of uncertainty. One of the contested parcels in 1966 was Block 33, which contains the madapai of Tinganabalbal. The madapai of the new Vunatoboai vunatarai is Block 47 of the same name (see Map 5), which adjoins Block 33, and it was that adjoining part of the latter parcel that IeTieve claimed. In the event her claim was unsuccessful, as it was on two subsequent occasions (in 1968 and 1974) when Vunatoboai again formally raised the matter before the LTC. This dispute over the boundary between Blocks 33 and 47 is only one manifestation of the two vunatarais' continuing conflict over the partition of their parent group's original landholdings. Consistent with this partition, Vunatoboai is also recorded as having land in the Rakunat Reserve, and claims its own areas within the the Rabaul Town boundary. In 1982 its lualua, Daniel ToWaai, was reported as claiming K50 million compensation for town land acquired without payment (East New Britain Informer, vol.1, no.3, p.1). A small segment of the vunatarai has acquired land at Korere as a result of an in-marriage to that village, and further landholdings by the group on both sides of Rakunat are indicated.

(v) Rakalikel vunatarai (Pikalaba moiety)

Located centrally in Rakunat are three parcels (Blocks 38, 45 and 95) which were recorded in 1966 as owned by Ramaur vunatarai. This group, with 37 living members when its genealogy was compiled at Matalau in 1963, was one of the original settlers at Rakunat, having migrated to the area from the North Coast across the northern inside slopes of the caldera. The name "Ramaur" is a misnomer, being ascribed to the vunatarai from a plot of land at Matalau which its members long occupied, but which belongs to TaMalamalagene vunatarai, also of the Pikalaba moiety. Although this latter group comprised 88

---

12 According to the present Vunatoboai lualua, Daniel ToWaai, the genealogical division was made between two sisters shown at eight generations' depth in 1963, each of whom is the apical ancestress of the respective vunatarai.

13 Another vunatarai named Rakalikel, of the Marmar moiety, also owned land at Rakunat (see below in the text).
living members in 1963, in the early decades of this century it had no
senior males to arrange ceremonial activities (distributing tabu at
funerals, raising the tubuan, etc.) for the group, so the then lualua
of "Ramaur" - ToKaut, an important big-man in the area - fulfilled
these functions on the group's behalf. ToKaut also looked after the
TaMalamalagene landholdings at Matalau, and, because he was using his
own vunatarai's tabu for them in these ceremonies, he was entitled to
plant crops on their land at Matalau, part of which was the plot named
"Ramaur". The madapai of his vunatarai is a plot named "Rakalikel" in
Rakunat, within Block 45 (see Map 5), and this, according to my
informants, is the correct name of the vunatarai.

The generation after ToKaut in Rakalikel vunatarai contained only
three members, all women, the eldest of whom married ToManoa, a former
Paramount Luluai at Navuneram on the inland plateau. She was
succeeded by her daughter IaKolis, who was lualua of the vunatarai in
1963. After her death the TaMalamalagene land they had occupied at
Matalau was relinquished to its rightful owners, although today some
members (including Ainui, the current lualua) still reside at Matalau.
This vunatarai also claims land within the Rabaul Town boundary.

(vi) Nekupia vunatarai

In examining the Tinganabalbal origins at Rakunat their early
association with another Marmar moiety vunatarai, Nekupia, was
mentioned. This latter is also a migrant group from the Duke of
Yorks 14 (with which location they retain kinship associations), having
first arrived on the coast at a place adjoining the Rakunat
vunatarai's matanoi of "ToTuruna", just south of the Adjudication Area
boundary where their own matanoi is situated. From there Nekupia
extended its settlement along the southern borders of Rakunat,
eventually entering the Adjudication Area from the south-western
direction, where all the vunatarai's original landholdings were
concentrated (see Map 5). The authenticity of Nekupia's status as an
original settler of Rakunat is, however, complicated by the fact that
some time after its arrival at Rakunat, and probably late in the last

14"Ne" is the prefix used in the Duke of Yorks for women's names,
corresponding to "Ia" and its variants used elsewhere in the Tolai
area.
century, it was joined by a group originating in the Malaguna area west of Simpson Harbour, whose presence in the Rakunat neighbourhood is attributed to the in-marriage of a female ancestor to Matalau.

The genealogy of Nekupia vunatarai, compiled at Rakunat in 1963, comprises two distinct segments each of which descends from an apical ancestress at six generation's depth, although no relationship between these two women was established. The third generation descendant of one ancestress is a man ToIsaea ToWartul, who had a major impact on land affairs at Rakunat after the turn of the century, the repercussions of which are still felt to the present day. ToPuipui, a fourth generation descendant of the other ancestress, is the present undisputed lualua of Nekupia, but this status was only achieved after a long period of conflict within the group was relieved by the death in 1978 of his rival ToUva, a member of the other segment and maternal nephew of ToIsaea. Despite being treated as a single vunatarai, my strong impression is that what are represented on the Nekupia genealogy as two segments are in fact distinct vunatarai, having a common moiety but only connected by historical circumstances which will now be outlined.

ToIsaea was born at Matalau about 1875, attended a mission school in 1895 at Raluana, and died in 1956. He was by general repute a powerful and argumentative leader. His father, ToMetak ToMarakan, was the lualua of TaMalamalagene vunatarai (mentioned above), but ToIsaea, whose matrilineal origins were at Malaguna some generations earlier, had no access to vunatarai land in the Nodup locality where he resided. This lack he proceeded to remedy by moving in on Nekupia vunatarai at Rakunat. He was not alone in this enterprise, for in addition to his own siblings he was later joined by two men - Tito ToKabene and Rusiat Tipie - brothers born at Nodup to a woman who in-married there from Pila Pila on the North Coast. These two men are regarded at Rakunat as being connected with Vunatabun vunatarai, a Rakunat-based offshoot of Pianaokor vunatarai from Pila Pila whose arrival at Rakunat is examined below. In compiling the Pianaokor genealogy at Pila Pila in 1963 this long-absent segment was omitted, so no official genealogy for Vunatabun exists. Both Tito and Tipie do appear, however, on the genealogy of ToKubo vunatarai based at Nodup, for the two men married sisters who were members of that group.

During their lifetimes the three interlopers - ToIsaea, Tito (a notoriously powerful sorcerer) and Tipie - dominated the affairs of
Nekupia *vunatarai*, a circumstance no doubt assisted by the fact that for much of this period there were no senior males in the segment comprising the genuine Nekupia membership. They also occupied landholdings of Palakuka *vunatarai*, the next to be considered. Toisaea had three brothers and two sisters, but, in a telling indication of his lack of authenticity as a Nekupia member, he paid *tabu* to adopt a Nekupia woman as his sister, so that her children could take over the occupied Palakuka *vunatarai* land. Soon after World War II, Tito and Tipie, both approaching death, acknowledged that their occupation of the Palakuka land was spurious, and they entreated the *vunatarai* members to make necessary arrangements for their funerals, as they had no close matrilineal kin at Rakunat. As will be seen, however, final resolution of Palakuka's tenure to the land from which they were long excluded has not yet eventuated, and, so far as Nekupia's landholdings are concerned, the attachment of this foreign group to the *vunatarai* has left a legacy of conflict and disputed tenure. Even the location of its madapai is uncertain: three parcels are named "Nekupia" in the Adjudication Record, but the most likely site seems to be at the western corner of Block 89 (see Map 5). In addition to its Rakunat blocks the *vunatarai* also owns land in the Rakunat Reserve and at neighbouring Matalau, and claims areas within the Rabaul Town boundary.

(vii) Palakuka *vunatarai*

Of all the original settlers at Rakunat this *vunatarai* has had the most disjointed history, and, despite many interviews with its own members and Rakunat associates, I am still unable to resolve the question of their origins with certainty. One version is that this group also migrated by sea to the coast, landing at "Matanape" within Block 1 on the north-eastern corner of the Adjudication Area, its *matanoi* (see Map 5). Block 1 was indeed recorded in 1966 as owned by the *vunatarai*, but in the first place they have no other original landholdings in that vicinity, secondly there is another explanation

---

15 The woman in question is shown on the Nekupia genealogy at the same level of generation as Toisaea. If she were a real kinswoman, under Tolai kinship concepts she would already have been Toisaea's sister.

16 Also pronounced "Pilakuka", by some of its members.
for their presence on the block, and thirdly the superior claims of another vunatarai to Block 1 now seem to be generally accepted. The other original landholdings of Palakuka run from the south-western corner of the Adjudication Area interspersed through the landholdings of Nekupia, with which group (they are both Marmar moiety vunatarai) Palakuka has had a long but sometimes troublesome association. Entry to Rakunat from the south-west which this pattern of settlement suggests is confirmed by a tradition of original Palakuka settlement inland from Matalau.

According to this version, at some time (by my estimation about the middle of the last century) groups from all quarters around the caldera perimeter converged in a major battle on a fight-ground located beneath the present eastern section of Rabaul. Participants came from Karavia and Tavuiliu to the south-west, east from Malaguna and Pila Pila, across from the Nodup area, and north from Matupi Island. No details were given of how the contestants aligned themselves, but one consequence of the battle was the capture of a young male member of Palakuka vunatarai, ToKalukal, by a member of Tabururuk vunatarai. This latter group is thought to have come originally from the Gaulim area, on the remote outskirts of Tolai territory between the headwaters of Kerevat and Warangoi Rivers (see Map 2). In the 1960s it claimed land within the crater rim at Namanula Hill and where the road in that direction leaves the settled area of Rabaul township. Its genealogy shows marriages at the oldest generation to spouses from Tavuiliu, which may have been a staging-post in the group's migration to the eastern shores of Simpson Harbour.

Tabururuk vunatarai continued its eastern migration, crossing over the caldera rim and settling on the lower slopes of Mt Kabiu, inland from what later became Matalau village. ToKalukal, who was now co-resident with the group and had by then been joined by other Palakuka members, moved with them, and he settled with his kin on land called "Vagai", south of the boundary of Rakunat pakanaganan. After a conflict there, apparently associated with sorcery, they quitted "Vagai" (which was taken over by Tuturokin vunatarai, incorrectly named "Vagai" in the LTC genealogies), and joined ranks with Nekupia vunatarai, their neighbours on the Matalau side who had now established themselves in Rakunat. For a time they lived peacefully there, the current members claiming that they established a madapai in
Block 36 (see Map 5, although this conflicts with Nekupia vunatarai's claim to the same land), and the group took up other unoccupied land adjoining Nekupia's landholdings. At about the turn of the century, however, they were involved in another major incident. On their account the sorcerer Tito, then also co-resident with Nekupia (see above), killed two of their members and the others fled, but other Rakunat informants say the Palakuka members brought the trouble on themselves by trying to seduce women with magic.

In the ensuing decades the displaced group roamed the border areas of Rakunat, moving first back over the caldera rim to the northern part of present-day Rabaul, then settling on the slopes of Mt Tovanumbatir on the north-western edge of Rakunat pakanagunan, and finally being taken in by another Marmar moiety vunatarai, Rakalikel of Rabuana village. 17 There they settled on Block 1 and acquired other small plots of land by ikulia. 18 It was during this long period of absence from Rakunat that the Palakuka members say ToIsaea, Tito and Tipie - the three men then dominating Nekupia vunatarai and controlling its land (see above) - moved into occupation of their vunatarai land, and in particular took over Block 36 which they claim contains their madapai. As time went by ToIsaea and his associates grew old, and a new generation of Palakuka members was growing up, still excluded from their ancestral lands in Rakunat. Their continued settlement at Rabuana was being challenged. Shortly after World War II, ToIsaea summoned Robin ToMonongia, then a young Palakuka member, and an older man Tangia, the husband of Robin's mother's sister, who like Tito and Tipie also had his origins at Pila Pila. Being too old to walk, ToIsaea instructed Tangia to show Robin which land at Rakunat belonged to Palakuka, and which was Nekupia vunatarai land. Robin quoted ToIsaea as saying:

Your land is returned to you now. We can't retain the land any longer. We just came here, and we spent our lives among you, and we held these pieces of land. Our mothers were "bought" over here [in marriage], and we came and lived here, and held these lands. Now we are finishing off, so the land will go back to you.

---

17 Not be confused with the other Rakalikel (or "Ramaur") vunatarai based at Matalau, already dealt with.

18 This important Tolai method of land rights acquisition will figure prominently in the following chapters. Its nature will be discussed in Chapter 6.
A similar renunciation soon after, by Tito and Tipie of their claims to Palakuka land they occupied, has already been mentioned.

Palakuka members now reside on parts of their vunatarai land at Rakunat, but its long adverse possession by the spurious Malaguna-based segment of Nekupia vunatarai, with their powerful associates whose origins were at Pila Pila, has left the tenure status of much of their land there uncertain. Although until recently they maintained their claim to Block 1 on the north-east corner of the Adjudication Area (said to contain their matanoi), the general opinion is that this land in fact belongs to Rakalikel vunatarai, the group which took them in during the final stage of their exclusion from Rakunat. Apart from their blocks at Rakunat, Palakuka also has land in the Rakunat Reserve, in the Rabuana pakanagunan (probably acquired by ikulia), and inside the caldera adjacent to the north-eastern section of Rabaul.

(viii) ToKiliu vunatarai

This last of the eight Rakunat-based vunatarai is, and always has been, small, having only fourteen living members when its genealogy was compiled in 1963. The only senior members at that time were female, so they adopted a male member of an associated vunatarai also of Pikalaba moiety - Vunaolologomata (see below) - to manage the group's affairs, and he appears on the Adjudication Record as participating in ownership of the blocks recorded in ToKiliu's name. A young male member at that time has now reached maturity and is the present lualua of the vunatarai, and the Vunaolologomata member has ceased his involvement in the group's affairs. ToKiliu has a madapai at Rakunat, in Block 85 (see Map 5), but no matanoi there, and its concentration of original landholdings on the Rabuana side of the Adjudication Area corresponds with the tradition that the group entered Rakunat from Rabuana, where its remaining landholdings are located. Its pre-Rabuana origins are not known to me.

This completes consideration of the origins of the eight vunatarai regarded as based in Rakunat pakanagunan. From Map 5 it is apparent that these vunatarai were between them responsible for the original settlement of most of the land on a north-east to south-west axis through the body of Rakunat. Other small parcels in the central area may also have been originally settled by these primary vunatarai,
and later acquired by others, as we will see below. A continuous stretch of land on the northern Rabuana boundary of the Adjudication Area was unaffected by the original settlement of these eight vunatarai, as were a number of areas on the southern Matalau boundary. Consideration will now be given to the manner in which these areas were originally settled.

3. SETTLEMENT BY VUNATARAI BASED IN PAKANAGUNAN ADJOINING RAKUNAT

Within Nodup paparagunan two pakanagunan adjoin Rakunat – Rabuana to the north, and Matalau south. Vunatarai with their madapai in these two pakanagunan were responsible for original settlement of most of the remaining land in the Adjudication Area. The original landholdings of nine Rabuana-based vunatarai are largely concentrated on the Rabuana side, and between them they account for almost all the land in that part not settled by the eight Rakunat-based vunatarai (see Map 6). The boundary between Rakunat and Rabuana Adjudication Areas, although generally following the boundary between the two pakanagunan, is somewhat artificial, and was adjusted during demarcation in the 1960s as will be seen in the next chapter. Just as some Rakunat-based vunatarai were mentioned as having land in the Rabuana pakanagunan, so also did landholdings of Rabuana-based vunatarai spill over into the Rakunat area.

Two vunatarai – Rakalikel and Buringa – have matanoi in the Adjudication Area, the former within Block 1 ("Matanape", mistakenly claimed by Palakuka members as their matanoi – see above), and the latter at adjoining Block 2. Buringa also had two other small plots in this vicinity, but the concentration of landholdings along this boundary with Rabuana is more apparent in the case of Vunavar and Tiratira vunatarai, as Map 6 illustrates. Such concentrated landholdings strongly suggest that these two vunatarai were the

---

19 I suspect that recognition of Matalau as a pakanagunan is a relatively recent development. It seems likely that the name only gained prominence after a village grew up around the site "Matalau" (which means facing the open sea) where the Methodist missionaries began their operations in the area (see above in the text). We have already seen that the name "Rakunat" became prominent for similar reasons. In Chapter 2 I remarked the relativity of Tolai territorial concepts, and the relationship between social and territorial units. In this case I suspect that only with increasing population did the concentrations of settlement at both Matalau and Rakunat become recognisable as parts of a former large gunan centred around Nodup.
Map 6: Rakunat: Original Settlement by Rabuana-based Vunatarai
original settlers of the land in question, but where blocks are small and scattered - as, in the cases of Block 110 which Vunavar previously owned, the three parcels owned by Rarara, the two Vunatuucukekadek blocks located centrally, and the isolated blocks owned by Kurapitil (or Lovo20), Vunaologomata and Rakiki **vunatarai** (see Map 6) - it is possible that the land was acquired after it had already been settled by other **vunatarai**. There is no direct evidence of later acquisition in any of these cases, but had it occurred in the distant past it is quite feasible that by now the secondary nature of their settlement has been forgotten. Having madapai in the vicinity, their presence in the area is not liable to the same challenge which long endures against the land tenure of **vunatarai** known to have migrated to the locality since first settlement, whose madapai is elsewhere (see, e.g., the case of Vunatabun, below).

On the southern side of the Adjudication Area a Matalau-based **vunatarai**, Kabagia,21 has a single relatively large landholding (Blocks 111 and 116 - see Map 7) which, in view of its size and location, was probably acquired during original settlement, forming a buffer to the extension of the Rakunat, Nekupia and Palakuka **vunatarai** landholdings. The same primacy is unlikely, however, for the landholdings of the other **vunatarai** based at Matalau, for the three Livuan parcels are small and scattered, one (Block 54) even being located on the northern Rabuana boundary. My Rakunat informants regard the Livuan landholdings as having been acquired from other **vunatarai** after original settlement of the area. The tenure to the scattered landholdings of ToKubo **vunatarai** is similarly regarded as derivative. This **vunatarai**, thought to have come from the Kokopo locality in the remote past, has its madapai in Nodup pakanagunan, but

---

20 This **vunatarai** is called Lovo at Baai, where a segment is settled, and Kurapitil at Rabuana.

21 A very large genealogy for this **vunatarai** was compiled by the LTC at Matupit in 1963. The genealogy shows segments settled over long periods in many locations on Crater Peninsula. ToRupen was then recorded as its lualua, a man who figures prominently in land litigation at Matupit documented by Epstein (1969: 166-92). While ToRupen clearly regarded himself as an authentic Matupit resident (see, e.g., ibid., 190), he acknowledged that his mother (had?) lived in the Nodup area (ibid., 170). In recording the ownership of Kabagia land at Rakunat, the **vunatarai** leaders were said to be ToRupen of Matupit and ToKokupia of Rakunat. From this it seems that the latter was lualua of a Matalau-based apiktara of this large **vunatarai**.
Map 7: Rakunat: Original Settlement by Matalau- and Nodup- based Vunatarai
during this century its members have exercised a major influence on land affairs at Rakunat. Three main factors account for this, and once again the names of Tito and Tipie, the two brothers whose mother in-married to Nodup from Pila Pila, are prominent in the account.

As already mentioned, Tito and Tipie joined ToIsaea in dominating the land affairs of Nekupia vunatarai, from early this century until their deaths soon after World War II. The brothers married two sisters, members of ToKubo vunatarai, and during their lives, aided by Tito's menacing influence as a sorcerer, they were able to occupy many areas of Rakunat land belonging to other vunatarai. ToKubo itself was not without its contenders in the land stakes, for a prominent bigman ToLuk, the maternal grand-uncle of Tito and Tipie's wives, has notoriety as having been an avid acquirer of other groups' land. The third factor in explaining their Rakunat landholdings is the character of another member ToLiaser, the vunatarai's lualua during demarcation proceedings. Now dead, he has the reputation of having been a very forceful promoter of his vunatarai's land claims. During demarcation apparently he was able to override any objections made to the dubious tenure of parcels acquired by ToLuk, Tito and Tipie, and then occupied by his vunatarai members. All tyrannies come to an end, and the ultimate nemesis of ToKubo vunatarai was foreshadowed with the decimation of their ranks by a bomb during World War II. No female members survive, and the present elderly lualua has recently begun disposing of their Rakunat land.

Another Nodup-based group recorded in 1966 as owning land at Rakunat is styled in the Adjudication Record the Nereus apiktarai of Vunemule (correctly, Vunaimuli) vunatarai. The three parcels (Blocks 42, 80 and 99) recorded in this group's name had formerly been owned by the vunatarai of Panipas Tapuki, the father of Nereus. This vunatarai, Vunakokor, is based at Ratavul on the North Coast, and during the LTC inquiry into the draft Demarcation Plan for Rakunat a vunatarai leader from Ratavul stated that they had agreed to Tapuki giving their vunatarai landholdings at Rakunat to his son Nereus "and his immediate kin". It is apparent that in recording the ownership of these parcels the LTC used the apiktarai concept to suit the particular circumstances of the land entitlement. The land had not been given to the whole membership of Vunaimuli vunatarai, but only to that segment comprising the matrilineal descendants of Nereus' mother (who had in-married from Nodup to Rakunat), of which Nereus was then
the senior surviving male. As the land had originally belonged to Vunakokor, it is more appropriate to include these landholdings in the next category, i.e., settlement of vunatarai based outside Nodup paparagunan.

The original settlement of much of the northern side of the Adjudication Area by vunatarai based at Rabuana suggests that the boundary between the two Adjudication Areas might more appropriately have been located further south, although presumably its actual location generally corresponds with the border between Rakunat and Rabuana pakanagunan. In terms of land tenure no special significance attaches (in the Nodup locality, at least) to the boundary between adjoining pakanagunan of the same paparagunan, and the landholdings of Rakunat-based vunatarai in the Rabuana Adjudication Area were recorded during demarcation there in the same way as the Rabuana-based vunatarais' landholdings in Rakunat were recorded. Similarly, given the paucity of original landholdings of Matalau-based vunatarai on the southern side of the Adjudication Area, and the fact that a number of Rakunat-based vunatarai (in particular, Nekupia) have land in the Matalau Adjudication Area along the common boundary, this southern boundary between the two Adjudication Areas might also have been more appropriately located further south. The concentration along moiety lines already noted for the original settlement of the Rakunat-based vunatarai at this southern side is again apparent where the Rabuana-based vunatarai settled within the northern boundary. The three Marmar moiety vunatarai - Rakalikel, Buringa and Rakiki - have their landholdings concentrated at the north-east corner. The other six vunatarai are all Pikalaba, and they, together with Tokiliu - a Rakunat-based vunatarai, also Pikalaba - settled nearly all the remaining land along this northern side.

4. SETTLEMENT BY VUNATARAI BASED OUTSIDE NODUP PAPARAGUNAN

Members of four other vunatarai had also long been resident at Rakunat when the Adjudication Record was completed in 1966. The madapai of these vunatarai are located in the paparagunan of Pila Pila (in two cases), Tavui, and Matupit (see Map 4), so the tenure to their landholdings at Rakunat lacks the integrity enjoyed by vunatarai with madapai in Nodup paparagunan. In three cases vunatarai members settled in Rakunat as a consequence of in-marriage by a female matrilineal ancestor, and over the history of their settlement the
insecure status of their tenure to land they occupied was often manifested. The position of the fourth vunatarai, Vunakokor, is not so clear for, although it is regarded as based at Ratavul pakanagunan in Pila Pila paparagunan, it is also said to have had landholdings in the Korere pakanagunan of Nodup paparagunan, and at Rakunat, one parcel of which (Block 42, see Map 8) is even referred to as being its madapai. The central location of its main Rakunat landholdings is certainly consistent with the status of an original settler of the area, and the long residence of its members there is attested to by the fact that none of them was included in the genealogy of Vunakokor vunatarai, compiled at Ratavul in 1963. Its Rakunat landholdings are encircled by those of Rakalikel vunatarai (see Map 5), a group also known to have originated at the North Coast. Comparison with this vunatarai suggests the explanation that both groups migrated to the Rakunat area at the earliest stage of settlement, but whereas in the case of Rakalikel over time it severed its North Coast connections, those between the Vunakokor segment based at Rakunat and its parent vunatarai at Ratavul (possibly of shallower genealogical depth) were maintained. In time the Rakunat segment may have gained its own separate status (as the fact it was not included in the Vunakokor genealogy suggests was happening before 1963), but the segment became extinct with the death of the last member Panipas Tapuki, who before his death disposed of their Rakunat landholdings to his son Nereus as has already been mentioned.

One of the three groups settled at Rakunat as a result of female in-marriage is Vunatabun, also originally from Pila Pila paparagunan. While discussing Tolai settlement precepts in Chapter 2 I commented that in former times a major factor in creating links between distant communities was the movement of women in association with fighting. Such an incident at Pila Pila about the middle of the last century involved a woman IaMigir, the apical ancestress of Vunatabun. She was apparently involved in an intra-moiety incest there, and during the fighting which followed (referred to by my Rakunat informants as a nila) she fled the area to avoid execution, ending up at Nodup where she married and bore four daughters. One daughter back-married to Pila Pila, but the other three remained in the Nodup locality, the eldest IeVilau marrying Tatarek, a big-man and lualua of Rakunat vunatarai, probably around 1890. IaMigir and her daughters having settled in the area, other kin and members of associated vunatarai -
Map 8: Rakunat: Original Settlement by Vunatarai based outside Nodup Paparagunan
both male and female - followed from Pila Pila, one of whom was the mother of Tito and Tipie, the two men who, with ToIsaee, had such a disruptive effect on land tenure at Rakunat. The matrilineal descendants of IaMigir, lacking vunatarai land in the area, formed powerful associations with other locally-based vunatarai (including Nekupia, Tinganabalbal and, by marriage, ToKubo), which they manipulated to gain access to land. Tatarek also provided Rakunat vunatarai land for his children, and a parcel of Nekupia land (Block 39) was acquired in the vicinity of the Vunakokor landholdings (see Map 8) - a group with which Vunatabun may well have shared ancestral roots in the Pila Pila area. IaMigir's three daughters who married in the Nodup locality had thirteen children between them, three of whom - ToPairinga, Tioap (greatly feared as a sorcerer) and ToPanipas - were by all accounts adept at gaining land belonging to other vunatarai. Following their deaths in recent decades the vunatarai's influence has dissolved, although as will be seen in following chapters their involvement in Rakunat land affairs has left conflict over parcels still occupied by their children. IaMonika, one of IeVilau and Tatarek's children, now elderly, still resides at Rakunat with some of her own children on land acquired from other vunatarai, but, despite a century of settlement at Rakunat, the group's presence there is still strongly opposed in some quarters, and fears of sorcery have led some members to return to Pila Pila in recent years.

A second group which settled at Rakunat as a result of female in-marriage was a segment of Ramaravot vunatarai, whose madapai is at Talwat in the Matupit paparagunan. The group's presence in Rakunat was only temporary, and its impact minimal. About 1900 IaTatar, a Ramaravot member, in-married from Talwat to Rakunat, to a member of Vunatutukadek vunatarai. They had four children, all males, two of whom died in infancy. The remaining two settled at Rakunat, their father giving two blocks of Vunatutukadek land to them - Block 114 to both brothers, and Block 72 to only one of them, ToVultonia (see Maps 6 and 8). The two men are now dead. Block 114 has been recovered by

---

22 The LTC did not compile a genealogy for Vunatabun, but IaMigir is known to be the eldest sister of three siblings appearing as children of the apical ancestress of Pianaokor vunatarai, whose genealogy was compiled at Pila Pila in 1963. The present lualua of that vunatarai is Boas ToAlmatan, and in 1975 Sack recorded the name of their madapai as Vunakokokor - Vunakokor, with the syllable ko reduplicated (1975:199).
Vunatutukadek vunatarai, but Block 72, the gift of which to ToVultonia had been confirmed by a payment of ikulia to Vunatutukadek, is now occupied by his children, who are members of Rakunat and Vagai vunatarai (he had two wives).

The final in-married group is a segment of Bauvik vunatarai, based at Tavui 1 in the Tavui paparagunan. In contrast to the last group considered, the in-marrying woman in this case had four daughters among her eight children, and her matrilineal descendants continue to affect the tenure at Rakunat in seeking access to land. About 1900 IaVaula of Bauvik vunatarai married ToIsaea, the member of a Malaguna-based vunatarai who had attached himself to Nekupia and, together with the Pila Pila migrants, done so much in the first half of this century to confuse land tenure in the southern section of Rakunat. In discussing the settlement of this Tavui-based segment at Rakunat Dimain ToKurapa, the present lualua of Rakunat vunatarai, described how arrangements were made between the big-men of Pikalaba moiety vunatarai (to which Bauvik belonged) at Tavui and Rakunat for IaVaula to be "looked after" at Rakunat, and provided with access to land. The Pikalaba moiety vunatarai involved at Rakunat were the two main ones based there - Rakunat and Rakunai - but the occupation they gave to IaVaula and her children of their vunatarai land was only temporary, and over time the segment grew in size, without any secure access to Rakunat land.

By the demarcation proceedings in the early 1960s three of IaVaula's sons and three daughters had married spouses from the Rakunat locality, they and their children comprising a small but substantial group in the Rakunat community. By this stage, too, her eldest surviving son, ToKoniel, had become lualua of Bauvik vunatarai, and of the vunatarai membership still resident on their ancestral lands at Tavui only two young women survived to sustain the group's viability there. Their father ToIsaea, some time before his death about 1950, had given the children a plot of Nekupia vunatarai land (Block 36, see Map 8). To secure their tenure to it, during demarcation ToKoniel and his siblings made a payment of tabu and cash to the Nekupia lualua. The rationale given during fieldwork was that

---

23 Apart from giving her land to garden on, the "looking after" included her involvement with Pikalaba moiety vunatarai in ceremonial activities, and their protection of her from sorcery - to which, being an outsider, she was particularly vulnerable.
the group had to have a madapai at Rakunat - a "place to settle", and to distribute tabu during ceremonial activities. Because the children were born at Rakunat, had grown up there, and were "the children" of a Rakunat vunatarai, it was "easy" for them to acquire the land from their "fathering" vunatarai.

The Bauvik segment regard Block 36 as their "new" madapai, a number of the members residing there with spouses and children. But ToIsaea's entitlement to give the plot to his children is strongly contested by the Palakuka vunatarai membership, who (as was mentioned above in examining the history of their settlement at Rakunat) claim that their own madapai is inside Block 36, and that they were forcefully dispossessed during ToIsaea, Tito and Tipie's interference in Palakuka and Nekupia's land affairs. In the interests of village harmony the present Palakuka members are prepared to accept the current Bauvik occupation of Block 36, but they want their own superior entitlement recognised. Conflict over the block's ownership remains a legacy of this period of outside intervention in Rakunat land affairs.

5. THE PATTERN OF ORIGINAL SETTLEMENT

The process which has been described accounts for the first settlement of virtually all land in the Adjudication Area. In the case of some parcels I claimed there was good reason to believe that vunatarai based in neighbouring pakanagunan in fact acquired the land some time after it had already been settled by other vunatarai, although by now the secondary nature of their settlement has been forgotten, at least so far as details are concerned. To this extent there is, therefore, a case for adjusting Map 5 to expand the landholdings of the Rakunat-based vunatarai which first settled the area. It is highly likely, for example, that Block 102, to which the

---

24 Only one small parcel, Block 100 towards the western boundary, has not so far been accounted for. It was said to have been owned formerly by ToVultonia, the Ramaravot member whose mother in-married from Talvat, and possibly his father's vunatarai, Vunatutukadek, owned the parcel before him, although their tenure at Rakunat also seems to have been secondary (see text). Landholdings by vunatarai in the large Rakunat Reserve (Block 76) have been mentioned on a number of occasions, but in view of the lack of parcel differentiation in the Demarcation Plan, original settlement of that area cannot be treated with any particularity.
Nodup-based ToKubo *vunatarai* claims ownership, was originally part of the Rakunat *vunatarai*’s landholdings which surround it, but no direct evidence survives which would allow a reliable refinement of the pattern of original settlement shown on Maps 5 to 8. Although such details are lost in the mists of the past, the fact of secondary settlement is long remembered where migrant groups originated outside Nodup paparaqunan. Thus the lands originally settled by the three *vunatarai* segments whose presence at Rakunat was the consequence of female in-marriages long ago from Pila Pila, Talwat and Tavui are recalled as formerly being owned by other *vunatarai* (compare Map 8 with Maps 5 and 6), and still today the tenure of such outsider groups\(^\text{25}\) in Rakunat is precarious. The phenomenon of female in-marriage continues to have a major impact on Rakunat land tenure, and in the following two chapters I examine the arrangements whereby such groups gained land access over recent decades.

The traditions of the groups which first settled the Rakunat area indicate diverse origins, but a large proportion migrated by sea from the northern section of the Duke of York Islands group, either directly to the beach at Rakunat, or to the adjoining coast north at Rabuana and south at Nodup (including the area later separately identified as Matalau). The concentrated settlement from this direction, and the ancient New Ireland roots which these groups claim, corresponds closely with the linguistic evidence showing a separate dialect of Kuanua extending from the northern Duke of Yorks (in particular the island Makada, said to have been larger in former times\(^\text{26}\)) across to Watom Island (see Chapter 1), and probably including the Nodup locality on the mainland (Malcolm Ross 1984, pers.comm.). Smaller groups entered from the opposite direction, across the caldera rim around the southern slopes of Mt Tovanumbatir from bases on the North Coast, and from the western shoreline of Blanche Bay. A separate migration to the Nodup area originated in the Bilur-speaking area south of Cape Gazelle, its representatives intermarrying with the Rakunat settlers. Map 9, drawn from all the origin traditions mentioned during fieldwork, demonstrates a complex

\(^{25}\text{In discussing Tolai residence and settlement precepts in Chapter 2, I mentioned the important distinction made between members of a local community and outsiders resident in the community.}\)

\(^{26}\text{Parkinson remarked that "alternate rising and sinking" had occurred in the islands group (1907:55).}\)
Map 9: Migration Routes to Rakunat Pakanagunan
pattern of migration to the Rakunat area, the details of which -
recalled well over a century later - demonstrate the enduring
importance of group origins in Tolai identification with an area.

Map 9 suggests a convergence of groups on Rakunat and the
surrounding area. While only migrations in to Rakunat are shown
(there were also migrations out, as was seen with the later movement
of a Rakunat yuntarai segment to Malaguna), a general pattern of
Tolai settlement converging on the Crater Peninsula from other settled
areas does emerge from the available ethnographic data. In Chapter 2
I remarked that 1904 records show the peninsula as only lightly
populated, and that the scattered pattern of settlement observed in
the Nodup locality was indicative of fairly recent Tolai occupation.
Epstein suggests that occupation of Matupit Island began soon after
its emergence from the sea during volcanism around 1790 (1969:36), and
that groups migrated there from Raluana, Davaon, Valaur, etc.
(1964/65: 17), within Blanche Bay. From Matupit they took up land on
the neighbouring mainland, from the southern sections of present-day
Rabaul down towards Talwat on the tip of Crater Peninsula. The town
area itself appears to have been something of a melting-pot, and Sack
has collected evidence of a battle-ground near Sulphur Creek (see Map
4) where "formal fights" between the people of Nodup, Matupit and
Malaguna were waged (1975:57). While no doubt a similar survey of
origins conducted in other localities in the Tolai territory would
also indicate migration in from different sources, the convergence of
groups from diverse origins was probably more pronounced in the Rabaul
locality than elsewhere. Its topography as a peninsula offered ready
access, while travel there over water would have been relatively safe.

The genealogical evidence indicates permanent settlement by Tolai
at Rakunat began at least 120 years ago. It was preceded by
settlement at neighbouring Rabuana to the north and Nodup south, but
reliable estimation of the date this north-eastern section of the
Crater Peninsula coastline was first occupied by Tolai is not possible
on the evidence currently available. Lying in the lee of Mt Kabiu, the
area has been protected from volcanic ash-falls following eruptions
within the caldera (to which all recent volcanism has been confined),
so archaeological excavation would seem practicable, and could assist
in more positive dating. Otherwise the range of possibilities, from
settlement only recently before 120 years ago to a much longer period
of occupation by small and scattered groups, remains open. There is a
vague tradition of pre-Tolai occupation of the area by Bainings, and a period of simultaneous occupation by both peoples is not precluded, although Tolai entry to a vacant environment in this north-eastern section of their territory is also feasible.

If absolute dating of first Tolai occupation is uncertain, the process by which Rakunat was settled by the groups whose members have long resided there can be reconstructed with considerable accuracy. About the middle of the last century the ancestors of two vunatarai, Rakunat and Rakunai (formerly Darairat), arrived from the Duke of Yorks at two locations on the coast of Rakunat. Around the same time the Nekupia forebears made their landing from the Duke of Yorks slightly south and just outside the Adjudication Area, where they were later joined by the ancestors of the present Tinganabalbal and Vunatoboai vunatarai, also travelling from that islands group. Meanwhile, on the northern part of the coast within Rakunat Adjudication Area two other migrant groups - Rakalikel and Buringa - arrived and established their matanoi. From their bases on the coastal strip the groups extended their settlement inland, Rakunat and Darairat vunatarai establishing madapai on elevated land in the central part of the Adjudication Area. Nekupia, in association with the Tinganabalbal-Vunatoboai group, moved inland down the southern boundary of Rakunat, eventually entering Rakunat in the south-western corner, whence the latter group took up much of the central area not already occupied by Rakunat and Darairat vunatarai.

At some stage in this period of original settlement of Rakunat two smaller groups - Rakalikel and Vunakokor - entered the area migrating east across the caldera rim, from origins in the North Coast area. Palakuka vunatarai apparently first entered Rakunat in the south-western corner in association with Nekupia, and the land affairs of these two vunatarai have long been enmeshed. Meanwhile, along the northern Rakunat boundary groups from Rabuana were taking up unoccupied land, and to a lesser extent the same process by Matalau and Nodup-based groups on the southern side was occurring. At what date the land in the Adjudication Area was fully settled cannot be determined, but it is apparent that by the beginning of this century groups then settling at Rakunat were gaining access to land by acquisition from vunatarai which had first settled it, so it may be inferred that by this stage no unclaimed land remained. Some landholdings of vunatarai based in neighbouring pakanagunan no doubt
fall into this category of later acquisitions. The parcels originally settled by the three outsider groups - segments of Vunatabun, Ramaravot and Bauvik vunatarai - are all characterised as having been subsequently acquired, and the tenure of the groups is only secondary.

The continued presence of Vunatabun and Bauvik members at Rakunat, and the Ramaravot's departure, can be largely attributed to what Epstein calls "the random workings of human fertility" (1969:189). All three groups owe their settlement at Rakunat to a female ancestor's in-marriage at or before the turn of the century, but whereas in the case of Ramaravot the woman bore only sons, in the other two cases four daughters were left to propagate the lineage. Examination of the genealogies of Rakunat-based vunatarai indicates that a high proportion of pre-1900 marriages were contracted with spouses whose vunatarai were based in Nodup paparagunan. Inability to recall the identity of all spouses in the distant past together with the use of vunatarai names no longer current precludes reliable statistical analysis, but only seldom are spouses from this period identified with vunatarai based outside the Nodup locality, in places such as Pila Pila, Ratavul, Tavui, Talwat and Matupit, or further abroad at Birar or the Duke of Yorks. The Nodup community would appear at this stage to have been highly locally endogamous, while many marriages were contracted between the main Rakunat-based vunatarai - Rakunat and Rakunai members of Pikalaba moiety marrying Tinganabalbal, Vunatoboai, Nekupia and Palakuuka members of Marmar moiety.

The pattern of original settlement at Rakunat clearly shows a concentration of vunatarai landholdings along moiety lines (see Map 10). Informants affirm that same-moiety members deliberately settled next to each other when first arriving in the Rakunat area, and have over time maintained close associations (particularly in ceremonial activities) which in some cases may even have predated their Rakunat origins. The two concentrations of Rakunat and Darairat (now Rakunai) vunatarai landholdings, both around their matanoi on the coastal strip and around their madapai inland, adjoin, and they abut the original landholdings of other Pikalaba moiety vunatarai - Tokiliu and six of the Rabuana-based vunatarai - along the northern side of the Adjudication Area. The southern part is largely the preserve of Marmar moiety vunatarai - Nekupia, Palakuka and Kabagia - the former also having land on the Matalau side of the boundary, whence they entered the Adjudication Area about the same time as Rakunat and
Map 10: Rakunat: Original Settlement by Same-moiety Vunatarai
Darairat were extending their settlement eastward through the central parts. Tinganabalbal (including Vunatoboai, which later broke away) - also a Marmar vunatarai - apparently invoked its association with Nekupia in first settling in the area, but with nine women in the group at the same generation all having children in the second half of the last century its membership increased dramatically, and it took up much of the remaining land not settled by the vunatarai which had preceded it. In the north-eastern corner two other Marmar vunatarai - Rakalikel and Buringa - arrived at Rakunat. Although they have their matanoi there, they extended their settlement into Rabuana pakanagunan, where they established madapai and are now based.

This pattern of original settlement lays down the basic foundations upon which all tenure developments over the succeeding century or so have been established. A.L. and T.S. Epstein have remarked that "land and land-holding were the agencies through which the history and traditions of [vunatarai] were transmitted through the generations" (1962:80-81), but equally it can be said that vunatarai history is the agency by which land tenure is established. The Rakunat informants, by their ability to trace back the occupation history of virtually all Rakunat land, and explain the many changes in tenure which have occurred during six generations of settlement, demonstrate the inherence of this history in the tenure of every plot of land. By the continued identification of groups with no madapai in Nodup paparagunan as outsiders, despite in one case more than a century of settlement at Rakunat, they demonstrate the primacy of a madapai as the focus of a group's identity, and as the basis for the integrity of its members' settlement in an area.

Other Tolai cultural institutions outlined in Part I also figure in the foregoing account of group origins at Rakunat. As well as moiety solidarity there was one instance of group fusion, where a vunatarai segment from Malaguna with no apparent genealogical connection to Nekupia vunatarai attached itself to that group. Aided by a powerful alliance with two men whose group origins were at Pila Pila, the Malaguna-based segment succeeded in dominating Nekupia's land affairs, leaving a lasting impact on the tenure at Rakunat. The membership of Tinganabalbal vunatarai increased to unmanageable proportions, and Vunatoboai split off, taking its own separate landholdings with it. The division of land remains contentious, however, and Tinganabalbal is still subject to internal stress as a
number of members seek to assert their authority. A similar process of fission seems responsible for the emergence of Rakunai from Darairat vunatarai. The presence of a sorcerer is clouding the land affairs of that group, just as in the past the dread of two sorcerers with Pila Pila origins suppressed the claims of a number of vunatarai to parcels of their land, and produced confusions over tenure which have long survived the sorcerers' deaths.

We further saw that groups settling after all the Rakunat land had been occupied acquired land from other vunatarai, by the Tolai custom of ikulia which will figure prominently in the coming examination of land tenure change at Rakunat since first settlement. The presence of outsider groups at Rakunat is the consequence of female in-marriage, the outsiders first coming under the protection of vunatarai belonging to the same moiety (yet another demonstration of moiety solidarity), but ultimately their descendants being given access to the land of "fathering" vunatarai. In-marriages were uncommon in the past, and not all cases left a viable lineage segment seeking access to Rakunat land to meet its members' livelihood needs. In the period following European contact increased mobility will lead to an increased incidence of female in-marriage to Rakunat (and, correspondingly, of female out-marriage from Rakunat), and a growing village population will exert ever-increasing pressure on their finite land resources. The Rakunat community's adjustment of their tenure in response to these factors in the period up to demarcation and adjudication proceedings in the mid-1960s will now be examined.
CHAPTER 4

THE FORMAL DECLARATION OF RAKUNAT LAND TENURE

1. THE DEMARCATION AND ADJUDICATION PROCESS

In drawing out the foundations of Rakunat land tenure, I relied firstly on the records prepared by the Land Titles Commission (LTC) and its Tolai appointees during the period from the start of demarcation in December 1963 until completion of adjudication in October 1966. Fieldwork testing showed this body of evidence (described below) to be generally highly reliable as a starting-point for reconstructing the pattern of original settlement of all land in the Adjudication Area, although the Adjudication Record was not, of course, prepared for this purpose. Considerable supplementary information was necessary in order to complete and consolidate the picture, and in the process a small number of errors - mainly in interpretation of land transactions effected since first settlement - were identified. The purpose of an adjudication record was to declare conclusively the ownership of all land in an adjudication area, as that ownership stood under customary tenure on the date the record was completed\(^1\) - in the case of Rakunat, 14 October 1966.

By the time demarcation proceedings began at Rakunat in 1963 the Tolai had experienced a period of rapid and far-reaching change in their environment. In Chapter 1 we saw that after World War II the former policy aimed at promoting European economic development while preserving and protecting indigenous communities was replaced by an approach of parallel European and indigenous development. Under Hasluck's administration the metropolitan philosophies of liberalism and economic individualism were elaborated by the progressive extension of democratic government and judicial processes, a burgeoning of public services in administration, health and education,

\(^1\)The statutory provisions having that effect are considered in detail below.
and provision of agricultural extension services and rural credit to "progressive farmers". The pace of change was heavily controlled, however, under a centralised and exceptionally bureaucratic administrative system, which received its ultimate direction from the Australian Cabinet. A major vehicle for carrying forward the new developmental philosophy was a scheme of land legislation introduced in the colonial legislature in the early 1960s, with the long-term objective of converting all tenure in Papua New Guinea to registered individual titles. Thus the former strategy of concentrating economic development on land alienated from customary tenure remained essentially unaltered under the new, "enlightened" approach of parallel development.

In almost ninety years of Western penetration, and successive control by German, Australian, Japanese and then again Australian authorities, the Tolai had experienced an intensity of foreign influence unsurpassed by that of any other community in Papua New Guinea. If the imperialist designs of the colonisers made little concession to local institutions, at the same time there is evidence from the earliest period that Tolai were not supine under the forces of this cultural invasion. Indeed, many were quick to take advantage of the new opportunities presented, and the Tolai soon gained a reputation for their commercial enterprise and readiness to innovate. Despite the impact of colonial domination and their adoption of so many aspects of Western culture, the examination of their response to the changing environment in Chapter 2 showed that core Tolai cultural institutions have survived with relatively little modification. In their dealings with other communities of Papua New Guinea Tolai are supported by a keen awareness of their own distinct identity, partly a product of a shared colonial experience. The dual moiety system remains the critical factor in social organisation, and solidarity within kinship and affinal groups is constantly being invoked for social, ceremonial and economic purposes. The ceremonies associated with birth, death and marriage remain almost identical to those recorded by the earliest European observers. Tolai belief in magic, sorcery and symbolism has survived in the face of persistent opposition, and, despite their long participation in the cash economy, accumulating tabu - with its host of ritual, social and commercial functions - is still a prime motive force in Tolai lives.

The tendency has been for elements of Western culture to
supplement rather than supplant the corresponding Tolai institutions. Thus tabu co-exists with cash, no conflict is perceived between involvement in magic, sorcery and secret societies and in Christianity, and the two spheres of political activity - elected office and indigenous seats of authority - are relatively independent of each other. The emphasis on economic individualism, and the promotion and constant reinforcement of the patriarchal nuclear family under Christian ideology, formal education and the administrative and legal system, have presented a major challenge to the Tolai's capacity for cultural incorporation. Already to the fore by the early 1960s in their participation in commercial agriculture, and with their population increasing at an explosive pace, the Tolai were identified for the earliest application of the new developmental philosophy and supporting land tenure policies. The remaining chapters will examine the process of tenure change in response to the changing Tolai environment, and, in Part III, the Tolai experience of direct measures introduced to bring about tenure reform.

If the ultimate intention to individualise land tenure in Papua New Guinea was clear from official statements, the pace of implementation of the intended reform was far from clear.² In a detailed analysis of the scheme of land legislation introduced in 1963 and 1964 (Fingleton 1980: 39-75) I remarked that the scheme did not, on the face of it, represent a total commitment to individualisation of customary tenures, for provision was also made for registration of group titles in a Register of Communally Owned Land (ibid., 67). I noted that, unlike its British colonial precedents, the process for conversion from customary tenure to registered individual freehold was a process for sporadic (not systematic) registration of titles (ibid., 56-60), and that the alternative process for systematic registration of group titles left a critical gap by its failure to provide criteria for its implementation (ibid., 46,61). By administrative arrangements the attempt was made to individualise land tenure in some localities in a systematic manner (see ibid., 60-62), and there was provision for the registration under freehold of any individually-owned land which emerged in the course of systematic registration of group titles (see

²Access to Australian Government material associated with the reform is at present denied under the "thirty year rule".)
The LTC, which was vested with exclusive jurisdiction to administer the legislation, over time worked out a practice with the other arms of Government involved at different stages in the process, so that five avenues for registration of titles in customary land emerged. First there was the process for conversion of tenure to freehold upon individual application under the Land (Tenure Conversion) Act 1963. The ability to apply for registration in this manner was theoretically available to any person claiming ownership of land under customary tenure (hence the process was, essentially, "sporadic"), although obviously all persons were not equally placed to take advantage of it. Secondly, by administrative co-operation in a few localities, areas of customary land would be identified and subdivided, and arrangements made for tenure conversion applications by the individual members of the land-owning community to be processed systematically through adjudication to registration of individual freeholds. These were known as "land tenure conversion schemes", and in a limited sense this process could be termed "systematic" title registration, although the systematic elements arose from administrative arrangements, not from legislation.

The only prescribed process which could qualify as systematic was the third avenue, by which titles were registered under the Lands Registration (Communally Owned Land) Act 1962. Such registration followed demarcation and adjudication proceedings in an adjudication area (such as Rakunat), but, because in the absence of guiding criteria adjudication areas were declared almost indiscriminately over the whole of Papua New Guinea, in an overall sense the benefits of any "system" were largely illusory. Land registered under this process

---

3The purpose of the registration law was to register the ownership by "natives" of "native land" within a declared area. The term "native" was defined to include "a native kinship group, native descent group and native local group or community", in addition to its meaning of a natural person. Thus it was intended that both individual-owned and group-owned land could be registered in the Register of Communally Owned Land.

4The availability of tenure conversion, both generally and in the Tolai area, is discussed in Chapter 7.

5By 1968 Papua New Guinea had been divided into 536 Adjudication Areas, varying in size from about 100 to over 1 million hectares. Of the 475 Demarcation Committees then appointed some had more than a hundred members, and the biggest had 318.
remained customary land, but an attempt was made to link adjudication to tenure conversion by requiring the LTC to inquire after completion of an adjudication record whether any person wished to apply for conversion of any of the land to freehold title. Such an application would be dealt with as in the first avenue mentioned, this registration process being the fourth of the five avenues. Deriving from a prior adjudication it had systematic elements, but the process of conversion to freehold was certainly not systematic. The last avenue for title registration arose from the general jurisdiction of the LTC under the Land Titles Commission Act 1962 to hear and determine all disputes concerning, and claims to, customary land. The ownership of land the subject of such findings was also to be registered in the Register of Communally Owned Land, and also remained subject to custom.

In Chapter 7 the results achieved in the Tolai area under the first and second avenues for registration of titles in customary land (i.e., after sporadic application and in tenure conversion schemes) will be examined. The process at Rakunat is an example of the third registration avenue, with the option under the fourth avenue (of individual application after adjudication for conversion of title to freehold) also being available. By the middle of 1966 all customary land in the Tolai area had been divided into ninety-five Adjudication Areas. Rakunat Adjudication Record was the only one ever completed in Papua New Guinea, but before any titles were registered in the Register of Communally Owned Land the operation of the Lands Registration (Communally Owned Land) Act 1962 was suspended, on 16 February 1970.\[^6\] By that date the LTC had made eighty-eight findings over other Tolai land under its general jurisdiction, but none of these had followed the fifth avenue through to registration when the operative Act was suspended. The legislative provisions specifying the adjudication process are mainly contained in Division 2 (Adjudication Areas) of Part III (Jurisdiction and Functions of the Commission) of the Land Titles Commission Act 1962, which came into operation on 23 May 1963.

On 19 December 1963 the notice declaring Rakunat Adjudication Area was gazetted, specifying a three month period (subject to

\[^6\]The background of the Act's suspension is discussed in Chapter 5. Its operation was never revived.
extension) within which any person claiming an interest in customary land was required to present the claim, and on 2 January 1964 the membership of the Demarcation Committee was appointed. It comprised eleven members - four public servants, the then lualua of Rakunat, Tinganabalbal, Vunatoboai, Nekupia and Palakuka vunatarai, and in addition Dimain ToKurapa and Daniel ToWaaai from Rakunat and Vunatoboai vunatarai respectively. Subject to any directions issued by the LTC the Demarcation Committee was required, as soon as practicable after expiration of the period specified for claims, to prepare a Demarcation Plan of the Adjudication Area showing the boundaries of all customary land the subject of claims. In doing so it was to ensure that such marks were placed on the land as were needed to enable the boundaries to be located on the ground.

Over the next two and a half years the Rakunat Committee proceeded with its demarcation functions. There is no indication that it was issued with any directions by the LTC, and indeed surviving records of its operations are scanty. The Tolai members appear to have carried out much of the work, assisted in the latter stages by LTC field officers in the placing of boundary cements. The main reference system seems to have been an index of parcel cards maintained by the Deputy Registrar of the LTC in Rabaul, on which the name of the land and number of the claim was recorded, together with details of the claimants, the basis for the claim, the state of boundary marking, and whether or not the claim was disputed. ToKurapa recalls that the practice was for claimants to mark their boundaries first of all with stakes, and the situation was then left for some three months. Within that time a person disagreeing with their placement could stake out his or her own version of the boundary, but if no objection was raised then the stakes were replaced by LTC cements. If a disagreement could not be reconciled by the Committee

---

7Two of my principal informants, these latter individuals had succeeded to leadership of their respective vunatarai by the time of fieldwork at Rakunat. Tolai members of Rakunat Demarcation Committee also sat on other Committees in the Tolai area.

8The LTC office in Rabaul was closed in the mid-1970s, and its records dispersed or destroyed. Those still available during fieldwork were copies of the two Adjudication Records and the Demarcation Plan, the minutes of proceedings of the LTC in its inquiry into the Demarcation Plan, the minutes of proceedings and decision of the LTC on the single review application, and the parcel card index system.
members, the existence of a dispute was noted on the parcel card and the matter was left to be resolved by the LTC. The Committee apparently kept minutes of its meetings detailing the business conducted, but these records have not survived.

As the stakes were replaced by LTC cements at boundary corners the LTC field staff carried out low level "chain and compass" surveys, and began preparing the Demarcation Plan. On 27 January 1966, when demarcation proceedings were already well advanced, the northern boundary between Rakunat and Rabuana Adjudication Areas was adjusted, so that some land in each was transferred to the other to allow actual correspondence with the parcel boundaries identified in the course of demarcation. The draft Demarcation Plan for Rakunat was progressively updated, until a Plan containing 108 blocks was prepared on 29 July 1966 and submitted to the LTC. Between 19 August and 14 October 1966 the LTC inquired into the Demarcation Plan, as required by the Act. In the minutes of proceedings the Commissioner said that his inquiry occupied "the greater part of this time", for, "in addition to hearing evidence, it was necessary to identify each block on the ground and check the southern boundary of the land because of deficiencies in the map".

The LTC first inquired into five blocks on the north-eastern boundary of the Area. Although it is not apparent from the LTC record, the reason for this priority was that the land in question was required by the Administration for Boisen High School, for which purpose it was subsequently purchased (see Chapter 5). These five blocks were the subject of an Adjudication Record dated 16 September 1966. The inquiry continued into the remainder of the Area, and the disputed parcels - fifteen in all - were the subject of hearings, and settlements or determinations. The LTC noted, "Some blocks shown as having one owner were owned by two or more groups or persons", "Most of [the] claims were undisputed", and, "There were also some other undisputed claims revealed during the enquiry." On 14 October 1966 the LTC set out its findings over the whole Area in an Adjudication Record (incorporating the earlier Record) showing the ownership of each parcel of land. As a result of its findings, the LTC instructed the Demarcation Committee to amend the Demarcation Plan to show 133 blocks instead of the original 108, and to make the necessary alterations to the boundary marks on the ground (for which detailed survey instructions were given). Pursuant to the Land (Tenure Conversion)
Act 1963, the LTC inquired whether any person wished to apply for tenure conversion of any land, but it is recorded that no person wished so to apply. A single application for review of the Adjudication Record was lodged, but after this matter was resolved and there being no further appeals the LTC certified the Adjudication Record and Demarcation Plan, and forwarded them to the Registrar of Titles for registration.

2. RAKUNAT ADJUDICATION RECORD

The Adjudication Record followed the format prescribed in the Land Titles Commission Rules 1968 (see Appendix B). It recites the procedural steps and contains the formal finding of the LTC, which is elaborated by reference to three schedules, one (the Second Schedule)\(^9\) being the Demarcation Plan, the second (the Third Schedule) containing the burden of the findings in respect of each block of land, and the last (the Fourth Schedule) describing the customs applying to the land. The Demarcation Plan is substantially the same as that reproduced in miniature for the purposes of this thesis, but it also specifies boundary measurements and bearings of blocks, some block names, and the area of most of the blocks.\(^10\) The Third Schedule is in tabular form, an extract from it being reproduced in Appendix C. Details of the ownership of each of the 133 blocks as found by the LTC are recorded, being predominantly of two types: blocks found to be owned by a named *vunatarai* by "matrilineal inheritance from

---

\(^9\)The First Schedule records the gazettal details of notices relating to the Rakunat Adjudication Area and Demarcation Committee.

\(^10\)The blocks for which areas were specified were those of the 108 blocks in the original Demarcation Plan (see text) which were not affected by subdivision, when the number of blocks was increased after the LTC inquiry to 133. Where areas were specified they were in acres, roods and perches, which have in this thesis been converted to hectares. Where no areas were specified (i.e., the original block areas were altered by subdivision), block areas have been calculated by planimeter, for which service the author is grateful to staff of the Lands Department Drawing Office in Rabaul. The author was advised that, in making the calculations, the boundaries of some blocks were found to be the subject of substantial miscloses. In certifying the Adjudication Record and Demarcation Plan for the purposes of registration, the LTC directed that the land be registered "subject to survey", with the result under the Real Property (Registration of Leases) Act 1962 that neither boundaries nor any stated areas are guaranteed. The areas used in this thesis are, therefore, based on the best information available, but cannot themselves be "guaranteed".
ancestors", in which case the name of the current "leader" of the vunatarai is recorded (in Column 6); and blocks found to be owned by a named individual or individuals, in which case the customary method by which that individual ownership was acquired is stated (in Column 4). Four parcels (Blocks 13, 22, 44 and 67) were recorded as owned by either the "Rakunat Community" (in three cases) or the "Rabuana Community", one parcel - the largest (Block 76) - was described as "Reserved Land of Rakunat Village" and recorded in the names of fourteen vunatarai, and another (Block 108) was recorded as "alienated land, occupied by the Catholic Mission".\(^{11}\)

As provided for in Form 10, the Adjudication Record described in the Fourth Schedule the "native customs" in accordance with which the parcels were owned (see Appendix D). No provision was made in the legislation for a declaration of custom, and the Chief Commissioner's rule-making powers are confined to matters of practice and procedure. In view of the absence of legislative authority the statement of customs in the Fourth Schedule could have no substantive legal effect, although it may have been thought to be of evidentiary value. The statement is brief, and describes in simple terms Tolai social organisation, and principles of land inheritance and disposition. Objection could be taken to it, but in view of its lack of legal effect this seems unnecessary.\(^{12}\)

Taken together, the documentation resulting from the demarcation and adjudication proceedings conducted at Rakunat amounts to a remarkable historical record. Not only does the Adjudication Record itself (incorporating the Demarcation Plan) present a unique statement of a community's precise land tenure situation as it was perceived at a particular point of time, but the basis of tenure to each parcel was also enunciated, and a detailed record made of the statements given in support of all contested claims. Just as this material proved invaluable in reconstruction of Rakunat origins and the process of settlement, it also affords a starting-point for examining the land tenure changes in the decades which follow. Fieldwork revealed the need for some correction of details in using the material

\(^{11}\)It is not clear why this last parcel was included in the first place; another parcel of alienated land (Portion 123, occupied by the Methodist Mission) located centrally in the Adjudication Area was excluded.

\(^{12}\)Some aspects of the statement of Tolai custom are discussed below.
retrospectively and, similarly, the passage of time has allowed refinement in interpretation of the Rakunat land tenure picture presented so comprehensively in 1966. Had the legal process run its course, the ownership of all blocks at Rakunat would have been registered in accordance with the Adjudication Record's findings. Suspension of the Register of Communally Owned Land precluded this, thereby permitting consideration of what consequences might have flowed from registration, over and above the effects of all the preliminary establishment of land tenure short of actual registration. This question, vital in considering the effects of land registration, will be taken up in Chapter 6. In the present chapter the Adjudication Record will be taken at face value, and its contents analysed as they were intended to be registered. This will be done with the benefit of hindsight, however, and where fieldwork showed a finding to be wrong, or an interpretation to be capable of refinement, these qualifications on the Record's reliability will be identified. The relevance of such unreliability will also be considered later.

As already noted, with few exceptions the LTC recorded all blocks as owned either by a single vunatarai, or by an individual or individuals. My analysis will, therefore, proceed initially on this basic distinction between group-owned and individual-owned land. Of the exceptions, the parcel of alienated land (Block 108) can be excluded from consideration, and the others - the four parcels of Community-owned land and the block named "Reserved Land of Rakunat Village "(referred to here as "Rakunat Reserve") - can sensibly be included with the blocks owned by single vunatarai, as group-owned land. The global figures in Table 4.1 show that, of the total of 160.38 hectares of customary land in the Adjudication Area, the LTC found that 134.82 hectares (84%) were owned by groups, and 25.56 hectares (16%) were owned by individuals. The two categories of land ownership will now be separately considered.

(i) Group-owned land

Eighty-six of the blocks, with a total area of 107.23 hectares, were found to be owned by twenty vunatarai, as shown on Table 4.2. The vunatarai are listed there in descending order of total areas of their blockholdings. Notably, the first six vunatarai in this order are all based in Rakunat pakanagunan, the remaining two of the eight
Table 4.1 Rakunat Adjudication Record: Land ownership by groups and individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of blocks</th>
<th>Total area (has.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Group-owned land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Single vunatarai</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>107.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Rakunat Community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Rabuana Community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Rakunat Reserve</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>134.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Individual-owned land

| Total                  | 41            | 25.56             |

(iii) All land*

| Total                  | 132           | 160.38            |

Note:

* The parcel of alienated land (Block 108), with an area of 2.11 has., has been excluded (see text).
Table 4.2 Rakunat Adjudication Record: Land ownership of vunatarai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vunatarai</th>
<th>Pakanagunan</th>
<th>Paparagunan</th>
<th>No.of blocks</th>
<th>Total area(has)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rakunat*</td>
<td>Rakunat</td>
<td>Nodup</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.23#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rakunai*</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tinganabalbal*</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.72#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nekupia*</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Palakuka*</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vunatoboai*</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ToKubo</td>
<td>Nodup</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ToKiliu</td>
<td>Rakunat</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tiratira*</td>
<td>Rabuana</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kabagia*</td>
<td>Matalau</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rakalikel*</td>
<td>Rakunat</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Vunavar</td>
<td>Rabuana</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Vunaimuli</td>
<td>Nodup</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nereus apik)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Buringa*</td>
<td>Rabuana</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Kurapitil</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Livuan*</td>
<td>Matalau</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Rakiki</td>
<td>Rabuana</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Vunaologomata</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Rarara*</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Vunatabun</td>
<td>Pila Pila</td>
<td>Pila Pila</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Ramaravot*</td>
<td>Talwat</td>
<td>Matupit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Bauvik*</td>
<td>Tavui</td>
<td>Tavui</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 86 107.23

Notes:

* The vunatarai so marked owned land in the Rakunat Reserve (Block 76).

# Block 113, which does not appear on the Demarcation Plan, has been included in the Tinganabalbal landholdings (see text). It is a small segment (less than 0.1 ha.) of a block recorded as owned by Rakunat vunatarai but, without further details, the areas owned by the respective vunatarai cannot be adjusted. The adjustment would, however, be minimal.
vunatarai identified in the preceding chapter as based at Rakunat being ranked eighth and eleventh. Between them these eight Rakunat-based vunatarai were recorded as owning 53 of the 86 blocks, with a total area of 87.09 hectares - 81% of the area recorded as owned by single vunatarai. Apart from the twenty vunatarai recorded as owning blocks, two others - Ramaravot and Bauvik - had no particular blocks recorded in their names, but were listed among the fourteen vunatarai owning land in Rakunat Reserve. The twelve other vunatarai participating in the Reserve landholding all had blocks recorded in their names, and are indicated on Table 4.2. Before discussing vunatarai landholdings, the exceptional cases of group-owned land - the Rakunat Reserve and the four Community-owned blocks - will be examined.

The Rakunat Reserve, Block 76 of 26 hectares, is far the largest block in the Demarcation Plan, and the only one for which a multiplicity of vunatarai (fourteen) is recorded as land owners. The LTC noted in its inquiry into the Demarcation Plan that cement pegs had been positioned within the block "indicating internal boundaries", but the block was not subdivided "because of its rugged nature". It is located at the north-western corner of the Area, on the slopes of Mt Tovanumbatir. Dimain ToKurapa, a member of the Demarcation Committee, confirmed to me that formal identification of parcel boundaries in Block 76 had not proceeded because of the difficulty of survey, but he maintained that even at the time of demarcation the area had long been used for gardens, hunting and the collection of bush materials, and that the ownership of each parcel of land in the block by individual vunatarai was already well established. Today, although some areas of bush remain, a large part of the block has been planted to cocoa, and during fieldwork many references were made to individual plantings and gardens there. Because of its undifferentiated nature, however, it has not been possible to incorporate vunatarai landholdings within Block 76 in the following analysis with any precision, and accordingly the comparative treatment must proceed without direct regard to its influence on the landholdings of the vunatarai concerned. Nevertheless, as in the preceding chapter, the fact a vunatarai owns land in Rakunat Reserve is recognised where this is relevant, and, as will be explained below, for the purposes of statistical comparison this unavoidable limitation on the precision of the Adjudication Record is not critical.
The other exceptional cases of group-owned land are the four small parcels recorded as either Rakunat or Rabuana Community land. In the Adjudication Record the blocks are shown as being owned by "those natives for the time being resident" in the village concerned, Rakunat in the case of Blocks 13, 44 and 67, and Rabuana in the case of Block 22, located on the Rabuana side of the Adjudication Area. Only for Block 44 does the Record indicate the community purpose, being a cemetery for long used by the Rakunat villagers. Block 13 was acquired by ikulia from Rakunat vunatarai by the local members of the United Church, and the income from coconuts and cocoa planted there is used for the church's support. Similarly, Block 67 was acquired by ikulia from Karara vunatarai for the support of Rakunat United Church, but in this case only the residents of Darairat urur\textsuperscript{13} contributed to the acquisition. Block 22, formerly owned by Tiratira vunatarai, was acquired by ikulia by the Rabuana United Church membership, and is also used to support the church there. Such provision for church support is, I was told, general practice in the Tolai area.

Proceeding with analysis of the group-owned land as recorded in 1966, consideration will be given first to simple physical aspects—the size of land parcels, and the distribution of individual vunatarai's landholdings through the Area. I will then examine the more complex questions of how that distribution pattern evolved, and what the comparative availability of land between vunatarai was in 1966. After examination of the second category of land ownership (i.e., blocks recorded as owned by individuals), analysis of the changing pattern of land tenure at Rakunat between the period of original settlement and completion of the Adjudication Record will be undertaken.

The size of group-owned blocks varies greatly, the largest (Block 89) being 11.27 hectares and the smallest (Block 122) being 0.06 hectares in area. Table 4.3 shows that two-thirds of the group-owned blocks (57 out of 85) contain less than one hectare, while only three blocks are over five hectares (in fact, they all exceed nine hectares). The median-sized group-owned parcel is Block 54 on the Rabuana boundary, of 0.55 hectares, and a concentration of block areas (33 out of 85) lies in the range between 0.1 and 0.4 hectares. With

\textsuperscript{13}Village subdivision into urur is discussed in Chapter 2. Rakunat village has two urur, named Rakunat and Darairat.
Table 4.3 Rakunat Adjudication Record: Block area frequencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area range (has.)</th>
<th>Group-owned blocks</th>
<th>Individual-owned blocks</th>
<th>All blocks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 &lt; 1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &lt; 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &lt; 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &lt; 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &lt; 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 &lt; 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 &lt; 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 &lt; 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 &lt; 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85*</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>126*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
* Of the 133 blocks in the Adjudication Record, the seven excluded from this table are the block of alienated land, the Rakunat Reserve block, the four blocks of Community Land, and Block 113 - a small undifferentiated portion of Block 90 (see text).
very few exceptions, then, the group-owned blocks are small. The main exceptions are the three blocks exceeding nine hectares in area, which all have a special significance in Rakunat land tenure: Block 89 (11.27 hectares) contains the madapai of Nekupia vunatarai, and is the area first settled by that vunatarai when it entered Rakunat from the Matalau side; Block 3 (9.56 hectares) is the remainder of the large area settled by Darairat members, the forebears of the present Rakunai vunatarai, around their matanoi where they originally landed from the Duke of Yorks; and Block 90 (9.30 hectares) surrounds the madapai established by Rakunat vunatarai, when their ancestors first settled inland from the coastal strip.

Turning to the distribution of vunatarai blockholdings through the area, in the first place it should be noted that blocks recorded as owned by an individual vunatarai frequently adjoin, so that two or more blocks might have been amalgamated into one for the purpose of parcel identification. On the other hand most of the larger blocks have more than one land name in the Adjudication Record, showing that the block comprised a number of pakana pia whose boundaries were not identified during demarcation. Why in some cases a vunatarai's adjoining pakana pia were amalgamated in a single block while in others they were separately identified is not apparent, although deference to the wishes of the land-owning groups is likely. My fieldwork confirmed the experience of other commentators that Tolai land identification practice allows for increasing degrees of specificity depending on the context (see e.g., Salisbury 1970:67-68), so that even where blocks have only one name in the Adjudication Record separate pakana pia within the block are identifiable if the need arises. The impression may, however, be given by the multiplicity of blocks recorded as owned by individual vunatarai (see Table 4.2) that the dispersion of vunatarai land is greater than is in fact the case, given the propensity for separate block identification of a vunatarai's adjoining parcels. To illustrate the nature of block distribution, therefore, I have selected two vunatarai as examples, one showing a comparative concentration of landholdings and the other a fairly high degree of dispersion.

Five blocks were recorded as owned by Nekupia vunatarai, all located on the southern side of the Area (see Map 11). Two blocks actually adjoin, and a third (Block 89) by itself makes up 85% of the area recorded as owned by Nekupia. Comparison with Map 5 shows that
Map 11: Rakunat: Examples of Concentrated and Dispersed Vunatarai Landholdings (1966)
these five blocks form a large proportion (almost three-quarters) of Nekupia's original landholding at Rakunat, which had been concentrated along the southern boundary from the earliest days of settlement. The balance of its original landholding had passed out of Nekupia ownership as a result of acquisitions, a subject which will be treated generally when considering the process of land tenure change.

Blocks recorded as owned by Tinganabalbal *vunatarai* are an example of dispersed landholdings. There are nine such blocks, eight of which are shown on Map 11. The ninth, Block 113, is the only block which was not identified on the Demarcation Plan, but investigation showed it to be a small segment (probably less than 0.1 hectares) of Block 90, adjoining Block 49. It is again anomalous for being the single block recorded as owned by "Vunabalubal" *vunatarai*. This was noted in the preceding chapter to be one of the many variations used in naming Tinganabalbal *vunatarai*, but, in giving the details of ownership, the Adjudication Record named only one of the six Tinganabalbal ancestresses in the case of Block 113. It seems from this that the LTC intended to record only a segment of Tinganabalbal *vunatarai* as the owner of Block 113, and indeed I was informed that the land had been given by Tatarek, a former *jualua* of Rakunat *vunatarai*, to his son ToVue, a member of that segment of Tinganabalbal *vunatarai* of which the single ancestress named in the Adjudication Record was a member. For present purposes, however, Block 113 has been included with the Tinganabalbal landholdings. None of the eight identified blocks adjoins another, and their areas are fairly evenly spread across a range from 0.14 to 4.65 hectares (the latter block containing their *madapai*). Comparison again with Map 5 shows that Tinganabalbal landholdings were scattered from the start, but the degree of dispersion apparent in 1966 had been amplified by the fact that its landholdings were divided when Vunatoboai *vunatarai* split off from the parent body about a decade before demarcation (see Chapter 3). Apart from this division of its original landholding, Tinganabalbal had retained the areas it first settled at Rakunat virtually intact by 1966.

Each of the eight Rakunat-based *vunatarai* has the majority of its landholdings in Rakunat Adjudication Area. Two of them (Rakunat and Rakalikel) claim ownership of no other customary land,\(^\text{14}\) but the other

\(^{14}\text{Both *vunatarai* claim alienated land within the Rabaul Town boundary.}\)
six have parcels either as a result of original settlement in the adjoining Rabuana and Matalau pakanagunan, or elsewhere on the coastline between Baai and Korere as a result of later acquisitions (see Chapter 3). Only one of the eight vunatarai (ToKiliu) claimed no land in the Rakunat Reserve. The ownership of parcels outside Rakunat, and the undifferentiated nature of the Reserve landholdings, blemishes the land distribution picture which emerges from the Adjudication Record, but the detail is sufficient to form a representative impression of the pattern of vunatarai land distribution as it was in 1966.

The degree of dispersion of blocks owned by each of these eight Rakunat-based vunatarai fell generally between that noted for the two selected as examples - Nekupia with a relatively concentrated landholding, and Tingenabalbal, whose landholding was relatively dispersed. In each case the pattern of distribution reflects central factors in the settlement history of the vunatarai at Rakunat. Thus the eleven Rakunat vunatarai blocks are the residue of its original concentrations of land around its matanoi on the coast and its madapai inland (see Map 5), after the excision of parcels acquired from it since first settlement. Similarly, the seven Rakunai blocks are the balance of the coastal and inland concentrations of Darairat land, after acquisitions. As has been mentioned, Tingenabalbal land would be less dispersed if the holdings of Vunatoboai, formerly an integral part, were included, and the same factor has left Vunatoboai with a scattered landholding. Rakalikel, which entered Rakunat from the west and settled centrally, retained its landholdings around its madapai virtually intact, although by 1966 it had disposed of an isolated parcel near the western boundary. Nekupia's landholding is concentrated, and Palakuka's dispersed, but the position could have been reversed if the Palakuka claims to some land recorded as Nekupia-owned had prevailed.\textsuperscript{15} The last of the Rakunat-based vunatarai, ToKiliu, was recorded in 1966 as owning only three blocks, all slightly separated near the Rabuana boundary, but it had never owned much more land at Rakunat. The distribution pattern which emerges for each of these eight main vunatarai is essentially a product of two factors - the land originally acquired by the vunatarai

\textsuperscript{15} The confusion in land tenure between these two vunatarai was discussed in Chapter 3.
in the course of first settlement of the Rakunat area, as reduced by
the land disposed of during the intervening century or so till 1966.

The twelve remaining vunatarai of the twenty recorded as owning
blocks (see Table 4.2) owned 33 blocks between them, with a total area
of 20.14 hectares - 19% of the area recorded as owned by single
vunatarai. All being based outside Rakunat pakanagunan, it could not
be expected that their Rakunat landholdings would present a
representative picture of their land distribution. Nine of the
vunatarai are based in the two pakanagunan adjoining Rakunat - Rabuana
and Matalau - and, as discussed in Chapter 3, their Rakunat blocks are
either an extension across the boundary of their landholdings either
side of Rakunat, or later acquisitions of land from vunatarai which
first settled Rakunat. Blocks recorded as owned by the two
Nodup-based vunatarai and the Pila Pila-based vunatarai are probably
all in this latter category. Four vunatarai own only a single small
block, and seven own between two and four blocks, usually
non-adjoining, but in each case fairly close together in one part of
the Area. ToKubo vunatarai stands out, recorded as owning ten blocks
making up a total of 5.44 hectares. One of those parcels (Block 11) is
of 2.29 hectares, but the next largest is just over half a hectare.
The blocks are widely scattered and, as indicated in the preceding
chapter, there are strong reasons to believe that the ToKubo tenure to
land at Rakunat is based on later acquisitions.

For almost every one of the 86 blocks recorded as owned by
individual vunatarai the Adjudication Record states the custom under
which the land is owned to be "matrilineal inheritance from ancestors"
(see extract at Appendix C). Based on my analysis of Tolai corporate
identity and cultural institutions affecting settlement and residence
in Chapter 2, I find this description of the operative custom
unsatisfactory on two counts. My objections may be raised by
referring to the LTC's elaboration on Tolai customs in the Fourth
Schedule of the Adjudication Record (see Appendix D). Having
identified the vunatarai as the main Tolai land-owning unit, the
schedule states, "Land is inherited matrilineally within the
vunatarai". Ikulia is said to be the main means for permanent
disposition of vunatarai land, whereupon "the purchaser may decide
that all his children may inherit the land bought, or his male
children, or that it shall be inherited by his female children or his
sister's daughters for their descendants in the matrilineal line." I
have no objection to the vunatarai being identified as the main land-owning unit, nor to the notion that a person acquiring land (whether male or female) has some authority over the ultimate disposition of the land.

My first objection is that the statement of Tolai custom fails to recognise a crucial distinction between descent and inheritance, for my understanding (which will be supported in Chapter 6, after completing the history of land tenure change at Rakunat) is that all Tolai customary land is owned by descent groups, that inheritance has no application, and that the critical question is the manner of recruitment to the descent group concerned with a particular land parcel. Thus to say that vunatarai land is owned under the custom of "matrilineal inheritance from ancestors" is conceptually erroneous, and reveals nothing of significance to Tolai about the custom under which the land is owned. That the land is owned by a vunatarai is sufficient to show that recruitment to the land-owning group is governed by matrilineal descent, and all that could usefully be added in terms of the custom under which the land is owned would be to identify whether that ownership is based on original settlement, or on later acquisition. In Chapter 2, and again in examining the origins of Rakunat in the preceding chapter, it was said that the land tenure of vunatarai which originally settled an area is paramount in that area, and that the tenure of other resident groups who cannot claim such intense identification with the area is essentially subordinate.

As I have indicated, the blocks recorded as owned by Rakunat-based vunatarai were the residue of lands originally settled by those vunatarai, as were some of the blocks owned by vunatarai based at Rabuana and Natalau. The land recorded as owned by vunatarai based elsewhere, however, was in most cases clearly gained by later acquisition from a first-settling vunatarai. My second objection is that these latter blocks are also described as owned by "matrilineal inheritance". As I have said, land tenure is determined by descent, not by inheritance, but the nub of my objection is that the Adjudication Record suggests equivalent status for the tenure of groups which migrated to Rakunat from outside the Nodup paparagunan, and the tenure of first-settling vunatarai. As we saw in Chapter 2, Tolai draw a fundamental distinction between the local identity, and accordingly the land tenure, of locally-based and outsider groups. In a minority of cases blocks recorded as owned by vunatarai were said to
be held under a custom other than "matrilineal inheritance", and the basis for their tenure will now be examined in completing this consideration of how the 1966 distribution pattern of group-owned land evolved.

Three parcels (Blocks 42, 80 and 99) were acquired "by gift" from Vunakokor vunatarai, being recorded in the name of Nereus apiktara of Vunaimuli vunatarai. As discussed in Chapter 3, the land had long been occupied by a segment of Vunakokor vunatarai (based on the North Coast), and the last surviving member of that segment gave the land to his eldest son Nereus, with a view to its being held by his matrilineal descent group. The case illustrates an early stage in the process by which acquired land becomes vunatarai land. In the two other exceptional cases blocks recorded as owned by vunatarai were said to be held by the custom of ikulia. Block 50 was recorded as Palakuka vunatarai land, acquired by ikulia from Rakunat vunatarai. Inquiries showed that a Palakuka man, Robin ToMonongia, had lived on the land with his father ToLevi, a big-man of Rakunat vunatarai. The Palakuka members were at this stage still excluded from their vunatarai land at Rakunat (see Chapter 3), so after his father's death Robin remained on the land. Being anxious about his insecurity of tenure, however, he asked the then lualua of Rakunat and a senior female member if he could acquire the land. They agreed, "because Robin was their nauvana (cross-cousin)". About 1960 he paid ikulia in cash and tabu to Rakunat vunatarai, since when the land has been regarded as Palakuka vunatarai land. The second case involves Block 121, recorded as Vunatoboai vunatarai land acquired by ikulia from Kabalup vunatarai. The parcel had originally been part of Tinganabalbal's landholdings, but had previously been acquired by a member of Kabalup, a vunatarai based at Rabuana. After the split of Tinganabalbal vunatarai a member of the new vunatarai - Vunatoboai - cultivated the land, believing it still to be part of the parent vunatarai's landholdings. The matter was resolved during adjudication proceedings by the Vunatoboai leaders making an ikulia payment for the land to Kabalup vunatarai.

16 The Record specifically states that Blocks 80 and 99 were acquired by gift, and in the case of Block 42 the gift is a necessary implication of the details in the Record.
17 The two Rakunat members were children of women at the same generational depth as ToLevi in Rakunat vunatarai, i.e., children of ToLevi's "sisters", and therefore cross-cousins of ToLevi's son Robin.
So far as land availability within individual vunatarai is concerned, a number of variables make accurate calculation somewhat hypothetical. In the first place, many of the vunatarai have land in the Rakunat Reserve, although block parcellation in this area was never completed, so the areas owned by individual vunatarai cannot be calculated. Many vunatarai own land outside Rakunat, where members reside, but again the areas involved are unknown. Vunatarai members may make use of land not belonging to their own vunatarai for one purpose or another, each individual's land needs vary, and members have differential access to land, just as the qualities of the land plots themselves vary. These and many other factors make calculation of per capita land availability not only difficult, but also largely unrepresentative of the actual position of any particular individual. 18 Naturally, with increasing population pressure on finite land resources the availability of land becomes a consideration ever the more serious in providing for the livelihood of individuals, but analysis of land availability at the individual level would require a quantification of factors well beyond the scope of this study.

At group level, however, the Tolai identification of their social units with territorial units (discussed in Chapter 2) allows the relationship between group membership and group landholdings to be calculated from a common base, so as to indicate comparative land availability between groups with reasonable accuracy. The eight Rakunat-based vunatarai are known to have the majority of their landholdings at Rakunat, so calculation of the ratio between the total area of their vunatarai land at Rakunat and their total membership, while it would not represent the actual position of each member, nevertheless allows valid analysis of comparative land availability between these vunatarai. Furthermore, at group level the difficulties presented for quantifying individual land availability by the wide range of variables involved are largely overcome, for a reasonable constancy of these variables as between vunatarai memberships can be assumed.

Table 4.4 shows a wide range in per capita land availability between these vunatarai. At the top of the scale is Nekupia, which

18 The actual land access of all members of sample vunatarai will be considered in Chapter 6.
Table 4.4 Rakunat Adjudication Record: Per capita land availability of Rakunat-based vunatarai*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vunatarai</th>
<th>Total area (has.)</th>
<th>Living membership*</th>
<th>Per capita land availability (has.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nekupia#</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rakunai</td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rakunat</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ToKiliu</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Palakuka</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tinganabalbal</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Vunatoboai</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rakalikel</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>87.09</strong></td>
<td><strong>422</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

* The per capita land availability figures in this table are subject to qualifications mentioned in the text. The living membership figures are taken from LTC genealogies compiled in 1963. The Adjudication Record was not in fact completed until 1966.

# The living membership of Nekupia includes nine members of a vunatarai segment which had fused itself to Nekupia (see Chapter 3).
had the fourth largest total area recorded in its name (see Table 4.2), but when the LTC genealogies were compiled in 1963 it had only 21 living members. Its land availability at Rakunat of 0.63 hectares per member would be even greater if the nine living members of the spurious Malaguna-based segment were excluded (see Chapter 3), but for all practical purposes that segment was fused to Nekupia at the time of adjudication. At the other end of the scale is the small vunatarai Rakalikel (0.07 hectares per member), part of whose membership was resident at Matalau (see Chapter 3), and Vunatoboai and its parent vunatarai Tinganabalbal, both with a large membership, and having a Rakunat land availability of 0.08 and 0.12 hectares per member respectively. In the mid-1960s, therefore, Nekupia had about eight times as much land at Rakunat available to each member as Rakalikel and Vunatoboai had. These indications of comparatively "land-rich" and "land-poor" vunatarai at Rakunat will become especially relevant in examining the pattern of land tenure adjustment below, where those vunatarai which had been disposing of land before adjudication, and those whose members had been acquiring land, will be identified.

(ii) Individual-owned land

Table 4.1 shows that forty-one blocks, with a total area of 25.56 hectares (16% of the customary land in the Adjudication Area), were found to be owned by either a single individual or, more usually, a number of individuals. In all cases of blocks owned by single individuals the owner was named, but for blocks where more than one owner was involved, although one co-owner at least was named, the naming practice varied in identifying the remaining co-owners. In some cases all co-owners were named and the relationship between them specified, but in others only one (or sometimes more than one) co-owner was named, while the other co-owners were identified only by their relationship to the individual(s) named. In Appendix E the details of ownership of these forty-one individual-owned blocks are set out. Because in a number of cases an individual or combination of individuals figures in the ownership of more than one block, the relevant blocks have been grouped together in Appendix E in sets, so as to indicate such multiple block ownership. The sets of single or multiple blocks have been ranked in descending order of total area of landholding, that being the important consideration in terms of land
distribution. Finally, unless a repetition of individuals is indicated, it can be taken that all persons mentioned by name or description in Appendix E are different individuals. Analysis will proceed by examining first the size of blocks and, in the case of multiple block ownership, the distribution of an individual's landholdings through the Area. Finally the categories of owners and how they acquired their ownership will be considered.

Table 4.3 shows that only six of the forty-one individual-owned blocks exceed a hectare in area. The largest parcel (Block 5) is of 3.77 hectares, the smallest (Block 109) is of 0.06 hectares, and the median-sized parcel (Block 4, just inland from the coast) has an area of 0.42 hectares - not much less than the median-sized group-owned parcel (of 0.55 hectares). Even when the multiple landholdings of individuals are considered (see Appendix E), only seven of the sets of single or multiple blocks exceed a hectare in total area, four of them being single parcels. Where an individual is involved in the ownership of more than one block in most cases the blocks are fairly close to each other, but even where they are distributed through the Area (as in the case of the three parcels in which IaNonika is involved - see Set 10 in Appendix E), the Adjudication Area's general dimensions are such that the distance between blocks presents no practical difficulty for work purposes.

Turning to the categories of owners, fifteen of the blocks were recorded in the names of single individuals, eleven in favour of males (one male owning two blocks) and four in favour of females (see Table 4.5). The largest of these (Block 10) comprised 1.68 hectares, and their total area was 8.97 hectares - a third of the individual-owned land, and 5.6% of all customary land in the Adjudication Area. The remaining twenty-six blocks were recorded in the names of a multiplicity of co-owners. In terms of the relationships between co-owners, Table 4.5 shows that the blocks fall into six sub-categories of co-ownership. The largest total area (6.15 hectares) comprised twelve blocks recorded as owned by single females and their children. Five blocks, with a total area of 2.35 hectares, were owned by siblings, and a further four (total area 2.67 hectares) were owned either by female siblings and their children (in one case), or male and female siblings and the children of female siblings (in three cases). Three blocks with a total area of 1.04 hectares were recorded as owned by the same female and her daughter's children, and,
## Table 4.5 Rakunat Adjudication Record: Categories of individual owners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>No.of blocks</th>
<th>Area (has.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Single individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Multiple individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Female and her children*</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Siblings-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) female</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) male/female</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) male#</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Siblings and their children -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) female siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) male/female siblings and the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children of female siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Female and her daughter's children</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Male, his daughter and her children</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Male and his children</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
* In one case a female, her children and an adopted child, and in a second case a female and her adopted children.  
* In this single instance the male siblings had no female siblings.
finally, single blocks were owned by a male, his daughter and her children, and by a male and his children. This last block, of 3.77 hectares, was the largest individual-owned block in the Adjudication Area.

From this statistical analysis of the blocks recorded in the Adjudication Record as individually owned it emerges that, in keeping with the general area frequencies for all blocks (see Table 4.3), individual-owned blocks are almost without exception small in size, and, even where an individual figures as an owner or co-owner of multiple landholdings, in only seven cases did the combined area exceed one hectare. Five times more land was recorded as owned by vunatarai than as individually owned, but when this latter category was analysed it was found that only one-third of the area was actually recorded in the names of single individuals. In these circumstances, the Adjudication Record - even taken at face value (without investigating the quality of these individuals' tenure, as will be done in Chapter 6) - hardly manifests significant individualisation of tenure at Rakunat by 1966. Where blocks were recorded as owned by multiple individuals, the ownership was seen to comprise groups of two or more close kin (see Table 4.5). As stated in the preceding treatment of group-owned land, the critical tenure consideration is the manner of recruitment to these small groups.

Analysis of the relationships between the members of these small land-owning groups shows a clear preponderance of matriline segments. Of the twenty-six blocks for which multiple ownership by individuals was recorded, in no less than twenty-four cases the co-owning group comprised a closely-related segment of a single vunatarai of limited genealogical depth in the form either of siblings, siblings and the children of female siblings, a female and her children, or a female and her daughter's children (Categories B.1 to 4 in Table 4.5). Within each group of individuals one or a combination of the most important Tolai kin relationships identified in Chapter 2 is represented - those between siblings, between mothers (including

---

19 This proportion includes Rakunat Reserve, which was recorded as owned by fourteen vunatarai. Had full demarcation proceeded in this block it is likely that some parcels would have been recorded as individual-owned. Even if the block is excluded from calculation, however, the proportion of group- to individual-owned land is still four to one.
mother's sisters) and children, and between maternal uncles and their sister's children. In one of the two exceptional cases a matriline segment was partially involved, for the block was recorded in the names of a male, his daughter and her children (Category B.5). The father-child relationship, whose importance was also stressed, is also represented in this co-owning group, and is the apparent basis for recruitment to the membership of the final co-owning group - a male and his children. In Chapter 6 the tenure developments on these co-owned blocks in a generation since 1966 will be examined, to confirm the manner of recruitment to the land-owning groups, but the indications are already strong that recruitment is governed by matrilineal descent.

The Adjudication Record states for each individual-owned block the custom under which the land is owned (see extract at Appendix C). Thirty-seven of the forty-one blocks are said to have been acquired by ikulia, in most cases from a named vunatarai, while in some cases details of who effected the acquisition were also recorded. Three blocks are recorded as acquired by gift, two from a named vunatarai and one from a named individual, and in the final case the block is said to have been acquired as to part by gift and as to the remainder by ikulia from a named vunatarai. All acquisitions were investigated during fieldwork. In accordance with Tolai precepts, for considering how ownership of each block was acquired and the nature of its tenure it is necessary first to establish the local identity of the individual owners. All but two blocks were recorded as owned by sole members of a vunatarai, or by members comprising a segment of a single vunatarai, so for the purpose mentioned the forty-one blocks have been listed in Table 4.6 by reference to the vunatarai whose members were recorded as the block-owners. By this criterion, blocks owned by different members of the same vunatarai are all included under that vunatarai's name. The vunatarai are listed in descending order of the total area of their members' blockholdings. The exceptional cases are the two blocks whose ownership incorporates the father-child relationship, but, as in each case all co-owners except the father are members of a vunatarai segment, the blocks have been listed under that vunatarai's name. Following the basic Tolai practice of identifying groups by reference to their place of origin, the acquisitions will now be analysed under the same three categories employed in the preceding chapter for examining the original settlement of groups at
Rakunat. In this case, however, because it is not primary but secondary settlement after acquisition which is being considered, the order of the categories will be reversed.

(a) Acquisitions by members of vunatarai based outside Nodup paparagunan

The members of seven vunatarai fall into this category, owning between them a total of sixteen blocks with a combined area of 10.66 hectares (see Table 4.6). Three of the vunatarai - Vunatabun, Bauvik and Ramaravot - are already familiar, for, having had segments long resident at Rakunat, their origins there were considered in Chapter 3. In each case their members' presence in Rakunat is the consequence of in-marriage by a female matrilineal ancestor. Vunatabun vunatarai, originally from Pila Pila on the North Coast, ranks highest in terms both of total area acquired by its members, and (equally with Tinganabalbal) of number of blocks involved. Diagram 4.1 shows the relationships between the members of this vunatarai who figure in the ownership of the seven acquired blocks, the details of which are as follows:

Block 9 owned by IaMonika and her daughter IaTapiva;  
Block 10 owned by Tioap;  
Block 32 owned by ToRoli;  
Block 56 owned by Elipas Tabunur;  
Block 78 owned by IaMonika and her (unnamed) children;  
Block 79 owned by ToTita;  
Block 91 owned by IaMonika and her children IaTapiva, ToRoli, ToKavanamur, IeLita, ToPai'iringa, ToValaun and ToRollikun.  

The relationship between Elipas Tabunur and the others could not be established, although he was regarded at Rakunat as being a member of Vunatabun. The Adjudication Record names as his ancestresses three females included in the genealogy of a vunatarai named Vunatabun, compiled at Pila Pila in 1963 (although Tabunur does not appear), but the parent group at Pila Pila of the Vunatabun segment settled at Rakunat is Pianaokor vunatarai. A remote connection between these two Pila Pila-based vunatarai - Pianaokor, the ancestral vunatarai of the segment at Rakunat named Vunatabun, and Vunatabun, of which Tabunur was apparently a member - is indicated, although their genealogies show no common ancestry. Tabunur came to the Rakunat area as a catechist, and mobilised his kinship connections to settle there.

Members of Bauvik vunatarai, based at Tavui 1 on the northern tip
Table 4.6 Rakunat Adjudication Record: Vunatarai whose members are individual owners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vunatarai</th>
<th>Pakanagunan</th>
<th>Paparagunan</th>
<th>No.of blocks</th>
<th>Total area(has.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Vunatabun</td>
<td>Pila Pila</td>
<td>Pila Pila</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Vunatobai*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nodup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Vagai</td>
<td>Matalau</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Bauvik</td>
<td>Tavui</td>
<td>Tavui</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Tingana-balbal</td>
<td>Rakunat</td>
<td>Nodup</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.Palakuka</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.Vunaologa-mata</td>
<td>Rabuana</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.Vunaluba</td>
<td>Matalau</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.Vunalagir</td>
<td>Matupit</td>
<td>Matupit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.Ragalgalir</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.Ramaravot Talwat</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.Vunaimuli</td>
<td>Nodup</td>
<td>Nodup</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.ToValingen#Matupit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Matupit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.ToPilul</td>
<td>Nodup</td>
<td>Nodup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.Mamanuba Baai</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.Raim Korere</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.Takakap Nodup</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.ToMunapalap Kokopo</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.Tabururuk Matalau</td>
<td>Nodup</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 41  25.56

Notes:
* A single member of Kuraoko vunatarai (based in Matalau pakanagunan) was included in the co-ownership (see text).
# A single member of Rakunat vunatarai was included in the co-ownership (see text).
Diagram 4.1: Vunatabun \textit{vunatarai} segment
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of the Crater Peninsula, figured in the ownership of three blocks. Diagram 4.2 shows the relationships between the individuals involved, and the details of their block ownership are as follows:

Block 36 owned by ToKoniel, ToKoikoi, IaKurai and IePalamon;
Block 69 owned by IeVika, her sister IaKurai and their children;
Block 115 owned by IeVika and her children IeVa, IaLis, IaMalata, IaDesi and ToLidel.

The third vunatarai whose origins at Rakunat have already been considered is Ramaravot, based at Talwat on the southern tip of the Crater Peninsula. Two parcels (Blocks 72 and 114) were recorded in the name of a single member, ToVultonia.

Three more vunatarai whose members acquired land are based at Matupit, in the Matupit paparagunan. In the case of Vunalagir vunatarai, the single block was acquired for a female member (and her six children, by 1966) who had in-married to Rakunat, by her husband, Benson Tabu, from his vunatarai (Rakunai) of which he was lualua. Another single block was acquired by five brothers (they had no sisters), members of Ragalgalir vunatarai. Their mother had also in-married to Rakunat from Matupit, and her husband acquired the land for his children from his vunatarai (Rakunai). Finally, a single parcel was acquired from Rakalikel vunatarai by a male member of Rakunat vunatarai, ToBoboko, for one of his daughters and her children, members of ToValingen vunatarai. The man's wife had in-married from Matupit to Rakunat, but ToValingen proved to be a Rakunat-based segment of the Matupit-based vunatarai last mentioned - Ragalgalir. The Adjudication Record wrongly records the land as acquired from Rakunat vunatarai, and informants say inclusion of ToBoboko's name in the co-ownership (this is one of the two blocks incorporating the father-child relationship - see above) was mistaken. He had kept his daughter's bridewealth, so the land had been acquired for her and her children.

Last of the seven vunatarai in this category is ToMunapalap, based in the Kokopo locality, of which a single member, ToNiruk, was recorded as owning a small parcel (Block 133, of 0.20 hectares) acquired for him by his father from Nekupia vunatarai. Whereas members of the other six vunatarai segments owe their settlement at Rakunat to the in-marriage of a female ancestor, ToNiruk's presence there is the result of very exceptional circumstances. His father, a native of Kunakunai in the Raluana locality, was a policeman, and while stationed at Kokopo he met and married ToNiruk's mother. The
Diagram 4.2: Bauvik `vunatarai` segment
couple were both members of Marmar moiety vunatarai, and their moiety incest meant that they could not remain in their home areas. ToNiruk's father had formed some association with members of Balu, a Marmar moiety vunatarai based at Matalau, and he mobilised this association to resettle with his wife with Balu vunatarai at Matalau. After their arrival the wife "became a Pikalaba", to avoid as far as possible the opprobrium attaching to the incest. ToNiruk, their only child, was accordingly regarded as a Pikalaba, and subsequently married a Marmar moiety woman. Their children are now marrying Pikalaba members, so "it is back in the right direction again".

(b) Acquisitions by members of vunatarai based in Nodup paparagunan, but outside Rakunat pakanagunan.

The members of nine vunatarai fall into this category, owning between them a total of thirteen blocks with a combined area of 7.33 hectares (see Table 4.6). The vunatarai are from all the five pakanagunan of Nodup paparagunan other than Rakunat, three based at neighbouring Matalau (Vagai, Vunaluba and Tabururuk) and one at neighbouring Rabuana (Vunaologamata), and the others further afield at Nodup (Vunaimuli, ToPilul and Takakap) and Baai (Mamanuba) to the south-east of Rakunat, and at Korere (Rain) to the north-west. With one exception, all the members of these nine vunatarai recorded as owning Rakunat land were resident at Rakunat in 1966 as the result of a woman marrying a man already resident at Rakunat, and taking up settlement there. In some cases the person recorded as owner (or co-owner, with her children) was the woman who herself had married a Rakunat resident, while in others the owner (or co-owners) was the child (or children) of a woman who had married a Rakunat resident. With (until recently at least) a high degree of local endogamy being a feature of Tolai marriages (see Chapter 2), Nodup paparagunan was the area within which a large proportion of the Rakunat residents married. The wives and children of such marriages to male Rakunat residents

20 Rakunat informants expressed surprise that the wife rather than the husband adopted the opposite moiety, and indeed the alternative would have conformed more readily to Tolai concepts of social structure. A possible explanation is that it was the husband's association with a Marmar moiety vunatarai at Matalau which enabled the couple to resettle there, so this association had to be maintained.
have their madapai in the vicinity, and are members of groups which have in many cases associated with Rakunat-based vunatarai over a long period. As was remarked in the preceding chapter, the tenure of such persons to land acquired at Rakunat is not liable to the same challenge which may be raised against the landholding of groups in the first category, i.e., the descendants of in-marriages from outside Nodup papanagunan.

First of the three Matalau-based vunatarai, the Vagai members who acquired land were IaPuputa in respect of Block 66, and she and her adopted children in respect of Block 64. The combined area of the two parcels is 3.53 hectares - the second largest individual-owned landholding in the Adjudication Area (see Appendix E). IaPuputa moved to Rakunat after her marriage to Rusiat Tuat, later the lualua of Tinganabalbal vunatarai. Vunaluba is the second Matalau-based vunatarai, two members of which - IePiaka and her sister IaKurai - were recorded as owners of Block 119. Their mother had married a member of Vunatabun, the Rakunat-based segment of a vunatarai originally from Pila Pila. Finally, ToBola, a member of Tabururuk vunatarai, was recorded as the owner of Block 18. His mother had settled at Rakunat after marrying Semi ToMaiai, a former big-man of Rakunai vunatarai. From the other side of Rakunat ToLaku, a member of the Rabuana-based vunatarai Vunaologamata, acquired a parcel, Block 94 of 0.97 hectares. The single exception to the pattern of all owners being resident at Rakunat as a result of marriage, ToLaku had the reputation of an energetic acquirer of land.21

Members of three Nodup-based vunatarai acquired a total of five blocks. IaMin, of Vunaimuli vunatarai, acquired Block 51 by herself, and Block 48 together with her children. Her mother had married Panipas Tapuki, the last surviving member of a Rakunat-based segment of Vunakokor vunatarai, originally from Ratavul. In the preceding chapter it was seen that, before his death, Panipas disposed of the three parcels of Vunakokor land at Rakunat to his children, as a matrilineal segment of Vunaimuli vunatarai of which his eldest son

21Just before his death in 1982, ToLaku tape-recorded his last wishes regarding disposition of his acquired land. His daughter Relly Manning translated the tape to me. There are details of fourteen blocks acquired by ToLaku in Talwat and Baai pakanagunan. In my experience, such a profusion of land acquisitions is quite extraordinary.
then living, Nereus, was the senior member. IaMin and her children are therefore participants in the ownership of these three additional parcels (Blocks 42, 80 and 99), of 1.34 hectares total area. ToPilul is a second Nodup-based vunatarai, and Block 4 was recorded as owned by IeTabaining and her two children. Her husband was apparently a Rakunat resident, and Block 4, formerly owned by Rakunai vunatarai, was part of a land exchange, whereby ToPilul land at Baai was given to Rakunai members resident there, and this parcel was given to IeTabaining and her children. Finally, two blocks were recorded as owned by members of Takakap vunatarai, also based at Nodup. Takakap is a segment of a very large vunatarai which has undergone a long process of fission. Tokumaina vunatarai based at Matupit is known to have been a segment (the Takakap genealogy in fact overlaps partly with it), as was Palagumgum and Kuraoko. Block 109 was recorded as owned by four brothers, their two sisters and the sisters' children, the segment being resident at Rakunat as a result of the six siblings' mother having married a big-man of Vunatoboai vunatarai. Block 124 was recorded as owned by IaRubi, also a Takakap member, and apparently the matrilateral parallel cousin (i.e., a "sibling") of the six siblings recorded in the ownership of Block 109.22

Members of a Baai-based vunatarai, Mamanuba, figured in the ownership of two parcels. Block 125 was recorded as owned by ToPeu, and Block 105 by ToPeu, his two sisters and the sisters' children. ToPeu, a victim of polio, has not married. The segment resides in Rakunat as a result of ToPeu's mother marrying ToLiaser, who became lualua of ToKubo vunatarai, and whose incursions on Rakunat land were remarked in Chapter 3. The final block in this category was acquired by members of Raim vunatarai, based at Korere. It was recorded in the names of IaKavanamur and her four children. Her mother had married ToGogobol, a member of a Matalau-based segment of a Matupit vunatarai, but resident in Rakunat.

22IaRubi's named mother ("mother"?) appears on the Tokumaina vunatarai genealogy where it overlaps with Takakap, as the sister of the six siblings' mother. A complete copy of the Takakap genealogy was not available for checking during preparation of the thesis.
(c) Acquisitions by members of vunatarai based in Rakunat pakanagunan

The members of three vunatarai fall into this category, owning between them a total of twelve blocks with a combined area of 7.57 hectares (see Table 4.6). Owning the largest area (Block 5 of 3.77 hectares) are the four sons and four daughters of Amos Tanti, members of Vunatoboai vunatarai. Amos, a Kuraoko member, was also included in the co-ownership — the single instance of a co-owning group apparently being recruited by patrilineal descent. To acquisitions by Vunatoboai members could also be added the small Block 121, noted in the treatment of group-owned land as having been acquired for the vunatarai by an ikulia payment during adjudication proceedings.

Members of Tinganabalbal vunatarai, the group from which Vunatoboai separated, were recorded as owning seven blocks, with a total area of 2.62 hectares. The details of block ownership are as follows:

- Block 6 owned by ToLiakim and his sisters IaPikal and IaLuai;
- Block 55 owned by ToKevin and his sister IaKamara;
- Block 57 owned by Tuat Sem and his sister IaTinakap;
- Block 82 owned by IeLisabet and her children Iagapau, IaMiriam, IaVaula, IaRubi, IeLen, IaRakan and an adopted child ToValaun;
- Block 86 owned by IeVutete and her daughter's children IeVibi, IeLidia, IeLiap and Sialis;
- Block 87 owned as for Block 86;
- Block 97 owned as for Block 86.

Tinganabalbal is a very large vunatarai, and those members in the above list are so spread through its segments as to render diagrammatic representation of their interrelationship impracticable. IeVutete and IeLisabet are elderly sisters, and ToLiakim and his sisters and Tuat and his sister are in the same generation as IeVutete and IeLisabet, i.e., they are all "siblings". ToKevin and his sister are the children of another "sibling" at this generation.

The last Rakunat-based vunatarai whose members acquired land is Palakuka. Four blocks with a total area of 1.18 hectares were involved, having ownership details as follows:

- Block 15 owned by IaPativil;
- Block 24 owned by ToMonongia;
- Block 100 owned by IaTilda and her (unnamed) children;
- Block 110 owned by IaPal and her (unnamed) children.

IaPativil, IaTilda and IaPal are sisters, and ToMonongia is their matrilateral parallel cousin, i.e., their "sibling". In my examination
of group-owned blocks I noted that Palakuka vunatarai also acquired Block 50, of 0.38 hectares, by ikulia before adjudication. The Adjudication Record shows, therefore, that only three Rakunat-based vunatarai had acquired land before 1966. From the analysis of per capita land availability of Rakunat-based vunatarai it emerged that these three vunatarai - Palakuka, Tinganabalbal and Vunatoboai - were among the four comparatively "land-poor" vunatarai at Rakunat in 1966 (see Table 4.4). Members of the other "land-poor" vunatarai - Rakalikel - were occupying land at Natalau in 1966 (see Chapter 3). This evidence strongly indicates that the acquisitions were motivated by land shortage, felt particularly within these three "land-poor" vunatarai.

The foregoing analysis of individual-owned blocks answers the most crucial question in Tolai land tenure: how closely can the occupants identify with the land concerned? In descending order, the degree of identification ranges from members of vunatarai with madapai in Rakunat pakanagunan of Nod up paparagunan, to members of vunatarai whose madapai are located outside Nodup paparagunan - the outsiders in Rakunat. For each category of owners their tenure of the land is based upon an acquisition by one of the two main methods of securing secondary settlement under Tolai custom - purchase (ikulia) and gift (tinabar). Informants claimed that land gifts, especially by a father of part of his vunatarai land to his children, had been more common in the past, but that in recent decades because of population pressure such gifts were increasingly being challenged. After the father's death his vunatarai members would prevail upon his children to leave the land, so a policy had been adopted during demarcation proceedings of confirming such earlier land gifts by an ikulia payment. Only four of the forty-one acquisitions by individuals contained in the Adjudication Record depended solely upon gifts, but many of the...

I take such a statement to mean not that exchanges of land were generally more common in the past, but that those exchanges which did occur were more commonly by gift than by ikulia. Most land exchanges over the history of settlement at Rakunat are reflected in the Adjudication Record (though the details recorded were usually rudimentary), but I unearthed a number of additional land dispositions, and in Chapter 3 I claimed good reason to believe that some early acquisitions from originally-settling vunatarai had by now been forgotten. I am, nevertheless, confident that my account includes the great majority of all the land exchanges over the history of settlement at Rakunat.
recorded ikulia acquisitions would have been in confirmation of an earlier gift of the land.

Investigation of the forty-one acquisitions showed clearly, for the great majority, that some pre-existing connection between the parties to the transaction lay behind the acquisition. In twelve cases a male acquired land from his own vunatarai for his children, and sometimes for his daughters' children as well. In another twenty-three cases long-standing associations between vunatarai of the same moiety were invoked to acquire the land, either by persons acquiring land from an associated vunatarai for themselves, or in a few cases by males acquiring land from an associated vunatarai for their children. In the six remaining cases, although I have insufficient evidence to establish what relationship or intra-moiety association lay behind the acquisition, I have no doubt from my general findings on land exchanges (see below, in Chapter 6) that further inquiry would turn up a pre-existing connection between the parties. From the details of transactions it is apparent that the acquisitions recorded in 1966 range over the whole period from original settlement at Rakunat up to the time of demarcation and adjudication. In four cases where a male acquired land for his daughter investigation established that she was his eldest daughter, and the acquisition was effected in fulfilment of his obligation to provide her with land for herself and her children, in reciprocation for his having received her bridewealth at marriage. Just as the intensity of identification with the Rakunat area fundamentally qualifies the tenure of individuals occupying acquired land, so also will we see that the acquired tenure is characterised by the relationship or association of which it is a product.

3. THE CHANGING PATTERN OF LAND TENURE

To the extent that the land law reform brought into operation during 1963-64 was intended to provide for an increasing individualisation of customary tenure, the Rakunat experience denies that such a trend was spontaneously occurring among the Tolai in the period up to 1966. Five times more land was recorded as owned by vunatarai than as individually-owned, and two-thirds of the latter was recorded in the names of small kinship groups, to which with only one exception recruitment was clearly governed by matrilineal descent. Fifteen blocks were recorded as owned by single individuals, the most an individual owned (either in single or multiple holdings) was 1.68
hectares, and the total area owned by single individuals was only 5.6% of all customary land in the Adjudication Area. In Chapter 6 I will argue that, from tenure developments on these blocks since adjudication, it is not valid to regard the tenure of even this small area as having been individualised. While the long-term objective of the land law reform was to convert all customary tenure to registered individual titles, there is no indication that this objective was intentionally promoted during demarcation and adjudication proceedings at Rakunat. The sole aim was apparently to declare the land tenure status quo, as perceived in 1966. The statutory link between adjudication and conversion to individual freeholds - which would have reformed the tenure - had no impact at Rakunat, for when this option was offered after adjudication no person elected to apply for tenure conversion.24

In declaring the land tenure status quo at Rakunat in 1966 the LTC recorded information on the basis of tenure to each block of land. This information, although in many cases only rudimentary, supplies the crucial qualities of the tenure under which each block was held. During fieldwork the recorded information was checked and supplemented, so that the history of land tenure change at Rakunat from original settlement until adjudication could be established. To see such an historical account as merely background information would, however, be mistaken, for just as the tenure of each block recorded in 1966 depended on such factors as the local identity of the owners, associations between groups, and relationships between individuals, so also will these factors continue to affect the character of the tenure after 1966, as we will see.

Before examining the changing pattern of land tenure between original settlement and adjudication, it should be noted that the legislative process for demarcation and adjudication and the procedures adopted at Rakunat worked remarkably well. Not only were the boundaries of the great majority of the land parcels settled by agreement at the time without the need to resort to judicial determination, but those boundaries remain overwhelmingly acceptable to the present day. Although investigation revealed the need for

24 In 1977 Amos Tamti, a co-owner of Block 5, applied for tenure conversion of the land, but when the application came on before the LTC for hearing in May 1980 it was adjourned sine die. Amos died in 1984, so the application can be taken to have lapsed.
correction of the ownership details for some blocks, most such adjustment was a case of refinement in interpretation of the recorded ownership, assisted by tenurial developments since 1966. If the purpose of the legislation was to declare the land tenure status quo, then the Adjudication Record stands as impressive evidence of the suitability of the process, the ability of the Rakunat community to reach agreement on the tenure to their land, and the sensitivity of officials to the wishes of the community.

In the preceding chapter the pattern of original settlement at Rakunat was reconstructed. In a process beginning at least 120 years ago groups converged on the Rakunat area from diverse origins, some establishing themselves within Rakunat itself and gradually expanding their settlement onto unoccupied land, others settling originally at neighbouring Rabuana and Matalau and later moving into Rakunat, and yet others arriving on the scene after the area had been fully occupied, and taking up secondary occupation on land already settled by the original arrivals. The primary settlement process was gradual, possibly spanning a number of decades, and at this late stage it is not possible to establish with any precision when original settlement of the whole Rakunat area had been completed. Eight Rakunat-based vunatarai are known to have been original settlers, as are a number of Rabuana- and Matalau-based vunatarai, but the position with respect to other groups long settled at Rakunat remains obscure, and they may have been among the original settlers, or groups whose secondary occupation from neighbouring pakanagunan has by now been forgotten. For some groups long resident at Rakunat, however, their secondary status is still a major qualification on their tenure to land they occupy, for they are identified as matriline segments of groups originating outside Nodup pakanagunan, whose presence at Rakunat is the result of a distant female in-marriage.

The great majority of Rakunat land was originally settled by the eight Rakunat-based vunatarai, with almost all of the remainder being originally settled by vunatarai based in the neighbouring pakanagunan of Rabuana, Matalau and Nodup. Change in the landholdings of these original settlers in the century or so until adjudication was predominantly the consequence of land dispositions. Acquisitions recorded in the names of these vunatarai were negligible, so their landholdings in 1966 were generally the lands originally acquired by the vunatarai in the course of first settlement of Rakunat, as reduced
by the parcels disposed of since. One product of the land tenure adjustments made at Rakunat by 1966 is, therefore, a reduction in the landholdings of vunatarai which originally settled the area. It follows that the main tenure developments will be found by examining the ownership of those parcels acquired in dispositions by these vunatarai.

With very few exceptions, the ownership of all blocks recorded as owned by vunatarai was said to be based on "matrilineal inheritance", but I claimed good reason to believe that some blocks owned by vunatarai based in the neighbouring Rabuana, Matalau and Nodup pakanagunan had in fact been the subject of early acquisitions from groups of original settlers. This was clearly so in the case of blocks owned by the three migrant groups, from Pila Pila, Talwat and Tavui, whose presence at Rakunat in each case was the result of in-marriage by a female matrilineal ancestor. Some of the acquired parcels were, therefore, owned by vunatarai in 1966.

In the case of blocks recorded as acquired by individuals, the preponderance of matriline segments prompted analysis under three categories of owners. First, there were members of vunatarai based outside Nodup pakanagunan. With a single exception (in the case of resettlement because of a moiety incest), all these persons were settled at Rakunat as a result of in-marriage by a female matrilineal ancestor. Being the matrilineal descendants of a locally exogamous marriage (see Chapter 3), these persons are outsiders in the Rakunat community. Although the blocks were recorded as owned by individuals or small matriline segments of individuals, the tenure position on these blocks approximately to that of the three migrant groups just mentioned, and indeed all three groups are represented among the individual owners in this first category. The second category of individual ownership derived from acquisitions was that of members of vunatarai based in Nodup pakanagunan but outside Rakunat pakanagunan. With only one exception, all these persons were resident at Rakunat in consequence of a female matrilineal ancestor's in-marriage to Rakunat. Such marriages are locally endogamous, so these persons are identified to some extent with the Rakunat locality, as explained in Chapter 3. Finally, there were the acquisitions by members of vunatarai actually based in Rakunat pakanagunan, and here the only vunatarai involved were among the comparatively "land-poor" vunatarai at Rakunat. In all cases of land acquired by individuals, therefore, the acquisitions
were motivated by lack of access to land in the Rakunat area - an absolute lack in the case of members of vunatarai based outside Nodup paparagunan, and a comparative lack in the case of members of the other vunatarai. Based on the experience with early acquisitions by individuals which over time matured into full group ownership, it may be supposed that here, too, nascent vunatarai ownership is involved, particularly given the preponderance of matriline segments represented in the ownership, and the intra-moiety associations and kinship relations which underlay the acquisitions. This supposition will be verified in Chapter 6.

If, as it seems, the changing pattern of Rakunat land tenure should be seen as involving the exchange of land between vunatarai, the final matter to address is the pattern of that land exchange. Table 4.7 lists the vunatarai whose land was disposed of, to meet the needs of those persons acquiring land. The vunatarai are listed in descending order of the total areas involved in their dispositions, and comparison with Table 4.4 shows that three of the four most significant disposers of land were the three comparatively "land-rich" Rakunat-based vunatarai. Six vunatarai disposed of only a single block, in each case the area involved being less than a hectare. Two Rabuana-based vunatarai disposed of eleven parcels between them: the three Vunatutukadek dispositions amounted to less than a hectare in total area, and the explanation of the eight Vunavar dispositions (total area, 5.60 hectares) is that by the time of adjudication the vunatarai had been reduced to a single surviving male, who was disposing of the vunatarai's land before its extinction. When Tables 4.4, 4.6 and 4.7 are compared it emerges that only members of "land-poor" Rakunat-based vunatarai were acquiring land, and only the comparatively "land-rich" Rakunat-based vunatarai were disposing of land to any significant extent. The central feature of the pattern of land tenure change between original settlement at Rakunat and adjudication, therefore, was the exchange of land from comparatively "land-rich" vunatarai to members of vunatarai who, by reason of either

25 It will be apparent from details of the acquisitions that I use the term "exchange" to connote not a two-way exchange in land, but an exchange of land from one vunatarai to another. The term "transfer" is not generally a satisfactory alternative, for it fails to import the exchange relationship which I will argue is implicit in any land transaction.
Table 4.7 Rakunat Adjudication Record: Land-disposing vunatarai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vunatarai</th>
<th>Pakanagunan</th>
<th>No. of blocks</th>
<th>Total area (has.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rakunai</td>
<td>Rakunat</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vunavar</td>
<td>Rabuana</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nekupia</td>
<td>Rakunat</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rakunat</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vunatutukadek*</td>
<td>Rabuana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ToKiliu</td>
<td>Rakunat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rakalikel</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tinganabalbal</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Vunatoboai</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Rarara</td>
<td>Rabuana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tiratira</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
*Block 100, of 0.22 has., is shown on the Adjudication Record as disposed of by ToLeo vunatarai, a name unknown at Rakunat. It appears to have been disposed of by Vunatutukadek vunatarai.*
an absolute or a comparative lack of land, were the "land-poor" groups at Rakunat in the period up to 1966. In revealing this spontaneous redistribution of land through a long history of intergroup transactions, the Adjudication Record is an eloquent testimony to the capacity of the Rakunat community to regulate its internal land affairs in response to the emerging social and economic contingencies of the changing Tolai environment.
CHAPTER 5
LAND TENURE CHANGE AT RAKUNAT SINCE ADJUDICATION

1. FORMAL CHANGES IN LAND TENURE

The Land Titles Commission Act 1962 required the LTC, after the period for review or appeal had expired, to certify the Adjudication Record and forward it to the Registrar of Titles, who was to make such register entries and issue such documents as the LTC directed "to give effect to the decision of the Commission and to register the land in the names of the persons specified in the adjudication record as the owners of the land." On 3 December 1964 another component of the major land law reform of the early 1960s - the Lands Registration (Communally Owned Land) Act 1962 - came into operation. It required the Registrar of Titles to establish the Register of Communally Owned Land, and to enter in that register, inter alia, the land the subject of findings in an adjudication record, and the land owners. Land entered in the register, and any interests in the land, remained "subject in all respects to and regulated by native custom", but an entry in the register was "conclusive evidence of the facts therein stated as at the date of the relevant finding of the Commission." On 26 February 1969 the Rakunat Adjudication Record was certified by the LTC, and forwarded to the Registrar of Titles with directions for the land to be registered. The directions were for entries to be made in the Register of Communally Owned Land, showing in respect of each block "the name or names of the person, persons or group described as the owner". Before this action was taken, however, the operation of the Lands Registration (Communally Owned Land) Act 1962 was suspended, with effect from 16 February 1970.

Suspension of the Act was one consequence of a report by

---

1In Chapter 4 I mentioned that the legislation intended customary land found to be owned by individuals as well as by groups to be entered in the Register of Communally Owned Land.
S. Rowton Simpson (1969), who had been engaged by the Australian Administration with a wide brief to comment on the functions and operations of the LTC. Simpson was highly critical of legislation introduced under the land law reform, and he recommended steps towards a thorough change of the system for registration of customary land. He was particularly concerned that under the Lands Registration (Communally Owned Land) Act 1962 provision was made for "registered individual customary titles" (which he called "a contradiction in terms" - ibid., 13), and that a process was being established for "unregulated private conveyancing" (ibid.), which in his view could "only be disastrous if all the principles of registration of title and Torrens' whole thesis have any validity at all." (Ibid.) Simpson's wide experience of land registration in former British colonies afforded considerable authority to his views, but his report was produced after only minimal investigation (a fact he himself acknowledged - ibid., 3), and there is reason to believe that, in his concern that registration under the Act would produce freely-negotiable titles without the protection of indefeasibility normally provided under the Torrens system, he fundamentally misunderstood the purpose and effect of that legislation.

Simpson's anxiety about "unregulated private conveyancing" arose in part from his interpretation of the Rakunat Adjudication Record, which had by the time of his investigation been presented for registration. He claimed that "the Tolais certainly are now 'dealing-minded'", evidence for which he found in the fact that forty-three of the 133 blocks at Rakunat had been purchased by ikulia (ibid., 13). In the preceding chapter we saw that only fifteen of the ikulia acquisitions were by single individuals, two were by vunatarai, and the remainder were almost all by matriline segments, and that the acquisitions recorded in 1966 ranged over a very long period from original settlement at Rakunat. Only a minority of the transactions, therefore, were "individual dealings", as Simpson described them (ibid.), and the acquisitions were by no means evidence of an increasing incidence of land dealings. His main misunderstanding, however, was in interpreting the adjudication process as leading to the registration of freely-negotiable registered titles, and to this assertion the Administration responded:

However the [Act] providing for this Register does not say this. It merely provides for the issue of a certificate showing who the owners were at the time that the Land Titles
Commission conducted its hearing. It does not provide for changes in ownership from time to time, through natural causes or through sales, leases or other dealings, to be recorded. It does not give any additional rights to deal with customary land than are already provided in other legislation. (Director of Lands, Surveys and Mines, in Papua New Guinea 1969:2052.)

The only "rights to deal with customary land" provided in other legislation confined dealings to disposal of customary land to Papua New Guineans in accordance with custom, or to the Administration.

The Administration felt that final repeal of the Lands Registration (Communally Owned Land) Act 1962 should await the comprehensive review of the registration law which Simpson had also recommended (ibid., 2052-53), and accordingly the operation of the Act was suspended. In 1971 the legislative scheme consequent on Simpson's Report was presented in the House of Assembly but, in the face of strong opposition (see Fingleton 1981: 214), the bills were withdrawn. The Somare-led coalition government won office in the 1972 elections, and in February 1973 set up the Commission of Inquiry into Land Matters. Its Report (Papua New Guinea 1973) has been the basis for land policy formulation since 1973, although its recommendations on customary land registration are yet to be implemented. In the meantime, the demarcation and adjudication activities of the LTC have been terminated, and the operation of the suspended registration law was never revived.

In the absence of the registration intended as the culmination of adjudication proceedings, the legal status of Rakunat Adjudication Record is uncertain. Although both the Land Titles Commission Act 1962 and the Lands Registration (Communally Owned Land) Act 1962 were integral parts of the scheme of land law reform introduced in 1963-64, the former enactment, which set out the LTC's jurisdiction including its jurisdiction in adjudication areas, was independent of the latter, which provided the machinery for registration of all customary land the subject of LTC findings as to ownership. In the case of such findings under the LTC's general jurisdiction to hear and determine disputes and claims, a provision in the Land Titles Commission Act 1962 afforded them the limited indefeasibility of being "final and conclusive" as a statement of the interests existing at the date of the decision. In the case of such findings in an adjudication record, however, it is arguable on the one hand that they attracted the limited indefeasibility of LTC findings under its general jurisdiction, but it is also arguable that their indefeasibility would
only have arisen upon registration, pursuant to a provision giving that effect in the Lands Registration (Communally Owned Land) Act 1962. The difficulty with this interpretation is that the latter provision applied equally to registrations after LTC findings under its general jurisdiction, and in these circumstances it would seem inconsistent to say that one category of LTC decisions were indefeasible before registration, but another category were only indefeasible after registration. Suspension of the registration law was obviously an unforeseen contingency, and, in the absence of judicial determination, whether the findings of block ownership in Rakunat Adjudication Record are to be considered "final and conclusive" as at 14 October 1966 must remain uncertain.

The most important changes in Rakunat land tenure since adjudication are those which occurred internally, in transactions within the village community which continued the process of adjustment to changing land demands observed in the preceding chapter. Even if the Adjudication Record be considered indefeasible as a statement of the interests as at 14 October 1966, the blocks and any interests in the blocks remained "subject in all respects to and regulated by native custom", so transactions valid under Tolai custom would affect the ownership recorded in 1966. Before examining the effects of these transactions, a number of alienations of Rakunat land from customary tenure since 1966 must be considered, and also an apparent abandonment of an area alienated to the Catholic Mission in the last century.

In the preceding chapter it was noted that the LTC, in inquiring into the Demarcation Plan, gave priority to five blocks on the north-eastern boundary, and that this land (Blocks 23 to 27 - see Map 12) was the subject of a special Adjudication Record, made one month before the Record covering the whole Adjudication Area was completed. The five blocks have a total area of 4.11 hectares, and had been recorded as owned by four Rabuana-based vunatarai, and by a male member of Palakuka vunatarai, who had acquired his block by ikulia from one of the Rabuana-based vunatarai. The Administration in 1967 paid a total of $2,565:40 to acquire this land, $1,030:00 of which was paid to the land owners and the balance distributed among the owners of tree crops on the land. In the official report prepared after negotiations the alienation of the land was recommended in consideration of "the wishes of the people and the benefit that a High School will give to the community", but in recognition of their land
shortage it was further recommended that "preference be given to a member selected by the land owning groups of Blocks 23-27" for a lease in one of the Administration's land settlement schemes. Part of a Boisen High School building was constructed across the boundary of the acquired area onto Block 106 (see Map 12), and in 1972 a 10-year lease over the 0.09 hectares affected was negotiated.

Education requirements made other inroads on Rakunat land. Two areas were leased for teacher's housing, all of Block 5 and part of Block 6 adjacent to the beach (see Map 12). Block 6 of 0.20 hectares had been recorded as owned by ToLiakim and his two sisters. It had been acquired by ikulia from Rakunai vunatarai by their father, and they agreed to the Education Department leasing the land and erecting an Administration house. In 1966 the land was leased for 20 years from 1962 (when the site was prepared for building), for a lump sum payment of two hundred and fifty pounds. In 1982 the lease expired, but Rakunai vunatarai recovered the land and house, rejecting the claims of ToLiakim and his sisters. On the leased portion of Block 5, an area of 0.32 hectares, two other Administration houses had been built in 1963. In 1964 a 20-year lease from 1962 was negotiated, for a lump sum payment of one hundred and eighty-eight pounds. This lease also expired in 1982, and the land together with the two houses reverted to Amos Tanti and his eight children, in whose names the block ownership had been recorded in 1966.

Official reports prepared for these alienations mention an "emergency education programme" begun in 1962, and two other blocks in Rakunat Adjudication Area were caught up in the Administration's efforts to acquire land for education purposes. One was Block 108 of 2.11 hectares (see Map 12), the single parcel of alienated land included in the Adjudication Record, which had originally been part of Rakunat vunatarai's matanoi but was according to Rakunat informants acquired by the Catholic Mission in the last century in compensation for the attack on Fr Lannuzel (see Chapter 3). The Mission had used the land for a primary school, but by 1966 all that remained were two unused classroom blocks of little value. In 1966 the Administration

2I have no details on the acquisition of this land, other than that in the German Ground Book the land is shown as having previously been entered in Oertzen's provisional land register. The land would, therefore, have been acquired before 1887. The Lannuzel incident occurred in 1883.
began action to acquire land in and adjacent to Block 108 for a pre-school site, and for housing teachers from Boisen High School and the Waterhouse Memorial Primary School at Nodup. In surveying the land part of the northern boundary of Block 108 could not be established, as the old German survey cement on the foreshore had been encroached on by the sea. The surveyor's view was that the Mission's title extended over part of Block 8 (see Map 12), and that the LTC had mistakenly treated this area as customary land. The Administration negotiated with the Mission to acquire the land in the 1970s, but by 1981 progress was still being frustrated by the survey difficulties. Rakunat informants acknowledge that the Mission had a building on Block 8, but they claim that both blocks were abandoned in the early 1960s. Dimain ToKurapa, the present lualua of Rakunat vunatarai, says that in 1983 the land was returned to him by the Catholic Bishop. 3

In summary, the land permanently alienated in the Adjudication Area - Block 108 owned by the Catholic Mission, Portion 123 owned by the United Church, 4 and Blocks 23 to 27 owned by the State - totals 7.27 hectares in area, or 4.4% of the land in the Adjudication Area. Three small areas (parts of Blocks 106 and 5, and Block 6) totalling 0.61 hectares were temporarily alienated under leases which expired in 1982, and the land plus improvements have reverted to customary tenure. Land alienations have, however, had a far greater impact on land availability in the Rakunat community for, as was mentioned in Chapter 3, most of the vunatarai based at Rakunat formerly held land outside the Adjudication Area, within the precincts of Rabaul town boundary. This land, possibly twice as large again as the Adjudication Area, was partly alienated under German administration, and partly resumed for public purposes by the Australian Administration in 1928 (see New Guinea Gazette No.199 of 19 April 1928). It is currently the subject of proceedings for registration as National Land, under the National Land Registration Act 1977 (see National Gazette No.G4 of 26 January 1984). The Rakunat community has, therefore, had to adapt its

3I am indebted to Dr Christine Bradley for this information, which she collected at my request. Whatever agreement the Bishop may have made, the title to Block 108 (with its uncertain boundary) remains vested in the Catholic Mission.

4The United Church land is shown in the German Ground Book as having been acquired by the German Administration in 1901, and transferred to the Methodist Mission in 1907.
landholdings not only to the internal land requirements for the livelihood of its members, but also to the religious and educational needs of their own and the wider community, and the general public necessity for an urban centre to service the region. There is no doubt Rakunat residents benefit from the proximity of Rabaul in many ways, but the cost in terms of reduced land availability has been considerable.

2. THE CONTINUING PROCESS OF LAND REDISTRIBUTION

My reconstruction of the original settlement pattern at Rakunat in Chapter 3 was based upon the central Tolai concept that land tenure is dependent upon the intensity with which a group can identify with an area, so groups settled at Rakunat at or soon after the whole area had been occupied were classified as either vunatarai based in Rakunat pakanagunan, vunatarai based in other pakanagunan of Nodup paparagunan, or vunatarai based outside Nodup paparagunan. In Chapter 4 I analysed land tenure adjustments made over a century of change in the composition of Rakunat community. The main agents of change were settlement of groups at Rakunat in consequence of a female in-marriage from a vunatarai based outside Nodup paparagunan, marital exchanges between vunatarai based within Nodup paparagunan, and land shortage experienced by the comparatively "land-poor" vunatarai based in Rakunat pakanagunan. Land was exchanged from "land-rich" to members of "land-poor" vunatarai by Tolai customary methods of acquisition in which key elements of the Tolai structure - in particular, associations between vunatarai of the same moiety, and the connection between individuals and their "fathering" vunatarai - were invoked. In the present chapter land tenure change at Rakunat since 1966 will be analysed according to the same basic Tolai tenure criterion - the intensity with which a group acquiring land can identify with the Rakunat area. Consideration of acquisitions will be followed by analysis of the groups which disposed of land, so that the process of land tenure change over the whole period of Tolai settlement at Rakunat may then be addressed in Part III.

From 1966 the Rakunat community, no doubt encouraged by the increased familiarity with administrative procedures engendered by demarcation and adjudication, and convinced of the value of keeping records of land transactions, continued to document changes in their land tenure, through until closure of the LTC office in Rabaul in the
mid-1970s. These records (see Appendix F for an example\(^5\)), although lacking any statutory authority, are of considerable evidentiary value, and from confirmation during fieldwork I have no doubt as to their reliability. As mentioned in the preceding section, even if the LTC findings of block ownership in the Adjudication Record as at 1966 were indefeasible short of registration, the land remained subject to and regulated by custom, and transactions valid under custom would alter the ownership therein recorded. Closure of the LTC office in Rabaul arrested this recording activity, but it was apparent that my arrival at Rakunat in 1981 was perceived as an opportunity to renew the record-making, and many persons came forward for the details of transactions to be documented. Other acquisitions became apparent during fieldwork. The following account of land tenure developments at Rakunat since adjudication, therefore, draws upon a body of evidence - both written and oral - which I am satisfied contains all significant land transactions conducted during that period.\(^6\)

A final matter concerning the records of transactions needs mention. Invariably the land involved in a transaction was identified by a land name only (see, e.g., Appendix F). Many of these land names corresponded with names of blocks entered in the Adjudication Record (see, e.g., Appendix C), and associated details usually confirmed that the land involved in the transaction was the block so named in the Adjudication Record. On other occasions the land name was new,\(^7\) and the land involved could not always be located from the associated details of the transaction. But even where the block in question could be identified, the transaction often only affected part of the block. In the following treatment, therefore, it will not always be possible to locate the land involved in a transaction precisely, and, as there were no follow-up surveys, the areas cannot be established. While no doubt the boundaries of each parcel the subject of a transaction are identifiable on the ground, the level of accuracy possible in the preceding chapter (where each block could be located from the Demarcation Plan, and areas calculated) cannot be achieved in this chapter.

\(^5\) Many of the records were in Kuanua or Tok Pisin.

\(^6\) No rigorous attempt was made to document transactions affecting land in the undifferentiated Rakunat Reserve (Block 76).

\(^7\) I mentioned in the preceding chapter that Tolai land identification practice allows for increasing degrees of specificity. Land for which the name was new would be *pakana pia* within named *pakana pia*. 
In the sixteen years between completion of the Adjudication Record in October 1966 and final fieldwork at Rakunat in October 1982 a total of forty-two transactions affecting the ownership of blocks was documented in the manner already described. The transactions will be analysed first in their capacity as land acquisitions, and then as land dispositions.

(i) Land acquisitions

All recorded acquisitions were in favour of either a single individual, or more usually a number of individuals who comprised a small matriline segment of a vunatarai. Following the basic classification under Tolai tenure adopted in the two preceding chapters, the acquisitions will be analysed under three categories, by reference to the place of origin of the vunatarai whose members acquired the land. Table 5.1 lists the forty-two acquisitions in this manner, the first category being vunatarai based outside Nodup paparagunan, the second being vunatarai based in the pakanagunan of Nodup paparagunan other than Rakunat, and the third being vunatarai based in Rakunat pakanagunan.

(a) Acquisitions by members of vunatarai based outside Nodup paparagunan

The members of five vunatarai fall into this category, being responsible between them for a total of nine acquisitions (see Table 5.1). Members of ToLonglong vunatarai, based at Rapolo in the Malaguna pakanagunan (see Map 4), acquired four parcels, all from Rakunat vunatarai. Something approaching an exchange of marriage partners between these two vunatarai exists, for in recent generations two (possibly three) men from Rakunat vunatarai married women from ToLonglong, and another marriage was contracted between a Rakunat

---

8To those familiar with Tok Pisin the name may cause amusement. "Longlong" means stupid or mad, deriving from the Kuanua word of the same meaning. It is a fairly common Tolai name, in this case probably being the name of the vunatarai's founding ancestor, though why he was so called can only be speculated.
Table 5.1 Vunatarai whose members acquired land at Rakunat since adjudication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vunatarai</th>
<th>Pakanagunan</th>
<th>Paparagunan</th>
<th>No. of acquisitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ToLonglong</td>
<td>Rapolo</td>
<td>Malaguna</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rarup</td>
<td>Matupit</td>
<td>Matupit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ToValingen</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vunalagir</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bauvik</td>
<td>Tavui</td>
<td>Tavui</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Category 2**  |             |             |                    |
| 6. Mamanuba     | Baai        | Nodup       | 9                  |
| 7. Kiur         | "           | "           | 3                  |
| 8. Tuturokin    | Matalau     | "           | 6                  |
| 9. Kuraoko      | "           | "           | 1                  |
| 10. Kurategete  | Nodup       | "           | 3                  |
| 11. Tamanakulap | "           | "           | 1                  |
| 12. Vunaimuli   | "           | "           | 1                  |
| 13. Namabuk     | Korere      | "           | 1                  |
| 14. Raim        | "           | "           | 1                  |
| **Sub-total:**  |             |             | **26**             |

| **Category 3**  |             |             |                    |
| 15. Tinganabalbal Rakunat | Nodup |        | 4                  |
| 16. Palakuka    | "           | "           | 2                  |
| 17. Vunatoboai  | "           | "           | 1                  |
| **Sub-total:**  |             |             | **7**              |
| **Total:**      |             |             | **42**             |
A woman and a man. No genealogy under the name ToLonglong was compiled by the LTC in the Malagna area, and, although ToLonglong is regarded as related to Vunakokor vunatarai, no genealogical connection between the three Marmar-moiety vunatarai of that name in the Malagna vicinity and the ToLonglong members resident at Rakunat could be established. It is possible that an exchange of marriage partners between Rakunat and ToLonglong vunatarai reflected a similar exchange relationship between the parent group of ToLonglong at Malagna and Vunavavav vunatarai, the Malagna-based offshoot of Rakunat vunatarai (see Chapter 3). In the absence of a ToLonglong genealogy this could not be established, nor could all the relationships between the ToLonglong members who figure in the ownership of the four acquired parcels. The details of these acquisitions are as follows:

- Block 46 (part) acquired for the adopted children of IaParaide;
- Block 90 (part) acquired for the children of IaMalom;
- Block 90 (part) acquired for one son of IaMalom;
- Block 62 (part) acquired for the children of IaPidak.

The first acquisition involved Rakunat vunatarai land containing the house, some cash crops and food gardens of Dimain ToKurapa, the present lualua of the vunatarai, and his wife IaParaide, a member of ToLonglong. The couple had no natural children, but they adopted three daughters and a son. Two of the adopted daughters were members of ToLonglong, being IaParaide's sister's daughter and sister's daughter's daughter. The third adopted daughter was a Tinganabalbal vunatarai member, but was "fathered" by Rakunat vunatarai, being the daughter of ToKurapa's mother's sister's son. The adopted son was a member of Livuan vunatarai, but was "fathered" by Tuturokin vunatarai, a long-standing associate of Rakunat. The pattern of adoption of the first three children, who are consanguineally related to either IaParaide or ToKurapa, is shown in Diagram 5.1.

In discussing marriage choice in Chapter 2 I noted that in some localities the distribution of marriages approached a pattern of exchange between vunatarai. As Epstein indicates, the Tolai have no institutionalised system of marital exchange between vunatarai (1969: 212), but at Rakunat I discerned a limited pattern of continuing exchange, just as Epstein did at Matupit (ibid., 215). The case mentioned in the text does represent a statistical concentration of marriages between Rakunat and ToLonglong vunatarai, not present for other marriages at Rakunat.
Diagram 5.1: ToLonglong vunatarai segment
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An account of the transaction recorded in 1973 contains a statement by ToKurapa that he had received or borrowed from his (adopted) children *(mi bin kisim or [sic] dinau long ol pikinini bilong mi)* 50 fathoms of tabu, and that their (adoptive) mother had been pressing him for its return. He had consulted with the then lualua of his vunatarai about the possibility of giving the children a piece of land in return for the 50 fathoms of tabu, and the lualua had told him that, as he had a house built from permanent materials on part of Block 46, this land should now belong to his children. The arrangement had been approved by twelve named members of Rakunat vunatarai, and also by the lualua of Vunavavar, their related vunatarai at Malaguna. There is a further record of this transaction in 1974, in which it is simply stated that the land was purchased by IaParaide from Rakunat vunatarai for 50 fathoms of tabu for her three named children, one of the adopted daughters being omitted. During fieldwork IaParaide claimed that she had bought the land for her children, and on another occasion ToKurapa said that he had given the land to one of his adopted daughters, because he had kept the bridewealth paid at her marriage. This was one of the few acquisitions where the nature of the transaction was specified in some detail in the documentary records, and a couple of general points emerge.

Firstly, many of the formal records contain only rudimentary details, of which the 1974 account of the transaction given above is a good example. It appears as a straightforward acquisition by a woman of land from her husband's vunatarai for her named children. The 1973 account, however, together with information given during fieldwork, gives a different complexion to the transaction. A simple initial point is the omission of one of the daughters in the 1973 record of the transaction. There is no apparent reason for her omission, and during fieldwork in 1981 her name was included with the other three adopted children as a beneficiary of the acquisition. The omission can only have been fortuitous, and many other examples were found of persons' names being omitted, although they were intended to participate in the benefits of a land acquisition and were, indeed, found during fieldwork to be so participating. One general point, then, is that written records cannot be accepted as conclusive, even on the details which they do contain.

A second point is the more general one, that the whole nature of a transaction may be fundamentally different from how it appears on
the written record. The present case is exceptional in that the 1974 record of acquisition is supplemented by ToKurapa's statement, so that what at first sight appears to be a simple purchase is found to involve the repayment of an obligation. But it is ToKurapa's remark made during fieldwork which accounts for that obligation, and thereby reveals the full nature of the transaction. It now appears that upon the marriage of one of his adopted daughters ToKurapa received the bridewealth himself, rather than its going to the daughter's vunatarai as would usually happen. Such receipt by a father of his eldest daughter's bridewealth is an accepted practice (see Chapter 2), but it carries with it the obligation on the father to provide land for the daughter. The 50 fathoms of tabu was his daughter's bridewealth (or part of it), and in receiving it ToKurapa was under an obligation to her vunatarai (including her mother and adoptive siblings). The tabu was incorporated in ToKurapa's loloi (coil of tabu) and became part of Rakunat vunatarai's accumulated wealth. In exchange for the tabu the vunatarai agreed that IaParaide and her adopted children should have part of the vunatarai land. In the circumstances of this case recourse to the practice may be connected with the fact that the daughter's vunatarai is based at Rapolo, a considerable distance from Rakunat, and she is therefore remote from her own vunatarai land. But use of this practice is not confined to such circumstances, as later examples will show.  

The second ToLonglong acquisition listed above also involved Rakunat vunatarai land (part of the large Block 90) acquired for the children of a Rakunat vunatarai male who married a female member (IaMalom) of ToLonglong. The man was Jack ToVuru, and although the record of the transaction names only his two natural children as beneficiaries of the acquisition, during fieldwork an adopted child (his wife's sister's son, also a ToLonglong member) was included in the parcel ownership. The third acquisition, also involving part of Block 90, was in favour of one of IaMalom's sons, and resulted from an unusual event by which magic was performed to render a moramoro (meeting ground of the iniet secret society - see Chapter 2) safe for cultivation. Although attempts to exterminate the iniet society date from the earliest period of European settlement, fear of its magical powers and the objects and areas associated with its activities still

---

10The practice is analysed in Chapter 6.
remains influential. Increasing population has forced even such dangerous places to be brought within the ambit of land available for cultivation, and ToKurapa's account of the proceedings in this case was as follows:

Before, not a single person could occupy a moramoro. My two kandere, ToNgapipi and Turagik, however, did something, ... I am not sure what; they worked magic on it. They then cleared it, cutting down the bush. They discovered some iniet stones there, so they got some leaves from a tree, and my kandere, a very old man, put some banana leaves over the stones. You could see that the stones heated up the banana leaves; they still had life in them. "Look at the banana leaves - they are weeping. The stones are still alive!" The people are using the land now, planting coconuts and so on. But magic has been performed to enable this, otherwise they would become sick.

ToNgapipi and Turagik were members of Rakunat vunatarai, and because they had rendered the land safe for cultivation they were entitled to nominate who could occupy it. ToNgapipi nominated a son of ToVuru and IaMalom, a ToLonglong member, but I was advised in 1984 that a Rakunat vunatarai member is now challenging his occupation. Turagik nominated his own son, who is a member of Namabuk vunatarai based at Korere, so his acquisition will be dealt with under the second category. The fourth acquisition, of part of Block 62, was effect by a Rakunat vunatarai male in favour of his children. Their mother IaPidak is a member of a Malaguna-based vunatarai, but the evidence that it is ToLonglong is only circumstantial, and could not be confirmed in the absence of a genealogy for that vunatarai.

Members of three vunatarai based at Matupit in the Matupit paparagunan gained four land parcels in post-adjudication acquisitions (see Table 5.1). The two acquisitions in favour of members of Rarup vunatarai involved the same persons - IoLea and her children. IoLea's mother in-married from Matupit to Rakunat, to a member of Vunatabun vunatarai, the segment of a Pila Pila-based group long resident at Rakunat (see Chapter 2). Apart from the fact that IoLea and her children have no access to land in Rakunat through vunatarai membership, and that the status of her father's occupation there was tenuous (like for the other Vunatabun members), their land access was further restricted by the fact that IoLea's husband Toiun is himself a migrant to Rakunat. He was born at Mioko on the Duke of York Islands, and was brought to Rakunat as a child to attend the school at Nodup by a woman from Tinganabalbal vunatarai (IeLisabet), who adopted him. Two parcels of Nekupia vunatarai land, both apparently in Block 89, had
been planted to coconuts by IoLea's father, who worked as a catechist at Rabuana. After his death the lualua of Nekupia suggested that the planted areas be acquired, so IoLea bought one area for herself and her children, and her husband ToIun bought the other area for one of the sons.

A single parcel, part of Block 34, was acquired by IePinia, a member of ToValingen, the second Matupit-based vunatarai. IePinia's mother had in-married from Matupit to Rakunat, to ToBoboko, a member of Rakunat vunatarai, which was recorded in 1966 as the owner of Block 34. The Adjudication Record shows IePinia and her children as the owners of Block 101 (her father ToBoboko was also included, wrongly according to Rakunat informants), as a result of a pre-adjudication acquisition. ToValingen proved to be a Rakunat-based segment of Ragalgalir vunatarai from Matupit, of which five brothers were recorded as owning Block 19 in 1966, their mother also having in-married from Matupit. ToBoboko had first given part of Block 34 to his daughter IePinia, and then later paid ikulia for it to his vunatarai, at the suggestion of ToKurapa the present lualua. This is an instance of the confirmation by payment of a previous gift of land, already mentioned in Chapter 4. The final acquisition in favour of members of a Matupit-based vunatarai was the purchase by Benson Tabu, the lualua of Rakunai vunatarai, of about half a hectare in Block 92 from his vunatarai for house sites for his children. Tabu's wife, IaVartovo, is a member of Vunalagir vunatarai. As in the preceding case, she and her children had been the beneficiaries of a pre-adjudication acquisition (of Block 84 - see Appendix E).

Last of the vunatarai based outside Nodup paperaganun, Bauvik is based at Tavui 1 in the Tavui paperaganun. In Chapter 3 the presence of a major segment of Bauvik vunatarai at Rakunat was seen to have stemmed from a female in-marriage from Tavui about 1900, and their attempts in recent decades to establish a madapai at Rakunat were discussed. In 1966 Bauvik was recorded as owning land in Rakunat Reserve, while three blocks were found to be owned by members of the vunatarai segment. In the post-adjudication acquisition a further parcel (part of Block 127) was acquired by ikulia payment to Nekupia vunatarai by a man for the benefit of his children, who are members of the Rakunat-based segment of Bauvik vunatarai (IaKurai's children - see Diagram 4.2). The same land was the subject of an earlier disposition to a member of a Baai-based vunatarai (Mamanuba), which
will be dealt with under the next category. The conflicting dispositions, by two men contesting the leadership of Nekupia vunatarai, are only one manifestation of the legacy of confusion left by the attachment of a Malaguna-based segment to the genuine membership of Nekupia vunatarai, discussed in Chapter 3. In the case of the present disposition it is significant that ToIsaea, the father of IaKurai whose children acquired the land, was the leader of that Malaguna-based segment.

This completes consideration of the nine acquisitions by members of vunatarai based outside Nodup paparagunan. As was observed in the last chapter for the acquisitions in this category recorded in 1966, a common feature of all such outsider groups whose members acquired land was that their presence at Rakunat was the result of a locally-exogamous marriage by a female matrilineal ancestor. Members of groups so placed have no local identity at Rakunat, and resort must therefore be had to connections with paternal kin and Tolai customary methods of acquisition to meet their land needs. In five of the nine acquisitions a male acquired land from his own vunatarai for his children, and in a sixth case (the exceptional moramoro acquisition) the vunatarai land was acquired by a male for the children of a fellow vunatarai member. The individuals in all these cases acquired the land of their "fathering" vunatarai. In a seventh case, the last acquisition considered, the acquired land belonged to Nekupia vunatarai, whose affairs had long been dominated by the maternal grandfather of the persons in whose favour the land was acquired. The last two acquisitions in this category also involved Nekupia land, which had been planted to coconuts by the maternal grandfather of the land-acquiring persons. This man was a member of Vunatabun vunatarai, the Pila Pila-based group which had long associated with Nekupia and occupied its landholdings at Rakunat (see Chapter 3). The connections invoked in these final cases are not with paternal kin as such, but the same concept is involved, for the land in question in each case belonged to the land-acquiring persons' mother's paternal kin - "kin" in these instances having an extended meaning to denote associated vunatarai.

(b) Acquisitions by members of vunatarai based in Nodup paparagunan, but outside Rakunat pakanagunan

The members of nine vunatarai fall into this second category,
being responsible between them for a total of twenty-six acquisitions (see Table 5.1). Twelve acquisitions were in favour of members of two vunatarai based in Baai pakanagunan south-east of Rakunat, seven in favour of two Matalau-based vunatarai members and five for members of three Nodup-based vunatarai, with the remaining two acquisitions being in favour of members of two vunatarai based at Korere north of Rakunat. Of the two Baai-based vunatarai, members of a segment of Mamanuba vunatarai were between them responsible for nine acquisitions. The members of the segment are set out in Diagram 5.2. They had already been active in acquiring land at Rakunat before 1966, for the Adjudication Record shows Block 105 as owned by ToPeu, his sister IaDorti and her children, and his sister IaMila and her children, and Block 125 as owned by ToPeu (see Appendix E).

The mother of these three siblings, IaTagaula, moved after marriage from Baai to Rakunat around 1920. She married ToLiaser, later to become lualua of ToKubo vunatarai and an active promoter of his vunatarai's land interests at Rakunat (see Chapter 3). The couple had five children, of whom two died young. IaMila, the elder daughter, married a Rakunat vunatarai member around 1945 and had twelve children—five daughters and seven sons. The other daughter IaDorti married ToPidik, a ToKubo vunatarai member and the son of her father's sister11 (see Diagram 5.2), and had eleven children—six daughters and five sons. ToPeu, IaTagaula's only surviving son, did not marry. He had polio as a child and has no use of his legs, but despite this handicap he has a reputation as one of the most active farmers in Rakunat. The details of the nine acquisitions by members of this matriline segment are as follows:

Block 72 (part) acquired for two sons of IaMila;
(Unidentified parcel) acquired for three sons and a daughter of IaMila;
Block 73 (part) acquired for the children of IaMila;
Block 62 (part) acquired for the children of IaMila;
Block 90 (part) acquired for the children of IaMila;
Block 60 acquired for the children of IaMila;
Block 43 (part) acquired for two sons and a daughter of IaDorti;

11 The single instance encountered during fieldwork of a marriage between cross-cousins (nauvana). Such a relationship is regarded as too close for marriage, but I was advised that 100 fathoms of tabu was paid "to settle the matter", and that ToLiaser, the father of IaDorti and maternal uncle of ToPidik, agreed to the marriage because ToKubo vunatarai was close to extinction, and he wanted IaDorti's children to take over the vunatarai land.
Diagram 5.2: Mamanuba vunatarai segment
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Block 89 (?) (part) acquired for a daughter of IaDorti; Block 127 (part) acquired for ToPeu.

IaMila and her husband ToKaviria, on one occasion together with her brother ToPeu, effected six acquisitions, all in favour of IaMila's twelve children. They have been listed above in order of the date of acquisition. The first transaction involves Block 72, and was effected in 1967 immediately after adjudication. In 1966 Block 72 was recorded as owned by ToVultonia, a member of Ramaravot vunatarai based at Talwat on the southern tip of Crater Peninsula, whose mother had in-married from there to Rakunat. She married a member of Vunatutukadek vunatarai from Rabuana, which had originally owned Block 72, and this man had acquired the land from his vunatarai by ikulia for his son ToVultonia. ToVultonia married two women, one a member of Rakunat vunatarai and the other a member of Vagai vunatarai, based at Matalau. By his first wife he had three children, one of whom was ToKaviria, the husband of IaMila, and by his second wife he had eleven children. When ToVultonia acquired the land, his intention was that it should be shared between the children of his two wives, and for some time all of them worked together on the land with their father. In 1967 the eldest child, ToKaviria, acquired part of the land from his father by ikulia for the benefit of two of his sons. During fieldwork ToWaai, the lualua of Vunatoboai vunatarai, said that after ToVultonia died, followed by the death of ToKaviria in the late 1970s, the eldest daughter of ToVultonia by his second marriage, IaTatar, attempted to oust ToKaviria's children from the land. IaMila, however, resisted, and the block was eventually "divided between the two lines - the children of the first wife, and of the second."

As ToWaai exclaimed, "Too many wives create too many problems." The remark has a special significance in a matrilineal society, for the children of each wife belong to different vunatarai, and cannot be assumed to have a community of interest - particularly where there is competition for scarce resources. The case is also significant as an illustration of the necessity for a further transaction in order that the male beneficiary of an original acquisition may pass the land on to his children. ToVultonia's acquisition was for the benefit of himself and his children by his two wives, one family being a segment of Rakunat vunatarai and the other being a segment of Vagai vunatarai. During ToVultonia's life his son ToKaviria, a Rakunat member, made a payment to him, which in effect settled any claims by ToVultonia's
vunatarai to the land concerned, and entitled ToKaviria's children, members of Mamanuba vunatarai, to remain on the land. The two other children from the first marriage were both sons, so while they would have rights to the land stemming from their father's acquisition, their own children would have no entitlement in the absence of a further payment to ToVultonia's vunatarai. As there were no daughters from this marriage, the question of an entitlement in a Rakunat vunatarai segment based on descent did not arise. From ToVultonia's second marriage there were seven sons and four daughters, all of whom would have a claim on the land arising from his original acquisition. Only the children of the four daughters, however, could sustain a claim in the next generation, and for the son's children to have an entitlement there would have to have been a payment to ToVultonia, similar to ToKaviria's payment. He now having died, it is likely that the land the children from the second marriage now occupy (after the block was divided) is regarded as belonging to the Vagai vunatarai segment which they comprise, and a payment to that vunatarai would be necessary in order for the son's children to remain on the land.

The second transaction involved the ikulia payment by ToKaviria to ToGagau, a member of Rakunat vunatarai, for a parcel originally owned by Kurapitil vunatarai. ToKaviria acquired the land for three of his sons and a daughter. The land cannot be identified from the record of the transaction, but it may have involved Block 52 or 58, the two parcels recorded as owned by Kurapitil in 1966. ToGagau's entitlement to dispose of it arose from the fact that Kurapitil was his "fathering" vunatarai, and as ToGagau's mother had made contributions to the funerary feast when a Kurapitil big-man died the land had been given to him. Rakunat informants said that in former times when land was relatively plentiful land was often given in recognition of services rendered, but that with increasing population pressure land gifts in general could no longer be relied upon to give secure tenure.

Third of the six acquisitions involving IaMila and her husband ToKaviria was the ikulia purchase in 1968 by them and IaMila's brother ToPeu of part of Block 73, which adjoins Block 72 mentioned in the first acquisition for IaMila's children. Block 73 was recorded in 1966 as owned by Rakunat vunatarai, of which ToKaviria was a member, so the transaction is another case of individuals gaining land from their "fathering" vunatarai. Two payments were made, one for the land
and the second shortly afterwards for coconut and cocoa trees on the land to IaTatar, ToKaviria's half-sister, who had planted them. In specifying IaMila's children as the beneficiaries it was stipulated that neither her sister IaDorti nor her children had any interest in the land. Singular features of the transaction are that it was effected in favour of children by their parents and the mother's brother, that the beneficiaries were confined to those children and there was no extension of beneficiaries through the vunatarai segment at that level of generation, and, thirdly, that in making payment a distinction was drawn between the land and crops planted on it. Tolai, in common with other Melanesian peoples, differentiate where necessary between ownership of land and ownership of crops, although usually there is a correspondence between the two. In the case of acquired land, because most acquisitions are in favour of persons who have already been in long-term occupation of the land (as I will discuss in Chapter 6), the land-acquirers would frequently have planted the crops on it. Where tree crops (e.g., coconuts) had been planted by members of the land-disposing vunatarai, the ikulia payment for the land can be taken as including payment for the crops. In the present case, however, because the owner of the tree crops, IaTatar, was not a member of the land-disposing vunatarai, a separate payment to her was made. IaTatar was the eldest daughter of ToKaviria's father's second marriage, and her name has already come up in the above examination of the first acquisition in favour of this Hamanuba vunatarai segment. She lives on Block 72, adjoining Block 73, and an overplanting by her of the crops in question into Block 73 is indicated.

The fourth transaction took place in the mid-1970s, again being an acquisition by ToKaviria for his children of his own vunatarai land. The record of the transaction stipulates that it was "for residential purposes, not for planting cocoa and coconuts" (ure ra kiki, vakir ure ra kakao ba lama). The land concerned part of Block 62, a section of the large original Rakunat vunatarai landholding around its madapai, where as will be seen many Rakunat members and their families now reside in what is formally Rakunat village. In 1980 another acquisition involving Rakunat vunatarai land in the vicinity of Rakunat village was effected. The land in question is within Block 90, and IaMila is said to have acquired it by ikulia so that her children, some of whom were working in other Provinces, could
have a place to return to and build houses. The sixth and last acquisition in favour of IaMila's children was one in effect "transacted" during fieldwork. The parcel concerned is Block 60 of 0.46 hectares, one of the ten blocks recorded in 1966 as owned by the Nodup-based ToKubo vunatarai. IaMila's father, ToLiaser, was the former lualua of ToKubo. In the last two generations twenty-nine members were born into this vunatarai, but many of them were killed by a bomb during World War II, and its membership has been reduced to four males, one of whom, Taupa, is the sole survivor of the fourteen members in ToLiaser's generation. Being on the verge of extinction some of the vunatarai's landholdings are being distributed. During fieldwork in 1981 Taupa came forward and declared that he was giving Block 60 to IaMila's children.

Two of the remaining three acquisitions in favour of members of the Mamanuba vunatarai segment involved the children of IaMila's sister, IaDorti. She, it will be remembered, married her cross-cousin ToPidik, and they have eleven children, the eldest born about 1947. Shortly after adjudication the two parents acquired part of Block 43 from Tinganabalbal vunatarai, naming two sons and a daughter as the intended beneficiaries. In my investigation during fieldwork of the occupation of Block 43, it emerged that ToPidik was living with his wife IaDorti in a house they had built on the land. In response to my query how they came to be living there a Tinganabalbal spokesman said that they had heard that the couple were "a bit short of land", and they had agreed to their building a house on Block 43, because ToPidik had married "a woman from our moiety" (meri long bisnis bilong mipela). The ikulia payment was made to the then lualua of Tinganabalbal, and the house had been built. When I asked whether the acquisition was only for residential purposes, the reply was no, the land had been bought. The second acquisition appears in a 1974 record of a transaction, where it is stated that ToPidik purchased a named parcel of land from ToUva of Nekupia vunatarai for his eldest daughter. The land cannot be conclusively located, but from its name it may be in Block 89 in the vicinity of Block 37.

ToPeu, the brother of IaMila and IaDorti, has already figured in one transaction, being the joint acquisition with IaMila and her husband ToKaviria of part of Block 73. He was also involved in two pre-adjudication acquisitions. Last of the nine transactions involving this Rakunat-based segment of Mamanuba vunatarai was an
Ikuilia acquisition by ToPeu in 1970 of Nekupia vunatarai land, stated in a 1974 record to have been acquired "for himself". The subject land is named "Kurakukup No.1", but it is in fact part of Block 127 (named "Nekupia" in the Adjudication Record, wrongly it is said), over some at least of which a further transaction was effected in 1973 by ToBola, in favour of his children who are members of Bauvik vunatarai (see above).

The other Baai-based vunatarai whose members acquired land in post-adjudication transactions is Kiur. The members of the vunatarai segment involved in their three acquisitions are shown in Diagram 5.3, being the children of IaTeniana who moved from Baai to Rakunat after her marriage to ToPanipas, a member of Vunatabun, the Rakunat-based segment of a vunatarai from Pila Pila. Details of the three acquisitions are as follows:

Block 10 (part) acquired for the children of IaTeniana;
Block 89 (part) acquired for a son of IaTeniana;
Block 89 (part) acquired for another son of IaTeniana.

The first transaction involved Block 10, part of Rakunat vunatarai's original landholdings, but recorded in 1966 as owned by Tioap of Vunatabun vunatarai (see Diagram 5.3), having been acquired by Ikuilia from Rakunat vunatarai. The ownership of this land is at present disputed, with claims being made to it at two levels - at one refuting a Vunatabun acquisition, and at the second relying on such an acquisition, but claiming a further transaction between Vunatabun and Kiur vunatarai.

Firstly, the Rakunat vunatarai leadership dispute the fact that Tioap acquired the land from them. They acknowledge that a payment was made "a long time ago", but they claim that it was only a totokom payment of five fathoms of tabu to use the land for one garden cycle. The progressive infiltration of the Rakunat community by Vunatabun members and their associates from Pila Pila was discussed in Chapter 3, and their pre-adjudication land acquisitions were treated in Chapter 4. A central factor in the Rakunat claims at this level (and also in the Kiur segment claims at the second level) is that Tioap, who died soon after adjudication, was widely regarded as a very powerful sorcerer. In response to my question why objection was not taken to Tioap being recorded as the owner of Block 10 in 1966, the Rakunat vunatarai leaders said that if anyone had spoken up against him they would have died. Tioap himself having died, the Rakunat
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claims are now being advanced, although the leaders say that they are agreeable to those presently in occupation of the land (including Tioap's children) remaining there.

The claims at the second level were put during fieldwork by IaPailingan, the eldest daughter of Tioap's brother ToPanipas (see Diagram 5.3). She claimed that there were in fact three payments relating to this land. The first was made before World War II by her father to Rakunat vunatarai, the amount being 70 fathoms of tabu. She clearly regarded this payment as being an acquisition of the land, although she acknowledged that Rakunat vunatarai recovered the land afterwards, and in this respect the Rakunat claim that the pre-War payment was only for gardening rights gains some support. There is a major discrepancy in the two versions of payment made (5 and 70 fathoms of tabu), and the present Rakunat leadership say they know nothing of a major payment. IaPailingan said that after World War II a second payment of eighty pounds and 80 fathoms of tabu was made by her brother ToLavuvur to Rakunat vunatarai, and that during demarcation proceedings their father ToPanipas asserted that the land belonged to his children. In 1966, however, ToPanipas died - an event for which, in IaPailingan's view, his brother Tioap was responsible. Tioap "straightaway grabbed the land", and as no-one was willing to resist his claims he was entered in the Adjudication Record as the owner.

By this stage IaPailingan and the other children of ToPanipas appear to have reluctantly accepted the necessity of dealing with Tioap, and a third payment of $40 and 20 fathoms of tabu for half of the block was made to him by IaPailingan and her sister IaTapiva. Occupation of the block today reflects this division, with some of Tioap's children living on one half, and some of ToPanipas' children, and four children of one daughter Iai!adin, living on the other. In the background there is the claim by Rakunat vunatarai that the land was never purchased (they made no mention of ToLavuvur's payment), but the present leadership agree to the current occupiers remaining there, and they say they have plenty of land for their membership, so the claim is lying dormant at present.

Two other acquisitions in favour of members of this Kiur

---

12 Such subjective statements ring rather false, given the general pressure on land at Rakunat. Actual land availability at Rakunat is examined in Chapter 6.
vunatarai segment were mentioned during fieldwork, both involving the large Block 89 containing Nekupia vunatarai's madapai. Tikel, IaTeniana's eldest son (see Diagram 5.3), was said to be living on land bought by ikulia by his sisters IaPailingan, IaTapiva and IaMadin, with IaMadin's husband, Daniel ToWaai, the lualua of Yunatoboi vunatarai, also contributing to the payment. Another son, ToMaiding, was said to be living on part of Block 89 which he had acquired himself by ikulia from Nekupia vunatarai. In explanation of this latter acquisition I was told that ToMaiding's father, ToPanipas, had lived there with the lualua of Nekupia, ToPuipui, his kandere (in the classificatory sense of being a male member of a vunatarai of the same moiety at a generation higher than ToPuipui's - see Appendix A), and that ToMaiding was ToPuipui's nauvana (in the classificatory sense of being a member of a vunatarai of the opposite moiety at the same generation as ToPuipui).

Seven post-adjudication acquisitions were effected in favour of members of two Matalau-based vunatarai - Tuturokin in six cases and Kuraoko in the seventh. Tuturokin vunatarai does not appear under that name in the LTC genealogies, although two parcels (Blocks 64 and 66) with a total area of 3.53 hectares were recorded in 1966 as owned by a female member of Tuturokin, IaPuputa, in one case together with her adopted children (see Appendix E). IaPuputa appears on the genealogy of Vagai vunatarai, as do some others of the named membership of Tuturokin, and it is apparent that Tuturokin is a segment of Vagai, which is based at Matalau. A female Tuturokin member, IaMamar, figures in five of the six acquisitions for Tuturokin members, the relationships involved being shown in Diagram 5.4. Female members of the matriline segment have been marrying male residents of Rakunat for at least the last four generations. Details of the six acquisitions are as follows:

Block 89 (part) acquired for the children of IaMamar;
(Unidentified parcel) acquired for IaMamar;
Block 28 acquired for the children of IaMamar;
Block 35 acquired for the children of IaMamar;
Block 39 acquired for IaMamar and her adoptive siblings IaKapana and ToMoragu;
Block 62 (part) acquired for Siapan Boas.

IaMamar is the only child of IaNamiau and ToKiriat, a male member of

---

13Under the name "IaBit", a mis-spelling of her first name "IaIdit".
Diagram 5.4: Tuturokin vunatarai segment
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Vunatabun, the Rakunat-based segment of a Pila Pila vunatarai. She married Tuat Semi, whose maternal uncle Rusiat Tuat was lualua of Tinganabalbal vunatarai at the time of adjudication, and the couple have five children, the eldest of whom is now 20 years old. Acquisitions for the children's land needs began around 1966, although Tuat Semi, himself from a comparatively "land-poor" vunatarai (see Table 4.4), had acquired Block 57 before adjudication, together with his sister. During fieldwork it was acknowledged that at the time of adjudication Tuat Semi had made it clear to his vunatarai that he intended his children to share in the ownership of Block 57, but by 1981 he said he had accepted that the land would pass to his sister's children, and that his own children had no interests - a clear example of claims based on matrilineal descent prevailing over patrilineality.

First of the transactions listed above was an ikulia acquisition of part of Block 89 from Nekupia vunatarai by IaMamar for her children. The second acquisition involved an unidentified parcel of Tinganabalbal vunatarai land, said to have been purchased by IaMamar for herself, but evidently with a view to her children participating in the acquisition - another example of land being acquired for individuals from their "fathering" vunatarai. Three acquisitions then took place in the early 1970s, one being the purchase of Block 28 of 1.17 hectares by Tuat Semi from Tiratira vunatarai for his children. A second parcel acquired was Block 35 of 0.18 hectares, recorded in 1966 as owned by Nekupia vunatarai. The background of this acquisition is more complex, involving a number of the relationships shown on Diagram 5.4.

In the record of the LTC inquiry into the Demarcation Plan there is brief mention of Block 35, said to have been the subject of a dispute between ToUva and ToPelis. By 1966 ToUva was lualua of the Malaguna-based segment which had attached itself to Nekupia vunatarai (see Chapter 3), and he and ToPuipui - the lualua of the genuine Nekupia membership - were contesting leadership of the vunatarai. When ToPuipui stated that his vunatarai had given Block 35 to ToLison of Vunatabun vunatarai (see Diagram 5.4) ToUva acknowledged the gift before the LTC, but asserted that because ToLison had died and there had been no payment, the land should revert to Nekupia vunatarai.

---

14Rusiat Tuat's wife was IaPuputa, the Tuturokin member recorded in the 1966 ownership of Blocks 64 and 66 - see above in the text.
ToPelis did not appear before the LTC and the nature of his claim is not apparent, but he was the son of the first marriage of IaRuti (a Tuturokin member, see Diagram 5.4), who later married ToPuang the lualua of Nekupia, and it is probable that his claim derived from a disposition of the land by his "father" on him. The mature coconut and cocoa trees on the land today are said to have been planted by ToMata'apa, a half-brother of ToPelis, whose tenure would similarly have derived from his father. In the absence of ToPelis to support his claim, the LTC recorded Block 35 as Nekupia vunatarai land. In a 1974 record of a transaction it is stated that IaMamar paid ikulia for the land to Nekupia vunatarai, acquiring it for her children. As IaMamar is a Tuturokin member (her mother was the "sister" of ToPelis - see Diagram 5.4), and as her father ToKiriat was a member of Vunatabun vunatarai (ToLison was his maternal uncle), the acquisition achieved a neat reconciliation of the competing claims to this land.

The fifth acquisition involving this Tuturokin segment concerned Block 39 of 0.14 hectares, recorded in 1966 as owned by Vunatabun vunatarai. This land, like the last parcel which is nearby, had originally been owned by Nekupia vunatarai, and ToUva (lualua of the spurious Nekupia segment) had challenged the Vunatabun claims during adjudication. ToTita of Vunatabun (see Diagram 5.4) claimed the land had been given by Nekupia to his maternal uncle ToLison (the man involved in the last transaction), in recognition of compensation he had paid in settlement of a grievance caused over a woman by a Nekupia member. In a 1975 record the land is said to have been acquired by ikulia by IaMamar, IaKapana and ToHoragu, from "their father" (tamai diat) ToTita, for a house site (ure ra kiki). The latter individuals are two of ToTita's children (see Diagram 5.4), but IaMamar is the daughter of ToTita's brother ToKiriat (ToTita is thus her "father"), and was "taken care of" by ToTita after ToKiriat's death. IaMamar, IaKapana and ToHoragu are parallel cousins, i.e., classificatory siblings, so all three can be regarded as children of ToTita, acquiring the land of their "fathering" vunatarai.

Last of the six acquisitions in favour of a Tuturokin member involved the acquisition of part of Block 62, the Rakunat vunatarai land in the vicinity of Rakunat village where many children of male Rakunat vunatarai members now reside. The parcel was acquired by Siapan Boas, whom the Rakunat leaders described as "our kandere, but from another vunatarai". Siapan appears on that part of the Vagai
vunatarai genealogy which overlaps with part of the stated Tuturokin membership, his mother's sister being IaPuputa, the Tuturokin member recorded in the 1966 ownership of Blocks 64 and 66 (see above). His relationship with the Tuturokin membership set out in Diagram 5.4 could not be established. Tuturokin being, like Rakunat, a Pikalaba vunatarai, and Siapan being a generation lower than the Rakunat leaders, he is their classificatory kandere (see Appendix A). The final post-adjudication acquisition in favour of members of a Matalau-based vunatarai was the ikulia payment by ToPuipui, the lualua of Nekupia vunatarai, for part of Block 89 for his children, who are members of Kuraoko vunatarai - yet another case of individuals acquiring land from their "fathering" vunatarai.

Members of three Nodup-based vunatarai - Kurategete, Tamanakulap and Vunaimuli - were the beneficiaries of five post-adjudication acquisitions (see Table 5.1). Three were in favour of Kurategete members, being some or all of the eight children of IaMalira and her husband ToKavanamur, a member of Vunatabun vunatarai and the son of IaMonika IeVilau who figured prominently in pre-adjudication acquisitions (see Chapter 4). Details of the three acquisitions are as follows:

Block 126(?)(part) acquired for the children of IaMalira;
Block 90(part) acquired for IaMalira and her children;
Block 89(?)(part) acquired for three children of IaMalira.

The first transaction appears to involve Block 126, recorded in 1966 as Nekupia vunatarai land. This block is within the area of land which is contested between Nekupia and Palakukā vunatarai - a consequence of the disruption of their land affairs occasioned by the intrusion of the Malaguna-based matriline segment and their associates during the decades following 1900 (discussed in Chapter 3). When IaMalira stated during fieldwork that her husband ToKavanamur acquired the parcel for their children, ToNonongia, a Palakuka leader, took up the account of the transaction, as follows:

ToKavanamur bought the land from me and ToUva [then claiming Nekupia leadership]. ToUva didn't just agree to it, but he asked me first, "What about this - my brother [turagu - ToKavanamur and ToUva belong to the same moiety and generation] wants a small piece of land to live on." I agreed to it, saying, "Alright, we feel sorry for ToKavanamur, and you can keep the payment for his settling on this land". So the payment was made to ToUva.

The second acquisition involving this Kurategete segment was the
ikulia payment for part of Block 90, the large parcel of Rakunat vunatarai land around its madapai. ToKurapa the current lualua explained that because IaMalira is a member of a Pikalaba moiety vunatarai (as is Rakunat), and she had been staying with the Rakunat members although she had no rights to their land, they had agreed to her purchasing the parcel for herself and her children. The final Kurategote segment acquisition was the ikulia payment in 1970 by ToKavanamur to Nekupia vunatarai for what appears to be a part of Block 89, in favour of three named children - the only ones of the ultimate eight who had been born by 1970. Although the record of the transaction names only three children, there is no doubt that the children born subsequently are regarded as equally entitled to benefit from the acquisition. The case is, therefore, a simple illustration of the general point that where written records designate particular beneficiaries they may not be taken as circumscribing the group of persons intended to benefit, and it remains a matter for interpretation how membership of the landowning group is recruited. This subject will be returned to in the next part of the thesis.

Members of Tamanakulap vunatarai gained land in a single post-adjudication acquisition. Again the parcel concerned was part of Block 89, the large area around the Nekupia vunatarai madapai which was the subject of a number of post-adjudication transactions. During fieldwork ToPuipui, the Nekupia lualua, advised that Tioap had purchased the parcel by ikulia for his five children, members of Tamanakulap. Tioap was a member of Vunatabun vunatarai, and no doubt the long-standing association between Vunatabun members and Nekupia vunatarai lay behind the acquisition. The final Nodup-based vunatarai whose members gained land in a post-adjudication acquisition was Vunaimuli. Members of this vunatarai (including its Nereus apiktarai) had acquired five land parcels in transactions before 1966, one such parcel (Block 48 of 0.31 hectares) being the subject of a further transaction to be considered here. The Adjudication Record states that Block 48 was owned by IaMin and her children, Vunaimuli members, having been acquired "by gift" from Rakunai vunatarai. In a 1975 record of a transaction it is stated that the land had been "given as a present" (tabar) to IaMode and her daughter IaMin, and that when IaMode died IaMin "held this land as her own" (iga vatur vake go rapi). The record continues that she and her husband then decided to buy the land from Rakunai vunatarai for their children, they paid
ikulia, and "there were no objections from anyone". With twelve children, all now adult, the couple's need to acquire land for them is obvious.

The transaction is a clear example of an initial gift of land being confirmed by a subsequent payment, to secure the tenure of children of an original beneficiary to the land. Rakunai vunatarai had given Block 48 to IaMin's mother IaMode many years before, in response for the services she had rendered to the vunatarai in contributions of tabu during Rakunai ceremonies, provision of food, and visiting sick members. IaMin's entitlement to the land as IaMode's daughter had been recognised, but with increasing population pressure and the declining security of tenure based on gifts IaMin and her husband ToMonongia had decided in 1971 to secure their children's entitlement to the land by making the ikulia payment to Rakunai, "to clear out all the vunatarai's claims." Rakunat informants lamented that, as land gifts were no longer acceptable, the practice of such intra-moiety assistance was disappearing. An additional consideration in ToMonongia's contribution to the payment was that he had received his eldest daughter's bridewealth upon her marriage, and so was obliged to acquire land for her.

The last two acquisitions in this category were in favour of members of two Korere-based vunatarai - Namabuk and Raim (see Table 5.1). The one involving a Namabuk member was mentioned in the preceding category: as a child of the Rakunat vunatarai big-man Turagik, ToKede of Namabuk was nominated to occupy part in the moramoro land in Block 90 which Turagik participated in rendering safe for cultivation. The second acquisition was the ikulia payment for part of Block 34 by ToGogobol for his daughter IaKavanamur and her children, members of Raim vunatarai. ToGogobol, a member of a Matupit-based vunatarai with a segment located at Matalau, resided at Rakunat with his daughter IaKavanamur, who married a member of Bauvik, the Tavui-based vunatarai which has a major segment resident at Rakunat (see Chapter 3). IaKavanamur had gained a small parcel of land in a pre-adjudication acquisition (Block 118, see Appendix E), and as neither she, her father nor her husband had vunatarai land at Rakunat, the acquisition of the Block 34 parcel was clearly motivated by the need to provide land for her and her nine children. Block 34 was recorded in 1966 as owned by Rakunat vunatarai. Notable features of the transaction are that ToKurapa, the present Rakunat lualua,
claims the land was disposed of by ToBeniamin, a rival for vunatarai leadership, without the knowledge of other vunatarai members, and that the ikulia payment was given to ToPatiliu, lualua of Vunavavar, the Malaguna-based offshoot of Rakunat vunatarai mentioned in Chapter 3.

Consideration of the twenty-six acquisitions in this second category is now complete. In every case the persons gaining land in the acquisition are members of vunatarai whose landholdings are located in other pakanagunan of Nodup paparagunan, and whose presence at Rakunat is the consequence of a female matrilineal ancestor marrying a male Rakunat resident, and then settling there. Four vunatarai figured prominently, whose members between them were responsible for twenty-one of the twenty-six acquisitions. The presence at Rakunat of the Kurategete vunatarai segment, whose members gained land in three acquisitions, was the consequence of the marriage of the mother of the beneficiaries, IaMalira, to a Rakunat resident. Similarly, the three acquisitions for a segment of Kiur vunatarai involved the children of a woman IaTeniana (see Diagram 5.3) who married a Rakunat resident in the early decades of this century. For the other two prominent vunatarai segments their presence at Rakunat was the consequence of a marriage to a male Rakunat resident by a more distant female matrilineal ancestor. IaHamar, a key figure in five of the six acquisitions in favour of a Tuturokin vunatarai segment, was the daughter of a woman IaNamiau, whose own mother IeTitere (see Diagram 5.4) had married a Rakunat resident about the turn of the century and settled there. The children of the two sisters IaMila and IaDorti, who were involved in eight of the nine acquisitions in favour of members of a Mamanuba vunatarai segment, were themselves the maternal grandchildren of a woman IaTagaula (see Diagram 5.2) who married in to Rakunat from Baai around 1920.

Acquisitions examined under the preceding category were in favour of members of vunatarai whose own landholdings are remote from Rakunat, and whose presence at Rakunat is the consequence of a locally-exogamous marriage by a female matrilineal ancestor. Persons gaining land in acquisitions under this second category are also present at Rakunat in consequence of a female matrilineal ancestor in-marrying to Rakunat and settling there, but the marriages in these cases were locally-endogamous, contracted within the area where spouses had traditionally been chosen. The matrilineal descendants of such marriages are already identified to some extent with the Rakunat
locality (see Chapter 2), and they are embraced by a pattern of interpersonal relationships and associations between vunatarai which had been evolving over a long period of time. These relationships and associations could be invoked by persons seeking land for themselves or their children. Twenty-one of the twenty-six acquisitions involved parents acquiring land for their children, in thirteen cases the acquiring parent being the father, in six the mother, and in two both parents contributing to the acquisition.

In six of the nine acquisitions examined in the preceding category the land was acquired for children from their "fathering" vunatarai, and nine of the twenty-six acquisitions in the present category involved land acquired for persons from that source. In most cases the ikulia payment was made by the father of the land-acquiring persons to his vunatarai, but in some instances both parents or only the mother made the payment, and on one occasion the children themselves paid ikulia to their "fathering" vunatarai for the land. Two more acquisitions involved land which had originally been acquired by a male from his "fathering" vunatarai. In one the persons who gained the land in the later acquisition were children of the male's "sister's" daughter, and in the other they were children of the male's "brother" in his vunatarai. In three of the remaining fifteen cases it was specifically stated that the land was acquired from a vunatarai of the same moiety as that of the persons in whose favour the acquisition was effected, the cases affording further examples of intra-moiety solidarity being invoked for gaining access to land. In another case the acquisition was explained by reference to the fact that the acquiring person was the classificatory cross-cousin (nauvana) of the lualua whose vunatarai disposed of the land, and a further case involved the gift of land owned by a vunatarai approaching extinction to the children of a male member's daughter.

In eight of the remaining ten acquisitions it is apparent that a connection between vunatarai of the same moiety lay behind the acquisition, and seven of these eight cases involved land owned by Nekupia vunatarai. The infiltration of this vunatarai's landholdings since the turn of the century by a Malaguna-based matriline segment and by members of Vunatabun vunatarai and their ToKubo affines has received frequent mention in preceding chapters. In five cases Vunatabun males acquired Nekupia land for their children, and two acquisitions were effected by Tokubo males (a vunatarai affinally
connected to Vunatabun by the marriage of two brothers to two sisters) from Nekupia for their children. In the eighth case the acquisition confirmed an earlier gift of land to the acquiring persons' maternal grandmother, in recognition of services she rendered to the land-disposing vunatarai. In the final two cases no kinship connection or association between vunatarai was apparent as a background factor in the acquisition, but I have no doubt that common moiety between parties to the transaction and long co-residence in the Rakunat area underpinned each acquisition, for leading land authorities at Rakunat maintain that no transaction can be mounted without a pre-existing connection between the parties. This general subject will be returned to in the first chapter of the next part.

(c) Acquisitions by members of vunatarai based in Rakunat pakanagunan

Members of three vunatarai fall into this final category, being responsible between them for a total of seven acquisitions (see Table 5.1). Members of a fourth Rakunat-based vunatarai participated in an acquisition already considered under the preceding category, being the fifth transaction involving IaMamar of Tuturokin vunatarai. She acquired Block 39 together with her classificatory siblings IaKapana and ToMoragu, the children of IaMamar's father's brother (see Diagram 5.4), and members of Rakunat vunatarai. Four acquisitions were in favour of Tinganabalbal vunatarai members, the details of which are as follows:

(Unidentified parcel) acquired for IeVutete;
Block 17 acquired for IaMar and her children;
Block 8 (part) acquired for IaKamara;
Block 34(?)(part) acquired for two sons and two daughters of IaLarmi.

IaMar is a daughter of IeVutete, IaKamara is IaMar's "sister", and IaLarmi is IeVutete's "sister", but their common ancestry lies four generations back in the vunatarai, so diagrammatic representation of their interrelationship is not practicable.

The first acquisition in the above list arose out of an unofficial hearing in 1969 conducted by two Deputy Chairmen of Demarcation Committees. The record of the hearing is in Kuanua, and it states that the land in question belonged to Semi ToMaiai (a former lualua of Rakunai vunatarai, who died about 1950), but that Rusiat Tuat (a former lualua of Tinganabalbal, who has died since
adjudication) had given permission to IeVutete to plant coconuts on it, for he believed that the land had been paid for in 1947. A complaint was made in 1969 by Benson Tabu, the then lualua of Rakunai vunatarai, that IeVutete had not purchased the land, but the record continues that he and two other members of Rakunai (IaElti and ToKaul — see Diagram 5.5) "said that the land must be given to IeVutete as she had already planted coconuts on it" (dital ga biti ba go ra pia kai IeVutete ta go i ga tar vaume ra lama tana). The Deputy Chairmen "decided" that IeVutete should purchase the land, which she did with a small ikulia payment. A factor facilitating settlement of the dispute was the close relationships between members of these two Rakunat-based vunatarai, illustrated in Diagram 5.5. Rusiat Tuat's elder sister IaGapau was the wife of Semi ToMaiai, the former lualua of Rakunai, and IeVutete was the daughter of another sister IaRakan. Rakunai was therefore IeVutete's "fathering" vunatarai, and no doubt this fact lay behind IeVutete's original occupation of the land in question. The claimant to the land in 1969, Benson Tabu, is the son of Semi ToMaiai's sister IaPalabel, and thus is the classificatory cross-cousin (nauvana) of IeVutete.

IeVutete had been involved in three pre-adjudication acquisitions, in favour of herself and the children of her daughter IaMar (see Appendix E). In discussing these acquisitions IeVutete and IaMar said they were prompted by land shortage within their large vunatarai, and the same pressure led to the second acquisition listed above. Block 17, of 0.54 hectares, was recorded in 1966 as owned by ToKubo vunatarai. IaMar's father, Taupa, is a ToKubo member, and when she married a Rakunat vunatarai member the bridewealth was paid not to IaMar's vunatarai but to Taupa, for IaMar was his eldest daughter. During fieldwork Taupa declared that he gave Block 17 to IaMar and her children. ToKurapa, the present Rakunat lualua, elaborated:

The tabu which we paid for IaMar is being looked after by Taupa, and when Taupa dies his kandere will distribute it. After that there will be no need to pay for the land. If Taupa's vunatarai raised the matter IaMar would say, "You distributed my bridewealth when my father died". IaMar herself, when I asked whether she had to pay ikulia for the land, said:

If my father had simply given the land to me, and he had not received the [bridewealth] tabu, then I would have to pay for it. But the tabu was paid to him. I can't pay for the land again.
Diagram 5.5: Tinganabalbal vunatarai segment

Moiety: Marmar
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- TAUPA (ToKubo)
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- TOKAUL (Rakunai)

- IAMAR (Tinganabalbal)

- IEVUTETE (Tinganabalbal)

- ELIAP TAMAN (Rakunat)
The third Tinganabalbal acquisition also involved the land of a person's "fathering" vunatarai. IaKamara, whose father was a Rakunat vunatarai member, acquired part of Block 8 within the Rakunat matanoi by ikulia which she paid herself. The last acquisition by a segment of Tinganabalbal cannot be satisfactorily explained, either from the written record or by Rakunat informants. A 1974 record states that ToGagau, a Rakunat vunatarai member, purchased land named "Rapidik" from Tinganabalbal vunatarai for four of his children in 1970. ToGagau married IaLarmi, a Tinganabalbal member, and they have fourteen children, but Rakunat informants were frankly unable to explain why land would have been acquired from a vunatarai for its own members.\textsuperscript{15} ToGagau is now dead, and the present Rakunat lualua, ToKurapa, says he did not witness the transaction. The land concerned is believed to be within or in the vicinity of that part of Block 16 which adjoins Block 34. Block 16 was recorded in 1966 as owned by Tinganabalbal and Block 34 as owned by Rakunat, so a possible explanation is that the parcel acquired was in fact a part of Block 34 (i.e., an acquisition from the "fathering" vunatarai), not Tinganabalbal land at all.

Two post-adjudication acquisitions were in favour of members of Palakuka vunatarai, both being of Rakunat vunatarai land. ToBeniamin, a Rakunat member, acquired part of Block 12 by ikulia for his only child IaKali, a female member of Palakuka. Members of Vunavavar vunatarai, the Malaguna-based offshoot of Rakunat, had formerly cultivated part of the land, and senior Vunavavar members came to Rakunat to witness the transaction. In the second acquisition ToRupen of Rakunat vunatarai paid ikulia to his vunatarai to purchase part of Block 62 near Rakunat village for a daughter and son, members of Palakuka vunatarai.\textsuperscript{16} The concentration of settlement by Rakunat vunatarai members and their children on Block 62 and neighbouring Block 90 surrounding the Rakunat madapai has already been mentioned.

The final transaction in this category, and last of the forty-two

\textsuperscript{15}While theoretical explanations are available (e.g., that the land was "acquired" exclusively for the use of the children), I found no similar case of Tolai customary methods of securing the secondary settlement of land being used in favour of members of the vunatarai which owned the land. Tolai informants totally rejected such a notion.

\textsuperscript{16}ToRupen and his brother ToBeniamin married two sisters from Palakuka vunatarai.
post-adjudication acquisitions, was the purchase by Daniel ToWaai, the present lualua of Vunatoboai vunatarai, of Block 109 comprising 0.06 hectares. This small parcel was recorded in 1966 as owned by four brothers, two sisters, and the children of the two sisters, having been acquired by ikulia. The owners comprise a matriline segment of Takakap vunatarai, based at Nodup but with segments resident at Baai and Matupit. The mother of the six siblings had married a Rakunat resident about 1910, but by the time of fieldwork they had all moved away from Rakunat. ToWaai explained that as the land was not being used, and because there was a copra drier on it, he decided to acquire it by ikulia from them. A relationship lay behind the acquisition, for the six siblings were the children of ToWaai's mother's brother, i.e., his cross-cousins (nauvana).

In analysing these seven acquisitions in favour of members of Rakunat-based vunatarai the first point which emerges is that the three vunatarai involved - Tinganabalbal, Palakuka and Vunatoboai - are the only three Rakunat-based vunatarai which figured in the pre-adjudication acquisitions of Rakunat land (see Table 4.6), and are three of the four comparatively "land-poor" vunatarai of Rakunat (see Table 4.4). As in the pre-1966 phase of land tenure change at Rakunat, provision is being made by transactions to improve the land access of members of the Rakunat-based vunatarai whose own landholdings are under the greatest population pressure. Five of the acquisitions were clear cases of land being acquired for persons from their "fathering" vunatarai, and a sixth possible case was the Tinganabalbal acquisition where the land was recorded as acquired from Tinganabalbal, but may in fact have been acquired from Rakunat vunatarai. In three of these cases the father made the ikulia payment for the land, in two a daughter paid ikulia to her "fathering" vunatarai, and in the sixth case the land was given to a woman and her children by the "fathering" vunatarai in consequence of the father having received the woman's bridewealth. The seventh acquisition was transacted between cross-cousins, so in all cases in this category a close relationship between the persons acquiring the land and the group whose land was being acquired lay behind the transaction.

(ii) Land dispositions

The preceding analysis clearly demonstrates that all land
acquisitions at Rakunat since 1966 were motivated by the need to secure land for Rakunat residents whose land access there was tenuous and restricted. Persons gaining land by acquisitions considered under the first category comprise segments of vunatarai based outside the Nodup paparagunan whose presence at Rakunat stems from the in-marriage of a female matrilineal ancestor, and whose own vunatarai land is for practical purposes inaccessible to them. Acquisitions considered under the second category were in favour of segments of vunatarai whose land is located in the Nodup paparagunan but outside Rakunat pakanagunan. Practicality of access to their vunatarai land for members of these segments varies, the land being fairly readily accessible for vunatarai based in neighbouring Matau, Nodup and Rabuana pakanagunan (significantly, no members of vunatarai based in the latter were involved in acquisitions), but relatively remote for members of vunatarai based at Baai and Korere. As in the first category, the presence of the vunatarai segments in this second category at Rakunat derives from a female matrilineal ancestor marrying a male Rakunat resident and settling there, but their land access position was improved by the fact that long practice of local endogamy within the paparagunan presented a range of relationships and associations which could be activated to satisfy their land needs. The limited land access of persons who benefitted from acquisitions considered under the third category is attributable to their membership of Rakunat-based vunatarai which have, in recent decades at least, been chronically short of land. In all three categories there were many instances where the post-adjudication acquisitions were a continuation of a pattern of acquisitions by members of the same vunatarai segments begun before 1966.

In considering the forty-two acquisitions the vunatarai whose land was acquired in each case was identified. It now remains to analyse the transactions in their capacity as land dispositions, to see whether a pattern emerges in satisfying the land needs of the matriline segments which gained land in the acquisitions. Table 5.2, which lists the ten vunatarai whose land was disposed of in the forty-two acquisitions in order of the total number of transactions involved,17 shows that twenty-nine of them (just over two-thirds)

---

17 As explained in the text, ranking the vunatarai in order of total areas disposed of (as in the preceding chapter, see Table 4.7) was not possible for the post-adjudication dispositions.
Table 5.2 Land-disposing vunatarai at Rakunat since adjudication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vunatarai</th>
<th>Pakanagunan</th>
<th>No. of transactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rakunat</td>
<td>Rakunat</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nekupia</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rakunai</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tinganabalbal</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ToKubo</td>
<td>Nodup</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vunatabun</td>
<td>Pila Pila</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tiratira</td>
<td>Rabuana</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Kurapitil</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Takakap</td>
<td>Nodup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ramaravot</td>
<td>Talwat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total:</strong> 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
concerned the land of two Rakunat-based vunatarai - Rakunat and Nekupia. These two vunatarai, together with the third-ranking land-disposer, Rakunai, had the highest per capita land availability for their memberships of the eight Rakunat-based vunatarai at the time of adjudication (see Table 4.4), and were three of the four most prominent land-disposing vunatarai in the period preceding adjudication (see Table 4.7). The spontaneous redistribution of land from the comparatively "land-rich" vunatarai at Rakunat to those groups experiencing the most serious restrictions on their access to land, already observed for the preceding period, can convincingly be seen to have continued in the years since adjudication.

Reference to the order of per capita land availability of Rakunat-based vunatarai in Table 4.4, and comparison of the statistics on vunatarai whose members acquired land and the land-disposing vunatarai (Tables 4.6 and 4.7 respectively for the period before adjudication, and Tables 5.1 and 5.2 respectively for the post-adjudication period), demonstrates that only members of "land-poor" vunatarai have been acquiring land, and only the comparatively "land-rich" vunatarai have been disposing of land to any significant extent. What the material does not show, however, is whether the recorded acquisitions satisfied the needs of all groups settled at Rakunat whose members were for one reason or another experiencing restricted access to land. To assess this correlation the residence of all adult members of a vunatarai sample and the state of occupation of its Rakunat land will be considered in the next part, but in concluding this chapter a relevant distinction between the nature of dispositions by the two main land-disposing vunatarai in this post-adjudication period should be noted.

Rakunat vunatarai disposed of land in sixteen transactions, in thirteen of which the persons gaining land were children of a male Rakunat member. In contrast, only one of the thirteen dispositions by Nekupia vunatarai involved persons gaining land from their "fathering" vunatarai. ¹⁸ Although for many of the other twelve Nekupia dispositions some intra-moiety association was apparent as the basis of the transaction, undoubtedly a factor in the dispositions was the

¹⁸It should be noted that only one senior male survives in Nekupia vunatarai, and he is the person whose children gained land in the acquisition.
leadership rivalry which has racked the vunatarai for much of this century, for it appears that by the competitive disposition of land the contenders for leadership sought to assert their authority over the vunatarai. While Rakunat, therefore, affords an example of members of a comparatively "land-rich" vunatarai making provision for their "land-poor" patrilineal kin from the vunatarai's own land resources, Nekupia exemplifies a disunited group whose comparative land surplus is being consumed by "land-poor" persons with whom it has no direct kinship connection. No land transaction may be mounted without a pre-existing link between the parties,\(^1^9\) but the relativity of Tolai concepts of group corporateness and kinship facilitates establishment of a connection between willing people. The connection, however, whether direct or indirect, forms the basis of the land transaction. It characterises the tenure thereby gained, so that its security remains indefinitely dependent upon maintenance of the formative connection.

\(^{1^9}\)Although in the case of Nekupia no direct kinship connection between the vunatarai membership and persons gaining land underlay the acquisitions, I show in Appendix G that the acquisitions were based on relationships with groups which had previously occupied Nekupia land.
PART III

THE PROCESS OF LAND TENURE CHANGE
CHAPTER 6
SPONTANEOUS CHANGE IN CUSTOMARY TENURE

1. THE INFLUENCES CAUSING CHANGE IN LAND TENURE

The two chapters of Part I examined the Tolai experience of change from two perspectives, the first offering an historical account of change in the general Tolai environment, and the second looking at the impact of those environmental influences on Tolai cultural institutions. Early European residents among the Tolai describe a vigorous, innovative and mobile society, still in the process of expanding settlement through their fertile territory. Knowledge of the area's rich resources soon attracted commercial interest, and within two decades of first European settlement a large proportion of the Tolai territory had been acquired for plantation development. Reflecting contemporary attitudes to colonisation, successive administrations followed policies aimed first at simultaneous promotion of European economic interests and protection of indigenous communities, and later at integration of Papua New Guineans into a modern Western-style state.

While the original purpose in introducing structural elements of Western culture was to serve the interests of the colonisers, under a more "enlightened" developmental philosophy their progressive extension to the population was motivated by the ultimate goal of replacing indigenous cultural institutions with a "more advanced" Western legal order. At independence a constitutional commitment to an alternative philosophy was made, under which indigenous cultural institutions were to be fostered and embraced as the main agencies for integrated social, political and economic development. The experience since 1975, however, has shown that the inherited colonial philosophy of prescriptive social change is deeply embedded in the infrastructure of the State, and its persistence leaves a constant tension between the intransigence of official attitudes and State institutions and the durability of Melanesian cultural institutions, through which the
changing demands of the bulk of Papua New Guinea's population are being expressed.

The processes of state formation and consolidation, and the increasing penetration of Western values and behaviour patterns have left no aspect of Tolai culture untouched, yet by its comprehensiveness and flexibility the integrity of Tolai culture has survived - intact, but modified to accommodate the new demands made on it by changing circumstances and changing Tolai expectations. Deprived of much of their territory which might otherwise have accepted expanded settlement, a rapidly-increasing Tolai population was obliged to satisfy rising material aspirations by the more intensive exploitation of its finite land resources. Decreasing land availability was, however, alleviated by reduced dependence on village land, in consequence of local wage employment, non-residence during employment outside the village, and more recently resettlement on Government land at the periphery of the Tolai territory and in West New Britain. The changing demands on village land are manifested by more intensive land use for food gardens and cash crops (with associated land erosion and soil fertility depletion problems - see Dixie 1981), and the gradual encroachment of housing on agricultural land.

With many village residents engaging in part-time employment, and others absent in employment for periods of varying duration, it is difficult to assess the degree of dependence on village land for residents' livelihood. Bradley, in a detailed study of the economy of Pila Pila (which she describes as "one of the most prosperous villages in the Gazelle" - 1982:45), found that 40% of households "have no land for proper food gardens" (ibid.,46), and that during 1978 "income to Pila Pila from residents' wages and salaries was over three times greater than income from the sale of cash crops" (ibid.). In terms of both population pressure on available land and degree of dependence on wage incomes Pila Pila would rank among the most extreme cases of all Tolai villages. In investigation reports prepared for the Administration acquisition of Rakunat land for school purposes (see Chapter 5) it was estimated that in 1964 Rakunat village population was increasing at 3.3% per annum and that average land availability was one acre per three residents, and in 1971 that 30% of the adult male residents were in wage employment of some form or other. The Electoral Roll for 1976 shows just over 20% of the Rakunat electors as
engaged in wage or salary employment (see Chapter 3). Whatever their main source of livelihood, all Tolai villagers are inclined to work the land to some extent, and, by resort to the wide range of customary methods for gaining land access, links with their cultural heritage are sustained.

Overall population increase has a general impact in reducing land availability at village level, though the degree to which the pressure is experienced will vary between localities. For villages in less heavily-settled localities on the margins of the traditional Tolai territory it is likely that some areas of uncleared land remain available for occupation by the village membership, but in villages in the Rabaul locality, for example, most accessible land has long been occupied. For such communities increasing demands on land can only be accommodated by more intensive land use practices, but the land tenure in all Tolai villages is continually being adjusted — in response not so much to increase in overall village population, as to change in the village composition.

In Chapter 2 I said that, under Tolai concepts by which their social units are identified with particular localities, three basic categories of village resident are recognised. Those most closely identified with a village are the members of vunatarai with madapai in the pakanagunan which surrounds the village. Members of vunatarai with madapai in neighbouring pakanagunan of the same paparagunan are identified with the locality in which the village is situated, but their identification with the village is of a lower order than for persons in the first category. Finally, village residents with no madapai in the paparagunan in which the village is situated are, in Tolai terms, not true members of the village at all. In former times when most marriages were locally-endogamous there would have been a high degree of correspondence between village residence and village membership, but today many village residents are non-members, and many village members reside outside the locality with which they are identified. In both cases the people concerned are outsiders in the community where they reside, but they retain their identification with the locality where they originated. The non-members resident in one village are, therefore, the absent members of another.

\[1\] Some probably part-time, although this was not specified.
The changing composition of villages is mainly a consequence of increased social mobility, but a further apparently influential factor is the increased importance of the nuclear family. This latter development has been mentioned many times, and it has a wide variety of manifestations in contemporary Tolai society. In my view, however, its relevance to Tolai land tenure adjustments is still not clearly understood, through a basic failure to distinguish between causes and effects. The fundamental factor causing change in land tenure is the change in marriage patterns, and the increasing incidence of locally exogamous marriages. Local identity is the crucial consideration governing a Tolai's access to land; a Tolai's most reliable and secure access is to land in the locality with which he or she is identified. Local exogamy by itself would present no complications for land tenure, were it not for the continuation of the general practice of virilocal residence after marriage. There are signs that a trend to uxorilocal residence may be emerging, and in such cases children of the marriage may grow up in the locality with which they are identified. Tolai are clearly conscious of the advantages for their children's land access of such a shift to uxorilocal residence where the marriage is locally exogamous, but the consequence, of course, is that the husband is required to leave the locality with which he is identified.

The continued practice of virilocal residence after marriage, when combined with an increasing incidence of local exogamy, has the result that an increasing proportion of village residents have no practicable access to their own vunatarai land, and no local identity in the community to invoke for land access purposes. I examine below the options open to such non-member residents, and discuss the steps taken at Rakunat for meeting their land needs. In the present analysis of the influences causing change in Tolai tenure, however, it is enough to mention that many such non-members choose to maintain their residence in the area where they have no local identity, with recourse being had to Tolai methods of securing secondary settlement of land to meet their land needs. The access problem is immediately presented for the children of the first exogamous marriage, although I will demonstrate below that the problem re-emerges in successive generations. Before reaching adulthood the children live with their parents on their father's vunatarai land, and it is to this land that the main recourse is had to meet their land needs. To secure their
continued settlement after adulthood on the land where they have been raised an acquisition from their "fathering" vunatarai is often effected.

Where adult children of a male are found residing on his vunatarai land the impression may easily be gained that they are residing patrilocally, in a further manifestation of the increasing importance of the nuclear family. At group level, it is true that they are patrilocally resident in the sense that they are living in the locality with which not they but their father is identified. But how is their residence to be designated after the land has been acquired from the father's vunatarai? Their tenure to the land derives from membership of a matrilineal descent group, to whom, as I have claimed, the land has been transferred by the father's vunatarai. They are, indeed, residing on their "own" land, albeit that their tenure will depend on the maintenance of cordial relations with their "fathering" vunatarai, and that, as outsiders, their future in the community will remain precarious. Nor is their continued settlement on the land a reflection of the increased importance of the nuclear family. They grow up in the locality with which their father is identified because of their mother's virilocal residence, and they have remained on his land because, without a local identity of their own to invoke in the area, they have no other practicable land access. The cause of this predicament is the locally exogamous marriage. Apart from their remoteness from their own vunatarai land, by maturity the children are likely to have reinforced their dependence on their father's locality for their livelihood by the planting of permanent tree crops on his land. Many marriages are still locally endogamous, and in these circumstances no need is generally presented for a father to acquire land for his children, nor is there a noticeable trend towards such acquisitions.² The co-residence of a male and his children in the same locality is a long-standing Tolai phenomenon which, while it has facilitated a greater emphasis on the nuclear family caused by other factors, is not itself responsible for that

²A need is, however, presented in the case of children whose vunatarai land is insufficient to meet the needs of its membership. In Part II we saw that, while the preponderance of acquisitions were in favour of members of vunatarai based outside Rakunat, the remainder were for members of Rakunat-Based vunatarai which had been chronically short of land.
development, and is not itself the factor motivating land acquisitions.

The increased incidence of local exogamy seems common to the Tolai area, so a general correspondence between the degree of in-marriage to, and out-marriage from, any locality may be presumed. In assessing the impact of local exogamy on land availability the crucial factor – in terms both of village size and of village composition – is the couple's residence after marriage. Given the better amenities enjoyed by residents near urban centres it might be thought that a drift to such localities would be likely if either spouse had local identity there, but the continued preference for virilocal residence seems to have countered such inclinations. It may, therefore, be presumed that the impact of local exogamy on land availability at village level is generally self-cancelling – the degree to which women from other localities are settling in a village after marriage to a male member roughly corresponds with the degree to which female members of that village are settling in other localities after marriage. Analysis below of the changing settlement pattern at Rakunat village confirms this correspondence, but the Rakunat experience also bears out the major change in village composition over recent generations. Whereas most senior male residents are village members who have spent their adult life in occupation of their own vunatarai land having settled there upon maturity, we shall see below that a large proportion of the junior adult male residents are non-members of the village, who have remained there living on their father's vunatarai land, instead of moving to land in their own locality upon maturity.

Apart from village members settled in other localities in consequence of a locally-exogamous marriage by a female ancestor, the non-residence of village members is usually the consequence of wage employment – either of the member concerned, the member's spouse, or, in the case of non-adult children, a parent. On overall census figures, about one in five Tolai work and live outside the village. Another cause of members' absence from their village is Government-sponsored resettlement. Rakunat was included in the

3 Some leading members even moved from neighbouring pakanagunan, e.g., Dimain ToKurapa the lualua of Rakunat vunatarai and Daniel Towaai the lualua of Vunatoboai vunatarai, who both spent their youth on their fathers' vunatarai land at Matalau and Nodup respectively.
original land settlement scheme, mounted by the Rabaul Native Local Government Council at Vudal in 1952 (see Chapter 7). Thirty-two Rakunat villagers (including six women) claimed interests in separate leasehold blocks at settlement schemes in the Kerevat and Warangoi localities, and at West New Britain. Most persons were involved in only a single block, but one outstanding male, Robin ToMonongia, has together with a son and daughter a total of five blocks.\(^4\) In only a minority of cases, however, were the individual claimants found to be the registered leaseholders of the blocks concerned, a fact indicative of the extension of interests in leasehold blocks beyond those of the actual title-holder, discussed generally in Chapter 7. Non-resident members of Rakunat, whether in employment in the Tolai area or at such centres as Port Moresby, Lae, Madang, Goroka or Arawa, or working periodically on settlement scheme blocks, maintain regular contact with the village. Some younger members have already built houses of permanent construction there, and probably most can be expected to retire there (as an older generation of workers has already done), for emotional attachment to the village remains extremely strong. Many leasehold settlers, even those with blocks in West New Britain, maintain their houses and tree crops at Rakunat, and again it can be expected that they look forward to retiring to Rakunat in their old age, leaving one or more of their children in occupation of the blocks. The superior services and amenities of the Tolai area are likely to attract eventual return of Tolai absentees to a greater degree than is the case with migrant workers and settlers absent from other areas of Papua New Guinea, but their long or intermittent short-term absences from Rakunat meanwhile relieve immediate land pressure there, and for many it can be expected that by their ultimate return the heavy land demands normally experienced during child-raising in a village will be past.

A final demographic factor affecting local land availability is what Epstein describes as "the random workings of human fertility and other hazards" (1969:189), to which, as he observes, small groups such as vunatarai are "especially susceptible" (ibid.). Improved health services have promoted longevity and reduced infant mortality, but the

\(^4\)ToMonongia was the male member of Palakuka vunatarai whose land was acquired for Boisen High School (see Chapter 5). He apparently was allocated one settlement scheme block pursuant to the recommendation of preference made on that occasion.
major differentiating factor in the growth or decline of vunatarai strength is the number of female members. In the case of the Rakunat-based vunatarai Tinganabalbal, its present populous membership results from the fact that of the nine children of its apical ancestress the five who survived to adulthood were all women, of whom the 117 living members in 1963 were descendants. By contrast, only one female among the five children of ToKiliu vunatarai's apical ancestress survived to adulthood, and, although she had three daughters, in the following generation only two female members lived long enough to bear children, and the vunatarai's strength in 1963 was just fourteen members. ToKubo vunatarai presents a striking example of the effects of "hazards" on vunatarai strength, for of the twenty-nine members born in the last two generations only four persons, all males, survive. Many members were killed by a bomb during World War II, and the vunatarai is on the point of extinction. An expanding vunatarai membership naturally decreases its per capita land availability, but declining membership relieves land pressure within a vunatarai, and, as seen in the preceding chapters, presents opportunities for members of the hard-pressed groups to satisfy their land needs.

As I explained in Chapter 4, per capita land availability may validly be postulated for the purpose of analysing comparative land availability between vunatarai, but it does not represent the actual situation of individual members. While a greater number of female members would increase the size of the vunatarai, the virilocal residence of those who out-marry from their locality would improve the land availability condition of the members remaining resident within the locality. On the other hand, the more male members there are in a vunatarai the greater the likelihood that demands will be put on its landholdings to meet the needs of resident children of locally exogamous marriages contracted by those males. As I said above, the impact of local exogamy on land availability at village level is generally self-cancelling. The implications for land tenure arise not so much from the effects of local exogamy on village population levels, but from the change in village composition it produces.

The overall dynamics of Tolai land tenure change, then, are the changing demands on land - both in intensity and in type of use - and the changing make-up of the village, the main social unit where those demands are being made and met. While Tolai have for long been alive to their predicament under circumstances of ever-increasing land
pressure, and they recognise the differential land access of groups within the village, at the same time they deny that land tenure changes result from a concerted strategy to redistribute land in response to changing land needs. Nevertheless, Rakunat informants were unanimous in affirming that all land transactions are motivated by limited land access, and no acquisition (with one minor exception) over more than a century since original Tolai settlement at Rakunat was undertaken except to meet the needs of persons resident there, but experiencing either an absolute or a comparative lack of access to land. The consistent pattern emerging from the history of spontaneous land transactions at Rakunat is the redistribution of land from the comparatively "land-rich" vunatarai from time to time to members of the "land-poor" groups at Rakunat. Every transaction depended upon a pre-existing kinship or affinal relationship between the parties or a long-standing association between vunatarai, which was invoked in using Tolai customary methods of securing secondary settlement of land. If factors affecting land availability comprise the dynamics of land tenure change, then intergroup and interpersonal relationships are the static elements.

2. THE MEANS BY WHICH LAND TENURE CHANGE IS ACHIEVED

From 1950 a more positive official commitment to promote indigenous development was undertaken, although still within an overall strategy of parallel (but far from equal) European and indigenous advancement. The meagre efforts to develop Papua New Guinean commercial agriculture before World War II had concentrated on communal operations, apparently on the mistaken understanding that communal ownership of customary land implied communal land use and organisation of labour (see Fingleton 1984: 157-58, 160-61). Official attitudes were geared to the plantation model, also favoured for its supposed ease of supervision, but the manifest failure of communal plantations (largely a result of disregard for tenure matters, but also through neglect of management and marketing requirements) provoked the wholesale dismissal of customary tenures as inherently unsuited to commercial agriculture, and from the early 1960s Administration policy initiatives concentrated on land tenure reform.

The impact of land tenure reform has been greater for the Tolai
than for almost any other ethnic group in Papua New Guinea.\textsuperscript{5} Not only was such a large proportion of their territory acquired in early land alienations, but the land legislation enacted in 1962 and 1963 was applied more comprehensively in their area than anywhere else in the country. In Chapter 7 the Tolai experience of both systematic and sporadic conversion of customary land to registered individual titles, and of resettlement on State-owned land under leasehold titles, will be considered, as well as their post-independence experience under plantation redistribution. No Tolai community was unaffected by at least one of these measures, although naturally their impact varied between localities. For most Tolai, however, land tenure change has been predominantly experienced within the framework of their customary tenure, as Tolai cultural institutions have been adapted in response to the changing demands on land.

The legislative process for demarcation of customary land parcels and adjudication of ownership under custom was the least intrusive of the tenure reform measures, for the objective was simply to record the land tenure status quo. Given the official commitment to ultimate individualisation of all customary tenures, to provide for the registration of "communally owned land" would seem counter-productive, but perhaps Simpson in his report criticising the registration laws expressed an informed view that "the real intention" of such provision was "to make sure that the enormous amount of detailed work which was being done by the Commissioners under the Native Land Registration Ordinance [the predecessor of the Land Titles Commission Act 1962] to determine group holdings should be effectively recorded." (1969:14.) Whatever its intention, the Rakunat experience is that the process was highly valued, not just for recording existing land ownership but also for documenting the basis of tenure in each parcel of land. The local identity of owners, associations between groups, and kinship and affinal relationships between individuals are crucial to the quality of Tolai land tenure, for land interests not only derive from these factors but they continue to depend upon them, and be influenced by their change over time.

\textsuperscript{5}Other heavily-affected communities were the Motu around Port Moresby and the Butibum and Kamkumun around Lae (especially by land alienations), and the Orokaiva around Popondetta (especially by land tenure conversion schemes).
Rakunat Adjudication Record was the only one completed in the country before suspension of the registration provisions in 1970, but its uniqueness is fortuitous, for even in the Tolai area demarcation in readiness for adjudication had been completed in a number of other Adjudication Areas, and was proceeding towards completion in many others, when the Administration began to wind up the process after 1970. Without completed Adjudication Records from elsewhere in the Tolai area being available for comparison, definitive assessment of the typicality of Rakunat Adjudication Record as indicating the general process of change in Tolai land tenure would require research beyond the scope of this thesis. In its proximity to Rabaul, and the extent to which land which might otherwise have been available to village members was alienated in establishing the town, Rakunat might be thought of as exceptional. But a large proportion of Tolai live in villages around Rabaul and Kokopo (the other main urban centre), and a comprehensive road network ensures that no village community is unaffected by urban influences. Many Tolai communities were obliged to adapt to land alienations for plantation operations at least as significant in their effects as the early alienations of Rakunat land. Perhaps only in its comparative recency of settlement, and the ease of access to migrating groups afforded by its peninsular location, does Rakunat stand out somewhat from the influences on land tenure change shared to a greater or lesser extent by all Tolai communities.

In my analysis in Part I of a century of change in Tolai social organisation, residence and settlement patterns, religious beliefs, and political and economic life under the impact of environmental change, I stressed the Tolai capacity to exploit the comprehensiveness and flexibility of their cultural institutions in adapting to change. Nowhere has this capacity been more evident than in adjustments to the tenure of their customary land - at once the focus of Tolai identity, and for most Tolai the main resource for meeting their rising material expectations. The first chapter of Part II established the pattern of original Tolai settlement at Rakunat, showing how groups from diverse origins concentrated initially along moiety lines around their matano on the coastal strip, and later consolidated their settlement at madapai inland. Although the general population density of the locality at first European contact was low, it is likely that by then the pattern of land distribution between vunatarai reconstructed in Chapter 3 (see Maps 5-8) had largely been established. Much of the
land would still have been covered by primary forest, but a small population would, by shifting garden cultivation, hunting and use of forest products, soon have apportioned the land among themselves into identified parcels in accordance with Tolai practice. While the precise location of boundaries may not have been established (in the absence of any need to do so), it is reasonable to expect that the distinct landholdings of the groups which first settled the area were recognised at an early stage. The comprehensiveness and coherent nature of vunatarai landholdings emerging from the reconstructed pattern of original settlement bears out this supposition.

Though at what date the Rakunat land was fully settled cannot be determined, the fact that by the beginning of this century new groups settling there were resorting to transactions with the locally-based groups to gain access to land suggests that by this stage no unclaimed land remained. The land tenure of the vunatarai which first occupied land at Rakunat from madapai either in Rakunat or adjoining pakanagunan is paramount, and the tenure of other resident groups gained by later acquisition remains subordinate for so long as the secondary nature of their settlement is remembered. Epstein says that the Tolai at Natupit employ the term a kakalei in referring to the tenure of a vunatarai whose matrilineal ancestors first occupied the land, and marked it out for settlement or cultivation (1969:126). The term, he says, means "a claim as of right, the ultimate interest in land known to them" (ibid.), but Bradley apparently regards the concept as embracing all claims to land "as of matrilineal right" (1982:60). Many Rakunat residents occupy land owned by their vunatarai or vunatarai segment, their claims being based on "matrilineal right", but only certain vunatarai are identified as original settlers of the land their members currently occupy, so that their interests are recognised as "ultimate".

The process of secondary settlement of Rakunat land began, therefore, about the turn of the century, and the foregoing treatment shows that land tenure change since then has proceeded predominantly by the redistribution of land from first-settling vunatarai to members of resident groups experiencing from time to time either an absolute or a comparative lack of access to land. In reconstructing the pattern of original settlement at Rakunat I claimed reason to believe that, in the case of some vunatarai based in pakanagunan adjacent to Rakunat, what was regarded by the time of adjudication as land their
matrilineal ancestors had first settled would in fact have been acquired from locally-based *vunatarai*, but by 1966 the secondary nature of their settlement had been forgotten. In the case of the locally-based segments of three *vunatarai* whose presence at Rakunat was the consequence of remote female in-marriages from outside Nodup *paparagunan*, however, the fact of their secondary settlement was still recalled in 1966, and continues to qualify the tenure to the land they occupy today. In Chapter 4 I analysed the forty-six transactions documented in the Adjudication Record of 1966 by which members of matriline segments secured secondary settlement of Rakunat land, and in Chapter 5 the forty-two transactions since adjudication, in continuation of this process of secondary and even more subordinate settlement, were examined. In the remainder of this section I will review the elements of all transactions over the history of land tenure change at Rakunat, to demonstrate how core Tolai cultural institutions have been manipulated in response to the changing demands on land.

In the previous section I identified increasing population and an accelerating trend to patrilocal residence⁶ as the key developments within the village which demanded adjustment to Rakunat land tenure. Both factors are Tolai-wide phenomena, and it may be assumed that the tenure adjustments seen at Rakunat were similarly being made in other Tolai villages in response to the same stimuli. Because for the great majority of Tolai their most important and reliable access to land is gained through *vunatarai* membership, the impact of these two factors on land availability must be assessed at the level of the *vunatarai*. So far as population increase is concerned, its effect on land availability is unevenly experienced at *vunatarai* level, for growth or decline of *vunatarai* strength depends mainly on the number of female members born into the *vunatarai*. Within individual *vunatarai* membership will, of course, vary over time, but at any one point there will be *vunatarai* whose members are experiencing a comparative surplus of land, and others experiencing a comparative lack. One main feature of the history of transactions at Rakunat is the exchange of land from the comparatively "land-rich" *vunatarai* to members of locally-based

---

⁶As explained above in the text, by "patrilocal residence" I mean that children are living in the locality with which not they but their father is identified.
vunatarai whose land availability was at the time low. The trend to patrilocal residence is associated with the increasing importance of the patriarchal nuclear family, but as we have seen its significance for land tenure results from another phenomenon - the increasing incidence of female local exogamy. To a far greater extent than ever before children are growing up in communities remote from their own vunatarai land. The combined effects of increased female exogamy (or, from the host community's point of view, female in-marriage) and patrilocal residence has had the greatest impact on Rakunat land tenure, and their implications will now be considered in detail, based on the Rakunat experience.

Where a woman resides virilocally after a locally-exogamous marriage, tenure implications arise initially for the first generation of her descendants. For female children of such an in-marriage, if they marry locally (and local endogamy remains a common factor in marriage) and follow the general practice of virilocal residence, no difficulty is necessarily presented in meeting their land needs, but their children will also grow up remote from their own vunatarai land, so land access again presents a problem for this generation in adulthood, as indeed it continues to do for successive generations of matrilineal descendants who remain resident in the new area of settlement. Male children of a female in-marriage upon their marriage have the possibility of uxorilocal residence (a prospect not preferred, although some males accept it nowadays), but more commonly resort is had to customary methods of acquiring land owned by other vunatarai, in order to satisfy the land needs of such males residing distant from their own vunatarai land. At he next generation, where the males have married locally no problem is usually presented in meeting the land needs of their children, who can at adulthood make claims on their own vunatarai land in the area. To illustrate the long-term consequences of female in-marriage, and the land tenure adjustments made to accommodate the needs of members of the resultant matriline segment who remain resident in the new area of settlement, the history of Tuturokin vunatarai's settlement at Rakunat will be considered.

The six post-adjudication acquisitions by Tuturokin members were dealt with in Chapter 5, under the category of acquisitions by members of vunatarai based in Nodup paparagunan, but outside Rakunat pakanagunan. Tuturokin is a segment of Vagai vunatarai, the latter...
being a Pikalaba moiety vunatarai based at Matalau, which had maintained long-term associations with other Pikalaba moiety vunatarai in the Nodup paperaquman, in particular Rakunat, Darairat (or Rakunai), ToKubo and ToMau'uva vunatarai. One ancestress of the Tuturokin vunatarai segment is IaRuti (see Diagram 5.4), who in-married to Rakunat from Matalau about 1900 to ToPuang, a big-man of the Rakunat-based Nekupia vunatarai. The second Tuturokin ancestress is IaRuti's "sister" IeTitere (see Diagram 5.4) who also in-married to Rakunat, to ToRiaria - a member of Vunakokor, a vunatarai based at Ratavul but a segment of which had originally settled land at Rakunat (see Chapter 3).

IaRuti had five children, two sons (ToLete and ToPelis) from an earlier marriage to a man whose identity cannot be recalled, and three more sons (ToMata'apa, Teu and Tirip) from her marriage to ToPuang. Presumably she would have used her husband's vunatarai land at Rakunat for her own and her infant children's livelihood, although she may have invoked her vunatarai's associations with other Pikalaba moiety vunatarai to meet their land needs. Of her first two sons, I have no details on ToLote's residence, but ToPelis apparently occupied Nekupia vunatarai land during his adult years (i.e., the land of his step-father, ToPuang), and as he married a member of Tingananabalbal vunatarai (IeLisabet), she and her children had access to their vunatarai land at Rakunat. Of IaRuti's other three sons, ToMata'apa for a while occupied his father's vunatarai land at Rakunat, but later moved to Matupit, whence his wife came. Teu, the present lualua of Tuturokin, lives at Matalau, presumably having returned to his vunatarai land, but I have no details on his brother Tirip's whereabouts, except that he is not resident at Rakunat. IaRuti's children all being males, no land access needs arose for later matrilineal descendants.

The three children of IaRuti's "sister" IeTitere, on the other hand, included two daughters. IeTitere first married ToRiaria, with whom she had two children - IaNamiau and Tito. She then married ToVue of Tingananabalbal vunatarai, and had another daughter, IeTamian. Presumably IeTitere also occupied her husbands' land, with her

---

7 ToMau'uva was said to be a Nodup-based vunatarai, although no genealogy was compiled for it by the LTC. The group originated at Birar, south of Cape Gazelle (see Map 2), and first settled in the Nodup area with Tamanakulap vunatarai, also of the Pikalaba moiety.
children during their infancy. The first daughter IaNamiau married twice, first to ToKiriat (a member of Vunatabun vunatarai - the Rakunat-based segment of a group originally from Pila Pila), and then to a man whose vunatarai I did not identify. She bore a single child, by her first husband ToKiriat, a daughter IaNamar. The son Tito apparently moved back to his vunatarai land at Matalau, and married a woman from a vunatarai based there, and the second daughter IeTaman married a man from the Duke of Yorks, where she and her children have settled. Thus from the two "sisters", IaNerti and IeTitere, who in-married from Matalau to Rakunat some time around 1900, two generations later only one female descendant, IaNamar, remained resident at Rakunat. It was in favour of her and her children that five of the six post-adjudication acquisitions by members of Tuturokin vunatarai were effected. IaNamar married Tuat Semi, a member of Tinganabalbal vunatarai, around 1960, and presumably worked his vunatarai land with him, but the couple became active in acquiring land for their children soon after adjudication.

The pattern which emerges is clear. A woman in-marries to Rakunat, and lives on her husband's land together with their children during their youth. Upon reaching adulthood, the male children's needs are satisfied either by returning to their own vunatarai land (as IaNerti's son Teu and IeTitere's son Tito did), or by their father arranging for them to remain on his vunatarai land (as was done in the case of the brothers ToPelis and ToNata'apa). Female children of the in-marriage, upon their own marriage, move to settle with their husbands, either locally (as in the case of IaNamiau) or elsewhere (as IeTaman did). At the next generation of resident descendants, if they are the children of a son who married locally (as ToPelis did, in marrying IeLisabet of Tinganabalbal vunatarai) then they have assured access to land at Rakunat. If, on the other hand, the children's father married a woman from a vunatarai based elsewhere, then the husband may later gravitate in that direction, where once again his children's land rights are assured (as ToNata'apa has done, in moving to his wife's pakanagunan at Matupit). The position with resident children of daughters of the original female in-marriage is, however, fundamentally different. During their youth they, too, would usually live on their father's land, but upon reaching adulthood they would have no assured access to Rakunat land. Males could return to their vunatarai land, but otherwise they face the prospect of living
uxorilocally, unless some arrangement is made to acquire land for them. Females can gain land access by marrying a spouse who is a member of a locally-based *vunatarai* (as IaNamar did, in marrying a Tinganabalbal member), but the problem re-emerges in the next generation, when once again arrangements have to be made for children with no access to *vunatarai* land (as was done with IaNamar's children). For each generation of matrilineal descendants of the original female in-marriage, their residence at Rakunat continues to present a land access problem.

Apart from the few cases of acquisitions by members of locally-based *vunatarai* whose land availability was comparatively low, all but two of the eighty-odd transactions over the history of settlement at Rakunat were motivated by the need to provide land for the resident matrilineal descendants of female in-marriages. For each matriline segment the tenure implications illustrated by the Tuturokin example are present to a greater or lesser extent, depending on the number of members who remain resident at Rakunat. With a general reduction in land availability (though unevenly experienced between *vunatarai*) there are indications that land access is becoming an important consideration in marriage choice, and I was advised that sometimes parents of a male will try to arrange his marriage to a woman from a Rakunat-based *vunatarai*, so as to secure their children's future land access. Reduced land availability is also affecting residence practice, with a significant number of men now residing uxorilocally (see below). In most cases, however, resort is had to customary methods of acquiring land to meet the needs of resident members of the matriline segment, and the Rakunat experience shows that associations between *vunatarai*, and kinship and affinal relationships, are essential elements of these acquisitions.

I will analyse the social connections underlying land acquisitions next, but first some clarification of what is meant in Tolai terms by an "acquisition" of land is necessary. In reviewing land tenure adjustments over the history of settlement at Rakunat in Part II I said that Tolai customary methods of land acquisition were employed to secure the secondary settlement of land, and it is vital

---

8The two exceptions were the acquisitions for the single child of a moiety-incestuous marriage between parents who had resettled at Mataialu from the Kokopo-Raluana area, and by a member of a Rabuana-based *vunatarai* with a reputation as a major land acquirer.
to appreciate that in almost all cases of land acquisition the land in question was already occupied by the persons in whose favour the transaction was mounted— and sometimes had been over many decades, by successive generations of a matriline segment. Tolai say that in the past such occupation of a *vunatarai*’s land by non-members was usually allowed without requiring payment, and they use the term for gift (a *tinabar*) to describe the method by which the land has been acquired. It is apparent, however, that, far from being an instantaneous transaction, what is connoted by the "gift" is simply that the occupiers’ tenure has after the passage of time been recognised by the *vunatarai* which owned the land, and that a payment for that tenure had not been demanded. We also saw in Part II that for a number of the acquisitions at Rakunat an *ikulia* payment was made in explicit confirmation of an earlier gift of the land, and that in general persons who acquired land by whatever method were expected to maintain their relationships with the land-disposing *vunatarai*—by participating in their ceremonial activities, contributing *tabu* at a member’s funeral and so forth. Two major points about Tolai acquisition methods emerge: first, that an acquisition is generally a gradual process of building up identification with the land in question, by long-term occupation and the maintenance of relationships; and secondly, that acquisitions by *ikulia* payment differ only from acquisitions by gift in the degree of security they afford to the tenure gained.

Looking now at associations between *vunatarai*, we have seen that in the first settlement of Rakunat groups congregated along moiety lines, in an expression of the moiety solidarity remarked in Chapter 2 to be a principal feature of Tolai social structure. Groups arriving in succession from distant origins first attached themselves to same-moiety *vunatarai* already settled at Rakunat and later occupied adjoining land, so that by the time all the land had been fully occupied virtually the whole area had been divided into two collections of contiguous parcels owned by *vunatarai* belonging to each moiety (see Map 10). From remarks made by informants it is clear that in the past transfers of land out of the moiety were resisted, and while over the history of transactions there have been many instances of *vunatarai* land being transferred to members of a *vunatarai* of the opposite moiety (see below), there is still a residual inclination to retain land within the moiety. In earlier times when land was
relatively abundant, solidarity within the moiety was commonly expressed by the arrangements made to provide land for a woman in-marrying to Rakunat from a distant area. Remote from her kin, such a woman was particularly vulnerable in her new area of settlement, and I received a number of accounts of the arrangements made between big-men from the woman's moiety in her place of origin and in her new area of settlement to protect her from sorcery, to include her in local ceremonial activities, and to provide land for her and her children. In the case of a number of more recent transactions, the fact that the land-acquiring person belonged to the same moiety as the land-disposing vunatarai was expressly stated as being the basis of the transaction, and thirty-one acquisitions of the eighty-eight investigated during fieldwork were found to be based on such intra-moiety associations.

In some cases we saw that a land gift to a member of an associated vunatarai was made in reciprocation for a service rendered, in one case the land acquirer having paid compensation to settle a grievance over a woman caused by a big-man of the land-disposing vunatarai, and in another the woman who acquired the land having assisted the land-disposing vunatarai over many years by contributing tabu and food during their ceremonies. A similar acquisition method mentioned by some commentators is by "sons' generous distribution of shell money to their father's relatives (kutu bat ra tambu) on the occasion of the father's mortuary ceremonies." (Bradley 1982:59.) Bradley says that sons thereby try to establish a claim to land through patrifiliation (ibid., 119). Rakunat informants recognised the practice, but they say that such tabu distribution by the deceased's sons is expected anyway, and nowadays is not accepted by itself as a method of acquiring land. My own impression is that, today at least, instead of being a separate land acquisition method, such contributions at mortuary ceremonies (not just by sons) are part of the maintenance of intergroup and interpersonal relationships necessary to preserve land rights gained by some other method. A further instance of moiety solidarity underlying a land transaction was the single case of an exchange of land between two vunatarai of the same moiety, the Nodup-based ToPilul vunatarai exchanging a parcel of its land at Baai for a parcel of Rakunai vunatarai land at Rakunat. The exchange has broken down, however, ToPilul claims to the Rakunat parcel now being withdrawn under the threat of sorcery by a Rakunai member.
The most significant impact of intra-moiety associations on Rakunat land tenure has been through the infiltration of the community by groups settled in the area as a result of a female in-marriage, the male members of such groups invoking their common moiety with locally-based *vunatarai* to prevail upon the latters' land affairs. The clearest example of this phenomenon was the attachment of the segment of a Malaguna-based group to Nekupia *vunatarai*. Deriving from a female in-marriage to the Rakunat locality about the middle of the last century, around 1900 the members of this matriline segment began moving onto Nekupia land, taking advantage of the lack of senior males in the *vunatarai* at that time. The principal figure in this encroachment was ToIsaea ToWartul, but he was joined by his three brothers, and also by two members of a same-moiety Pila Pila-based *vunatarai* - the brothers Tito and Tipie. ToUva, a son of ToIsaea's sister, continued the group's interference in Nekupia's affairs, being responsible for the disposition of many parcels before his death around 1978. Vunatabun *vunatarai*, in association with Tito and Tipie, also flourished for a time at Rakunat, at one stage just before demarcation having five male members exercising considerable influence on the land affairs of locally-based *vunatarai*. Its two earlier associates, Tito and Tipie, had married sisters from ToKubo *vunatarai*, originally based at Nodup, and over many decades male members of this matriline segment (in particular, ToLuk and ToLiaser) settled on the land of other *vunatarai* at Rakunat.

ToKubo *vunatarai* is on the point of extinction, the only survivors of the spurious Malaguna segment of Nekupia (a brother and sister) reside outside the Tolai area, and the elderly IaMonika and some of her children are the only remaining members of Vunatabun still resident at Rakunat. Despite their present reduced influence, the past involvement of members of these three matriline segments has confused the tenure of many parcels of land at Rakunat, and left a legacy of conflicting claims. Although Vunatabun members have been settled at Rakunat for over a century, present residents are still reminded of their lack of authenticity in the area. IaMonika's oldest child ToRoli has succumbed to this pressure, abandoning the Rakunat land recorded in his name in 1966 and returning to reside at Pila Pila, whence his mother's maternal grandmother IaMigir fled to Rakunat about the middle of the last century. More enduring is the presence of the Bauvik *vunatarai* segment, originally from the Tavui paparagunan.
IaVaula, the apical ancestress of this segment, in-married to Rakunat about 1900, to ToIsaea ToWartul of the spurious Nekupia segment. ToKoniel, one of her eight children, is now the Bauvik lualua, and they have established what they regard as their new madapai on Nekupia land given to them by their father, although its ownership is contested by Palakuka vunatarai.

Other intra-moiety associations have reduced the pressure on land at Rakunat. Concentration on the tenure adjustments made in response to the needs of groups newly-settling at Rakunat may give the impression that population movement has been one-way only, and it must be kept in mind that the factors (such as in-marriage) producing movement in to Rakunat were also operative in other Tolai villages, so that some movement out of Rakunat is continually occurring. Shifts in settlement are not exclusively the product of out-marriages, for while intra-moiety associations allowed new groups to settle on Rakunat land, in the case of Rakalikel, a Rakunat-based vunatarai of the Pikalaba moiety, a segment long resided outside Rakunat on the land of TaMalamalagene vunatarai (also Pikalaba) at Matalau. The latter had no senior males in the early decades of this century to arrange their ceremonial activities, so ToKaut - the then lualua of Rakalikel - fulfilled this function for them, and he and other members of his vunatarai occupied their land over three generations. Similar circumstances prompted the temporary adoption by ToKiliu vunatarai (based at Rakunat) of a male member of a Rabuana-based vunatarai, who appears on the Adjudication Record as participating in the ownership of ToKiliu land at Rakunat, although his involvement in their land affairs has now ceased.

Turning to relationships between individuals and how they have been activated in adjusting Rakunat land tenure, it is important to recall the general point made in Chapter 2 that, implicit in the relativity of Tolai social concepts, there is an essential coherence between interpersonal relationships and intergroup connections. Thus where a land transaction is based upon an interpersonal relationship, the transfer is seen as an exchange of land between two corporate groups connected by one (or sometimes more than one) of the key relationships in the Tolai social structure. With the increased incidence of patrilocal residence, a large proportion of the transactions was effected to secure children's rights in land
belonging to their father's vunatarai, where they had remained after reaching adulthood, planting their cash crops and gardens and building residences. While these transactions were based on the father-child relationship, in an extended sense they are regarded as the exchange of land between the children's "fathering" vunatarai and the matrilineal segment comprising the children, and their later matrilineal descendants.

Such acquisitions of "fathering" vunatarai land entail the exchange of land across the moiety division. A clear illustration of the interpersonal relationships involved, and how at group level they continue to affect the tenure of the subject land, is afforded by the tenurial developments in recent decades on Block 50. In 1966 the parcel was recorded as owned by Palakuka vunatarai, having been acquired by ikulia from Rakunat vunatarai. My investigations during fieldwork revealed that a Palakuka member, Robin ToMonongia, had lived on the land with his father ToLevi, a big-man of Rakunat vunatarai, and after his father's death ToMonongia had remained in occupation. Shortly before demarcation he had approached the leadership of Rakunat vunatarai, who had agreed to his acquiring the parcel by an ikulia payment. Their agreement was expressly based on the fact that ToMonongia was their cross-cousin (nauvana), but the effect of the transaction was that he acquired the land of his "fathering" vunatarai. Block 50 is now regarded as Palakuka vunatarai land, not only by ToMonongia and other Palakuka members (some of whom have houses there) but also by Rakunat vunatarai. The case shows that where an acquisition is primarily based on one interpersonal relationship (i.e., father/child), it is also supported by other relationships (i.e., that of cross-cousins, in all cases of acquisitions of land from a "fathering" vunatarai). In this case it is also evident that, in the hands of the new owners, the land is regarded as owned by the matrilineal group which they represent, but this raises the more general matter of the character of tenure gained by acquisitions, which I will deal with later in this chapter. Two

9Of the eighty-eight transactions investigated during fieldwork thirty-six were direct acquisitions for children (and also in some cases daughter's children) of land belonging to their father's vunatarai. Four other acquisitions also involved land with which the land-acquirers were indirectly associated through a paternal connection.
other acquisitions at Rakunat were expressly stated as being based upon a cross-cousin relationship.

Six acquisitions were said to be based on the fact that a father had received his eldest daughter's bridewealth upon her marriage. Other acquisitions by males of their own vunatarai land for their children may well have been based on the same consideration, for the practice of a father receiving his eldest daughter's bridewealth was said to be common. The implications of this practice afford another illustration of how relationships first promote a land tenure adjustment, and thereafter continue to qualify the nature of the land tenure gained from an acquisition. The practice involves a complex and delayed exchange, the main elements of which are the interests in a woman (in her sexuality, labour, etc.), tabu, and land. Marriages generally involve a reciprocal exchange between a woman's and her husband's vunatarai, whereby certain interests in the woman pass from the former to the latter, and tabu is transferred from the latter to the former. Upon dissolution of marriage return of bridewealth tabu would be expected, although this will depend on the particular circumstances (see Bradley 1982: 189). The arrangements for eldest daughters are different, however, as a leading Rakunat authority, Daniel ToWaai, explained:

Under our custom, when the first daughter is born into a family it is seen as a gift by the mother to the father. When the [bridewealth] payment is made for this first daughter, the tabu goes to her father. In return, he must buy some land or do something for her, because he received the tabu for her.

There are three steps in the exchange, and only after completion of the final step is the exchange closed. The first step is the "gift" of a female member of one vunatarai to her father, a member of another vunatarai of the opposite moiety. This "gift" entitles the father to receive the woman's bridewealth upon her marriage (the second step), which would normally be received by the woman's vunatarai. The father is thereby obliged, finally, to acquire a parcel of his vunatarai land for his daughter by making an ikulia payment.

---

10 Epstein noted the practice of a father receiving his first-born daughter's bridewealth at Matupit (1969:217), but the explanation he was given, that it was a way of compensating the father for the loss of nidok fees for his son's initiation into the then moribund tubuan society (ibid.), was rejected both by my Rakunat informants and by the Tolai anthropologist Jacob Simet, himself from Matupit (1984, pers.comm.).
The reciprocity (at both vunatarai and moiety level) present in the usual marital exchange is preserved in the special case of first daughters, once the exchange is completed. The combined effect of the three steps is that, at vunatarai level, the woman's vunatarai has exchanged interests in a woman for land, her father's vunatarai has exchanged land for tabu, and her husband's vunatarai has exchanged tabu for a woman (in the normal way). At moiety level, the woman's moiety has exchanged interests in a woman for land, and the father's moiety has exchanged land for interests in a woman. The bridewealth tabu, having been paid by the husband's vunatarai to the woman's father, and then by the father to his vunatarai in acquiring the land for his daughter, remains within the same moiety. The foregoing account presents the "ideal" situation, and as with so many aspects of Tolai cultural practice there is scope for variation. Informants said, for example, that the father's reciprocation could take other forms, such as contributing tabu in ceremonies involving his daughter's vunatarai, or in assisting her in developing her vunatarai land. What is agreed, however, is that if the reciprocation takes the form of the father acquiring vunatarai land for his daughter, then in the first place the ikulia paid becomes part of the vunatarai's common store and must be held for distribution in ceremonial activities on its behalf, and secondly that the land concerned is held by the daughter in her capacity as a member of a matriline segment. In all six cases investigated at Rakunat, not only the daughter herself but also her children, and in some instances her siblings and her sisters' children, were regarded as having interests in the subject land, and were usually found in occupation.

In Chapter 2 I said that the moiety can be regarded as a classificatory vunatarai. From an individual's point of view, therefore, all land at Rakunat is owned either by that person's vunatarai or by that person's "fathering" vunatarai, in this classificatory sense. If actual interpersonal relationships are not available, an individual may therefore invoke classificatory relationships with any vunatarai in order to gain access to Rakunat land. While this may suggest a total latitude for acquiring land, the scope for activating classificatory relationships is in fact subject to the practical consideration that, apart from the members of vunatarai which first settled in the Rakunat locality and are identified with it, all other Rakunat residents are there in
consequence of either their own in-marriage to a person already settled there, or their matrilineal descent from an in-marrying female ancestor. By kinship or affinity, or frequently by a combination of both, over time these outsiders increase their indentification with the community, and usually it is only after settlement in the area for a number of generations by that person's matriline segment that the social connections and political associations necessary to effect a successful acquisition of land can be developed. The great majority of acquisitions were effected by payment of ikulia, and the nature of these transactions will now be considered.

The term ikulia, used generally by Tolai nowadays (and adopted by the LTC) for the transaction by which land is acquired for payment, is a compound term derived from the verb kul. Commentators have noted that kul means both "to buy" and "to sell", and stress that it is used especially in exchanges where there is immediate reciprocity (e.g., Salisbury 1970:179; Bradley 1982:108). Tolai say that the exchange of land for tabu is a long-established practice, and that, while in the past it was more usual for land to be acquired by gift (tinabar), today no land transfer can afford security of tenure unless accompanied by a payment. They expressly attribute this development to the increasing population pressure on land, which has led to a general tightening of the requirements for land transfers. In the preceding discussion I claimed that all land transactions involve the mobilisation of connections at both group and individual levels. Correspondingly, interests in the land the subject of a transaction, and in the tabu used in payment for the land, must be considered at both group and individual levels.

All transactions involve the disposition of land by a group - usually the vunatarai which originally settled the land, but sometimes a matriline segment which itself had acquired the land from the original land-owning vunatarai. While a vunatarai generally owned the land, the person effecting the disposition was usually the vunatarai's lualua, although on occasions other senior members of the vunatarai were consulted, and were expressly mentioned as having approved the disposition. The lualua of a vunatarai is generally obliged to look

---

11 A probable manifestation of the new strictures is the constraints on land use (e.g., only for housing) specified in a number of the acquisitions.
after (balaure) the interests of its members, including to manage and control its landholdings (kure ra pia). Informants say that in the past lualua were entitled to dispose of vunatarai land without consulting other vunatarai members, but that in more recent times a lualua would not act without consulting the adult members of the vunatarai, and that the wishes of female members must be given special consideration.

In Chapter 2 the importance of tabu as a medium of exchange was discussed. Demand for cash has steadily increased since the Tolai's early involvement in the cash economy, and from World War II at least it was common for ikulia payments at Rakunat to comprise both cash and tabu. Senior members of vunatarai which disposed of land recall precisely the payments made over thirty years ago (the cash element of payments from this period being stated in pounds), so I was able to get details of most land payments made in recent decades. Reliable statistical analysis of the value of payments is precluded by uncertainty over the areas involved in many acquisitions since 1966, but my clear impression is that commercial factors (including inflation) have had little impact on payment amounts. To illustrate, in 1951 a payment of 40 fathoms of tabu and ten pounds was made for 0.38 hectares, while in 1975, for a parcel about a third the size, 10 fathoms of tabu and K20 was paid. Meanwhile, in 1967 the Administration paid a total of $2,565 to acquire 4.11 hectares at Rakunat for Boisen High School - a rate of $624 per improved hectare, which probably reflects the contemporary commercial value of land in the area. In a few transactions only cash was paid. Rakunat leaders said that tabu was a desirable but not an essential element of ikulia, and that manner of payment depended on the wishes of the land-disposing vunatarai (in particular reflecting their need at the time for either cash or tabu), and whether the person making the payment had cash or tabu at his or her disposal. From comments made it was clear that the amount asked was kept low in the case of needy individuals, and that in general the payment was of more symbolic than commercial importance.

Ikulia payments received by a lualua for vunatarai land are part of the vunatarai's common store, and must be applied for the vunatarai's purposes, in particular by distribution at an important member's funeral or at other ceremonial activities. Persons occupying land in consequence of an acquisition are also expected to contribute
tabu and food on these occasions, in confirmation of the association upon which the land transaction was based. Failure by them to contribute, and even failure by the lualua to apply the ikulia payment to vunatarai purposes (over which the land acquirers would have no control), can lead to repudiation of the acquisition, and attempts by the land-disposing vunatarai membership to oust the land acquirers from the land. While I agree with Bradley that "there is a sense in which every individual's tambu constitutes part of the vunatarai fund" (1982:115), Rakunat informants say that a common cause of land disputes arises from the failure of lualua to keep tabu acquired in ikulia payments separate from their own personal store. This continuing identification of acquired land with the ikulia payment made for it operates to qualify the tenure gained by the acquisition in two ways - not only by rendering the tenure liable to challenge if the payment is misapplied, but also by characterising the group whose members will benefit from the acquisition. The ikulia transaction will now be examined from the viewpoint of the land acquirers.

Chapters 4 and 5 showed that, almost without exception, land acquisitions over the history of settlement at Rakunat have been in favour of members of vunatarai or smaller matriline segments who were experiencing either an absolute or a relative lack of access to land at the time. Many cases involved a father acquiring land by ikulia for his children who were so placed, but in other cases a mother, maternal grandmother, maternal uncle, or even the children themselves effected the acquisition. The crucial question so far as the character of the group whose members stand to gain from the acquisition is not so much who made the ikulia payment, but whose tabu was used in the transaction. Where the person making the ikulia payment is a woman there is no real scope for ambiguity; whether the tabu she uses is regarded as her own or as part of her vunatarai's common fund, it will be generally understood that she is acquiring the land for the matriline segment of which she is a member. Where a man makes the ikulia payment, however, the crucial question which arises is whether he used his own personal tabu or tabu which is regarded as part of his vunatarai's common store.

The potential for ambiguity in the case of males arises from their dual roles, one as a member of their own vunatarai with responsibilities towards their matrilineal relatives, and the other as a father with responsibilities to children who are members of another
vunatarai. From the Rakunat experience, most acquisitions are
effected to secure the occupation of outsiders resident in a locality
in consequence of a female in-marriage. In many cases ikulia payments
were made to secure the tenure of children occupying land belonging to
their "fathering" vunatarai. If the person making the payment in these
circumstances is the father of the children then he can only use his
own personal tabu, for a vunatarai's tabu cannot be used in payment
for its own land. If, on the other hand, a man is acquiring the land
of another vunatarai for his children he must be careful to use only
his personal tabu, for if the tabu used should be regarded as
belonging to his vunatarai then his matrilineal relatives will claim
the land as theirs, and attempt to oust his children after his death.
Where a man wishes to acquire land for his matrilineal relatives
(e.g., his sister's children) the risk to be guarded against is that
his children may attempt to claim the land as theirs. If he uses tabu
belonging to his vunatarai his matrilineal relatives would be in a
strong position to resist any claims by his children, but if the tabu
is his own the potential for conflict between his kin group and his
children's kin group remains. The difficulty may be presented in any
case of acquisition by a male, but it is more pronounced where the
male concerned is the lualua of his vunatarai, for he will have in his
possession tabu which unequivocally belongs to his vunatarai, as well
as his own personal tabu. Furthermore, use of cash in substitution
for tabu in some recent acquisitions may increase the difficulty of
establishing which kin group is ultimately entitled to benefit from
the acquisition.

The critical importance of the source and ultimate disposal of
ikulia payments reflects the continuing centrality of intergroup and
interpersonal relationships to the quality of tenure gained by this
major method of secondary land settlement. The relationships which
underlie a land transaction must be maintained in order for the tenure
to remain secure, and because of their inherence in the tenure of each

\[12\] Informants claimed that the failure by lualua to differentiate
between their vunatarai's and their own tabu (both in making payments
for land and in applying payments received for land) has created a
serious problem in recent times, although no clear instance of the
problem arose during fieldwork at Rakunat. Perhaps doubts over the
tenure to acquired land have so far been suppressed by the evident
reluctance to upset the well-being of fellow-residents in the village
who have long occupied and developed their acquired land.
parcel of land I claimed that Tolai land tenure is characterised by the relationship or association of which it is a product. Not only is this so for persons occupying land in consequence of an acquisition, but it is also of the essence of an individual's occupation of his or her vunatarai land that it is held in their capacity as vunatarai members. It now remains to consider the effects of over a century of social change at Rakunat, in the course of which my other major claim drawn from the Rakunat experience - that all customary land is owned by descent groups - will be confirmed.

3. THE EFFECTS OF SOCIAL CHANGE ON LAND TENURE

The inherence of Tolai social organisation in their customary tenure entails a correlationship under which a change in one element will have consequential effects on the other. In Chapter 7 I will examine how prescriptive changes in land tenure affected the qualities of the intergroup and interpersonal relationships identified as central to Tolai social organisation, but in the remainder of this chapter the effects on land tenure of change in Tolai social organisation will be considered. My conclusion from the Rakunat experience is that the formative social factor generating change in Tolai land tenure is change in the pattern of their settlement.

Elderly Tolai hark back to former times when they say land was readily obtainable: lualua could dispose of vunatarai land with relative freedom, migrant groups could occupy land without the need for payment, and short-term access to another vunatarai's land for gardening could be gained without difficulty. In times when land was plentiful there would have been no practical reason to resist land dispositions, and the Rakunat experience shows that over a very long period the land needs of outsider groups settling with the community were met by acquisitions from locally-based vunatarai. With a high degree of local endogamy at the time, most groups newly settling in the area could invoke a range of social connections and political associations to effect these acquisitions, but powerful figures (sometimes active sorcerers) were also able to intrude upon the landholdings of local groups with relative impunity. Against such impressions of fluidity in tenure adjustments, however, must be set the historical record that, by 1966 at least, the great majority of Rakunat land was still owned by the vunatarai which originally settled it, and that the potential to acquire land by one of the Tolai methods
for securing secondary settlement, however great, had only seldom been exploited. Furthermore, for many of the newly-settling groups the derivative nature of their tenure to the acquired land is still recalled, and pressures are today being exerted in some cases for restoration of the original ownership.

Since 1966 an increase in the frequency of land transactions at Rakunat has been apparent, almost entirely in consequence of increased female in-marriage to the community, and the resultant trend to continue patrilocal residence into adulthood. A growing village population demands more intensive land use, but the principal cause of land tenure adjustment is the changing composition of the village. While most Rakunat land is still owned today by the vunatarai which originally settled it, an increasing proportion of the membership of those vunatarai reside away from the Rakunat locality (a consequence often of out-marriage by a matrilineal ancestor), and increasingly the land of Rakunat-based vunatarai is being occupied by outsiders who are the product of female in-marriages, pursuant to land acquisitions. In Appendix G I examine the present settlement pattern of sample Rakunat-based vunatarai - to establish both the current residence and basis of that residence of all adult members, and the current occupation of all vunatarai-owned land as recorded in 1966, and basis of that occupation. Analysis of the data showed not only the increasing proportion of outsiders in the village population, but also that the changing settlement pattern was heavily influenced by the comparative land availability of respective vunatarai.

Thus of the fifty-three adult members of Rakunat - a vunatarai of median land availability - only nineteen were occupying vunatarai land in one way or another in 1982. These nineteen were, however, a large majority of the vunatarai's resident adult membership. Others resided on settlement schemes or were absent in the course of employment (either their own or their spouse's), but another nineteen were living either virilocally (in the case of females) or patrilocally (in the case of their children) on other customary land in the Tolai area, while two male members resided uxorilocally at neighbouring Rabuana. Probably as many non-members occupied land recorded in 1966 as owned
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13 In the absence of surveys of land acquired from vunatarai since adjudication (see text), the areas of remaining vunatarai-owned land could not be calculated.
by Rakunat vunatarai as members, and a majority of these were children of male members, who had acquired the parcels from their "fathering" vunatarai. Children of nearly all the resident senior males had thus acquired land, in some cases because, their father having married exogamously, they were outsiders, and in others because, although they were village members, their vunatarai's landholdings were insufficient to meet the land needs of the resident membership. From the data on this vunatarai of median land availability I drew two main conclusions: first, that vunatarai land has been allocated among the membership in response to the differing needs of individuals; and second, that tenure to the vunatarai land has been adjusted in response to the land needs of the wider Rakunat community. The settlement pattern of Rakunat vunatarai was compared in Appendix G with that for two other Rakunat-based vunatarai - Vunatoboai, a vunatarai of low land availability, and Nekupia, a vunatarai of comparatively high land availability. In circumstances of acute land pressure, Vunatoboai vunatarai land was only available for a small minority of its locally-resident adult membership, while the rest either used land elsewhere or were absent for employment reasons. No Vunatoboai land had been acquired by non-members. Nekupia, on the other hand, was not only able to provide land for both its resident and absent membership (the latter being recognised as owning cash crops), but had also supplied the land needs of many persons related by kinship connection to groups historically associated with the vunatarai.

In concluding Chapter 5 I said that, while the history of land transactions at Rakunat revealed a spontaneous redistribution of land from the comparatively "land-rich" vunatarai to members of "land-poor" vunatarai, it remained to be seen whether the recorded acquisitions satisfied the needs of all groups settled at Rakunat, whose members were experiencing restricted access to land. A systematic survey of the land needs of all Rakunat residents, and how those needs were met, was not feasible, but as almost no-one resides at Rakunat in the absence of some kinship or affinal connection with a land-owning group, the provision made for both members and connected non-members of the sample vunatarai observed in Appendix G is, I would claim, impressive evidence of the community's commitment and capacity to respond to the land needs of the village membership as a whole. Such a commitment was frequently articulated during fieldwork: often it
was said that the group disposing of land had "felt sorry" for the predicament of the land acquirers, and there were a number of instances where a group suppressed its claims to acquired land in the interests of village welfare and harmony.

At group level, changing residence patterns have meant increasing dispersion of *vunatarai* segments. Appendix G shows that a large number of the younger adult members of *vunatarai* live in Rabaul, on settlement schemes, or outside the Tolai area for employment reasons. Many of the absentees are expected to return to Rakunat, and some land acquisitions were expressly motivated by provision for their return. Others have settled in villages elsewhere in the Tolai area, in the same manner as was observed for newly-settling groups at Rakunat. Names of junior members of long-absent segments were sometimes unknown to the *vunatarai* leadership, and in the contemporary circumstances of long-term and even permanent absence of a large proportion of the younger *vunatarai* membership the continued viability of the *vunatarai* as an operational social unit might be doubted. The comprehensive road network in the Tolai area, however, allows easy travel to any location, and workers in other parts of the country make regular return visits by plane. Ceremonies, in particular at the death of a prominent *vunatarai* member, are the occasion for a congregation of *vunatarai* members, and the recent revival of *tubuan* activities has restored links with distant kin. Nevertheless, the trend to a greater dispersion of *vunatarai* membership is likely to continue, and its implications for group solidarity and land tenure in the village are a subject of lively Tolai debate.

In the first place, as I remarked in Chapter 2, older villagers frequently complain that the younger generation (especially absentees) do not bother to inform themselves on kinship connection and land tenure history. It will by now be manifest that such knowledge is essential to support a claim to land, or to promote a successful land acquisition. It can only be gained by active participation in village affairs - in one's own and associated *vunatarai* s ceremonial activities, in *tabu* exchange and day-to-day social interaction, and by attending at the ventilation of disputes. Persons who opt out of village involvement will be at a permanent disadvantage so far as land access is concerned, and are pitied by the older Tolai for the social deprivation they can expect in their old age. Some migrant workers may never return to the village, but for some they may not be offered
the choice. The departure of such persons will have no major impact on the solidarity of the vunatarai (indeed, by relieving pressure on vunatarai land it may contribute to its continued viability), but more serious consequences would follow if a disregard for vunatarai knowledge were to become generalised among the younger generations - both resident in the village as well as absent.

Over twenty years ago, A.L. and T.S. Epstein claimed that the influence of the lineage elders was "markedly lessening", that "their days are numbered", and that as they died off they were being replaced "not by those made in their own social image, but by a new generation of more educated men holding widely different sets of values and attitudes." (1962:81.) The generation of Tolai leaders at that time had all lived through the environmental transformation since first European contact. While undoubtedly the pace of change has quickened since World War II - especially in political developments over the last twenty years - my leading Tolai informants in the early 1980s were all members of that new, replacement generation of leaders the Epsteins predicted, yet they saw themselves as holding to traditional values and attitudes, and, as I have mentioned, bemoaned the passing of old ways. Perhaps such despair for the younger generation is only human, but my own impression is that, as they grow older, those Tolai who remain resident in the village (and those absentee planning to return) show an increasing susceptibility to cultural conformity. That culture is, of course, changing from generation to generation, but thus far its central institutions have retained their integrity.

No better illustration of this cultural persistence in the face of environmental change can be found than in the effects of changed settlement patterns of vunatarai membership on the vunatarai's land tenure. Appendix G showed that many vunatarai members today live away from their vunatarai land. Interviewing all such non-residents was impracticable, but their attitudes were probably reflected by those of Rakunat residents who themselves were living remote from their vunatarai land. At a general meeting called of Rakunat residents the future of vunatarai land was discussed at length. People recognised the in-roads being made on vunatarai land (especially by

---

14 The occasion of the meeting was the regular week-night assembly to discuss village affairs, at which people were notified I would be attending to discuss general aspects of my research. About forty men, women and teen-agers attended.
male members acquiring parcels for their children - a subject I will return to shortly), but the meeting seemed generally agreed that the vunatarai with its characteristic landholdings would, indeed "must", survive. Again the madapai, that piece of land originally settled in the area which is the focus of the vunatarai's identity, was emphasised. The lualua's main responsibility is to preserve the madapai, which holds the "history" and the "power" of the vunatarai. Its commemorative feasts (balaguan) are held there, the sacred stones (pal a vat) holding the powers of the tubuan society are buried there, and within its precincts the mystical taraiu and moramoro sites are located. The vunatarai remains vitally important for gaining access to land, for accumulating and distributing tabu on its members behalf in ceremonies, and for teaching each new generation their history and their place in society.

The vulnerability of groups resident in an area where they have no madapai has been mentioned often. In preceding chapters I remarked instances of outsiders being pressured to return to the original areas their matrilineal ancestors had left many generations before, and newly-settling groups were seen striving to establish new madapai at Rakunat. Such forces in the community indicate the two extreme positions in which members of a migrant group might find themselves in their new area of settlement, and produce the key for understanding the quality of tenure gained in land acquired for their needs. From an analysis of the tenure developments on all parcels of land acquired before 1966 by Tolai customary methods of securing secondary settlement, I conclude in Appendix H that all such acquired land is owned by kinship groups to which recruitment is governed by matrilineal descent. To a limited extent land was exchanged in these transactions from one Rakunat-based vunatarai to another, but the great majority of the transactions secured land for members of matriline segments who were newly settled at Rakunat. In some cases the tenure acquired in these transactions had been overturned by the time of fieldwork, the ownership of some migrant groups to their acquired land was being challenged, while in other cases the group had left Rakunat and relinquished their landholdings. Most acquired land was, however, still occupied by the land-acquiring matriline segment, whose membership had often been extended in the decades since acquisition. Now settled for some generations at a distance from their place of origin, these groups are in the process of gaining
their own separate local identity, and their characteristic landholdings with which the future membership will identify.

Thus, in all its essentials, the process by which Rakunat was originally settled has been continued to the present day. Newly-arrived groups invoke connections with associated vunatarai, and after a generation or so of continuous settlement develop the relationships necessary to acquire their own landholdings and establish themselves in the area. The process is gradual, and even after many decades their presence in the area may be challenged. With increased vunatarai dispersion this new settlement is occurring more frequently nowadays, but the basic pattern of land tenure - i.e., ownership by vunatarai or emerging vunatarai - remains. With change in village composition the ownership of many parcels of land at Rakunat has changed, but the essential character of the tenure has not changed.

While examining the impact of environmental change on Tolai cultural institutions in Chapter 2, I acknowledged claims that the increased importance of the nuclear family has had major implications for land tenure. Based on the foregoing analysis of the impact at group level of changing settlement patterns, it remains to examine the effects of change in interpersonal relationships on Tolai land tenure. Growth in importance of the patriarchal nuclear family is manifested principally by contrasting the relationships of father with maternal uncle, and, correspondingly, of child with sister's child (male speaking). In *Kinship and Marriage* (1967) Robin Fox says:

> There is always this tug in matrilineal systems between the needs of the lineage to keep its autonomy, and the desire of a man to have control over his wife and children.... He is of course caught in a dilemma, for on the one hand he is a husband and father and wants to have his wife around, while on the other hand he is a maternal uncle with lineage responsibilities to his maternal nephews and hence needs to keep some control over them and their mother, his sister. (Ibid., 108.)

Bradley relates this dilemma to Tolai land tenure:

> As parents, men and women are anxious to buy vunatarai land for their children, while as members of their respective vunatarai, they are trying to prevent others from depleting their own lineage lands by doing the same. Conflicts arise as the Tolai try to maximise their own matrilineal claims to land while minimising those of others. (1982:71.)

In Chapter 2 I discussed a father's role during his children's infancy and noted that his continued interest in their lives - though
evident in the past - is much more pronounced today, with father's tendency to take over responsibilities of the child's maternal uncle. This development is related to the increased incidence of sustained patrilocal residence after adulthood, which has facilitated the official promotion of the nuclear family in all spheres of government. The Rakunat experience shows in the first place that the practice of fathers acquiring land from their *vunatarai* for their children has existed for many generations, and secondly that upon such acquisition the land does not cease to be *vunatarai* land, but is exchanged from one *vunatarai* to the emerging *vunatarai* their children represent. It is not denied that males thereby deplete their *vunatarai* landholdings, although, as it can be presumed that the same process is occurring elsewhere, other segments of their *vunatarai* will be gaining land in the same manner (at the expense, of course, of other *vunatarai*). Meanwhile, the acquired land over time comes under the authority of the senior male of the emerging *vunatarai*, to whom, as their maternal uncle, new generations of members will have recourse for their land access. It is only in narrow focus, therefore, that such acquisitions by a father for his children can be seen to deplete *vunatarai* land in general, or his *vunatarai* land in particular, and to diminish the importance of the *vunatarai*, the lualua's authority, and the role of the maternal uncle.

The main land tenure implication of a father's increased involvement in the provision of land for his children's needs is the stimulus it gives to exchange of land between *vunatarai*. The Rakunat experience shows a general tightening of requirements for land dispositions, particularly with a view to full consideration of the needs of the next generation of *vunatarai* members. At the same time the needs of other residents in the community must be catered for, and this has been achieved by a sensitive balancing of individual land needs and the comparative land availability between *vunatarai*, in a climate of generally increasing land pressure. As with so many other aspects of changing Tolai culture, an element of Western culture - emphasis on the nuclear family - has been incorporated by supplementing, not supplanting, the Tolai institution. One consequence is that smaller groups are now owning smaller areas of land (although most land at Rakunat is still owned by the originally-settling *vunatarai* and occupied by their resident membership), but the overall result has been the continuous optimisation of land distribution,
which clearly for the Tolai is the latent dynamic of their land tenure change.

A final matter to address in this chapter is the impact of the Adjudication Record - and record-keeping in general - on land tenure change at Rakunat. In Chapter 5 I said that suspension of the registration provisions in 1970 left the legal status of Rakunat Adjudication Record uncertain. At its highest, its effect is to declare conclusively the ownership of all blocks as at 14 October 1966, although the blocks and any interests in them remained "subject in all respects to and regulated by native custom". Such limited indefeasibility, if indeed it obtained without registration, would preclude a legal challenge to the declared ownership, but the operation of custom was not arrested, and the recorded ownership of each block remained subject to all the qualifications arising out of the inheritance of Tolai social organisation in their customary tenure already discussed. Rakunat informants who had been involved in the adjudication process were irritated that they had never received the expected documentation of block ownership, but it is difficult to see that any practical consequences would have followed if they had. The fact that on one interpretation of the operative law the Adjudication Record did attract the limited indefeasibility, while on another it did not, is a matter of sublime indifference to the Rakunat community.

The apparent ineffectuality of registration which this suggests is partly the consequence of the heavy limitations placed on indefeasibility, partly because no documentation of the adjudication proceedings and its results is held at Rakunat, but mainly because for the community the greatest service seems to have been all the preliminary establishment of land boundaries and block ownership short of actual registration. To this day the boundaries of blocks identified during demarcation are undisputed,\(^{15}\) and, while the tenure of many blocks has been adjusted in consequence of post-adjudication acquisitions under Tolai custom, the recorded block ownership as at 1966 was found to be reliable with few exceptions. Recorded vunatarai ownership was generally accurate, but Palakuka vunatarai still maintains claims to some blocks recorded as owned by Nekupia - a

\(^{15}\) Although many of the small LTC cements positioned at turning-points on block boundaries had disappeared by the time of fieldwork, most boundaries were related to clear physical features and could thus still be identified.
product of the long association between these two vunatarai, and the interference in their land affairs by powerful members of outsider groups. Block 1 at the north-eastern corner of the Adjudication Area was recorded as owned by Palakuka vunatarai, but by 1984 it seemed accepted that it was instead the matanoi of a Rabuana-based vunatarai.

Most instances of unreliability in recorded block ownership were found in cases of land acquisitions, but the inaccuracies arose mainly from lack of precision in identifying the persons intended to benefit from the acquisitions. Tenure developments on acquired land since acquisition have in most cases allowed positive identification of the intended beneficiaries as matriline segments - an eventuality apparently recognised by the LTC, for even in the case of blocks recorded as owned by single male individuals the names of matrilineal ancestors "for the purposes of inheritance and descent by native custom" (see Appendix C) were recorded. In one case a male was wrongly included in the block ownership with his daughter and her children, but the man has died and no tenurial consequence has flowed from this error. In many cases persons additional to the individuals recorded as the owners in 1966 were found during fieldwork in occupation of the block concerned, and it was recognised that their entitlement arose out of the circumstances of the acquisition, but in all such cases their inclusion in entitlement arose from membership of a matriline segment - which I have argued that the recorded ownership represented, but did not comprise exclusively. Rakunai vunatarai was found to have abrogated a land exchange and a disposition, and the reputed presence of a sorcerer in the vunatarai was suppressing claims to the two blocks based on the ownership recorded in 1966. Similarly, claims to some land suppressed during adjudication through fear of sorcerers then living are now being revived after their deaths.

The constant contingency of tenure in acquired land to the political forces in the community and to maintenance of social relationships entails an inevitable degree of unreliability in any attempt to record the land tenure status quo at a particular point of time. On a liberal interpretation of the statutory continuance of custom's operation over the land and its recorded ownership most shortcomings in the Adjudication Record can be accommodated, but senior Rakunat informants who had participated in the adjudication proceedings recognised the need for rectification of the block ownership recorded in 1966 where it was plainly wrong. How such cases
might be identified - without reopening the whole Adjudication Record - would be a matter of sensitive judgment, but the Rakunat experience showed that they were few in number. Nevertheless, they indicate that some process for periodic review and subsequent rectification should attend any measure for recording land interests.

Informants frequently expressed the high value they attached to the keeping of land tenure records - a value manifested not only by their seizing the opportunity presented by my research to have their tenure adjustments recorded, but also by their general enthusiasm and support for the research. Increasing literacy, and increasing resort to written records, is tending to replace oral tradition as the source of land tenure knowledge, particularly as it is depleted with the deaths of village elders. Without such knowledge the present elder generation predict increasing confusion over land tenure, and strife within the village community. Undoubtedly there is a serious risk that, by committing land tenure information to written form, the intrinsic flexibility of Tolai cultural institutions, and their responsiveness to changing circumstances, will be lost. But if historical knowledge is to retain its critical importance in Tolai land tenure, and there is every indication from my research that it will, then costs in terms of reduced flexibility may be offset by the benefits of a recording process sensitive to the needs of the society - the need to sustain core cultural institutions, but also the need to allow for their adjustment to changing circumstances.

---

16 One direct consequence of adjudication mentioned at Rakunat was the departure of a few residents, identified as having no entitlement to land at Rakunat, to land settlement schemes.
CHAPTER 7

LEGISLATING FOR LAND TENURE CHANGE

1. THE GENERAL LAND TENURE PATTERN

Beginning with land alienations by traders and missionaries in the early 1880s, the tenure to Tolai land has experienced major incursions during the last century under legal processes intended to secure the tenurial base for economic development. For much of that time development policies were principally concerned with promoting the economic interests of European settlers, and tenure reform consisted of the relatively simple legal processes by which land was alienated from customary tenure, either by individual settlers prior to 1885, or by the Neu Guinea Kompagnie under its land acquisition monopoly from then until 1899, or thereafter by the German and Australian administrations. At what date the alienation of Tolai land reached its peak is difficult to establish, for at any time many claims based on purported acquisitions were awaiting official investigation prior to registration of titles, and from 1900 registered titles were being cancelled or amended under the more restrictive approach to land alienations adopted by the German Imperial Administration. The administration negotiated acquisitions of land already registered in the ownership of private concerns, missions or the Neu Guinea Kompagnie for the establishment of Native Reserves, and, by negotiated exchanges or in exercise of expropriation powers after 1903, further reserves were established within registered land (see Sack 1973: 155-86). By the First World War, it is estimated that 40% of Tolai land on the Gazelle Peninsula mainland had been alienated from customary tenure1 (Irwin 1965: 130). As Map 3 shows, degree of alienation varied greatly between localities, and was heaviest in the

1Land had also been heavily alienated in the Duke of York Islands group, but I can give no accurate indication of the total area involved by World War I.
Cape Gazelle and Cape Livuan areas, in the Duke of York Islands and along Ataliklikun Bay. Rowley points out, however, that these were "the most fertile and accessible areas." (1958:90.)

Although further land alienations followed under the post-War Australian Administration, the basic land tenure pattern laid down during the German colonial period survives, and serves to distinguish the two spheres in which separate legal systems, State services and developmental objectives operate. Pursuant to the Treaty of Versailles land owned by German nationals and companies was expropriated, and sold to British nationals under conditions intended to give special preference to ex-servicemen (Rowley 1958: 316). The Lands Registration Ordinance 1924 supplied the machinery for registration of alienated land either already registered in, or entitled to be registered in, the German Ground Book, and for registering future grants of freehold by the Administration and Administration leases. Lands recorded in the Ground Book as owned by or on behalf of "natives", or encumbrances in their favour (such as in Native Reserves), were to be registered as owned by the Director of District Services and Native Affairs "as a trustee for natives". In the years between the wars there was little new alienation of Tolai land - nor, indeed, did the needs of settlers require it, for only a small proportion of the land already alienated had been cleared for cultivation when the expropriated German properties were offered for sale. Inexperience in tropical agriculture and the economic slump of the 1930s left little scope for expansion of plantation operations.

Following the devastation of the Tolai area during World War II and a period of rehabilitation and restoration of basic services, a new emphasis on economic growth - and in particular a more positive commitment to promote indigenous development - was manifested by further land developments in the Tolai area. The land most affected by these changes in fact lay in the traditional buffer zone between the Tolai and Bainings, being the fertile low-lying country of the Warangoi and Kerevat valleys (see Map 2). Sparsely-settled by its original Baining, Taulil and Butam occupants, early European accounts show that the Tolai were then in the process of extending their territory into these areas (see Chapter 1). During the 1950s the Administration added to the areas of alienated land acquired in German times along these rivers by two major acquisitions - one in 1951 of 15,000 hectares west of the Kerevat River for forest exploitation and
development, and the second in 1955 of 12,000 hectares along the central Warangoi River. Although both tracts of land could only be considered as marginally within the traditional territory of the Tolai, their alienation certainly would have impeded the process of Tolai expansion south and west into the Gazelle Peninsula, were it not for the fact that the Administration at about the same time began a policy of resettlement of Tolai on unoccupied Administration land. Some 6,500 hectares have been allocated to Tolai individuals under leasehold in eleven settlement schemes, and the Tolai experience of this new form of tenure will be the first prescriptive change examined in this chapter.

From the early 1960s a change in attitude to decolonisation of the political leadership in Canberra led to increased urgency in developmental effort, a concentration of resources on areas of highest economic potential, and promotion of economic individualism. The main "principle" of a major land law reform introduced in 1963 and 1964 to underpin this new strategy was that the tenure to all customary land should ultimately be converted to registered individually-owned titles. By 1984 only a total of some 78 hectares under thirty-five registered freehold titles had been converted from customary tenure in the Tolai area under the Land (Tenure Conversion) Act 1963. The Tolai experience under this prescriptive tenure reform will be the second tenure change examined in this chapter.

Formation of the Somare-led government after the 1972 general elections produced a more responsive official attitude to grievances over alienated land, which had historically been most persistently expressed among the Tolai. The Report of the Commission of Inquiry into Land Matters (Papua New Guinea 1973) recommended Government acquisition of alienated land in areas of land shortage, for redistribution to the land-short local population. In 1974 a scheme of legislation was enacted to implement this policy, and by the time of fieldwork a total of twenty-four plantations embracing nearly 5,000 hectares had been acquired in the Tolai area for redistribution. The final prescriptive tenure reform to be examined is the Tolai experience under the Plantation Redistribution Scheme.

There is today no part of the Tolai area which has remained unaffected by the succession of statutory provisions for reforming land tenure. The laws under which customary land was alienated and subsequently registered in indefeasible title had, of course, the most
radical effect on tenure, for by that process all customary interests in the land were abolished, and customary control over it ceased. Where Native Reserves in alienated land had been created the title vested in a public official as trustee, so that the local Tolai communities resident on the land remained reduced to the status of beneficiaries under a trust. To terminate reserve status a specific enactment was necessary, as where the large reserves excised from Queen Emma’s original Ralum and Gire Gire properties near Kokopo were statutorily declared customary land in 1968. Of the alienated land, 21,000 hectares on the Peninsula mainland were held under freehold tenure at the eve of independence (see Table 1.1), largely comprising land alienated during the German administration. A further 8,600-odd hectares were held under leases, granted originally only to European and Chinese interests, but increasingly during the 1960s also to Tolai small-holders on Administration-sponsored land settlement schemes. All land within the townships of Rabaul, Kokopo and Kerevat had been alienated, and the Administration owned two large tracts of unallocated land along the Kerevat and Warangoi Rivers, the former having been dedicated in 1954 as a Territory forest under the Forestry (New Guinea) Ordinance 1936.

About half the total area of Tolai land remains unalienated (see Table 1.1), but here, too, the legislation for reforming land tenure has had an impact. By mid-1966 all Tolai customary land had been divided into a total of ninety-five Adjudication Areas, in preparation for its registration in the Register of Communally Owned Land. Only in the Rakunat Adjudication Area had the whole adjudication process been completed, but in the six Adjudication Areas making up the former Ralum-Gire Gire Reserve 2,938 blocks had been demarcated by 1971, 2,404 blocks in twelve other Areas were awaiting survey, demarcation was proceeding in sixty-six Areas, and in the remaining ten the process was said to be "in suspense" (LTC File 75-00). No land was ever registered, and I have argued from the Rakunat experience that, given the limitations placed on indefeasibility, it is unlikely that the final step of registration would have added much to the benefits gained from demarcation and adjudication. To the extent that
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2 By the Gire Gire - Ralum Lands Act 1968, which even recited that there was "no suitable way by which [the declaration of customary ownership] can legally be done", other than, of course, by enactment.
demarcation had proceeded in other Adjudication Areas similar benefits may have accrued. Despite its having aborted in the early 1970s, the intense activity in identifying land parcels and their ownership has probably had lasting consequences in many areas.

The LTC also made a total of eighty-eight findings over parcels scattered through the Tolai area, under its general jurisdiction to hear claims and settle disputes over customary land. Such findings are "final and conclusive" as to the interests existing at the date of the decision, but the land concerned and any interest in it remain subject to custom. The thirty-five parcels whose tenure was converted to registered freeholds, on the other hand, have by operation of law ceased to be customary land, and ceased in all respects to be subject to custom. I will examine below the extent to which this statutory termination of custom is actually reflected in tenure developments on the land concerned. Titles in the twenty-four properties acquired by the Government under the Plantation Redistribution Scheme are vested in the State, but little progress has been made under the statutory provisions for a revesting of title in the Tolai groups intended to participate in their redistribution. Successive reforms have left a complex pattern of land tenure over the Tolai area. I will consider the Tolai experience of the three main prescriptive changes in land tenure over recent decades in the remaining sections of this chapter.

2. LEASEHOLDS ON LAND SETTLEMENT SCHEMES

(a) Introduction

It may seem unusual to describe the Administration's initiative from the 1950s of promoting the systematic resettlement of Tolai on Administration-owned land under leaseholds as a land tenure reform. The policy of promoting individual small-holdings, however, represented a new official approach to indigenous commercial agriculture, and certainly for the Tolai the experience of leasehold tenure was a novelty. The principal concern of this chapter is to examine the social and economic consequences of the Tolai embracing forms of tenure alternative to that obtaining on customary land, and in this context the Tolai who chose the option of resettling under lease conditions can sensibly be said to have experienced a land tenure "reform".
By June 1981 a total of 130 land settlement schemes comprising 7,203 blocks and covering an area of 76,345 hectares had been established through most Provinces of Papua New Guinea (Hulme 1982:22; Appendix). Reasons given for their establishment include "increased agricultural production, relief of population pressure, improvement of rural living standards, increasing indigenous participation in the cash economy, bringing unused land into cultivation, providing employment for national and expatriate ex-servicemen and stimulating growth centres." (Ibid., 21.) The genesis of resettlement policy, which now occupies a prominent place in public expenditure, may be found in a 1946 statement by the Director of Agriculture, that the objective for indigenous agriculture was to promote a system of "mixed farming on individual small holdings capable of producing adequate subsistence for a man and his family and, in addition, sufficient cash crops to obtain the money necessary to him for the satisfying of his other wants and for the payment of taxes" (quoted in Irwin 1965a:349). The tendency which led to the later formal dismissal of customary tenures as unsuitable for commercial agriculture is already evident in this statement, and the Administration was to place "great faith in the ability of [land settlement] schemes to raise agricultural production and demonstrate to Papua New Guineans the superiority of individualized tenure over the traditional systems." (Hulme 1982:25.) The Tolai area, for long treated by administrators as a "forcing house" for innovation (Irwin 1965a:350), was the first to experience the new resettlement policy.

(b) The Early Council Schemes

The rapid post-war increase in Tolai population, and their extension of cash-cropping in an area where land available for agriculture was limited by terrain and extensive alienations, focused attention on the fertile but sparsely-populated Kerevat and Warangoi valleys (ibid., 350-51). The first scheme began in 1952, on 400 hectares of coastal land between the Kerevat and Vudal Rivers (see Map 13) - part of a large area alienated during German times. Local government had been introduced in 1950, and this new legal entity was co-opted by the Administration in granting a 99-year agricultural lease to the Rabaul Native Local Government Council over the Vudal land. One of five councils which together covered most of the Tolai
Map 13: Land Settlement Schemes in the Tolai Area
area, the Rabaul Council at the time embraced 7,500 Tolai living in twenty-six villages round Simpson Harbour, over to the North Coast, and down the length of the Crater Peninsula (Fenbury 1972:3). Use of the local government institution in this early resettlement period, and the consequent division of administration between local and central government, makes reliable attribution of responsibility for separate aspects of the measure difficult. Fenbury, for example, who was then the officer responsible for introducing local government, claims that the Vudal scheme was promoted by the Department of Native Affairs (ibid.), but Irwin says that the scheme was initiated by the Rabaul Council (1965a:351), although, as Healy points out, the councils were "tied at every step from Konedobu [Administration headquarters in Port Moresby]" (1972:12). The division of responsibilities between central and local government, then in its infancy, was far from clear, and Fenbury acknowledges that "the initial desire of the Rabaul Council leaders was to plant up the area communally" (1972:4), but that "the Administration only achieved slightly reluctant acceptance of the concept of individual tenures after much hard arguing." (Ibid., 7.)

In the early years of its operation access to the Vudal scheme from the Rabaul area could only be gained over almost 50km of coastal road around Cape Livuan. 3 Half the 400 hectares was reserved for gardening, in which any resident of the Rabaul Council area could mark out a plot for subsistence cultivation. In 1954 the other 200 hectares was subdivided into 96 blocks of equal area, and clearing of the heavy timber by voluntary labour provided from the villages intended to participate in the scheme began. Before block allocation the number of blocks was reduced to 72, when a survey indicated that the original area encroached on an adjoining Administration lease. The Council then called for applications for these blocks from residents in the Council area, which were processed in open sessions of the Council. Although the Land (New Guinea) Ordinance 1922 then in force 4 allowed a maximum leasehold period of 99 years (the term of the Council's head lease), and stipulated improvement conditions requiring

---


4 The Ordinance was replaced in 1963 by the Land Act 1962.
planting-up of only one-fifth of the arable area of the leased land within five years of grant, the Council sub-lease period was only 20 years, sub-lessees were required to clear the whole block in the first eighteen months, and to fully plant the block within three years of grant. Other sub-lease conditions required that cocoa be cultivated (in accordance with officially-approved practice), that a maximum of three pounds annual rent be paid at the discretion of the Council, that each sub-lessee should nominate his heir, and that no block be sold or subdivided without the Council's consent. Jacob Simet from Matupit, whose father participated in the scheme in its early stage, says that blocks were allocated in clusters to members of respective villages in the Council area, and that most block-holders lived in village sections on a housing "reserve" beside the Vudal River (1984, pers.comm.).

Fenbury claims, "Initial enthusiasm was high" (1972:5), but it "gradually waned" (ibid.) and by 1960 the Assistant Administrator publicly branded the scheme "a failure" (quoted in Healy 1972: 13). Most of the problems can be attributed to lack of planning and co-ordination (see ibid., 12-13) - partly the consequence of official inexperience and short-sightedness. Although the land, apart from some swampy patches, had been classified as first-class agricultural land suitable for cocoa, as blocks were cleared the water table rose, so that in 1960 of the 72 allocated blocks only 19 were regarded as completely suitable for cocoa, while 30 blocks were found to be too wet. A credit scheme through the Native Loans Board had been worked out, but by 1960 no loans had been made to either the Rabaul Council or its sub-lessees. The heavily-prescriptive nature of the scheme - through from selection of the original area of land and its mechanical subdivision, to the allocation of blocks to members of different villages all remote from the scheme, to the demanding conditions of the leases - allowed no scope for adjustment to the limitations of the land as they emerged, and made block-holders dependent on administrative inputs. Healy says that the Council leased the land "without any clear idea of what was to be done with it, and without any clear lead from the Administration on what should be done with it", and that "officials generally, for the first few years of the scheme, were remarkably uninterested." (1972:11.) "Support from Administration Departments", he claims, "was lamentable or non-existent." (Ibid., 13.) Intense rivalry at the time between the
Departments of Native Affairs and Agriculture (see Chapter 1) contributed to the failure in co-ordination.

Because in 1958 only twelve settlers remained on their blocks, in 1959 the Administration threatened foreclosure of the Council's lease. Instead, it reviewed the scheme in 1960, made an additional area available, and re-subdivided the land into 63 blocks varying in size from 3.2 to 4.0 hectares. Forty-one sub-leases were in fact forfeited, and new grants were made to Tolai from outside the Rabaul Council area. In June 1962 about 40 hectares of cocoa had been planted, and a further 120 hectares was being prepared for planting.

Despite its inauspicious beginnings, the Vudal precedent was followed by the second settlement scheme mounted in the Tolai area. In 1957 a 99-year agricultural lease was granted to Vunamami Council, in recognition of the heavy alienations of land in its area and consequent land shortage of its some 7,000 Tolai residents. The leased land, about 25 kilometres from Vunamami (see Map 13), was part of the large tract acquired by the Administration from Taulil and Baining groups in 1955. At the same time as the Council gained its lease over 160 hectares, applications from expatriates were invited for nineteen agricultural leases over an adjoining part of the acquired land covering 3,142 hectares (an average of 165.4 hectares per block) - a striking illustration of the Administration's contemporary policy of parallel, but far from equal, expatriate and indigenous development (see Chapter 1). As with the Vudal scheme, the Administration's plan for individual tenure was initially resisted by the Council, but, for reasons of expediency, the Administration again adopted the conflicting practice of clearing the land by voluntary communal labour provided by villages in the Council area. In this case, however, the land was not only cleared but also lined and planted with shade and cocoa, before subdivision. The incentive for this major investment of voluntary labour was expected to come from the intended method of block allocation - the sub-lessees were to be selected by ballot, two from each of the seventeen villages in the Council area (Irwin 1965a: 353). When the Council plan for a communal landholding was rejected the villagers realised that very few would
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5 The extent to which clearing, lining and cocoa planting had proceeded by the time of allocation of each block is not apparent from the written sources.
benefit from their labours (Singh 1967: 13), and communal work ceased in 1959. Vunamami Council had meanwhile invested 2,800 pounds\(^6\) of its taxpayers' money in the scheme, on transport, tools and some paid labour.

Further confusion between the Council's original plan for a communal landholding and the Administration's objective of individual small-holdings followed from the fact that most of the land had been fully-planted to shade trees at the time of subdivision, so that no areas remained for block-holders' housing and subsistence gardens. Consequently a block of 5 hectares had to excised in the subdivision for these purposes, leaving only 33 blocks to be allocated between members of the seventeen villages. All blocks were allocated in 1960, on 20-year terms and other conditions similar to those of the Vudal sub-leases. Unsuccessful applicants, who had worked voluntarily in clearing the land, felt "considerable resentment" (Irwin 1965a: 353). Most sub-lessees had built residences on the housing site by 1961 (although they had no formal title in that land), but only five were permanently engaged on their blocks, while others maintained their village residences, cash crops and gardens, only visiting the scheme occasionally. Some settlers were still in wage employment by early 1966, engaging kin and casual labour from their villages to assist in the development and maintenance of their blocks (Singh 1967: 20;15). Credit facilities were better organised than at Vudal, and by the end of 1965 a total of 4,865 pounds had been lent to Vunamami scheme settlers by the Native Loans Board (ibid., 46). Attempts to collect repayment instalments, however, had by that date proved to be "almost completely unsuccessful." (Ibid., 47.) Processing facilities were inadequate - wet cocoa beans were sold to a European-owned fermentary about 5km away. The nearest Tolai Cocoa Project fermentary was over 15km distant from the scheme.\(^7\) By 1966 about 95 hectares of cocoa had been planted, and the settlers were producing a wide range of fruit and vegetables, a small proportion of which was being marketed (ibid., 24).

\(^6\)This figure is supplied by Irwin (1965a: 353), and is apparently included in Singh's costing of the scheme to the Council at the end of 1960 at $8,000 (1967: 14).

\(^7\)In Chapter 1 I noted that by tying the TCP operations to local government councils Tolai producers outside council areas, e.g., on land settlement schemes, were denied its facilities.
Fenbury says that "the basic idea" of both the Vudal and Vunamami Council schemes "was to achieve the technical advantages of a relatively large plantation lay-out (facilitation of central processing, pest and disease control, etc.) with the administrative and political advantages of individual small holdings" (1972:7), and he claims that expenditure of council funds was thought justified by such "an experiment designed to educate the population into the advantages of individual tenure." (Ibid.) Blocks were inspected by Lands Department officials in 1965, 1966 and 1969, to check compliance with the sub-lease conditions for improvement and maintenance. Settler absenteeism was found to be common, while development performance on individual blocks varied greatly over time. Block-holders were often said to need a "shake-up" by the Council. From 1970 official interest in the scheme abated, and the remaining settlers in 1982 regarded themselves as having been abandoned by the Government. At the time of fieldwork, however, expiry of the original sub-lease terms of 20 years, coinciding with a Development Bank initiative to promote replanting of senile Tolai cocoa, led to renewed official interest in the scheme. A special Land Board was constituted under the Land Act 1962, to recommend on block re-allocation. By this stage six of the original sub-lessees had died, 8 and many others were elderly. At a general meeting of resident settlers some complained that their blocks were not big enough to support the settlers' children and grandchildren now resident there, while others said their children showed no interest, and they feared their blocks would be taken from them for unsatisfactory performance. Recovery of customary land in their home villages, after such a long period of absence, was thought to be impracticable.

(c) Schemes under Central Government Control

By the early 1960s the Administration viewed land settlement schemes as a major part of its economic development strategy (Hulme 1983: 71). Two different approaches were adopted, the first being "based on the colonisation of land solely by a group of settlers under government supervision", while the second was "characterised by a
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8 No transmission of title to a sub-lessee's successor had been effected.
nucleus estate - outgrower plan of development." (Ibid.) All schemes in the Tolai area were of the former category, the latter being adopted elsewhere from the mid-1960s following recommendations from a visiting World Bank mission (ibid., 72). In 1971, when blocks in the last of the eleven schemes in the Tolai area were allocated, a total of 618 blocks embracing 6,510 hectares had been settled (see Table 7.1). Three schemes - Vunamami Council, Warangoi 15-acre and Tavilo - were investigated during fieldwork, but the following analysis will concentrate on research findings at Tavilo (see Map 13).

Tavilo and the adjoining Kerevat scheme of the same area were, unlike the earlier council-administered scheme, directly administered by the central government, and were expected to "serve as a prototype for future resettlement schemes in the country." (Singh 1967: 33.) Tavilo's 140 hectares were subdivided into seventeen blocks ranging from 7.2 to 10.8 hectares in area, for which applicants were interviewed by the Land Board in 1963. Questions were asked about their previous work experience, family size, their occupation of village land, sources of development finance and intentions regarding residence on the scheme. Leases granted to the successful applicants were governed by the Land Act 1962, and contained the standard conditions as to the term of lease (99 years, with a qualified right of renewal), rental (5% of the unimproved capital value, to be reappraised every ten years), and development (one-fifth of the arable area to be planted to approved cash crops in the first 5 years, two-fifths in 10 years, three-fifths in 15 years and four-fifths in 20 years and for the remainder of the term). Improvements were to be maintained in good order and condition, and, under the general provisions of the Land Act 1962, no transfer of the lease could be approved unless the rent was paid up to date and the improvement conditions had been satisfied. The leases were registered under the Lands Registration (New Guinea) Act 1924, which provided machinery for transmission of title upon the lessee's death. The lease was liable to forfeiture if rent remained unpaid for six months, or if a covenant or condition of the lease was not observed. By an amendment in 1973 the Minister for Lands was given the option of imposing a fine instead
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9 Tolai participate in schemes of the latter category in the West New Britain Province. At the Hoskins Oil Palm Scheme in 1976, 228 blocks (14.6% of the total number) were held by lessees of East New Britain origin (see Hulme 1984:243, Table 7.4) - presumably all Tolai.
## Table 7.1 Land Settlement Schemes in the Tolai Area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>No. of blocks</th>
<th>Approx. total area (has.)</th>
<th>Approx. average block size (has.)</th>
<th>Year of allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vudal</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vunamami Council</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warangoi 15-acre</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilugi</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerevat</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavilo</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunum</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japalik</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vunapaladig</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandres</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengmutka</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>618</strong></td>
<td><strong>6510</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
* My main source for this data is Hulme 1982:41, but I have made amendments where I regard my own information from Government files as more reliable.
of forfeiture. These were the main elements of the tenure regime accepted by resettling Tolai.

During fieldwork at Tavilo in 1982 I collected data on the circumstances of the seventeen settlers at the time the leases were granted, their history of occupation of the blocks and employment of labour, the finance available to develop their blocks, and their compliance with the lease conditions. The blocks were granted to sixteen males and one female, twelve of whom were from villages in the Rabaul locality, three from Raluana, and one each from the Duke of York and Watom Islands. All were then married with children. Five were employed as clerks (four with the Tolai Cocoa Project), three were Local Government Councillors, the female was a teacher (as was her husband), and other males worked as a carpenter, a Public Works Department employee, wharf labourers, an employee on an adjoining plantation, and a sawmill operator. One male had been a carpenter, a foreman, a private contractor and manager of a European-owned trade-store and cocoa fermentary. By 1982 four of the lessees had died, although in only one case had the title been transmitted to a successor.

Until 1975 the scheme had been visited by Lands Department officials on almost an annual basis, so from inspection reports the history of each block's occupation and development can be traced. Officials clearly set great store by settlers' residence on their blocks in settlement schemes, although frequently this attitude conflicted with the settler's need to remain in employment in order to finance development of the block. Eighteen months after the grant of leases only two settlers resided on their blocks, two had family and relatives resident, four had resident labour, and one settler resided on an adjoining plantation. Five blocks contained no housing at all. Nine block-holders employed labour, in two cases four units and in another three units of labour. Between 1965 and 1980 labour was being employed on about half the blocks when they were inspected, while others were being worked by the lessee and his family, on a full-time or part-time basis. In 1980, seventeen years after the date of grant, only five lessees resided full-time on their blocks, and two more resided part-time. One lessee's son was resident on his block, a deceased lessee's daughter and her husband lived on another, and an employee of the lessee was on a third. In seven cases no person connected to the lessee used the block. Two lessees had died many
years before, in one case leaving an unresolved dispute between the lessee's munatarai members and his children over entitlement to succeed him. One block had been forfeited and was occupied by "squatters" from Finschhafen, in one case after an attempted transfer had fallen through the lessee had abandoned his block, another lessee was working in Morobe Province, and two other blocks had also been abandoned. Highlanders were gardening on one of these latter blocks in 1980.

The lessees had little luck in seeking finance for development. Early reports indicate that all initial development was self-financed, either from personal savings (up to 500 pounds) or from wages. Four lessees made immediate application for Native Loans Board finance, two of which were refused, and two approved, although no funds were ever advanced. Officials frequently advised that loans would assist development, and even strongly recommended them for some block-holders, but by 1980 only two loans had ever been granted. In 1982 four lessees received Development Bank loans, as part of its cocoa rehabilitation programme. Lessees were chronically in arrears with their rental payments. In 1965 only one lessee was paid-up, with others already being up to three years in arrears. In 1970 thirteen lessees were behind by up to five years, and in 1975 no single lessee was up to date with rental payments.

Regarding compliance with improvement and maintenance conditions, the inspection reports show not only wide variation between settlers but also great fluctuation of performance on individual blocks, especially in maintenance of improvements. Though the planted area of each block generally increased over the years, in both 1970 and 1975 seven of the seventeen lessees had not complied with their development conditions. In 1975, 60% of the whole scheme was planted with cash crops, 10% with gardens and the rest was under primary or secondary bush. Forfeiture for poor maintenance was recommended for six blocks in 1965, for two blocks in 1970, and for one block in 1975. The same year only seven blocks were regarded as well maintained. Many lessees

---

10. Perhaps indicative of the tight credit situation is a 1966 inspection report, which solemnly records that the lessee was "self-financed from earnings as a one-time clerk for TCP, and theft of $600 from a fermentary".

11. The ad valorem rents ranged initially between $12 and $20 per annum, and after a reappraisal in 1973 from $25 to $40:50 per annum.
were issued with "letters of warning" over failure to control shade and weed growth, pests and disease. Perhaps such harassment had some effect - one lessee whose maintenance was described as "only fair" in 1965 was "the best on the scheme" in 1967, while another whose lease forfeiture had twice been recommended for poor maintenance received a "very good" report a few years later.

(d) Economic Performance and Social Consequences

Land resettlement policy in Papua New Guinea, with the great variety in its application between the 130 schemes introduced over the last thirty years, has been appraised from many economic and social perspectives (see Hulme 1984 for a review of the literature). In a 1982 overview of performance Hulme identified a close correlation between scheme costs per settler family and scheme performance, categorising schemes as low cost (under K500 per settler family), medium cost (between K500 and K5,000 per settler family) and high cost (over K5,000 per settler family):

Low cost schemes have shown a relatively high failure rate for a number of reasons. Prominent amongst these reasons are the lack of adequate planning and the failure to provide settlers with an acceptable minimum level of infrastructure and social services. Medium cost schemes have also had a relatively high failure rate.... The high cost schemes have been more economically successful than the other types and have demonstrated an ability to retain settlers, to produce substantial rural incomes and to boost national export earnings. Basing the schemes upon the cultivation of a single export crop has permitted efficient production but exposes the schemes to a relatively high degree of instability should the world market price for the product decline significantly. A number of serious social problems have arisen on high cost schemes.... (1982:34-35.)

Among the social problems identified on some schemes are failure to integrate settlers into their host communities (ibid.,35), poor nutritional standards (ibid.,34; Nakikus 1984: 8-12), increased levels of crime, alcoholism and prostitution (Lambert 1979:4) and the subordination of women in the schemes (Nakikus 1984).

Of the eleven schemes in the Tolai area Hulme classified seven (including Tavilo) as low cost and the other four as medium cost (1984). 12 In 1981 he conducted research at two low cost schemes

12In this later publication Hulme reclassified low cost as under K1,000 per settler family, and medium cost as between K1,000 and K5,000 per settler family (1984:105, Table 4.1).
(Vunapaladig and Mandres), finding high rates of settler absenteeism on both schemes, that in one production of cocoa was "running at only a fraction of the potential despite the investment of a considerable amount of agricultural extension effort since 1976", and in the other "more than 50 per cent of blocks had never been used for agricultural purposes." (Ibid., 149-50.) The same year his research on the four medium cost schemes in the Warangoi area also showed high rates of settler absenteeism (ibid., 222), and that "overall production has run at only a fraction of the area's physical potential since the scheme's \[sic - read "schemes'\]] inception." (Ibid.) Calculation of actual production from settlement schemes is not possible in the absence of reliable tree counts and because of the many outlets used by settlers in marketing their produce (see ibid., 149). My impression gained from the three schemes I researched, however, bears out Hulme's findings that much of the land involved is unused or under-utilised - a view clearly shared by the East New Britain Provincial Government and the Department of Primary Industry (ibid., 221).

The benefits gained from resettlement can be assessed at both the level of the Tolai people as a whole, and of individual Tolai settlers. An express objective of the schemes in the Tolai area was to relieve increasing population pressure, but as Irwin pointed out in 1965 the schemes by then initiated had "only touched on the problems of over-population", and had provided land to only about half the then number of annual Tolai population increase (1965a:355). Salisbury wrote of the Warangoi 15-acre scheme that it "may make some rich Tolai even richer, but the contribution of this scheme to Tolai resettlement and relief of population pressure is negligible." (1970:101.) Hulme's 1981 research suggests that Salisbury's prediction "may well have been fulfilled", for he found:

A significant proportion of lessees are national or provincial politicians, local government councillors, village leaders, successful businessmen or high ranking public servants. Thus the schemes may have exacerbated socio-economic inequality on the Gazelle Peninsula whilst totally failing in their declared objective of relieving land shortage problems. (1984: 223.)

While 618 blocks were allocated to settlers and their families during the years from 1954 to 1971, the Tolai population grew by 41,000 (see Diagram 1.1).

Hulme observed of the Tolai schemes that settler performance "has varied along a continuum from total non-participation to full-time
commitment to the scheme." (Ibid., 222.) He assessed the benefits to individual settlers in terms of three broad categories - non-resident, part-time resident and resident (ibid.). Non-residents had "the privilege of knowing that they have access to good agricultural land should they require it", while some worked their blocks by hired labour, and others allowed third parties to use the block on a profit-sharing basis (ibid.). Part-time residents were able to participate in village life and exercise their rights to customary land, while at the same time "deriving a supplementary income from the occasional harvesting of cocoa from settlement blocks." (Ibid.) Residents, finally, "derived an income from the scheme which is roughly proportional to the effort which they have invested", they could expand their operations to a larger scale than would be possible on customary land, and they had "preferential access to agricultural extension services, quality planting materials and Development Bank loans." (Ibid., 223.) All three categories of settlers were represented in the Tavilo scheme, and I would generally endorse Hulme's comments on settlers' attitudes to their blocks, and the benefits they derive from them.

A matter of particular concern pursued in my research was how the Tolai's adoption of leasehold tenure in land settlement schemes affected the quality of intergroup and interpersonal relationships, identified in the early chapters as central to Tolai social organisation. With very few exceptions leases were granted to males, but under applicant selection criteria the preferred unit for resettlement, in the early schemes at least, was a young family comprising parents and one or more infant children. Access to schemes in the early years was difficult, so residence on a remote block entailed continual (if periodic) absence for Tolai settlers from their home village. Particularly was this so for settlers on the Vudal scheme, who were drawn from villages in the Rabaul locality. Irwin noted that for them the social costs of resettlement were "very great", involving loss of religious, educational, health and recreational facilities, and the "breaking of kinship affiliations" (1965a:354). All settlement schemes in the Tolai area are located distant from the settlers' home villages, but the improvement of roads

13 Many middle-aged Tolai were allocated blocks in the larger schemes in 1970-1971.
and transportation allows most settlers today to maintain regular contact with their villages.

Allocation of blocks to single individuals was, of course, central to the Administration policy of promoting individualisation of tenure, and the predominance of male lessees no doubt reflected the attitudes of the male European administrators of the policy.\textsuperscript{14} It is noteworthy, however, that acceptance of individual blockholdings in the early schemes was only achieved in the face of a strong Tolai preference for communal landholding, and that at Vudal the retention of group identity was attempted through the allocation of blocks in clusters to members of the same villages. Official intransigence precluded any experimentation on a compromise form of tenure, and after the early Council leases all titles were issued directly to individuals by the Administration. Yet today tenurial developments can be found occurring on settlement scheme blocks which are similar to those identified on acquired parcels of customary land at Rakunat.

In the first place the involvement of groups in the leased land was clearly manifested, in two main ways. Despite the requirement in early Council sub-leases that a single successor be nominated, settlers interviewed during fieldwork were unanimous that the blocks were for their children. It cannot be said that the blocks were originally acquired for the children, but nor can the children's interests be regarded as arising only from inheritance upon their father's death. Rather, as at Rakunat, my understanding is that resident children are perceived as having an immediate interest in the block, in conjunction with their father's interest. As settlers pointed out, practical considerations demand that their entitlement be recognised, for resident children had lost access to \textit{vunatarai} land by virtue of their long absence from home villages. A further illustration of group interests was the concern expressed by many settlers that their \textit{vunatarai} claims to the block should be excluded. A common practice was for settlers to divide their labours between the block and \textit{vunatarai} land in the village, so that \textit{vunatarai} members

\textsuperscript{14}And probably Tolai attitudes as well, although it is an interesting speculation how they would have responded to the idea that blocks be granted in the wife's rather than the husband's name. As invariably settlers wished their children to succeed them, their \textit{vunatarai}'s claims upon their death might more readily have been excluded if the lease was held in the wife's name (see below, in the text).
would not feel disadvantaged and make claims to the block upon their death. In some cases, however, the fact that matrilineal kin have assisted the settler with block development is likely to give rise to competing claims, and in the Warangoi 15-acre scheme, where no less than fifteen of the original settlers had died by 1982, in three cases *vunatarai* members had moved into possession of the block.

The second notable tenurial development is the indications that perceived block entitlement is governed by matrilineal descent. Only thirty years have elapsed since the first leasehold grants and, although many original lessees have died, a longer period of block occupation is necessary to confirm this trend. Nevertheless, in response to questioning, settlers stated their expectation that while both their sons and daughters would occupy the land, only children of the daughters would be entitled to remain in occupation. Thus despite official opposition to customary tenures, present indications are that the Government lease - intended to promote acceptance of individual tenures - will end up being held by a matrilineal descent group.

(e) Conclusion

Continued resettlement of Tolai seems inevitable, but important lessons for the future can be gained from past experience. The leasehold measure, inspired by "social-engineering" concerns to liberate the individual from group controls, made settlers heavily dependent upon the State supply of infrastructure in their new areas of settlement. The State released the land, and to promote the public interest imposed conditions on its occupation intended to optimise development. Lands Department designed the resettlement subdivision, based on the concept of the "minimum economic area" which could be farmed by a nuclear family, it allocated the blocks under lease, and monitored performance of the lease conditions. Agriculture (now the Department of Primary Industry) provided extension services and planting materials. The Works Department was responsible for provision of roads, and education and health services were the responsibility of their respective departments. In 1969 the Development Bank took over

---

15Cheetham (1963:72) sets out the criteria and value judgements employed in defining the minimum economic area for any given system of land use.
the provision of credit facilities from the Native Loans Board. A minimum level of social services is obviously essential if people are to take up occupation of a new area, and the level of their economic performance no doubt relates to the degree to which agricultural extension services and credit facilities are made available. The Tolai, however, are loath to abandon their home villages, which are generally well supplied with social services, and where the focus of their social and cultural lives resides. My perception of Tolai attitudes to resettlement, added to the historically high rate of absenteeism on present schemes even among those Tolai selected as the most suitable prospects for resettlement, leads me to conclude that maintaining a policy aimed at permanent resettlement along individual lines will continue to make a negligible contribution to relief of Tolai population pressure, and to yield economic performance well below the potential of the areas involved.

The manifest Tolai ability to adapt their customary tenure to the changing demands placed on land suggests the alternative policy in the Tolai circumstances - individuals should be abandoned in favour of groups as the basic unit for resettlement tenure. The analysis of Tolai social structure and corporate identity in Chapter 2 showed that, while Tolai feel a sense of solidarity with other members of their moiety, the central corporate unit in Tolai society is the vunatarai. Over the last century the village has emerged as a focal point of social and political organisation, and the nuclear family has assumed increasing importance. The corporate units perform different functions in Tolai social, political, economic and ceremonial life, and possibly scope for all of them to operate should be furnished under an alternative approach to resettlement. What this involves is a replication of the village environment in the new area of settlement, so that the self-regulating mechanisms of the community may adjust the tenure to the land involved in response to changing circumstances and the changing needs of its membership. The clearest manifestation of the inappropriateness of long-term individual titles has been their inability to adapt to the changing circumstances of the title-holder.

Use of already-existing Tolai cultural units as the agencies for resettlement would not only promote social and economic benefits, but would also greatly relieve administrative burdens. So far as benefits are concerned, the resettlement experience has seen both a trend to
increased socio-economic differentiation, and the serious under-utilisation of land. The village experience, on the other hand, has been for land distribution to be continuously optimised, and for available land to be used intensively for cash crop and subsistence food production. Replication of the village tenure environment in a new area would preserve the sense of identity which has so far been lacking on settlement schemes (see Hulme 1984:222), and would avoid social dislocation, for village members could determine their own priorities between living in the village and in the new area, dependent on their individual circumstances from time to time. Corresponding adjustments can be made in the tenure both of village land and of the land in the resettled area.

Regarding administrative inputs, the experience on Tolai resettlement schemes is one of almost total bureaucratic break-down. Rents are chronically in arrears, blocks remain unoccupied for years, and many harbour pests and diseases which contaminate adjoining plantings. All blocks are liable from time to time to forfeiture (some remaining so indefinitely), yet in the history of the Tavilo scheme, for example, only one block was ever forfeited.\(^\text{16}\) Settlers are frustrated in their attempts to transfer leases, and titles remain vested in deceased lessees for decades after their death. Lease conditions are predominately more honoured in the breach than the observance. Clearly an alternative approach to resettlement must be far less administratively demanding. Adoption of existing Tolai corporate entities, with their inherent capacity for self-regulation, would allow withdrawal of State control to a level it is more likely to administer efficiently.

Resettlement along the lines suggested would be no more than an extension in the modern context of the colonisation methods employed by Tolai settling in new areas in the past. Rakunat informants responded positively to the idea, adding that each participating vunatarai should establish its madapai in the new area. The suggestion is essentially that a radically different approach be adopted to resettlement in the Tolai circumstances, and further planning in consultation with Tolai authorities would be needed on such matters as

\(^{16}\)The Land Board promptly recommended its re-allocation to the same lessee. One block was the subject of forfeiture proceedings over ten years, until the action was abandoned.
the most suitable method of combining village, vunatarai and nuclear family in an alternative tenure regime for resettlement, and the associated question of land unit areas. The emergence of matrilineal descent groups as the occupants of present leasehold blocks shows that reinstatement of group interests is inevitable. Only by recognising this cultural determinant, and by installing it as the central factor in resettlement planning, can there be any prospect of proceeding with resettlement at a rate commensurate with Tolai population increase.

3. TENURE CONVERSION TO FREEHOLDS

(a) Introduction

The Land (Tenure Conversion) Act 1963 was officially described as "the cornerstone" of the land law reform introduced during the early 1960s (Papua New Guinea 1962:597). The stated ultimate policy objective was to individualise all tenure in Papua New Guinea, providing for formation of "a native peasantry that ... will not be a major employer of wage-earning labour." (Australia 1961:18). The Act contained the legal process by which such conversion of customary tenure to registered individual titles was to be achieved. The effects were tantamount to land alienation, for upon tenure conversion all customary interests in the land were statutorily abolished and a freehold estate created, and all customary regulation of the land ceased and the land became subject solely to the statute and common law governing registered titles.

The long preamble to the Act recited "the fundamental policy" of the Administration that interests in customary land "should be guaranteed and protected", but that it was "generally considered" that provision for the individualisation of tenure was "a most efficacious method of promoting the agricultural development of a country". In legislating for the abolition of customary interests in and control

17 The suggested alternative approach is not entirely new, for twenty years ago Irwin canvassed the possibilities of resettling whole communities, and thereby dispensing with the survey requirements of formal subdivisions (1965a:355-56). He acknowledged, however, that adoption of such an alternative was unlikely given the Administration's commitment to individual tenures (ibid.,356).
over land, the attempt was made to reconcile these two commitments by attributing to customary tenure the "right" to "exchange" interests in customary land for guaranteed individual titles. The preamble then recited that the LTC could properly be charged with the duty to promote and safeguard both rights to customary land and "the right freely and in accordance with law to exchange such rights for guaranteed individual titles", so the Act vested the tenure conversion jurisdiction in the LTC.

The process provided for this exchange was a sequence of steps, from application to notification, opportunity for objection, LTC hearing of the application and any objections, its determination, followed by an opportunity for review of or appeal against the determination, and finally, the registration of title. It observed the notions of "due process" and "natural justice" familiar to Western legal systems, but I have argued elsewhere that the law was based on questionable assumptions as to Papua New Guinean familiarity with judicial and administrative processes, and their capability for individual response to protect the long-term interests of a land-owning group (1980:69-70). Duties of a protective nature were imposed on the LTC in recognition of the novelty of the process in the circumstances of Papua New Guinea - under the Commission's rules elaborate machinery was developed with a view to achieving effective notification of applications, hearings and decisions; the LTC was required to assure itself that all persons with customary interests in a parcel of land proposed for tenure conversion understood what the effects of conversion would be, and that compensation was paid for all interests abolished; and a conversion order could not be made over land required to meet the "consumption" needs of the customary interest-holders. Despite these concessions, the appropriateness of the process depended upon their being a basic congruity between Western and Papua New Guinean patterns of thought and behaviour - the convertibility of land tenure depended in the end on the convertibility of Western and indigenous cultures. A further feature of the complex system of checks and balances by which the Act attempts to reconcile the commitments to protect customary interests but also to facilitate their abolition, is that each of the statutory steps from application through to ultimate registration depended for their effective observance on demanding administrative action.

By August 1984 a total of 2,065 applications for tenure
conversion had been received from all Provinces of Papua New Guinea. In a survey conducted in September 1977 I found that of the 1,826 applications then received 957 had been the subject of a decision by the LTC, 69 had been withdrawn, and the remaining 800 applications had not been decided. Of the 957 decisions, 702 related to land tenure conversion schemes. Schemes of this nature, which involved administrative co-operation in the subdivision of areas of customary land and the systematic processing of applications by members of the land-owning community (see Chapter 4), were introduced in the Oro (formerly Northern) Province in the 1960s on a trial basis. Of those 702 decisions, 644 related to twenty-two schemes in the Oro Province. The remaining 255 decisions of the total of 957 by September 1977 were the result of sporadic applications over individual land parcels in different Provinces of the country. By October 1978, only 737 registered titles had been issued as a result of tenure conversion. As 558 of these related to tenure conversion schemes in the Oro Province, for the rest of Papua New Guinea only 179 titles had been issued by that date.

The Commission of Inquiry into Land Matters opposed the registration of customary land in individual freehold title, and recommended an alternative registration policy (Papua New Guinea 1973: 27-40). Following its report the activities of the LTC were wound down, and in anticipation of replacement legislation processing of tenure conversion applications was suspended. Failure to proceed with law reform in this area, however, led to renewed LTC activity, and between September 1977 and August 1984 a total of 239 tenure conversion applications were received, of which 61 had been the subject of conversion orders. Decisions were also made in this period on some applications received before 1977.

Six tenure conversion schemes were mounted in scattered locations across the Tolai area, in 1973 and 1974 (see Table 7.2). Vunakubula was a small scheme of only 0.2 hectares total area, intended as house sites for ten members of Napapar 1 village on the central elevated plateau. The Nanga Nanga scheme lies inland from Raluana, and the Duke of Yorks scheme is in that islands group. Namanula is within the caldera rim, between Rabaul and the housing settlement on Namanula Hill, Rainau is located inland from Cape Gazelle, and the large Ralum No. 1 scheme comprised about 200 hectares of the former Ralum Native Reserve, which was declared customary land by statute in 1968.
Table 7.2 Tenure Conversion Schemes in the Tolai Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Year begun</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vunakubula</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanga Nanga</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Yorks</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namanula</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainau</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralum No.1</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|             |             |              | 222        | 0         |

Source:
Register of Claims, LTC Registry, Port Moresby.
Despite the enormous expense in surveying the 222 blocks in these six schemes, no single tenure conversion application has ever been decided.

By August 1984 a total of 100 sporadic applications for tenure conversion of land parcels in the Tolai area had been received, of which forty-six had been decided, eight withdrawn (some lapsing through the death of the applicant), and the remaining forty-six were still awaiting hearing (see Table 7.3). Thirty-eight decisions were in favour of tenure conversion, but only thirty-five certificates of title had by then been issued, with the other three conversion orders still being processed. The total area of parcels involved in the thirty-five titles is 78.2 hectares. One parcel embraced 33.8 hectares, and another 11 hectares, but twenty-four titles related to land less than one hectare in area. One of the two largest parcels is located in broken timbered country between the central elevated plateau and Ataliklikun Bay and the other is at Malabunga, on the outskirts of the traditional Tolai territory. One parcel is the small Palata Island west of Ataliklikun Bay, but most of the remaining tenure-converted parcels lie within the rim of the Rabaul caldera, or along the adjacent North Coast between Pila Pila and Tavui Point. Ten parcels lie within or adjacent to the Rabaul town boundary, and eight more could be regarded as being peri-urban land. In the whole of Livuan, Reimber, Vunamami, Bitapaka and Duke of Yorks Census Divisions, with a 1980 total village population of over 27,000, no single title has ever been issued after tenure conversion.

During 1978, as part of a survey of tenure conversion in five Provinces, I conducted research into the twenty conversions by then effected in the Tolai area. I examined the personal particulars of the successful applicants and their reasons for applying for tenure conversion, the LTC's compliance with the statutory process for notification, hearing and determination of the applications, and the history of the title and the occupation and economic development of the land since tenure conversion. In 1982 I researched developments on some of these pre-1979 tenure conversions, and in 1984 I collected documentary information on the eighteen conversion orders made since

---

18 The five Provinces were East New Britain, Madang, Central (including the National Capital District), Northern and Eastern Highlands. The experience of tenure conversion in the latter two Provinces was examined in Fingleton 1980.
Table 7.3 Sporadic Tenure Conversion in the Tolai Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of application</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Withdrawal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>No decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:
Register of Claims, LTC Registry, Port Moresby
1978, as well as on the state of all titles issued by then. This chapter is mainly concerned with identifying the social and economic consequences of prescriptive land tenure change, so the following treatment will concentrate on the nature and extent of the demand met by tenure conversion, and its social and economic effects.

(b) The Demand Met by Tenure Conversion

Apart from the systematic presentation of applications in Administration-sponsored tenure conversion schemes, with only 100 applications made in the Tolai area during the twenty years tenure conversion has been available the overall demand for the measure must be considered slight. Eight of the forty-six decisions made refused tenure conversion. Personal details are known of all but one of the thirty-eight successful applicants. Twenty-six successful applications were made by single individuals, twenty-two by males and four by females. Three males each gained tenure conversion of two land parcels, and a fourth participated in the co-ownership of a second parcel. Of the four successful applications by females three involved the same woman. In eleven cases ownership was recorded in the names of multiple individuals, in some cases as joint tenants and in the others as tenants in common.19 Four of the co-owned blocks were recorded in the names of persons who were connected by common membership of a vunatarai, and two others involved siblings. Women and their children figured in the co-ownership of three parcels, and the last two cases involved a husband and wife, and parents, their three daughters and a son. In this last case six younger children had also been included in the application, but were eventually excluded by the statutory maximum of six co-owners.20

My information on the particulars of applicants who gained tenure

---

19 The major practical distinction between the two forms of co-ownership is that, whereas upon death a tenant in common’s share passes to his or her successor, a joint tenant’s share passes to the survivor(s). My impression is that the LTC employed either form without appreciation of this major practical distinction.

20 The limitation on number of co-owners was imposed to avoid fragmentation of holdings. The parcel involved in this case was 11 hectares in area - the second largest ever converted in the Tolai territory.
conversion since 1978 is limited.\textsuperscript{21} Details of the twenty successful applicants by 1978 confirms my impression from research in the Eastern Highlands Province that sporadic tenure conversion "was the privileged reserve of an elite who, through a combination of personality and circumstance, had an effective monopoly of access", and whose members "were characterized by their increasing and reinforcing links with Western values and institutions." (1984:169.) Most applicants were already aged over 35 at the date of application, and had previous experience in a profession, trade or business other than cash-cropping. Three had been Local Government Councillors, and five (including a woman) claimed to be the lualua of their vanatarai or apiktarai. One successful post-1978 applicant was at the time the senior Lands Department officer in the Province, while another, whose application had languished since 1969, received his tenure conversion order (together with his five children) after a term as Premier of the Province. The female applicant who gained three tenure conversions (all in land within the Rabaul town boundary) was a school-teacher married at the time to a prominent European, and another successful male was at the time a field officer with the LTC, and later became the Deputy Premier. A further male applicant was a senior airline executive. The very paucity of their number makes generalisation on successful applicants difficult, and no doubt their personal qualities (e.g., work experience, group leadership, familiarity with administrative processes) could be found in many other Tolai. But, as I concluded from the Eastern Highlands experience, "it was the ability to develop initial advantages, culminating in the status, connections, knowledge and enterprise necessary to mobilise a successful tenure conversion application, which seems to distinguish the applicants as a group from the rest of their community." (Ibid.)

Given that the express purpose of the law was to promote indigenous agriculture, the successful applicants' intentions for the proposed use of the subject land declared to the LTC at the time of application are revealing. Only three of the twenty successful applicants by 1978 intended to use the land for agricultural purposes,

\textsuperscript{21}As mentioned in the text, tenure conversion proceedings were suspended from mid-1970, and most post-1978 conversion orders were made after 1982, when my fieldwork in the Tolai area had been completed.
and in one of those cases the intended use was as a poultry farm and trade-store. Four applicants intended to use the land for their own residences (the parcels in all cases being less than a hectare in area), and seven others intended leasing the land for residential purposes. Two applicants intended to build a trade-store, one a tavern, one a motel, restaurant and night-club, and another proposed an industrial subdivision. In ten cases non-Tolai promotion of the application was apparent on the LTC records - two declarations even stated the applicant's intention to lease the land to particular expatriates, and one frankly was intended "for sale or lease" to the Chinese occupant of adjoining land to enable extension of his shipyard.

(c) The Effects of Tenure Conversion

I noted above that tenure conversion was predicated as being an "exchange" of interests in customary land for registered individual titles, and that the main elements of the exchange were that all persons with customary interests in the subject land should be identified and should understand the effects of tenure conversion, that based on that understanding they should consent to the application, and that they should be compensated for customary interests abolished in the tenure conversion. The Act imposed duties on the LTC to satisfy itself that these requirements had been met, but my research on tenure conversion in the Eastern Highlands Province showed that performance of these duties was generally defective (1980: 254-58). Investigation of the fifteen tenure-converted parcels in that Province in 1978 showed that one parcel had actually been recovered by the former customary interest-holders, and the others were all perceived as affected by interests which either had been held in the land under custom at the time of tenure conversion, or arose from group support for the conversion, or had arisen since conversion as a result of customary obligations (see ibid., 301). I concluded that defects in performance of the statutory requirements were not attributable to lack of diligence on the part of the LTC, but rather to the practical difficulty of identifying all persons with interests in customary land, and in particular to the conceptual impossibility of imparting understanding to them of the effects of tenure conversion (ibid., 258-59). Similar defects in performance of the statutory
requirements, and for the same reasons, were found with tenure conversion proceedings in the Tolai area. In five cases of the twenty conversions by 1978 persons claiming customary interests were almost certainly not notified of applications and hearings,\textsuperscript{22} and customary interests in and control over most parcels were perceived as having survived their legal abolition. Attempts to satisfy the demanding administrative requirements, meanwhile, meant that only four cases were decided within a year of application, and thirteen took between two and six years to be finalised. Only half the applications lodged since 1968 ever came on for hearing (see Table 7.3).

S. Rowton Simpson, in reporting to the Administration in 1969 on the functions and operations of the LTC, stressed the distinction between registration of title as a conveyancing device ("the mechanical process"), and its use as a reform measure for the individualisation of customary tenure ("a policy matter") (1969: 3-7). The Land (Tenure Conversion) Act 1963 combined the reform of customary land tenure with land titles registration, and while it is clear that individualisation of tenure was its prime objective, the Minister for Territories of the time indicated that facilitation of dealings in land between Papua New Guineans was also a major objective (see Hasluck 1976: 126). Before examining the social and economic impact of tenure conversion its performance in facilitating land transactions will be considered.

The Act provides that a title-holder after tenure conversion is competent to transfer or otherwise deal with the land, subject to two main statutory limitations: the land can only be transferred or leased to the State, or to a Papua New Guinean, subject to Government approval; and a mortgagee can not remain in possession for longer than three years, or foreclose the title-holder's right of redemption. Until an amendment in 1968 the LTC had a discretion to exclude these limitations from the title, but the limitations automatically applied to all titles registered after that date, although administrative discretions to waive their operation in respect of proposed dealings were then introduced. Two of the twenty titles issued by 1978 had been transferred by 1984. One was a title issued before 1968 without any limitations on dealings, being the parcel on the Simpson Harbour

---

\textsuperscript{22} In some cases the only method of notification was display on a public notice board at a Sub-District Office.
foreshore for which the applicant had declared his intention to sell or lease it to the adjoining Chinese ship-builder. The title-holder had acquired the land by **ikulia** in the mid-1960s for $10 and 10 fathoms of **tabu**, and sold the land to the ship-builder in 1969 for $3,150 in an unimproved state. The **lualua** of the vending **vunatarai** complained to me in 1978 that they had not received the promised benefits from the sale. The second transfer involved a small parcel near the Rabaul Golf Course, which the female applicant had acquired by **ikulia** in 1968 for $500. In July 1969 she offered the land (unimproved, of 0.16 hectares) to the Administration for $4,000, but this offer was rejected as excessive. The land was unofficially leased in the early 1970s for $80 per month rental to a European, who constructed an engineering workshop on the site. In 1979 the limitations on dealings were cancelled, and in 1982 the parcel was sold for K25,000. The same woman tenure-converted another parcel within Rabaul, for which she had made an **ikulia** payment of $1,500 in 1969. The land, of 1.74 hectares, was officially valued at $17,000 in 1971, but she rejected an Administration offer of purchase at that price as unrealistic.

A further spectacular example of unearned profits being made from the tenure conversion of land is afforded by the third Rabaul parcel in which the same woman gained a title. Following an **ikulia** acquisition of the land (of 3.61 hectares) in 1963, for 100 pounds and 70 fathoms of **tabu**, she applied for registration in 1964, and was granted tenure conversion in 1968. About one-third of the parcel was subdivided, and from leases over this section a total of over K19,000 per annum rent was being paid in 1978.

Three other parcels had been the subject of leases in 1978, and a fourth lease had been attempted. One of the leased parcels was Palatar Island, west of Ataliklikun Bay. When the tenure conversion application was made in 1969 there was already a "permanent spacious residence" on the island, built by a European. This person had clearly promoted the application, and in 1971 he unofficially leased the land for 20 years at $60 per annum rental. In 1976 he unofficially sub-leased the island for K50 per month. In 1977, seventeen Bainings

---

23The limitations on dealings were not lifted until 1972. Leases not only required Government approval under the **Land Act 1962**, but if for a term exceeding three years also required registration under the **Lands Registration (New Guinea) Act 1924**.
and Tolais were committed for trial as a result of destruction of the residence, but the trial did not proceed, "presumably because of difficulties of countering [their] claim of right defence." (Theo Bredmeyer 1979, pers.comm.) A trade-store on a tenure-converted parcel at Nanga Nanga had been leased for four years at K100 per month, and a club was built on part of a parcel on the edge of Rabaul, for which rent was paid irregularly. On a foreshore parcel near Nonga Hospital the Tolai Cocoa Project apparently erected the large two-storey house found there in 1978, paying a nominal annual rental, but the house and land had by then reverted to the three title-holders. A lease had been submitted for approval, but this was refused as the limitations on dealings had not been uplifted.

Many applicants indicated at the time of application their intention to seek finance to assist their planned development of the land, and I have no doubt that the Development Bank's insistence on registered titles as a security for loans prompted most of these applications. Only five of the the thirty-five title-holders by 1984 had managed to gain a mortgage, although others had applied with their titles to the Development Bank, but been refused. Two of the successful mortgagors had not used the loan funds to develop their tenure-converted parcels. Twenty-seven of the titles had never been modified since their issue. In two cases a single title-holder, and in a third one of three tenants in common, had died, but despite the passage of between eight and thirteen years since their deaths, by 1984 no transmission of title to their successors had been effected. On this record of transactions in tenure-converted land, not only has the Act proved incapable of meeting the prime registration requirement of continuous finality (by its failure to deter illegal dealings, and to adjust to changes in entitlement upon death), but the only important land transactions it facilitated amounted to a gross exploitation of the tenure conversion process. Apart from the matter of unearned profits, the process was being used by expatriates as an alternative method of gaining access to land.

With the exception of the few persons whose applications were motivated by an immediate intention to dispose of the subject land (either permanently or temporarily under lease), all title-holders interviewed in 1978 had sought tenure conversion in order to secure their own occupation of the land. In four cases applicants tenure-converted a parcel of their own `vunatarai' land (two single
individuals, in one case three *vunatarai* members, and in another four), but the other sixteen conversions involved parcels acquired by *ikulia*. Twelve of these transactions were effected between the land-owning *vunatarai* and members of *vunatarai* based in the same *pakanagunan*. Although the available information is not sufficiently detailed to be certain, it is likely that kinship connections and long-standing associations between *vunatarai* underlay all these acquisitions, as was observed in the transactions at Rakunat. The other four transactions involved the disposition of *vunatarai* land to members of *vunatarai* based in *pakanagunan* other than that where the land was situated. Three involved the same female applicant, who acquired land within the Matupit *pakanagunan* on the outskirts of Rabaul. Her *vunatarai* is based in Talwat *pakanagunan*, which, like Matupit, is in the Matupit *paparagunan*, and investigation showed that an association between her own and the two *vunatarai* which disposed of the three parcels underlay the acquisitions. The final acquired parcel - half a hectare on the eastern border of Rabaul - was disposed of by *ikulia* to an LTC official from the Kokopo area, by none other than Nekupia *vunatarai*, identified in Part II as one of the major land-disposing *vunatarai* based at Rakunat. No doubt the applicant's familiarity with the *vunatarai* gained through work experience in the Rakunat area allowed him to establish the connections necessary to mount the transaction.

In Chapter 6 I concluded from the Rakunat experience that the tenure of acquired land is characterised by the interpersonal relationships or intergroup associations of which the acquisition is a product. Despite the legal abolition of customary interests and control under tenure conversion, post-conversion developments on the parcels indicate that their tenure remains dependent on recognition and maintenance of these underlying relationships. The most striking example of sustained customary interests is afforded by the three instances where tenure-converted land was found in 1978 to have been re-occupied by the former customary owners: Palatar Island had been taken over by seventeen Bainings and Tolai from the adjacent mainland in exercise of a "claim of right"; the title-holder of a small parcel on Karavia Bay had been ousted (obliging him to dismantle the permanent-materials house he had constructed there); and members of the land-disposing *vunatarai* had similarly ousted the registered proprietor of a small parcel near Rabaul Airport. In one case where a
member had tenure-converted vunatarai land he regarded the parcel as still owned by his vunatarai (three other members had residences there), and in two other such cases occupation by a segment of the original land-owning vunatarai was observed in 1978. The title-holders of two acquired parcels had died, and members of their vunatarai had settled on the land, in one case claiming to have contributed to the ikulia payment. Two titles had been transferred, but in one case members of the land-disposing vunatarai complained that they had not shared in the proceeds. In six more cases the title-holders said that they had acquired the land for their children, and thus could not dispose of it. On the Rakunat experience it may be presumed that an implicit understanding of the acquisition was that the children should have an immediate interest in the land. The woman's title to the valuable Rabaul parcel which had been partly subdivided for business tenancies was hotly contested by members of her vunatarai on the basis that she had breached understandings upon which the ikulia acquisition had proceeded.

With a total of only 78 hectares of land tenure converted, the economic impact of the measure in the Tolai area could be no more than negligible. The express purpose of the Act was to promote indigenous agriculture, but, where the applicant's proposed use of the land is apparent, an overwhelming majority had non-agricultural uses in mind. The state of development on most parcels showed very little change since tenure conversion, and many parcels had already been substantially developed before tenure conversion — when the land was subject to all the supposed constraints on development which tenure conversion was designed to remove. The largest tenure-converted parcel, of 33.8 hectares (over 40% of the total area converted), had seen no development by 1978, ten years after conversion. The main economic impact of the Act was to bring a few pockets of remaining customary land on the fringes of Rabaul under expatriate commercial development, at enormous profit to one female Tolai in particular.

(d) Conclusion

In the twenty years that tenure conversion has been available only 100 applications were ever made in the Tolai area, outside of Administration-sponsored tenure conversion schemes. As an indication of spontaneous demand for the process, it can only be concluded from
this figure either that demand was minimal, or that access to the process was extremely limited. The particulars of successful applicants showed that they were distinctive from most other Tolai for their superior status in the community, their connections with expatriates, their familiarity with administrative processes and, often, their previous business experience. Some sought the measure for immediate realisation of profit, but most wished to secure their own tenure to the land for purposes of future development. In very few cases did this intended development ensue, and it is likely that on most parcels the fact of tenure reform has been irrelevant in economic terms. Predicated as a voluntary exchange of customary interests for a registered individual title, the administrative requirements for satisfaction of the statutory process of exchange were so demanding as to constitute by themselves an obdurate impediment on access to the measure. Despite their legal abolition, the survival of customary interests and controls is manifested on most tenure-converted parcels by the perceptions of the title-holder, the state of occupation of the land, or challenges to the registered title. It can only be concluded that permanent individualisation of title is, for the Tolai, a conceptual impossibility.

4. REDISTRIBUTION OF PLANTATIONS

(a) Introduction

In December 1972, in its first year of office, the Somare government adopted a set of goals which included the decentralisation of economic activity with emphasis on agricultural development, the more equal distribution of economic benefits and reliance on typical Papua New Guinean forms of organisation. The Commission of Inquiry into Land Matters was appointed in February 1973 and, guided by these goals, presented its report in October of that year. It viewed the problems on alienated land so seriously, however,

24 Known as the Eight Aims, they were later elaborated in the National Goals and Directive Principles of the Constitution. Elsewhere I have examined the attempt to reconcile the contrasting claims of cultural identity and economic development through the constitutional provisions dealing with land - see Fingleton 1982.
that in June, after its conduct of public hearings in the Tolai area, it produced an interim report recommending Government acquisition of all undeveloped alienated land in rural areas and, in areas of land shortage, that the Government be empowered to acquire developed land by compulsory process for redistribution to the land-short people (Papua New Guinea 1973a). In August 1974 the House of Assembly passed a scheme of legislation comprising four enactments which, together with its guiding policy, is known as the Plantation Redistribution Scheme. The Scheme had its origins in the Commission of Inquiry's report, but in contemplating a radical reform of the plantation industry its scope went beyond their recommendations. I have discussed the policy elements of the Scheme elsewhere (1981: 218-23). As my particular concern in this chapter is to examine the manner of redistribution adopted by Tolai on plantations they acquired under the Scheme, only its basic features need be mentioned.

The heavy land alienations in the Tolai area during the early colonial period, and the rapid post-War increase in Tolai population, made the Tolai one of the most land-short people in the country. In 1962 non-official observers predicted the growth of "acute social unrest" arising from "the problem of growing wants and dwindling resources" (A.L. and T.S. Epstein 1962: 81). Clearly there was an apprehension in official circles of mounting stress within the Tolai community, but the main Administration response was to promote resettlement on Administration-owned land distant from the villages where most Tolai population was concentrated. As has been seen, land settlement schemes made a negligible contribution to relief of population pressures. The large area occupied by expatriate-owned plantations, many of which were located near villages where the population pressure was greatest, remained intact throughout this period of increasing land shortage. The Administration, in addition to its inclination to protect expatriate interests, was clearly averse to interfering with these important economic assets, which in 1970-71 produced 28% of the country's cocoa and 13% of its copra production (see Diagram 1.2).

In 1969 the Administration legislated to empower itself to recover undeveloped freehold land (the Land (Underdeveloped Freeholds) Act 1969), but the process was so fettered by protective provisions that it yielded no results. Negotiations were opened in the early 1970s for the Administration purchase of a few plantations which were
under heavy local pressure, but asking prices so far exceeded official valuations that no progress was achieved in this direction either. The Administration was not prepared to arm itself with the power to acquire expatriate-owned plantations by compulsory process. In Chapter 1 I mentioned that from the late 1960s Tolai political unrest grew, fuelled by the long-standing grievances over land alienations. In the absence of an adequate official response, Tolai began moving into unlawful occupation of plantation land. It was in attempting to rid Kabaira Plantation of such occupation that the District Commissioner was killed in 1971.

The Plantation Redistribution Scheme was not confined in its scope of operation to areas of land shortage, for its policy objective was for all plantations in Papua New Guinea to be brought under a programme for transfer of ownership to nationals\textsuperscript{25} (see Fingleton 1981: 220). In areas not experiencing land shortage it was intended that the transfer would proceed by increasing equity acquisition (ibid.), but in areas where land alienations were a major factor contributing to land shortage, the legislation supporting the Scheme was to be invoked. The \textit{Lands Acquisition Act} 1974 empowered the Government to acquire plantation land, either by agreement or by compulsory process, and contained provisions for assessing compensation in the event of compulsory acquisition. The \textit{Land Redistribution Act} 1974 provided for appointment, in relation to a plantation acquired or to be acquired under the Scheme, of a Distribution Authority made up of representatives of the groups claiming traditional ownership of the plantation land. That body was empowered to mediate and, if necessary, arbitrate a settlement of the claims, and to submit a redistribution proposal to the Lands Minister for his final determination. In doing so it was required to apportion liability for repayment of the purchase price to the Government. The Minister was required to take the steps necessary to vest the land in accordance with the proposed redistribution, unless specified exceptional circumstances existed. The \textit{Land Groups Act} 1974 supplied a simplified procedure for incorporation of customary land-owning groups, so that title could be vested in them and they could enter into legal agreements. The \textit{Land Trespass Act} 1974 provided machinery

\textsuperscript{25} Exceptions were made in the case of the new and heavily-capitalised tea plantations and nucleus oil palm estates.
for protecting properties intended for redistribution, if it appeared likely that unauthorised occupation might occur which would threaten the functions of the Distribution Authority.

By 1980 a total of seventy-five plantations had been acquired under the Scheme nationwide, twenty-one of them in the Tolai area (Eaton 1980: 7, Table 1). In March 1980 after a change of government the Scheme's suspension was announced, although after that date another three plantations in the Tolai area, then committed to acquisition, were acquired. In sum, the Government had acquired twenty-four plantations in the area embracing nearly 5,000 hectares for a cost of K1,390,150. Of these, nine had been fully paid off by fieldwork in 1982. All nine had either been redistributed under the Scheme, or were in the process of redistribution, and so they formed the basis of my research into the manner of redistribution adopted by the Tolai. The areas of the nine plantations, and details of their purchase and repayment, are shown on Table 7.4. Indicative of the Tolai demand for the Scheme is the high proportion of the purchase price tendered as a deposit by the groups intending to take over the plantations - more than one-third in six of the nine cases. The coastal area around Kokopo, and inland towards Mt Varzin (Vunakokor) had been heavily affected by early land alienations (see Map 3), and five of the nine plantations (Malapau, Gire Gire, Nganalaka, Kalulu and Kabakuau and Tovanabothot) are in that locality (see Map 14). Wangaramut on the North Coast is in another area of heavy alienation. Tatavana is near Nanga Nanga village, inland from Karavia Bay, Vunabal lies towards the mouth of the Warangoi River, and Kabakon is an island at the south of the Duke of Yorks group - all being areas experiencing heavy population pressure on remaining customary land.

(b) The Tolai Manner of Plantation Redistribution

In analysing the redistribution process adopted by the Tolai it is necessary to start by looking at activity in the villages surrounding a plantation some considerable time in advance of Government moves towards acquisition. Malapau was the first plantation acquired under the Scheme, in November 1974, but in anticipation of Government acquisition committees had been formed in the four villages located around the plantation, to recruit those village residents interested in participating in the redistribution
Table 7.4 Redistributed Plantations in the Tolai Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plantation</th>
<th>Area (has.)</th>
<th>Date of purchase</th>
<th>Purchase price (K)</th>
<th>Deposit (K)</th>
<th>Repayment (%-age of purchase price)</th>
<th>Repayment period (yrs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malapau</td>
<td>459.0</td>
<td>12.11.74</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nganalaka</td>
<td>157.9</td>
<td>11.2.75</td>
<td>38,800</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabakon</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>10.9.75</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>4,156</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabakaul &amp; Tovanabotbot</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>11.9.75</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gire Gire</td>
<td>227.3</td>
<td>27.11.75</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>37,926</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalulu</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>13.2.76</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaramut</td>
<td>498.9</td>
<td>20.4.76</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vunabal</td>
<td>282.2</td>
<td>17.11.76</td>
<td>62,800</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4.0-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatavana</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>10.8.79</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1850.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>362,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>148,082</strong></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. As explained in the text, formal redistribution had not been completed in all cases.
2. Repayment could have been finalised in 1.5 years, but the last payment was withheld pending a Government subdivision.
3. The Government in fact paid K30,700, but wrote off K20,700 in respect of part of the plantation subject to squatting.
4. It was not possible to establish the final repayment date, which fell between 4 and 6 years.

Source:
Department of Lands, Surveys and Environment, Rabaul.
Map 14: Plantation Redistribution in the Tolai Area
and to gather contributions towards a deposit. The Malapau acquisition attracted attention throughout the Tolai area, and the method of village mobilisation employed was used as a precedent by other communities wishing to recover plantation land. Choice of the village as the main unit for recruiting participation reflects its increasing prominence in Tolai social and political organisation (see Chapter 2), and possibly suggests that villages may play an important role in economic matters in the future.

Once a village committee had been formed, normally under the influence and ostensible leadership of one or more of its younger educated members but with the support of village elders, mobilising for the plantation acquisition began in earnest. No doubt drawing on a long Tolai experience of local government and business organisation, office-bearers were appointed and membership records kept. The committee's chairman lobbied politicians and officials, and the secretary/treasurer recorded the names of members and their contribution towards the deposit. After one village got under way, committees were usually started along the same lines in other villages claiming they had an interest in the same plantation. It seems that membership was at first open to all village residents who were willing to make contributions to the deposit, but that after a time the membership books were closed, and those villagers not prepared to join in the commitment at the early stages were refused admittance. As a result of the formation of village committees and their activities in recruitment of membership, it is apparent that identification of the villages with an interest in a particular plantation, and even of the individuals intended to participate in its ultimate redistribution, had already reached an advanced stage by the time Government moves towards acquisition began.

This method of proceeding closely paralleled the steps set out in the Land Redistribution Act 1974 (see above), yet by October 1982 a Distribution Authority had been appointed for only one of the nine plantations (Kabakon), and only one title had been vested under the Scheme - despite the fact all purchase prices had been fully repaid, some over five years previously. I have presented elsewhere my view that failure to absorb the village-level identification activity already under way for most plantations into the statutory redistribution process was the principal reason for break-down in the Scheme's operation in the Tolai area, and I have documented my opinion
that the cause lay in the excessively legalistic approach to compliance with the statutory requirements adopted by the Government lawyers (Fingleton 1983: 111-13). Despite this denial of legal recognition redistribution had proceeded on the nine plantations, and by 1982 most had been occupied by Tolai in accordance with their own chosen manner of redistribution.

During fieldwork in 1982 the progress made towards redistribution of all nine plantations was investigated. For one plantation (Nganalaka) detailed research was conducted in the villages participating in the redistribution, for two others (Malapau and Wangaramut) general meetings of participating villages were held, and for the other plantations information was drawn only from official records. The progress made on the nine plantations by October 1982 was as follows:

**Malapau:** This large plantation had been formally subdivided by the Government into four village "sections", for settlement by individuals from the neighbouring Ranguna, Balanataman, Karavi and Vunamami villages. Each section had been informally subdivided by Lands Department officials into equal-sized blocks, which were allocated to individual village members by the respective village committees. Balanataman and Vunamami sections were fully occupied, Karavi members were in the process of occupying their section, but there was disagreement over entitlement of individuals to occupy within the Ranguna section.

**Nganalaka:** The plantation was intended to be subdivided equally between Tagi Tagi 2 village on the one hand, and Malakuna and Ulaulatava villages on the other. The fact that only part of the property was under effective plantings had led to disagreement over positioning of the dividing boundary. All three villages intended to subdivide their sections into individual blocks.

**Kabakon:** The plantation fully occupies an island in the Duke of Yorks, and only one village, Kerewara on an adjacent island, was involved in its redistribution. The appointed Distribution Authority had recommended that the title be vested but, despite the fact that the Kerewara participants had incorporated in 1979 as a business group under the Business Groups Act 1974, no vesting had occurred. It was intended to continue running the property as a plantation unit, not to subdivide it.

**Kabakaul & Tovanabotbot:** These two adjacent parcels were intended for subdivision between the members of an incorporated business group, who came from the neighbouring Takubar, Livuan and Taui villages. Leases over the two portions were issued to the business group in 1981.

**Gire Gire:** Originally operated after take-over as a plantation unit, the whole property was apparently intended for subdivision into equal blocks for allocation to individual members of nearby Bitarebarebe, Gunanba, Ngunguna and Tingenavudu villages, for which purpose a private surveyor had been approached.
Kalulu: Acquired as part of Varzin Plantation, this portion adjoins Nganalaka (see above), and was excised after negotiations between Tagi Tagi 2 and Bitakapuk villages. The former village intended to amalgamate the portion with their half of Nganalaka, and then subdivide the whole area into individual blocks.

Wangaramut: Three-quarters of this large plantation was the subject of long-standing unlawful occupation by villagers from nearby Rakumkubur and Nabata at the time of Government acquisition. Blocks in that part were apparently being allocated to individual village members by the leaders of the six vunatarai which claimed former customary ownership of the land. The other quarter had been informally subdivided between the two other adjacent villages, Putanagororoi and Vunairoto, and further subdivided into equal blocks for the respective village members, who were going into occupation in 1982.

Vunabal: Originally operated after take-over as a plantation unit, the land was apparently being subdivided between Ralubang and Rakunai villages. The future redistribution intentions were not apparent.

Tatavana: This small plantation was in the process of an informal subdivision by Lands Department into blocks for allocation to individual members of Vunaulul, Vunamurmur and Nguvalian villages.

The general pattern has been for redistribution to be conducted initially on a village basis, and for villages then to allocate blocks of equal size to their individual members within each village section.

Nganalaka was selected for closer investigation of the land tenure implications of this redistribution pattern, and Malapau and Wangaramut received more superficial examination.

(i) Nganalaka Plantation

Of the three participating villages in the Nganalaka redistribution, Tagi Tagi 2 is located in a Wairiki pakanagunan, and Malakuna and Ulualatava are in a Ralum pakanagunan. As mentioned above, the plantation was intended for initial subdivision into two equal areas, one for the Tagi Tagi 2 members and the other for members of the two other villages. In the ultimate subdivision into individual blocks Tagi Tagi 2 intended to amalgamate adjoining Kalulu with their half of Nganalaka. I held separate meetings in each village, to

---

26 Paparagunan and Pakanagunan boundary maps compiled by the Native Land Commission for the area have been lost, and I cannot be more precise. My impression is that there is one paparagunan centred around Wairiki, and another centred around Ralum.
establish the composition of the village membership involved in the proposed redistribution, with the following results:

Tagi Tagi 2 village: There were sixty-four nominated members of the group formed to share in the redistribution, of whom fifty-seven were male and seven female. The members were all resident in the village, and every family in the village had been invited to join the group. I was told that a man's name "covers his wife and their children", and, in the case of female members, they were included because either their husband was dead or they were single at the time. About a dozen families had chosen not to join, and were later excluded. On data collected on family membership and residence I calculate that a total of 320 persons (being living nominated members, their resident spouses and resident children) made up the membership of the group intended to settle on the Tagi Tagi 2 part of Nganalaka and the adjoining Kalulu portion - a total area of 116.6 hectares. This group was over 90% of the village (whose 1980 population was 343), and it contained members of a total of thirty-two vunatarai, based predominantly in Wairiki pakanagunan. Of the sixty-four nominated group members only twenty-four were members of vunatarai recognised as the former customary owners of Nganalaka land.

Malakuna village: There were nineteen nominated members, of whom fourteen were male and five female. Apparently membership was largely restricted to persons whose own vunatarai land, or whose children's vunatarai land, was remote from the village. I calculated that a total of nearly 100 persons (of a village population in 1980 of 426) make up the membership of the group intended to settle (together with the Ulaulatava group) on their half of Nganalaka. This group contained members of a total of eighteen vunatarai.

Ulaulatava village: There were twelve nominated members, all male. The membership was confined to persons who were members, or whose fathers were members, of the vunatarai claiming former customary ownership of Nganalaka land. I calculate that just over fifty persons make up the membership of the group intended to settle (together with the Malakuna group) on their half of Nganalaka. The group contains members of nine vunatarai. Together with the Malakuna group, about 150 persons will settle on a total area of 78.9 hectares.

On the combined area of Nganalaka and Kalulu (195.5 hectares), therefore, it is proposed to settle a total of some 470 persons on ninety-five blocks. Selection criteria for the persons nominated as block-holders varied between the three villages, with Tagi Tagi 2 treating the redistribution as an opportunity for all village residents to acquire land, Malakuna concentrating on the residents

---

27 Ulaulatava village was not a census unit in 1980, so the village population is not apparent. It seems that residents were included in the Malakuna village census unit.
with no practicable access to vunatarai land, and Ulaulatava restricting participation to those residents with customary connection to the land through vunatarai membership or patrifiliation. Of the nominated block-holders males far outnumbered females, but the basic redistribution unit was the nuclear family, and thus the benefits will be spread across the village communities and through many vunatarai. More general conclusions will be drawn after examining the proposed manner of redistribution on the other two selected plantations.

(ii) Malapau Plantation

The plantation had been formally subdivided into four village sections, each to be allocated in blocks to individual members of each village, as follows:

- **Ranguna village:** 89 blocks to be held by sixty-three males and twenty-six females.
- **Balanataman village:** 120 blocks being held by seventy-nine males, twenty-three females and eighteen persons whose sex was not apparent from the membership records. One further block was retained for community purposes.
- **Karavi village:** 108 blocks being taken up by seventy-five males, twenty-eight females and five persons whose sex was not apparent. Two further blocks were retained for community purposes.
- **Vunamami village:** 135 blocks being held by eighty-five males and fifty females.

The total number of block-holders is 452, which, when spouses and resident children are included, represents a substantial majority of the total population of the four villages - 1,488 in 1980. The area of Malapau is 459 hectares.

(iii) Wangaramut Plantation

Three-quarters of this property was already unlawfully occupied at the date of acquisition by the people of Rakumkubur and Nabata villages (see above). The remaining one-quarter had been allocated in blocks to individual members of the two other neighbouring villages, as follows:

- **Putanagororoi village:** 36 blocks being held by sixteen males and twenty females.
- **Vunairoto village:** 45 blocks being held by thirty-three males and twelve females.

The total 1980 population of the two villages was 743. The eighty-one
block-holders, together with their spouses and resident children, probably represent less than half the village population, but preference was given in selecting participants to those families who most needed land. The plantation area involved is 129.9 hectares.

(c) Conclusion

In contrast with colonial land legislation, whose principal objective was the immediate or progressive elimination of customary interests in and control over land, the first post-independence land law reform was based on a recognition of the legitimacy of claims to alienated land arising out of customary entitlement. The 1974 legislation did not prescribe the form of title to be vested after redistribution, although its provision for the incorporation of customary groups in which titles could be vested clearly anticipated the introduction of registered group titles recommended by the Commission of Inquiry into Land Matters (see Papua New Guinea 1973:27). The failure since 1978 to proceed further with post-independence land law reform has meant the lack of an appropriate form of title, and the only titles vested in the Tolai area after redistribution have been leases.28 The supporting legislation for the Plantation Redistribution Scheme was predicated on the goal of achieving development "primarily through the use of Papua New Guinean forms of social, political and economic organization" (as it was expressed in the fifth National Goal and Directive Principle of the Constitution). The Acts sought to achieve this goal not only by the ultimate vesting of titles in incorporated customary groups, but also by reposing the prime responsibility for redistribution on local authorities made up of representatives of the groups claiming traditional ownership of the particular land. The statutory redistribution process has not worked satisfactorily, nor has the reform of tenure anticipated under the Scheme eventuated. The Tolai experience is, however, most instructive on both these matters.

Tolai used the social and political organisation of the village in mobilising for plantation acquisition and, in most cases, for

28 In the case of the two Kabakaun & Tovanabotbot portions, although why Agricultural leases rather than freehold titles were chosen is not apparent.
recruiting the persons intended to share in the redistribution. In doing so, larger and smaller social units were not ignored. Where, as in most cases, more than one village claimed entitlement to be involved in a plantation's redistribution, they co-ordinated their activities up to the point that the land had been subdivided into village sections, whereupon the responsibility for block allocation among village members was the sole concern of each village. This inter-village co-ordination was most successful in those cases where the villages were all within the same paparagunan - a consequence of the community of interest built up through intergroup connections and interpersonal relationships within this territorial unit (see Chapter 2). Problems in the division of Nganalaka into village sections undoubtedly have endured because the participating villages are located in different paparagunan, and I suspect a similar lack of cohesion between the four villages participating in the redistribution of Malapau made an early resolution of their conflicts difficult. The most important social unit at a lower level than the village is the vunatarai, and its interests were handled in a variety of ways.

As the dominant Tolai land-owning unit, it could be expected that the claims of vunatarai which originally settled the plantation land would receive special consideration in the proposed redistribution. Of the three plantations examined in detail the original land-owning vunatarai were indeed accorded prominence in some cases: the majority of Wangaramut was being allocated by leaders of the six vunatarai recognised as the traditional owners, and block allocation within the Ulualatava section of Nganalaka was confined to persons with a customary connection to the land through vunatarai membership or patrifiliation. In other cases the criterion for participation was land shortage, either of the whole village in common (as at Tagi Tagi 2) or of particular groups within the village (as at Malakuna), but in these cases vunatarai claims were not ignored, for tabu payments by the block-holders to the traditional land-owning vunatarai are intended, "so that the vunatarais' names will no longer be attached to the land". Preference for the village rather than vunatarai as the initial redistribution unit reflects the increasing prominence of the village community, but other reasons may include the long exclusion of vunatarai from the plantation land, the failure of vunatarai-based businesses in the past (see the comments on tinur guvai enterprises in Chapter 2), and, in particular, the fact that most Tolai treated the
Plantation Redistribution Scheme as an opportunity to relieve land shortage - a phenomenon experienced by the village community as a whole, or by particular groups within the village, rather than by just the traditional land-owning vunatarai.

The details of completed and proposed redistributions indicate that the benefits of the Scheme are being spread widely, with no special access being given to wealthy and powerful individuals. There are many female as well as male block-holders, but with the exception of Kabakon Plantation (which fully occupied a small island, and which the single village involved is maintaining as a plantation unit) the basic unit for land-holding is the nuclear family. In preceding sections of this chapter I observed that group interests deriving from matrilineal descent were being asserted on leasehold blocks in land settlement schemes, and that the tenure of land converted to individual freehold titles remains dependent on the recognition and continued maintenance of underlying intergroup connections and interpersonal relationships of which the individual's title was a product. On customary land, I claimed in Chapter 6 that the tenure is characterised by the ownership of matrilineal descent groups, even where the land was acquired by individuals, and held initially by a nuclear family. The recency of occupation of redistributed plantation land prevents definitive characterisation of the nature of the tenure, but comparative Tolai experience suggests that here, too, group interests based on matrilineal descent will be asserted, and that in time the family-held blocks will be owned by small matriline segments.

The manner of redistribution adopted by the Tolai can, therefore, be seen to have employed at different stages of the process all the main units of their social structure - both modern and traditional. The village was the unit involved in initial mobilisation, and for first subdivision of the plantation. The reconciliation of claims between villages was assisted by political alliances and kinship connections built up over a long history of common settlement within the same paparagunan. Each village allocated blocks within its section to its participating residents, in a manner which recognised the needs of residents and the interests of the traditional land-owning vunatarai. After allocation the blocks are held by nuclear families, but it is likely that block entitlement will eventually be governed by matrilineal recruitment, so that small groups will own small, dispersed parcels of land - a trend already emerging on customary land (see Chapter 6).
The economic consequences of the Scheme are difficult to quantify. It has been blamed for falls in production of export crops (e.g., Knetsch and Trebilcock 1981: 103), but to the extent this has occurred it is mainly attributable to factors other than redistribution. While new Tolai plantings of coconuts and cocoa have steadily increased, there is clear evidence that plantation crops were approaching a decline in production before the Scheme began, largely through failure to replant ageing trees and maintain existing plantings during the period of uncertainty leading up to independence. Malfunctions in the operation of the Scheme (largely the result of an unresponsive bureaucracy - a perennial problem in colonial times as well) have deprived the measure of its full benefits, for most redistributions have been denied official sanctioning. Survey costs, under inappropriate requirements for authorised surveys, have held up the issue of formal titles, without which development finance has not been forthcoming. Redistribution of the other fifteen plantations acquired by the Government in the Tolai area has been postponed in consequence of the official commitment (entirely inappropriate, in Tolai circumstances) to their retention as unitary plantation estates (see Fingleton 1983: 122).

Despite these bureaucratic barriers, the Scheme has made a major contribution to Tolai welfare, and has defused the explosive political crisis surrounding alienated land in the early 1970s. As a land shortage solution, achievements in eight years under the Scheme far exceed those managed in the preceding twenty years under land settlement schemes. At great cost and diversion of administrative resources, 618 small-holder blocks embracing a total of 6,510 hectares were allocated in the settlement schemes, whereas by invoking already-existing Tolai social institutions within eight years almost 5,000 hectares have been redistributed, or were in the process of redistribution, with minimal State intervention. On Malapau plantation alone 452 blocks had been allocated, and I calculate that 470 persons will benefit from the redistribution of Nganalaka and Kalulu. The blocks are small, in many cases amounting to only a

For coconut plantings see Wheeler et al. n.d.: 11, Table 6, and for cocoa plantings see Densley and Wheeler n.d.: 7,11, Table 7. Densley and Wheeler (ibid., 5) suggest a variety of reasons for the slump in cocoa production after 1974/75, only one of which was uncertainty caused by the Scheme.
hectare or so per family for food gardens and some minor cash-cropping, but average land availability in the areas concerned is often a small fraction of a hectare per person, so additional land of this order represents a major increase. Under extreme population pressure the distribution of plantation land has been optimised – clearly the prevailing goal of the Tolai organisers of redistribution. A visit to what once were heavily-overgrown plantations shows major investment in housing, cocoa replanting and light industry. For the many hundreds of Tolai now in occupation of former plantation land the Scheme has brought great satisfaction (though qualified by the lack of formal recognition of their tenure), and their achievement in redistribution confirms the Tolai ability to adapt and utilise their cultural institutions in responding to an opportunity for a Melanesian-style land tenure reform.
CONCLUSION

Pluralism seems to come naturally to the Tolai. In surveying over a century of interaction between the Tolai and Western cultures, it is tempting to conclude that their manifest competence in incorporating foreign cultural elements is somehow a product of the dualism intrinsic in Tolai social organisation. The moiety dichotomy is the central factor in Tolai society but, far from representing social cleavage, the interdependence of the moieties serves to integrate the Tolai people in all spheres of life. Modern Tolai culture is a compound of indigenous institutions and their introduced Western counterparts - each acting on the other; the Western institutions supplementing, not supplanting, the Tolai institutions.

Thus universal Christianity co-exists with a general recognition of the powers of magic and sorcery, of the importance of secret societies and of the dances, ritual and objects associated with these supernatural phenomena. Tabu shellwealth, with its host of social and ceremonial characteristics, retains its deep grip on the Tolai imagination. Despite an ever-increasing demand for cash, tabu continues to flourish as a currency, acting as the medium for conversion of commercial value into wealth of far greater cultural importance. While engaging in the cash economy through wage employment, service industries or cash-cropping, most Tolai maintain their subsistence garden tradition, not least for the social and emotional satisfaction thereby derived. Ambitious Tolai stand for elective office in the formal political arena, but they still seek the status associated with leadership in the traditional sphere. Under the influence of many factors Tolai have embraced the nuclear family as a central social unit, but without diminishing the importance of their vunatarai and extended kin. Since the earliest European influence on their lives the Tolai people have displayed a propensity to convert introduced institutions to their own purposes, and by organic synthesis have harmonised the competing demands of cultural integrity and environmental transformation.
European colonisation of Papua New Guinea installed another fundamental duality. The Western institutions of government were introduced to provide both the superstructure for colonial rule, and the infrastructure to service the colonisers' interests, but for purposes of government indigenous systems of authority and law were accorded formal recognition. Although a protective element in this approach is evident, such recognition enabled the establishment of relations between two legal systems posited as being essentially analogous. No conceptual barrier, therefore, was acknowledged to contractual relations for the acquisition of land, by which process it was removed from one legal system to the other. Moreover, the duality was only countenanced as a transitional expedient - there were never any official reservations about the superiority of the Western legal system, or the inevitability of its ultimate replacement of the indigenous systems. Throughout the colonial era this duality was represented in a tenurial dichotomy between alienated land and customary land, serving to distinguish the two spheres in which separate legal systems, government services and developmental objectives operated. The enduring colonial philosophy was the necessity to convert land from the customary to the Western tenurial regime.

At independence Papua New Guinea made a constitutional commitment to cultural pluralism, as part of which it undertook to embrace indigenous forms of social and political organisation as the main agencies for development. With such a fundamental shift in development philosophy it might well be expected that the colonial strategy of replacing customary tenures with Western-style titles would be abandoned. The inherited commitment to prescriptive social change is, however, deeply embedded in the infrastructure of the State. Its persistence leaves a constant tension between the intransigence of official attitudes and State institutions and the durability of Melanesian cultural institutions. Nowhere is this tension more evident than in the field of land tenure - at once the focus of the Melanesian villager's social, economic and spiritual existence, and of State measures aimed at promoting development.

Based on the approach that a society's land tenure represents the interaction of core cultural institutions under the influence of environmental factors, in Chapter 2 I examined the changing Tolai cultural setting over the period of environmental transformation since
first European contact. Greatly-increased mobility during the last century, an almost five-fold increase in Tolai population, and a growing demand for cash and material possessions have all had a profound impact on a people long-renowned for their readiness to innovate in response to new needs and opportunities. While analysing the trends in Tolai modification of core cultural institutions I sought to identify their underlying concepts - those cultural constants which are constitutive of the Tolai people, about which change has occurred while remaining themselves intact. Pivotal of these are the related concepts of corporate and local identity, in accordance with which units in the Tolai social structure are identified with different territorial units. At both group and individual levels, local identity is the key factor in all land tenure matters.

The remainder of the thesis may be seen as an elaboration of the Tolai concept of local identity - its centrality to land tenure, the evolution of the concept under changing Tolai conditions, and the Tolai experience under alternative forms of tenure which have either denied or recognised the primacy of the concept. While commentators have recognised the importance of group corporateness to Tolai land tenure, identification between social and territorial units has, in my view, not received sufficient emphasis in the literature. From the early evidence of observed patterns of settlement, the movements of individual Tolai, and relations between communities I suggest a greater degree of personal mobility and a wider network of alliances and communications than other commentators have allowed. The reconstructed pattern of original settlement at Rakunat village along moiety lines, taken together with the extensions of Tolai corporate concepts analysed in Chapter 2, suggests an explanation for the dubious claims of early European observers that pakanagunan were originally the territory of single matrilineages. The diverse and distant origins of groups settling at Rakunat shows not only the mobility of pre-contact times, but also, by its present-day recollection during village debate, the enduring importance of group origins in Tolai identification with an area.

Epstein, however, recognised the need to explore the processes of identification, in attempting "to define the thread of continuity in the context of social change." (1969: 320.)
Having remarked Tolai identification of units in their social structure with the territorial units that they recognise, I offered a refinement of the modern village entity in accordance with Tolai social and territorial concepts, and, on an individual level, distinguished between membership of a village community and simple residence in the village. Again, the concept of local identity is crucial for appreciating parochialism in village-level politics, and what for the Tolai are marriages within a local community and marriages to outsiders, with the critical consequences for local identity of spouses and matrilineal descendants of the marriage which necessarily follow. The analysis clarifies the basis of an individual's residence in a community, and accordingly the integrity of that person's tenure to the land he or she occupies there. I claimed that all customary land is owned by descent groups (either long established, or emerging), that inheritance has no application to land tenure, and that the crucial tenure issue is the mode of recruitment to land-owning groups.

Increasing village population has led to more intensive use by members of their vunatarai land, but the main factor causing adjustments to land tenure is the increased proportion of outsiders resident in the village (and, correspondingly, of members resident outside the village), in consequence of a higher incidence of local exogamy in recent decades. By Tolai customary methods of securing the secondary settlement of land, exchanges are effected to confirm the occupation of outsiders. All such land exchanges are based on intergroup and interpersonal relationships, which must be maintained if the tenure of the newly-settling group is to remain secure. By such transactions land is exchanged from one matrilineal descent group to small kinship segments, to which, on the Rakunat evidence, recruitment is overwhelmingly governed by matrilineal descent. Contrary to official understanding, the increased importance of the nuclear family has neither promoted land acquisitions, nor introduced a trend to patrilineal descent (much less to patrilineal land inheritance). Despite changes in the ownership of land parcels, the basic characteristic of Tolai land tenure - ownership by matrilineal descent groups - remains intact. The vunatarai, its lualua, and the role of the maternal uncle retain their central importance in the lives of all Tolai.

The centrality of these concepts accounts for the "continuity" of
Tolai culture, but we are not dealing with a people whose culture has resisted "change". Indeed, had the Tolai culture possessed no potential for adaptation, it would certainly by now have lost its integrity under the invasion of Western values, concepts and practices. I attribute the Tolai's proven capacity for adaptation to the inherent flexibility of their culture - itself a product of its comprehensiveness, and the contextual relativity of its underlying institutions. Far from undermining Tolai culture, some consequences of Western penetration seem to have enhanced it. Thus we saw that a sense of Tolai identity only emerged in the wake of a shared colonial experience, greater mobility, and the increased importance of administrative boundaries. A comprehensive road network has greatly extended the range of social contact in Tolai cultural life, reinforcing moiety affiliation and facilitating the formation and maintenance of intergroup and interpersonal relationships over much wider areas than was formerly possible. Improved health facilities have decreased the susceptibility of vunatarai to extinction, while wage employment has reduced demands on vunatarai land.

On the other hand, many aspects of Western penetration have presented major challenges to the Tolai. A large proportion of their land is alienated, leaving many communities unable to satisfy the land needs of their membership. Erosion and soil depletion are becoming serious problems in many areas. The expectations of school-leavers for gratifying occupation are not being met, and the village leadership, while conscious of these stresses, has no authority to mediate the impact of changes occurring in the wider Tolai environment. Part of the solution to these problems could be found in changes within the structure of government, by devolving the powers on Provincial and village-level authorities necessary to enable practical response to the new demands. Population pressure on land and limited employment opportunities might be mitigated by a greater Tolai awareness of the desirability of family planning, and the effective options available to that end. Much of the responsibility for present problems, however, must be recognised as stemming from the inappropriateness of the inherited official attitudes and State institutions, with their wasteful strategy of prescriptive social change.

Of all the tenure reforms introduced in the Tolai area, the one of greatest benefit was the least intrusive - the process for systematic demarcation and adjudication of existing ownership of
customary land. Ironically, this measure occupied a position of minimal importance in the plans of the policy-makers. From the first serious attempts in the early 1960s to facilitate adjustment of customary tenures to the rapid environmental changes by then in train, the official creed was the necessity to free entrepreneurial individuals from their customary obligations. Blaming the failure of early communal cash-crop plantings on their perception that customary tenures were inherently unsuited to commercial agriculture, and resisting the clear Tolai preference for communal operations in the early land settlement schemes, official efforts were concentrated on promoting the individual ownership and management of land. Legal measures - be they the immediate conversion to individual-owned freeholds, the allocation of settlement scheme leases, or the registration of communally-owned land - had as their ultimate objective the individualisation of tenure to all land in Papua New Guinea, and State services (particularly in agricultural extension and rural credit) were only provided in a co-ordinated manner to the individual operator on a registered title. The great bulk of the land and the population was systematically excluded from the opportunities for full participation in the development process.

My examination of a century of land tenure change at village level demonstrates both a commitment and a capacity to adjust customary tenure in response to the changing size and composition of the village, and the differential land needs of all its residents. By manipulation of the underlying concepts in Tolai social structure and political organisation, village land is being continually redistributed from those groups from time to time with a comparatively high availability of land for their resident membership, to those groups whose access to land is limited - either because they are newly-settled in the locality and are still in the process of establishing a local identity there, or, in the case of locally-based groups, because their own landholdings are insufficient to meet the needs of their resident membership. No Rakunat villager has ever received credit to assist development there, and it is many years since the last agricultural extension officer visited the village. Within the constraints of limited finance and technological inputs the people have exploited their land resources for housing, subsistence gardening and cash-cropping purposes in a manner which, to all appearances, makes optimum use of its potential for their diverse and
changing needs. The overwhelming impression gained is of a dynamic tenure regime, ever responsive to the requirements of the people whose culture it reflects.

The results of State intervention to promote the individualisation of tenure form the opposite impression. Despite the grossly disproportionate allocation of resources in funds and personnel to the small percentage of land in the Tolai area and the fraction of the Tolai population involved in tenure conversion and land settlement schemes, economic performance has consistently run far below the potential of the land concerned. In social terms, some tenure conversions enabled rank profiteering by well-placed individuals, and afforded advantages to the handful of other successful applicants denied to almost all other Tolai. Land settlement schemes have made a negligible contribution to relief of Tolai population pressure, and on recent indications are exacerbating social divisions among the Tolai. The legal interests represented by the titles commonly bear no resemblance to the actual state of occupation of the land, and observance and enforcement of the incidents of title are usually non-existent, under circumstances of almost total bureaucratic break-down. The inflexibility of the titles, the heavy dependence of settlers on the State supply of social infrastructure, and the failure of the tenures to accommodate the changing circumstances of the title-holders, all add up to an impression of a static tenure regime, increasingly dissonant with the needs of its subjects and of the wider Tolai community.

Presently occupying an intermediate position between customary and introduced tenures are the plantation estates in the Tolai area. Established mainly in the early colonial period on land alienated from customary tenure, these properties have been the subject of the only significant land tenure reform introduced since independence. In contrast to the colonial land legislation, the reform was based on a recognition of the legitimacy of claims to alienated land arising out of customary entitlement, and the process sought to promote, not terminate, the involvement of indigenous institutions in the land. Despite the vocal opposition of vested interests and bureaucratic hindrance, the Tolai have been able to redistribute a large area of plantation land among the critically land-short people of neighbouring villages. They have done so by employing all the main units in their social structure - both traditional and modern - at different stages
in the process from the mobilisation of support and collection of funds to acquire a plantation through to its ultimate Tolai occupation. They received little formal support in this undertaking, and the inherited intransigence of official attitudes and State institutions has denied them many of the benefits which ought to have accrued from their preparedness to compromise their just claims to alienated land, and to adopt the formal processes provided by the State.

Some remaining plantations have been acquired by the State with a view to redistribution among the neighbouring Tolai communities, but, despite this ultimate intention and the pressing needs of those Tolai, the State continues the artificial maintenance of these plantations as estates. Some expatriate-owned plantations have been abandoned by their owners, while many others have been seriously neglected. In determining its response the Government seems caught in a dilemma: either it makes a commitment to ownership by outsiders of plantation estates, and supplies the security of tenure necessary for major reinvestment; or it responds to the needs and wishes of the local Tolai communities by facilitating the expeditious redistribution of most remaining plantations. In social and political terms, the first approach would be retrogressive, and the second progressive. In economic terms, the first approach could only be preferred if the Government refuses to give due recognition in the allocation of State resources to alternative forms of tenure and land management, called for in the constitutional commitment to use Melanesian forms of organisation as the main agencies for development.

Over most of its history Papua New Guinea and its people have been pressured to conform to introduced notions of development, and strategies aimed at replacement of Melanesian institutions with their more "advanced" Western counterparts. The findings from my research that the dynamic tenure sector is in customary land, and that the introduced tenures are static and unresponsive, is no more than a reflection of the contrast between the inherent flexibility of indigenous institutions, and the intransigence of the particular version of Western institutions imported under colonial rule. No Western democracy has accepted prescriptive social change, yet countries such as Papua New Guinea are expected to suppress their natural cultural inclinations and basic human drives to a pace and pattern of development dictated by outsiders. By its participation in
the international economic order Papua New Guinea is inevitably susceptible to pressures over which it can have no control, but an emphasis on growth and economic development by no means disenfranchises Papua New Guinea from decisions on the most suitable means for their achievement. Too often, however, outside bodies prescribe nostrums for the country's perceived ailments, which amount to a recipe for cultural genocide.

For Papua New Guinea to realise its potential in land and human resources, the wasteful and outdated strategy concentrating all developmental inputs on the objective of prescriptive social change must be abandoned. In its place must be installed the alternative strategy laid down in the Constitution - that development proceed through reliance on Melanesian forms of social and political organisation. Far from being unrealistic idealism, the Tolai experience shows that this approach has far greater potential for achieving economic growth and improved social welfare. History has shown the minimal capacity of the State to intervene in customary tenures; what has so far received little recognition is the futility of State attempts to do so. In advocating a radical shift in the State's developmental strategy I am supported by the evidence that Melanesian institutions perform better for Melanesians on most economic and social criteria than their Western counterparts. By incorporating the inherent self-regulatory processes of Melanesian institutions as the central elements in an alternative development strategy, State intervention may be withdrawn to the appropriate level where it may be administered more effectively.

Adoption of this alternative strategy would necessitate a number of policy adjustments. Laws for the registration of State-guaranteed indefeasible titles in customary land have little to contribute to development in Papua New Guinea, and their social interference and administrative costs can probably only be justified where a radical and profitable alteration of the land's use is being contemplated by the State and the land owners. Such could be the case for pockets of remaining customary land in urban areas, or for a major industrial or agricultural project. Any registration law must provide initially for recognition of the ownership of the corporate groups in the locality concerned, which are the basic land-owning units under Melanesian tenures. As called for by the Commission of Inquiry into Land Matters in 1973, the socially disruptive, economically unrewarding and
administratively profligate Land (Tenure Conversion) Act 1963 should be repealed, and the policy of promoting individualisation of customary tenures consigned to the scrap-heap of history as a failed exercise in social engineering. In the place of such prescriptive measures, a system for recording the land tenure status quo - similar to that so highly valued at Rakunat - should be reintroduced, but on this occasion far greater attention should be given to its social and economic justification in each locality, before the administrative burdens of its effective introduction and progressive maintenance are undertaken. It is, in any event, far less administratively demanding than any of the alternative measures, and can be accompanied by a lower order of survey, thereby reducing direct costs. If State financial institutions are to make a genuine contribution to development, they must adapt to the acceptance of recorded interests in customary land as a reliable security, as the Tolai experience proves them to be.

The thesis has concentrated on rural land - the basis of Papua New Guinea's society and economy. While the artificially-created societies of towns and cities call for more specialised land tenure and administration systems, there is potential for the application of Melanesian rural tenure concepts in attempting to develop the sense of corporate identity in urban areas which is essential for the growth of social responsibility, and the reduction of lawlessness. In their advanced state of development Tolai are not representative of all Melanesians, but their exceptionality stems mainly from the rich potential of their land, and the duration of their exposure to Western influence. Factors which have produced change in the Tolai area are now evident in many other parts of Papua New Guinea, and the Tolai experience is indicative of the developments likely to occur elsewhere.

In revealing the success of Tolai adaptation I should counsel against the impression that no problems lie ahead for the Tolai. While a State commitment of resources to the customary tenure sector will enable more intensive and efficient use of land, many communities are fast approaching saturation of their finite land resources, and clearly there are limits to the ability to meet land needs by internal redistribution. Settlement in new areas seems inevitable for the Tolai, and I have argued for the social, economic and administrative benefits of replicating in such areas the Tolai colonisation methods
practised in the past. Such an approach will allow recourse to the communal pool of labour available in the village for the heavy work of clearing new areas, and will foster the establishment of group and individual identity in those areas which is clearly vital for their cultural continuity. In the increasing dispersion of Tolai groups their links with former areas of settlement will become attenuated, but written records, such as this thesis, may assist in preserving the historical knowledge, whose transmission through future generations is the vital link in the natural process of cultural adaptation to environmental change.
APPENDIX A
TOLAI KINSHIP AND AFFINAL TERMINOLOGY

1. METHODOLOGY AND CONVENTIONS

This analysis is based on data drawn from three main sources:

(i) transcripts of interviews conducted during fieldwork at Rakunat village in 1981 and 1982;
(ii) a list of Kuanua kinship and affinity terms compiled by Peter Sack in 1977 in collaboration with Jacob Simet, a Tolai anthropologist;
(iii) follow-up interviews conducted with Jacob Simet and a Tolai woman, Relly Manning, in 1983 and 1984.

The Rakunat interviews were conducted in Tok Pisin, and at the time of fieldwork I did not possess a working knowledge of the Kuanua terms for kinship and affinity. My informants used the Tok Pisin terms for relationships, but from the LTC genealogies compiled for the area I was able to identify the precise relationship between individuals denoted by a Tok Pisin term on each occasion of its use. As might be expected, however, Tok Pisin relationship terms are not sufficiently precise in their meaning to reveal some significant distinctions in Tolai relationships, nor do they cover the full range of relationships, and it became apparent that a knowledge of the Kuanua terms had to be gained in order to understand the intricacies of Tolai land tenure.

After returning from the field I examined the Sack-Simet list of Kuanua terms, and, aided by the LTC genealogies, I was able to establish the precise relationships between known individuals denoted by each of the Kuanua terms for both a male Ego (by interview with Jacob Simet) and a female Ego (by interview with Relly Manning). By this process the Kuanua terminology for all the core consanguineal and affinal relationships was established, as shown for a male Ego in Diagram A:1 and for a female Ego in Diagram A:2. My list of denotations for the Tok Pisin terms embraced only those relationships which came up in the course of interviews at Rakunat, but my two Tolai informants filled in the gaps, which allowed completion of the
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Diagram A:2 Core relationships (Kuanua): female ego
corresponding Tok Pisin terminology for the core relationships, as shown for a male Ego in Diagram A:3 and for a female Ego in Diagram A:4.

The symbols used in the diagrams and text follow standard anthropological practice, a male being indicated by the phallic triangle and a female by a circle, and relationship to Ego being indicated by the following abbreviations:

- M = mother
- F = father
- Z = sister
- B = brother
- W = wife
- H = husband
- D = daughter
- S = son

so that, for example, the combination ZDS means Ego's sister's daughter's son. Order of generation is indicated by degree of ascent or descent from Ego's generation, \( G^{+1} \) being one generation up and \( G^{-1} \) being one generation down from Ego, and so on.

The form of Kuanua terms I have adopted is that most commonly employed in the Tolai literature and actual usage by Tolai — the form incorporating the first person singular possessive suffix, -\( \text{gu} \).\(^1\) Thus with the term for brother (a male Ego speaking), where the collective noun for brothers is bar turana (bar being the plural particle for words expressing relationship, and -\( \text{na} \) being the third person singular possessive suffix), the form used is turagu, i.e., "my brother". Only the term for spouse (taulai) is used without a possessive suffix. The Tok Pisin terms present no such complication, as suffixes are not employed: "my brother" would be barata bilong mi. A final point on methodology is the matter of local variation. While it is reasonable to expect that, given the relative cultural homogeneity of the Tolai and the fact that Tok Pisin is an introduced lingua franca, Tolai usage of Tok Pisin kinship and affinity terms would have uniform meanings, this may not be a wholly reliable assumption in the case of the Kuanua terms. A number of different Kuanua dialects are recognised, and the authorities (e.g., Meier 1929, 1938, 1939; Trevitt

\(^1\)Chowning, an authority on Melanesian kinship, has pointed out to me a possible limitation of this practice, since first person singular forms are often distinctive (1984, pers.comm.). I am not qualified to comment on this, but it does not seem to be a major limitation for my purposes.
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Diagram A: Core relationships (Tok Pisin): female Ego
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1940; Lanyon-Orgill 1960; Methodist Overseas Mission 1964) indicate variations in the meanings of a number of Kuanua kinship and affinity terms. Both my Tolai informants on the Kuanua terms are from the Rabaul locality, and their usage may not have precisely the same application in other areas of the Tolai territory.

2. THE FINDINGS

Table A:1 summarises the findings from the data, but an elaboration on the meaning of the terms is necessary before analysis of the concepts underlying the relationship terminology. For this purpose I will employ the English relationship terms which correspond with what in the table I have styled the "primary sense" of the Kuanua terms and their Tok Pisin correspondents, and follow the same order as in the table.

Sibling

The Kuanua term for a sibling of the opposite sex is taigu, and, for a sibling of the same sex, turagu for males, and tanavavigu for females. The same terms are used, according to the same sex referents, for parallel cousins, with the refinement that in the case of patrilateral parallel cousins of the same sex the suffix -kava is added. Meier recorded this usage, though without noting the same-sex qualification, or giving any explanation (1939:81). The word kava, as a verb, means "to give birth to", and the explanation for its usage in the present context is to be found in the Tolai notion that individuals are "given birth to by", and are therefore "children of", their father's vunatarai. This appears to conflict with matrilineal ideology, but not so, in terms of social structure, for individuals are members, not children, of their own vunatarai. Patrilateral parallel cousins are, therefore, both children of their father's vunatarai. The suffix -kava is not used in the case of patrilateral parallel cousins of the opposite sex by reason of a prevailing

---

2 As shown in the preceding section in the text, the term vunatarai is not confined to the matrilineage, and patrilateral parallel cousins are equally children of the same vunatarai in its extended sense of the moiety, and indeed individuals are frequently referred to as children of the vunatarai in this extended sense.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kuanua</th>
<th>TP corresp.</th>
<th>Primary sense</th>
<th>Classificatory sense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>turagu</td>
<td>barata</td>
<td>sibling</td>
<td>same-moiety member at $G^0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsiigu</td>
<td>sista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanavavigu</td>
<td>barata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nauvagu</td>
<td>kasen</td>
<td>cross-cousin</td>
<td>opposite-moiety member at $G^0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nagu</td>
<td>mama</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>same-moiety female at $G^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tamagu</td>
<td>papa</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>opposite-moiety male at $G^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natagu</td>
<td>pikinini</td>
<td>child</td>
<td>opposite-moiety member at $G^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matuagu</td>
<td>kandere</td>
<td>(i) maternal uncle</td>
<td>(i) same-moiety male at $G^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) sister’s child</td>
<td>(ii) same-moiety member at $G^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(male speaking)</td>
<td>(male speaking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vivigu</td>
<td>(no term)</td>
<td>(i) paternal aunt</td>
<td>(i) opposite-moiety female at $G^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) brother’s child</td>
<td>(ii) opposite-moiety member at $G^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(female speaking)</td>
<td>(female speaking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tubugu</td>
<td>pupu (tubuna)</td>
<td>(i) grandparent</td>
<td>(i) opposite-moiety member at $G^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) grandchild</td>
<td>(ii) opposite-moiety member at $G^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>same-moiety member at $G^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kakugu</td>
<td>(no term)</td>
<td>(i) maternal granduncle</td>
<td>(i) same-moiety male at $G^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) sister’s daughter’s child (male speaking)</td>
<td>(ii) same-moiety member at $G^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(female speaking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taulai</td>
<td>meri</td>
<td>(i) wife (male speaking)</td>
<td>(i) (his) wife's classificatory parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>man</td>
<td>(ii) husband (female speaking)</td>
<td>(ii) classificatory daughter’s husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nimugu</td>
<td>tambu</td>
<td>(i) parent-in-law (male speaking)</td>
<td>(i) (her) husband's classificatory parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) daughter’s husband</td>
<td>(ii) classificatory son's wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enagu</td>
<td>tambu</td>
<td>(i) parent-in-law (female speaking)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) son’s wife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makuigu</td>
<td>tambu</td>
<td>sibling-in-law</td>
<td>classification sibling’s spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tamaagiugu</td>
<td>tambu</td>
<td></td>
<td>classification sibling’s spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keneaigu</td>
<td>tambu</td>
<td></td>
<td>classification sibling’s spouse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
observance, explained by Simet as follows:  

The suffix -kava indicates a "jovial" relationship between two people. The relationship between a male Ego and his FBS is more free than that with his B or his MZS, which is a "serious" relationship. A male's relationship with his FBD is also "serious", because she is a female. The term taigukava is not used, because the relationship is "serious", not "jovial". The same applies to the reciprocal relationship between a female Ego and her FBS. (1983, pers.comm.)

Whereas three Kuanua terms are used for siblings, only two are available in Tok Pisin - barata for a sibling of the same sex, and sista for a sibling of the opposite sex. Thus barata corresponds to the terms turagu and tanavavigu, while sista corresponds to taigu.

Despite their long exposure to European influence, evidence of a shift in meaning of the Tok Pisin sibling terms to that of their English analogues (where only the sex of Alter - the object of the term - is indicated) is almost entirely lacking in Tolai village usage - a demonstration of the centrality and durability of kinship concepts. A final point which may be made here, although it applies not just to sibling terms, is that while Kuanua kinship terms in their primary sense cover relationships only within the range from two generations above to two generations below Ego's generation, they are systematically extended to relationships at higher and lower orders of generation. Thus a term used for a relationship at G (e.g., a sibling term) is again employed at G and G (as appears from Diagrams A:1 and A:2), and a term for Ego's relationship with kin at G+1 is also used at G+4, and so on.

3The connotations of Simet's terms in the following quote are explained in the text.

4The alternate Tok Pisin term susa, more commonly used elsewhere in Melanesia, is known, but not usually employed by the Tolai.

5Most of my informants were middle-aged or older. Young Tolai children at school find the English sibling terms highly confusing (Simet 1984, pers.comm.). No doubt over time they come to appreciate the English terms, and in particular circumstances (e.g., away from the village, talking to Europeans) they use the Tok Pisin analogues with their English meanings. I have, however, known even highly-educated Tolai, speaking in English, to slip back to the same-sex/opposite-sex signification for the English sibling terms.
Cross-cousin

The Kuanua term for a cross-cousin is nauvagu. The term is used by an Ego of either sex in relation to an Alter of either sex, and applies for both matrilateral and patrilateral cross-cousins. In Simet's terms, the relationship between cross-cousins is "very serious", and he contrasted the position of a male Ego with respect to his FBS and with his FZS (1983, pers.comm.). The former, he said, is "more relaxed", whereas the latter is "very tense" (ibid.), and more so is this the case with cross-cousins of opposite sexes, where an incest taboo prohibits marriage. Simet made the further point in explaining the tension between male cross-cousins that there is a potential conflict over entitlement to land: "Your FZS", he said, "is in opposition to you, because he stands to gain from your F." (Ibid.) This potential conflict is discussed in following chapters. The corresponding Tok Pisin term for a cross-cousin is kasen, a clear borrowing from English, but, unlike its English analogue, not extending to parallel cousins, for whom, as already remarked, the sibling terms are used.

There is disagreement on whether cross-cousins observe avoidance behaviour towards each other. The above comments by Simet would suggest they did, and, at least so far as opposite-sex cross-cousins are concerned, there is in support Meier's remark that "the law of conduct forbids anything resembling company-keeping between persons of opposite sex and moiety previous to marriage." (1983:28.) But the same author has also claimed that there is "a kind of 'blood-relationship' between cross-cousins" (1939:116, fn 85), and that cross-cousins, "having a 'common meeting place' [i.e., the home of the linking male at G+1 - the F to one cross-cousin and the MB to the other] and frequently or regularly eating and associating together, are thus like blood relations or real brothers and sisters and so called such." (Ibid., 116-17, fn 87.) The usage of sibling terms for cross-cousins, recorded by Meier at Rakunai on the inland plateau, was not confirmed by my Tolai informants from the Rabaul locality, although Simet acknowledged a similarity between siblings and cross-cousins of opposite sexes so far as incest taboos are concerned (1983, pers.comm.). Finally on the question of avoidance,

---

6But see the following comments on avoidance behaviour.
Bradley claims that "joking behaviour [is] allowed, and even expected, between nauvana (cross cousins) of either sex." (1982:239, fn 4.)

**Parent**

The Kuanua term for mother is nagu and for father tamagu. The terms are used by an Ego of either sex. Nagu also includes maternal aunt (MZ) and paternal uncle's wife (FBW), and tamagu includes paternal uncle (FB) and maternal aunt's husband (MZH). The corresponding Tok Pisin terms are mama and papa, with the same extended meanings.

**Child**

The Kuanua term for child is natugu, used by an Ego of either sex. The term is also used by a male Ego for his brother's children (BS and BD), and by a female Ego for her sister's children (ZS and ZD). The corresponding Tok Pisin term is pikinini, with the same extended meanings in the same circumstances.

**Maternal uncle/Sister's child (male speaking)**

Of the terms dealt with so far, those for sibling and cross-cousin are fully self-reciprocal - i.e., the term used by an Ego for an Alter is identical to the term used by that Alter for that Ego, in both the primary and extended senses of the term. The remaining kinship terms share this feature of self-reciprocity, but the factor of generation difference is now added. The Kuanua term used for maternal uncle (MB) by an Ego of either sex is matuagu, and, reciprocally, the term is used by a male Ego for his sister's children of either sex (ZS and ZD). The corresponding Tok Pisin term is kandere.

**Paternal aunt/Brother's child (female speaking)**

The Kuanua term used for paternal aunt (FZ) by an Ego of either sex is vivigu, and, reciprocally, the term is used by a female Ego for her brother's children of either sex (BS and BD). My informants could offer no corresponding Tok Pisin term. Vivigu is also extended to apply to Ego's maternal uncle's wife (MBW) (who would, reciprocally, use the term for her husband's sister's children - HZS and HZD). It may be noted here that, though Simet agreed that the term matuagu
could be employed for Ego's paternal aunt's husband (FZH), the relationship with that person is "not very important", whereas, because Ego's maternal uncle (MB) occupies a position of central importance in Tolai social organisation, the term used for his wife (MBW) has a practical significance in day-to-day affairs (1983, pers.comm.).

Grandparent/Grandchild

The Kuanua term used by an Ego of either sex for a grandparent of either sex (MM, MF, FM and FF) is tubugu, and, reciprocally, the term is used by an Ego of either sex for a grandchild of either sex (DD, DS, SD and SS). The corresponding Tok Pisin term is ~ (sometimes pronounced bubu), or tubuna - the Kuanua term in its third person singular form, which is also used for more remote ancestors or descendants, either individually or collectively. Tubugu is extended to apply to all siblings of grandparents and, reciprocally, all grandchildren of siblings, with an important exception in the case of Ego's maternal granduncle (MMB) and the reciprocal relationship, to which the special term dealt with next applies.

Maternal granduncle/Sister's daughter's child (male speaking)

The Kuanua term used by an Ego of either sex for maternal granduncle (MMB) is kakugu, and, reciprocally, the term is used by a male Ego for his sister's daughter's children of either sex (ZDD and ZDS). There is no corresponding Tok Pisin term to designate this relationship.

Spouse

The Kuanua term for a spouse is taulai, and it is used by an Ego of either sex. This first of the affinal relationship terms has no extended meaning. Unlike all the other relationship terms taulai has no possessive-marker suffix. A man could refer to his wife as kaugu vavina (my woman), and a woman to her husband as kaugu tutana (my man). The Tok Pisin terms for spouse are borrowings from English, and incorporate the corresponding sex referents. Thus a male Ego uses the term meri for his wife, and a female Ego uses the term man for her husband.

Though Bradley implies that this might be disrespectful (1982:235).
Sibling-in-law

As with the sibling terms, the Kuanua terms for siblings-in-law follow strict sex referents. The term for sibling-in-law of the opposite sex is tamaiagu, and, for a sibling-in-law of the same sex, makuigu for males, and keneaigu for females. The sibling-in-law terms are also self-reciprocal, so that the term used by an Ego for an Alter (e.g., tamaiagu, used by a male Ego for his WZ) is identical to the term used by that Alter for that Ego (in the example, Alter's ZH). The corresponding Tok Pisin term is tambu, used without any sex referents. Apart from the actual spouses, the term tambu is used for all in-law relations. In both Kuanua and Tok Pisin it means "forbidden", and its use incorporates precepts of avoidance behaviour observed between in-law relations.

Parent-in-law (male speaking)/Daughter's husband

The Kuanua term used by a male Ego for his parents-in-law (WM and WF) is nimugu, and, reciprocally, the term is used by an Ego of either sex for their daughter's husband. The corresponding Tok Pisin term is tambu.

Parent-in-law (female speaking)/Son's wife

The Kuanua term used by a female Ego for her parents-in-law (HM and HF) is enagu, and, reciprocally, the term is used by an Ego of either sex for their son's wife. The corresponding Tok Pisin term is tambu.

3. ANALYSIS

The sociological significance of kinship terminology is a matter on which authorities are deeply divided, leading Tuzin to remark in the mid-1970s, "During the last 20 years, the study of kinship terminology has been one of the most contentious and provocative fields of anthropological inquiry." (1978:101.) He summarised the division as being "between those who treat kin-term taxonomies as derived from, and indicative of, significant social categories and processes, and those who contend that such systems are derived from, and indicative of, genealogical space and the formal properties of human cognition." (Ibid., 122, fn 1.) Such basic disagreement among authorities counsels caution in attempting to ascribe sociological
significance to the Tolai kinship terminology, and I will do no more here than indicate how Tolai fit into the system most commonly used for purposes of classification.

The terms used for cross-cousins, as they are related to those for siblings, parallel cousins and other kin, have long been regarded as of central significance to kinship classification, and were chosen by Murdock in his classic work *Social Structure* (1949) as the basis for establishing types of kinship terminology. Murdock, preparatory to constructing his typology, accepted that "there are substantial grounds for assuming an essential congruity between kinship terms and the culturally patterned behavior towards the relatives they denote", although he warned that "this by no means implies either (1) that the behavior patterns in particular societies are as sharply differentiated from one another as the associated terms, or (2) that the associated behavior patterns in different societies show an approximately equal degree of differentiation." (Ibid., 109.) From this basic assumption Murdock formulated his basic postulation, which he paraphrased as follows:

"The extension and differentiation of kinship terminology is the product of the joint interplay of all inherent and cultural factors which significantly affect the degree of similarity or dissimilarity between particular categories of relatives." (Ibid., 138.)

The Tolai kinship terminology is of the bifurcate merging type, in which F and FB are called by one classificatory term, and M and MZ by another, while MB and FZ are denoted by distinct terms (see ibid., 141). On the basis of cross-cousin terminology, of Murdock's six primary types the Tolai come under the Iroquois system, which he defined as FZD and MED called by the same terms but terminologically differentiated from parallel cousins as well as from sisters; parallel cousins commonly but not always classified with sisters (ibid., 223). His usage is confined to that of a male Ego for a female Alter. Under the Tolai system a male Ego calls his FZD and MED nauvagu, and he calls his female parallel cousins (both matrilateral and patrilateral) taigu, the same term as he uses for his sisters. Under each of the primary types Murdock set up sub-types, to provide for variation in residence rules or in descent. For the Iroquois type he has six sub-types (ibid., 244, Table 70), but, as none of them combines the Tolai features of virilocal or avunculocal residence and the

8Residence at marriage (more specifically, in the Tolai case, avuncuvirilocal) is dealt with in the text.
existence of moieties and clans, it is apparent that his method of classification soon breaks down in its application to the Tolai.

Authorities such as Needham (1971) and Scheffler (1971, 1972) intimate a pessimistic outlook for attempts to derive sociological significance from kinship terminology, but my own findings on Tolai terms suggest that there are some correlations to be drawn between the structure of their terminology and their social structure. My treatment of the terms (which tends to follow Scheffler's approach) may have suggested an egocentricity of meaning and significance, although, from the self-reciprocity of almost all the terms and the extensions of meanings mentioned, a wider dimension, involving relationships between groups, is adumbrated. To apprehend this wider dimension it is necessary to recall conclusions reached in the preceding treatment of Tolai social structure and corporate identity. I claimed that the moiety division is the critical factor in Tolai social organisation, but that units in the Tolai social structure are essentially relative concepts. This is particularly evident for the concept vunatarai, which in one context is used to refer to the moiety, and in another to the localised matrilineal descent group. In the same way, kinship terms may be extended from known biological kin to embrace classificatory kin, and, following up the extension process, each moiety may appropriately be regarded as a classificatory vunatarai.

Tolai claim to be related to all other Tolai, for every Tolai Alter is a member of either Ego's vunatarai or Ego's "fathering" vunatarai.9 The range to which kinship terms could be extended first became apparent to me in the usage of Tok Pisin terms during fieldwork. Not only were the terms being used with the extensions from their "primary sense" already mentioned in the foregoing findings, but they were also being used to denote persons with whom no biological connection existed at all. These indications prompted the attempt to identify what Scheffler and Lounsbury call the significatum - the necessary and sufficient conditions for membership in a class (1971:4) - for each kinship term in its classificatory sense, with the result shown in Table A:1. For each kinship term, the defining

---

9As discussed under the heading Sibling above, individuals are regarded as children of their father's vunatarai, which is referred to as their "fathering" vunatarai.
features are a combination of relative moiety (same/opposite) and order of generation relative to Ego, with the refinement that for some of the terms the sex of Ego or Alter is an additional defining feature. Using the three components of moiety, generation and sex referents it was possible to represent kinship terminology in matrix form (Diagram A:5), from which it is apparent that a kinship term is available for all combinations of these three referents, so that, indeed, Tolai are "related" to all other Tolai. Not only is a kinship term available, but in almost all cases only one term applies. The single exception is the term kakugu, denoting the relationship between maternal granduncle and sister's daughter's child (male speaking), which overlaps partially with the term tubugu in moiety, generation and sex referents. The explanation for this is that the same referents cover FF (and FFB) as cover MMB (i.e., same moiety, G+2, male Alter), and, reciprocally, the same referents cover SS and SD (and BSS and BSD) as cover ZDS and ZDD (i.e., same moiety, G-2, male Ego), and whereas the term for the former relationship (grandparent/grandchild) is tubugu, there is a special term, kakugu, for the latter relationship. This differentiation recognises the central position of the maternal uncle (MB) in Tolai social organisation, and correspondingly of the mother's maternal uncle (MMB)(discussed in more detail in the text).

The terminology for affinal relations is confined to actual relationships arising from marriage, and while extensions of meaning were mentioned in the treatment of the terms, their classificatory dimensions are limited by the link with an actual affinal relation. Using the same basic matrix combining the three components of moiety, generation and sex referents the affinal terminology may be represented as shown in Diagram A:6. Again, a minor overlap appears, for at Ego's generation the same referents cover W as cover WZ (i.e., opposite moiety, G0, male Ego-female Alter), and, reciprocally, the same referents cover H as cover HB (i.e., opposite moiety, G0, female Ego-male Alter). When the classificatory kinship terminology (Diagram A:5) is compared with the classificatory affinal terminology (Diagram A:6), it is apparent that the affinal terms correspond with kinship terms where bifurcate merging applies, although whether this correspondence possesses sociological significance is something I have not pursued. The remaining analysis of the implications of Tolai relationship terminology for social structure and interpersonal relations appears in the text.
Diagram A:5 Kinship terminology matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moiety</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Opposite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ego</td>
<td>Alter m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>kakugu/tubugu (−) / (pupu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>kakugu/tubugu (−) / (pupu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>matuagu (kandere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>matuagu (kandere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>turagu (barata)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>taigu (sista)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−1</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>matuagu (kandere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>natugu (pikinini)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−2</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>kakugu/tubugu (−) / (pupu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>tubugu (pupu)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Diagram A:6 Affinal terminology matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen.</th>
<th>Moiety</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Opposite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alter</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **m.** (male)  
- **f.** (female)  
- **tambu**  
- **meri**
Appendix B: Form 10; Land Titles Commission Rules 1968

FORM 10.

IN THE LAND TITLES COMMISSION

No.

In the Matter of the

Adjudication Area

ADJUDICATION RECORD.

Whereas pursuant to the provisions of the Land Titles Commission Ordinance 1962 (as amended from time to time) and the Gazette Notices described in the First Schedule hereto, an Adjudication Area was declared for the Adjudication Area and a Demarcation Committee was appointed for the said Adjudication Area;

And whereas the said Demarcation Committee duly prepared a Demarcation Plan of the said Adjudication Area in accordance with the provisions of the said Ordinance;

And whereas the Land Titles Commission duly inquired into the said Demarcation Plan which is the Second Schedule hereto;

And whereas the Land Titles Commission has duly determined all claims to native land before the Land Titles Commission within the said Adjudication Area;

And whereas the Land Titles Commission has duly declared (or has duly found that there are no) public roads, public rights of way or water and areas reserved for public purposes in or over native land within the said Adjudication Area (as delineated and described in the Second and Third Schedules hereto);

And whereas the Land Titles Commission has duly found what land within the said Adjudication Area is native land and the ownership of each piece of that land.

The Land Titles Commission doth hereby find, determine and declare:

That the pieces of land marked Blocks to in the Second Schedule hereto—

(1) are native land,

(2) are owned by the persons described in the Third Schedule hereto in accordance with the customs denominated in that Schedule and described in the Fourth Schedule hereto and, or, are declared as public roads, public rights of way or water or as areas reserved for public purposes in or over native land as described in the Third Schedule.

FIRST SCHEDULE.

(Particulars of date and number of Gazette Notices relating to the said Adjudication Area and Demarcation Committee).

SECOND SCHEDULE.

(Demarcation Plan).

THIRD SCHEDULE.

The Blocks numbered in the Second Schedule (Demarcation Plan) as shown in Column 1 below:

(1) are known wholly or partially by the name or names in Column 2 below, and

(2) (a) are owned by the person or persons or land owning group named in Column 3, below (whose common ancestor or ancestors for the purposes of inheritance and descent by native custom, is or are named in Column 4, below, the present leader or leaders of the said land owning group being the person or persons described in Column 5, below), in accordance with the native custom denominated in Column 6, below, and described in the Fourth Schedule, subject to any public interests [as set forth in Section 22 (1) (b) of the Land Titles Commission Ordinance] described in Column 7 below, or

(b) are declared for the public interest or interests (as set forth in the said Section) described in Column 7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Number</th>
<th>Block Name</th>
<th>Name of Person, Persons or Group</th>
<th>Owner or Commissioner of Native Land</th>
<th>Name of Committee or Officer of Present Leader</th>
<th>Brief Description of Custom</th>
<th>Public Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ctd.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOURTH SCHEDULE.

(Native Customs)

Dated the day of , 19 .

Commissioner.

NOTICE.

Take Notice that this Adjudication Record and Demarcation Plan may be inspected at (here give particulars of the place).

Dated the day of , 19 .

Registrar.

To: (Here set forth names and addresses of each person to whom Notice is directed to be given by the Commissioner signing the Adjudication Record.)

CERTIFICATE BY REGISTRAR.

I hereby certify that on the day of , 19 , I caused the above notice to be given to each of the above-named persons and that a similar Notice was published in the Gazette of

Dated the day of , 19 .

Registrar.

CERTIFICATE AND DIRECTIONS.

Pursuant to Section 25 of the Land Titles Commission Ordinance 1962 (as amended to date), the Land Titles Commission Hereby Certifies this Adjudication Record and Demarcation Plan and the Land Titles Commission Directs the Registrar of Titles to—

(1) enter in the Register of Communally Owned Land (as defined in the Lands Registration (Communally Owned Land) Ordinance 1962 as amended to date)

(a) a description of the boundaries and situation of each block mentioned and referred to in this Adjudication Record and Demarcation Plan,

(b) the name or names of the person, persons or group described as the owner of each of the said blocks, subject to any public interest which the particular block may have been found or declared to be subject to,

(c) an endorsement that the entry guarantees the area and boundaries of the land the subject of the entry (or that the entry is "subject to survey" in a similar manner to that provided in the Real Property (Registration of Leases) Ordinance 1962 and that when the factual requirements of that Ordinance which relate to "subject to survey" are complied with, the Registrar of Titles shall enter an endorsement that the entry guarantees the area and boundaries of the land the subject of the entry).

(Note.—The alternative direction as to endorsement is to be used where the land has not, in the opinion of the Chief Commissioner, been described to a practicable degree of accuracy.)

2. Forward a certified copy of the folio of the Register relating to each of the said blocks to the Subdistrict Office (specify the Subdistrict within which the land lies) and to the Local Government Council (specify the name of the Local Government Council Area wherein the land lies).

3. Forward a duplicate copy of each such folio to the person, persons or leader of the group found in the Adjudication Record to be the owner of the block described therein.

Dated the day of , 19 .

Commissioner.
## The Second Schedule

The Blocks numbered in the Second Schedule as shown in Column 1 below -

1. are known wholly or partially by the name or names in Column 2,
2. are owned solely and beneficially by the person or persons or
   land owning groups indicated in Column 3 whose common ancestor
   or ancestors, for the purposes of inheritance and descent by
   native custom, is or are named in Column 4, the name of the land
   owning groups, if any, being named in Column 5, the present
   leader of the said land owning groups being the person described
   in Column 6,
3. are owned by the native custom as referred to in Column 7 and
   described in the Fourth Schedule or are declared for the use
   described in Section 22(1)(b) of the said Ordinance and referred
   to in Column 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block No.</th>
<th>Name of Land</th>
<th>Land owning group</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
<th>Column 5</th>
<th>Column 6</th>
<th>Column 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VUNALAN No. 1</td>
<td>Land owning group.</td>
<td>TANAI, her daughter TIANII, TANIEI,</td>
<td>PALAIHA BUNAI,</td>
<td>HUGUAI, VUNALAI,</td>
<td>Matrilineal inheritance from ancestors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>KAROKI</td>
<td>Land owning group.</td>
<td>TANAI, her daughter TANAI, and</td>
<td>BUNAI, VUNAJAI,</td>
<td>TOTI, of VUNAJAI,</td>
<td>Matrilineal inheritance from ancestors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VUNALAN No. 2</td>
<td>Land owning group.</td>
<td>TANAI, her daughter TANAI, and</td>
<td>PALAIHA BUNAI,</td>
<td>HUGUAI, VUNALAI,</td>
<td>Matrilineal inheritance from ancestors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BAVAI</td>
<td>Aliene (TAMAI) and her children TANAI, and</td>
<td>TANAI, and her daughter TANAI of the</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TAPUAI</td>
<td>ANGSA TAMAI and his children DONU, KURAI, TANAI,</td>
<td>TANAI, and her daughter TANAI of the</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>VUNALANALAI,</td>
<td>VUNALAN No. 2</td>
<td>TANAI, and her daughter TANAI of the</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix C: Extract from Third Schedule; Rakunat Adjudication Record
The TOLAI people are divided into moieties which are exogamous. The moieties are divided into groups called *vunatarai*, each of which owns parts of the TOLAI land. The members of *vunatarai* are descended from known forbears who had a common ancestor. The name of this ancestor may be known or may be forgotten. *Vunatarai* are under the leadership of a man called the *alualua* who is usually the senior man or woman in it. *Vunatarai* land may sometimes be divided among subgroups of the *vunatarai* known as *apiktarai*, in which case the senior man of the *apiktarai* becomes its *alualua*. Land is inherited matrilineally within the *vunatarai*. Land cannot be disposed of without the consent of all adult members of the owning group. There are two main means of disposal of land, *totokom*, or rental for short periods, or sale, *ikulia*, to another group or individual. Such sale extinguishes the rights of the vendor, and confers on the purchaser full rights of ownership and disposal. Thus the purchaser may decide that all his children shall inherit the land bought, or his male children, or that it shall be inherited by his female children or his sister's daughters for their descendants in the matrilineal line. A third means of disposal, by gift by the *vunatarai* to one or a group of its members of land which has been developed by this person or group, is a new but not common custom. Persons may be adopted, *warvatur warpa*, into a *vunatarai* from another one, in which case they lose rights to their original *vunatarai* land, and acquire equal and similar rights with the members of their new *vunatarai*. 
APPENDIX E: RAKUNAT ADJUDICATION RECORD: LAND OWNERSHIP OF INDIVIDUALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Individual(s)</th>
<th>Block No.</th>
<th>Area (has.)</th>
<th>Total area (has.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Tamti, 4 named daughters and 4 named sons</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (a)</td>
<td>IaPuputa, 2 named daughters (in fact, adopted daughters) and 1 named son (in fact, adopted son)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>IaPuputa</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Tioap</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>ToKoniel, 1 named brother, 1 named sister (IaKurai, see 5(a) below) and 1 named daughter of another sister</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. (a)</td>
<td>IaVika, 1 named sister (IaKurai, see 4 above), and their unspecified children</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>IaVika, 4 named daughters and 1 named son</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>ToRoli and see 10(b) and (c) below</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (a)</td>
<td>IeVutete, 3 named daughters (in fact, daughter's daughters) and 1 named son (in fact, daughter's son)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>ToLaku</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>ToTita</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. (a)</td>
<td>IaMonika and 1 named daughter</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>IaMonika and her unspecified children (including ToRoli, see 6 above)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>IaMonika, 2 named daughters and 5 named sons (including ToRoli, see 6 above)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>IeLisabet, 6 named daughters, 1 named son and 1 named adopted son</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>IaVartovo, 4 named daughters and 2 named sons</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>IePiaka and 1 named sister</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>ToKulau and 4 named brothers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. (a)</td>
<td>ToVultonia</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. (a)</td>
<td>IaMin and her unspecified children</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>IaMin</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>ToMonongia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>ToBoboko, 1 named daughter, and the daughter's 1 named daughter and 2 named sons</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set</td>
<td>Individual(s)</td>
<td>Block No.</td>
<td>Area (has.)</td>
<td>Total area (has.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tuat and 1 named sister</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>IeTabaining, 1 named daughter and 1 named son</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>(a) ToPeu, 2 named sisters and the unspecified children of the sisters (b) ToPeu</td>
<td>105, 125</td>
<td>0.15, 0.17</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>IaKavanamur, 1 named daughter and 3 named sons</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>IaTilda and her unspecified children</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ToLiakim and 2 named sisters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ToNiruk</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>IaPal and her unspecified children</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ToKevin and 1 named sister</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>IaPativil</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ToBola</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>IaRubi</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Tabunur</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>ToBurua, 3 named brothers, 2 named sisters and the unspecified children of the sisters</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 41 blocks 25.56 25.56
Appendix F: Rakunat Minutes of Meetings (sample)

MINUTES OF MEETING

ADJUDICATION AREA: RAKUNAT N.E.I.

COMMITTEE:
Ch. Rusia Tuat
Dimain Kurapa

Meeting No.

Present:-
Beas Kamri
Konie To Vauntul

Held at Rakunat
Date 15/1/74

Absent:-
Rui Rui

LAND MARKED SINCE LAST MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Name of Land</th>
<th>Location (Village)</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Marked With</th>
<th>Disputed or Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>Kurakukup No2(1k)</td>
<td>Rakunat</td>
<td>ToBola Eremas</td>
<td>Cemented</td>
<td>Disputed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REMARKS

This block of land was purchased from ToPuipui and ToUva with $20 and 50 Tambu for his children IaMaone, ToMaiai, IaKuakua, IaMonick, and ToLivai by ToBola Eremas in the 15th December, 1973.

(SIGNATURE OF CHAIRMAN)
APPENDIX G
THE PRESENT SETTLEMENT PATTERN OF SAMPLE VUNATARAI AT RAKUNAT

1. INTRODUCTION

During fieldwork at Rakunat a survey was conducted on a sample of three vunatarai, to establish in each case -

(a) the current residence of all adult members, and the basis of that residence; and
(b) the current state of occupation of all parcels of land in the Rakunat Adjudication Area recorded in the Adjudication Record as owned by the vunatarai, and the basis of that occupation.

For the purposes of (a), adult members were taken to be all living members who were recorded in 1963 in the LTC genealogy of each vunatarai. As the survey was conducted in 1982, the youngest such person then would be at least 19. With respect to (b), land recorded in 1966 as owned by the vunatarai but since disposed of was included in the survey, and the fact that there had been an acquisition appears in indicating the basis of the acquirer's occupation.

The three vunatarai selected as a sample are all based at Rakunat, and the majority (if not all) of their landholdings are in the Adjudication Area. Each vunatarai represents a general "type" in terms of land availability, being -

(i) Rakunat vunatarai: large membership and relatively large area of land - median land availability;
(ii) Vunatoboa vunatarai: large membership and relatively small area of land - low land availability;
(iii) Nekupia vunatarai: small membership and relatively large area of land - high land availability.

The fourth possible combination - small membership and relatively small area of land - was not included in the sample, but such a vunatarai would again be one of median land availability. By examining both the current residence of all adult members (the "people-to-land" relativity) and the current state of occupation of all Rakunat land owned by each vunatarai in 1966 (the "land-to-people" relativity), and by comparing results between the three land availability "types", a
representative picture of the settlement pattern at Rakunat emerges. Although I have analysed the data for each of the three sample vunatarai in this manner, given the scope of this thesis it is not desirable (nor is it necessary) to spell out the results for each vunatarai in detail, and I will concentrate the following treatment on Rakunat vunatarai (the one of median land availability), and confine my analysis of the other two vunatarai to indicating how they vary from the median land availability "type".

2. RAKUNAT: A VUNATARAI OF MEDIAN LAND AVAILABILITY

(i) Residence of vunatarai members

The total adult living membership of Rakunat vunatarai in 1982 was fifty-three, of which thirty were males, sixteen were females, and for seven junior members the sex was not known, as they had lived remote from Rakunat since birth. The vunatarai consists of three main segments, or apiktarai,¹ being the matrilineal descendants of three females, who were themselves the daughters of two sisters, who were in turn the daughters of the single daughter of the apical ancestress of the vunatarai. Of the three females at the apex of the respective apiktarai, therefore, two were sisters. The membership and residence of the three apiktarai will now be examined. In each case the highest level of generation is of identical genealogical depth in the vunatarai, so that at each level of the respective apiktarai the order of generation from the apical ancestress of the vunatarai corresponds. All places named are in the Tolai area, unless otherwise specified.

¹As remarked in Chapter 2, the term apiktarai is used by Tolai inter-changeably with the term vunatarai, and vunatarai are not necessarily subdivided into recognised apiktarai. Separate segments of vunatarai based on matrilineal descent from a single ancestress are recognisable as apiktarai, however, and for convenience the term is employed here to identify such discrete matriline segments, although it is not implied that they are necessarily recognised as distinct corporate entities.
Residence:

1 B 3: Matupit, with his daughter who is residing virilocally.
1 B 5: Rakunat, virilocally, on her husband's vunatarai land (Block 43).

1 C 1: Rakunat, on vunatarai land (Block 90).
1 C 2: Malaguna 1, virilocally.
1 C 3: Rakunat, on vunatarai land (Block 90).
1 C 4: Port Moresby, National Capital District.
Residence:

2 B 6: Talwat, virilocally.
2 B 7: Rabuana, uxorilocally.

2 B 9: Partly at Rakunat, on vunatarai land (Block 62), and partly on a settlement scheme block at Kerevat.
2 B 10: Rakunat, ostensibly uxorilocally, but on land acquired before adjudication by his wife's vunatarai from Rakunat vunatarai (Block 50).

2 C 1: Rakunat, on vunatarai land (Block 8).
2 C 2: Rakunat, on vunatarai land (Block 34).
2 C 3: Madang, Madang Province.
2 C 4: Rabuana, with mother's sister's daughter, who is residing virilocally (see 2 C 8).
2 C 5: North Solomons Province, with her husband who is from mainland New Guinea.
2 C 6: Rabaul, with her husband who is from mainland New Guinea.

2 C 7: Rabuana, where he is the United Church pastor.
2 C 8: Rabuana, virilocally.
2 C 9: Kimbe, West New Britain Province, with his father who has a settlement scheme block.
2 C 10: Kimbe, as for 2 C 9.
2 C 11: Rabuana, uxorilocally.
2 C 12: Lae, Morobe Province, with his wife who is from Madang Province.
2 C 13: Kimbe, as for 2 C 9.
2 C 14: Kimbe, as for 2 C 9.
2 C 15: Kimbe, as for 2 C 9.

2 C 16: Tavui, patrilocally.
2 C 17: Tavui, as for 2 C 16.
2 C 18: Tavui, as for 2 C 16.
2 C 19: Tavui, as for 2 C 16.
2 C 20: Talwat, patrilocally.
2 C 21: Talwat, as for 2 C 20.
2 C 22: Talwat, as for 2 C 20.
2 C 23: Talwat, as for 2 C 20.
Residence:

3 A 1: Rakunat, with her daughter (see 3 B 3).

3 B 2: Rakunat, on vunatarai land (Block 46).
3 B 3: Rakunat, "virilocally" on her deceased husband's acquired land (Block 79).
3 B 4: Japalik, on an (unofficial) settlement scheme block.

3 B 5: Rakunat, on vunatarai land (Block 90).

3 B 6: Partly at Rakunat, on vunatarai land (Block 90), and partly at Mandres, on a settlement scheme block.

3 C 1: Rabaul, with her husband who is from New Ireland Province.
3 C 2: Rakunat, on vunatarai land (Block 8).
3 C 3: Ok Tedi, Western Province.
3 C 4: Port Moresby, National Capital District, with her husband who is from the Duke of York Islands.
3 C 5: Mt. Hagen, Western Highlands Province.
3 C 6: Bitapaka (apparently), virilocally.
3 C 7: Rakunat, "patrilocally" on his deceased father's acquired land (Block 79).
3 C 8: Rakunat, as for 3 C 7.

3 C 10: Rakunat, on vunatarai land (Block 12).
3 C 11: Partly at Rakunat, on vunatarai land (Block 12), and partly at Mandres, with her husband (a sawmill employee) who is from mainland New Guinea.
3 C 12: Namatanai, New Ireland Province, where his wife comes from.
3 C 13: Open Bay, East New Britain Province, with her husband (a sawmill employee) who is from mainland New Guinea.
3 C 14: Rabaul, with her husband who is from mainland New Guinea.
3 C 15: Rakunat, on vunatarai land (Block 8).

A number of general points may be made from the foregoing data about the pattern of residence of the adult vunatarai membership, and
the basis of that residence. In the first place, only nine of the fifty-three adult members (eight males and one female) are full-time residents on their vunatarai land, with three more (two males and one female) being part-time residents. Bearing in mind that, of the adult members whose sex was known, males outnumbered females by almost two to one, the residential status of the male and female adult membership in 1982 was as follows.

(a) Males

Eight male members are in full-time residence on vunatarai land. Of the other twenty-two known males, six are working outside East New Britain Province, and all are among the youngest generation of adult members. A possible seventh male member resident outside Rakunat for work reasons is the pastor in church service at neighbouring Rabuana (2 C 7), although as his father had lived there, and a sister and brother had in-married there, it is possible that his residence is based on an acquired interest in Rabuana land. Six other adult males are full-time residents on land settlement schemes, four being brothers living with their father at Kimbe in West New Britain, and the other two having blocks at Kerevat and Japalik (an unofficial scheme, introduced by the Mataungan Association in the early 1970s on disputed Government land) in the Tolai area. Two other males have settlement blocks, but they share their residence between the blocks and vunatarai land at Rakunat.

Two Rakunat males are residing uxorilocally, both at Rabuana. Another male is living at Rabuana (where his wife is from) with his mother's sister's daughter (i.e., his "sister"), who had in-married there and acquired the land on which they are resident. ToBeniamin, a contender with ToKurapa for vunatarai leadership, lives at Matupit with his daughter, who in-married there to a very prominent Tolai businessman Melly Paivu. Two brothers are resident "patrilocally".

---

2His father is a member of Tinganabalbal vunatarai, which has landholdings at Rabuana.

3As discussed in the text, the standard terminology for designating types of residence presents difficulties in the Tolai situation. In general, I use the term "patrilocal" to designate the residence of children in a locality with which not they but their father is identified. Here, however, the children's link with the land they reside on is through their father, but as Rakunat vunatarai members they are identified with the Rakunat locality.
on land at Rakunat which their deceased father had acquired, and the last of the thirty known Rakunat males resides patrilocally at Tavui, to which village his mother had in-married.

(b) Females

Of the sixteen known females only one, a young woman, is a full-time resident on vunatarai land, and notably she is not yet married. Another woman, married to a non-Tolai who is employed at Mandres in the Tolai area, is a part-time resident on vunatarai land. Six females are residing virilocally on their husband's vunatarai land, in three cases outside Nodup paparagunan, and a seventh (the oldest member of the vunatarai) formerly resided on her deceased husband's vunatarai land at Rakunat, but now lives with her daughter on land at Rakunat acquired by the daughter's deceased husband. Six more females are full-time residents with their husbands at their place of employment, in three cases Rabaul and in the other three cases outside East New Britain. Five of these six women are married to non-Tolai. The last of the sixteen known females is a young unmarried woman residing with her father on a West New Britain settlement scheme block. Of the fourteen married females, six married non-Tolai, four married male members of vunatarai based in Nodup paparagunan (two at Rakunat and one at Rabuana, and one being a member of Vunatabun, the Rakunat-based segment of a vunatarai originally from Pila Pila), and the other four married Tolai from Talwat, Malaguna, Bitapaka and the Duke of Yorks.

(c) Sex unknown

Of the seven members whose sex was not known, three are siblings of the male Rakunat member residing patrilocally at Tavui, to which village their mother in-married. The other four are all siblings living at Talwat. Their mother had in-married there, to a man who is a member of a vunatarai based not at Talwat but at Rabuana. His own mother had in-married to Talwat, and he had remained settled there.

Although only about one in six adult members are resident on vunatarai land, many others as will be seen are using plots for agricultural and other purposes. Some of the younger members absent because of employment can be expected to return, either periodically or at the end of their formal working lives, and resume their residential rights. Widows who have been living virilocally may
return on the death of their husbands, although nowadays some widows remain on their husband's land (see, however, Bradley 1982:180). Eight members, all among the youngest generation of adults, have married non-Tolai, and it may be significant that in only two of those cases was the marriage between a male Tolai and non-Tolai female. Such marriages cause major problems for the children's land entitlements, and in neither case is the male member expected to return to Rakunat.

(ii) Occupation of vunatarai land

As was indicated in the introduction, for the purpose of examining the state of occupation of all Rakunat vunatarai land at Rakunat (the vunatarai has no other holdings elsewhere), all land recorded in 1966 as owned by the vunatarai was included in the 1982 survey, although some parts of blocks had been disposed of by that date. Without the benefit of surveys it is not possible to locate the land the subject of acquisitions within a block with any precision, or to calculate the areas involved. In the following list, therefore, persons occupying a block in consequence of an acquisition have been included. While the acquired part of the block in such cases is regarded as having been disposed of by the vunatarai, I noted in Chapter 6 that the vunatarai retains residual interests in the land, and that attempts will be made to recover the land if subsequent obligations are not met. In particular, where as in many cases children acquire a parcel from their "fathering" vunatarai the father of the children usually remains in occupation of the parcel concerned during his lifetime, and will still be regarded as occupying the land in consequence of his vunatarai membership.4

My informants, in listing the occupants of each block, did not include the names of spouses or infant children (who, to my knowledge, were also occupants in some cases), presumably because their occupation was regarded as an adjunct of their spouse's or parent's occupation. The vunatarai land involved is shown on Map G.1, and the occupants of each block are listed below with details of the nature and basis of their occupation in each case. Rakunat vunatarai members

---

4 Salisbury uses the term pia na bartamana (which he glosses as "family land") for the transitional status of acquired land occupied by a father with his children (see 1970: 69-70; 72).
Map G.1 Rakunat vunatarai land, 1966
are identified in accordance with the notation in the preceding section on the residence of vunatarai members. Blocks 63 and 90 adjoin substantially and were heavily occupied, including parts of the formal Rakunat village. In listing occupation during fieldwork a distinction was not always made between these two blocks, so they have been amalgamated for the purposes of the following treatment.

**Block 8 (0.19 has.)**

ToKurapa (jun.): residential - a member (2 C 1).  
ToMoragu: residential - a member (3 C 2).  
IaMaduk: residential - a member (3 C 15).  
IaKamara: being prepared for residential - an acquisition (her father is a member - 3 B 5).

**Block 12 (2.97 has.)**

ToMatiut: residential/gardens - a member (3 C 10).  
IaBunguna: residential/gardens - a member (3 C 11).  
IaMaduk: residential - she is the adopted daughter of IaKali, see below.  
Tatar: cash crops/gardens - a member (3 B 5).  
ToBenjamin: gardens/trade-store/copra drier - a member (1 B 3).  
IaKonel: gardens - a member (1 B 5).  
Taman: gardens - a member (1 C 1).  
ToVartovo: gardens - a member (1 C 3).  
IaMaduk: gardens - a member (3 C 15).  
IaRupitil: gardens - a member of a related vunatarai from Malaguna 2 (Vunavavar).  
IaKali: trade-store - an acquisition (her father is a member 1 B 3).

**Block 34 (0.74 has.)**

ToLior: residential - a member (2 C 2).  
ToVauta: residential/gardens - his daughter is married to a member (ToLior, above).  
IePinia: cash crops/gardens - an acquisition (her father was a member - 3 A 3).  
ToGogobol: cash crops - an acquisition (currently being challenged).

**Block 40 (0.16 has.)**

Taman: cash crops/gardens/copra drier - a member (1 C 1).

**Block 46 (0.76 has.)**

ToKurapa (sen.): residential/cash crops/gardens - a member (3 B 2).  
ToKurapa's adopted children: residential/cash crops/gardens - an acquisition (their adoptive father is a member).
Block 49 (0.29 has.)

ToVuvu: cash crops - a member (2 C 7).
Tatar: gardens - a member (3 B 5).

Block 62 (1.93 has.)

ToPainene: residential - a member (2 B 9).
ToPainene's children: residential - an acquisition (their father is a member).
ToPoipoi: residential - an acquisition (he is a member of a same-moiety vunatarai).
ToRupen's children: residential - an acquisition (their father is a member - 2 B 10).
Siapan: residential - an acquisition (he is a member of an associated vunatarai).
ToKaviria's children: cash crops - an acquisition (their father was a member - 2 B 8).

Blocks 63 and 90 (10.17 has.)

Taman: residential/cash crops - a member (1 C 1).
ToPupun: residential/cash crops - a member (3 B 6).
IaRupitil: residential/cash crops - a member of a related vunatarai from Malaguna 2 (Vunavavar).
ToVartovo: residential - a member (1 C 3).
Tatar: residential - a member (3 B 5).
ToKaviria's children: residential - an acquisition (their father was a member - 2 B 8).
IaKaisel: residential - an acquisition (her father was a member - 3 A 3).
ToBeniamin: cash crops - a member (1 B 3).
IaKonel: cash crops - a member (1 B 5).
ToMisiel: cash crops - a member (2 B 7).
ToPainene: cash crops - a member (2 B 9).
ToRupen: cash crops - a member (2 B 10).
ToLior: cash crops - a member (2 C 2).
ToKede: cash crops - an acquisition (his father was a member - 2 A 2).
ToKurapa (sen.): cash crops - a member (3 B 2).
IaKolis: cash crops - a member (3 B 3).
Tarutia: cash crops - a member (3 B 4).
IaMalira: cash crops - an acquisition (she is a member of an associated vunatarai).

Block 73 (1.92 has.)

ToVartovo: cash crops - a member (1 C 3).
ToKaviria's children: cash crops - an acquisition (their father was a member - 2 B 8).
Block 93 (0.10 has.)

(Unoccupied): cash crops planted by a member (2 B 8), now deceased.

The two main types of occupation on the above data are residential and agricultural. In analysing each type a distinction will be drawn between occupation by members and by non-members of Rakunat vunatarai.

(a) Residential occupation

Only twelve Rakunat members, ten males and two females, reside on their vunatarai land, three of them only part-time (see Table G.1). Probably as many non-members of Rakunat vunatarai reside on land recorded in 1966 as owned by the vunatarai as members, for, in addition to four individuals, unspecified children of four senior male Rakunat members were the beneficiaries of acquisitions of land from the vunatarai, and some at least of these children are resident on the acquired parcels.

(b) Agricultural, etc., occupation

There are two preliminary points about agricultural use: first, while the term "gardens" in the above list means food crops, "cash crops" includes both cocoa and coconuts, though the latter have subsistence as well as commercial uses; secondly, while gardens and cocoa may be assumed to be personal or family plantings, old coconut palms are often regarded as communal property, available to all resident vunatarai members as the need arises.

Two of the twelve Rakunat members resident either full-time or part-time on their vunatarai land, both males, make no use of it for agricultural purposes, but the other ten (including two females), and a further five male and two female members, have either cash crops or gardens or both on Rakunat vunatarai land (see Table G.1). Eight have only cash crops and three have only gardens, but the other six members (five males and one female) have cash crops and gardens located in two or more separate blocks.

Six individual non-members, and the unspecified children of two male members of Rakunat vunatarai, use land recorded in its name in 1966 for agricultural purposes. The children concerned acquired the land from their "fathering" vunatarai, and they also have residential rights on other land acquired from Rakunat vunatarai. Of the six
Table G. 1 Rakunat vunatarai membership: residence on/occupation of vunatarai land (1982)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential status</th>
<th>Nature of occupation</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Non-resident</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential only</td>
<td></td>
<td>2  0</td>
<td>0  0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential/</td>
<td></td>
<td>6  1</td>
<td>2  1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5  2</td>
<td>5  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
individual members, two (IePinia and ToKede) acquired the occupied parcel on the basis that Rakunat is their "fathering" vunatarai, another (IaRupitil) is a member of Vunavavar, the Malaguna-based offshoot of Rakunat vunatarai, and a third (IaMalira) employed intra-moiety associations with Rakunat vunatarai to acquire the parcel she cultivates with cash crops and gardens. ToVauta is allowed to garden on Rakunat land because his daughter is married to a vunatarai member, but ToGogobol's tenure to a portion of Block 34 on which he has cash crops is being challenged by vunatarai members, who do not accept the purported disposition of the land on him by ToBeniamin, a contender for vunatarai leadership.

In most cases an individual's plantings are confined to a single block, but this does not imply that each individual's crops or gardens are consolidated, for some of the blocks are large, and gardens in particular are likely to be scattered. Six members and two non-members have plantings on more than one block, one male member having gardens on one block, cash crops and gardens on another, and cash crops on a third. Degree of occupation corresponds generally with the size of blocks, the larger blocks being more heavily occupied than the smaller. One block - the smallest (Block 93) - was said to be unoccupied in 1982, the owner of the cash crops planted on it having recently died. The block lies on the steep western boundary of Rakunat, but undoubtedly rights to its produce will soon be reallocated. Only one block is occupied by a single person (Block 40), but it is the second smallest parcel owned by the vunatarai.

3. CONCLUSIONS ON THE SETTLEMENT PATTERN

Combining the data on residence and occupation, a direct correlation between a person's residence at or near Rakunat and occupation of land recorded in 1966 as owned by Rakunat vunatarai emerges. This correlation is found not just for members of Rakunat vunatarai, but also for non-members, whose occupation in all cases is based either on an affinal relationship with a Rakunat member, on patrilineal from a Rakunat member, or on a long-standing intra-moiety association with Rakunat vunatarai. The residence-occupancy correlation will be examined with respect first to members and then to non-members.
(i) Members

This category can be subdivided into the members occupying their vunatarai land, and the non-occupants.

(a) Occupants

A preliminary point is that no pattern of distribution along apiktarai lines is apparent, although the segment with the largest membership is relatively unrepresented in block occupation, in consequence of the fact that three of the four sets of siblings in the youngest generation of adults reside outside Rakunat. Of the eight adult males in full-time residence on vunatarai land only four have both cash crops and gardens on their land, a fifth has just gardens, and a sixth has only cash crops. The two resident males who make no agricultural use of their vunatarai land are both in wage employment. The two males in part-time residence have cash crops but no gardens on vunatarai land. Only two adult females reside on vunatarai land, one (young and single) full-time and the other part-time. Neither has cash crops but both have gardens on their land.

Seven adult members (five males and two females) who do not reside on vunatarai land nevertheless use it for agricultural purposes. All five males have cash crops, and one has gardens in addition. One non-resident male lives full-time on a settlement block at Japalik, but two others reside uxorilocally nearby at Rabuana, and a fourth lives at Rakunat itself, on land previously owned by Rakunat vunatarai, but disposed of before 1966 to his wife's vunatarai. The last male, ToBeniamin, lives with his daughter and her husband at Matupit, but maintains both cash crops and gardens on vunatarai land at Rakunat. The two females who are non-residents of vunatarai land but use it agriculturally (one for cash crops, and the other for cash crops and gardens) both reside at Rakunat virilocally, on their husband's vunatarai land.

(b) Non-occupants

Of the fifty-three adult members of the vunatarai alive in 1982, with a total of fifteen males occupying their vunatarai land in one way or another and a further four female occupants (see Table G.1), this leaves thirty-four members (thirteen males, twelve females, and seven junior members whose sex was not known) who were making no use
of their vunatarai land at the time. There are three general categories of non-occupant adult members - those absent in consequence of a female out-marriage from the Rakunat area, members either themselves in wage employment or the spouses of employees, and residents on land settlement schemes. The impact of these three factors on member's use of their vunatarai land will now be assessed.

One set of siblings (four members, whose mother has died) reside at Tavui, where their mother in-married, and another four siblings reside together with their mother at Talwat where she in-married, both locations being outside Nodup paparagunan. The estrangement of such matriline segments from Rakunat may not be final, however, and in the case of the Talwat-based segment the Rakunat lualua was making arrangements in 1982 to enable those of the siblings who wished to return to Rakunat to settle on vunatarai land. Two other female members are residing virilocally with Tolai husbands, at Malaguna and Bitapaka, and two more are living with husbands in employment outside the Province. Three more females (all married to non-Tolai) are living with their worker husbands in Rabaul, and make no present demands on land at Rakunat, but a fourth, who comes and goes from Mandres where her non-Tolai husband works in a sawmill, has a residence and gardens on vunatarai land at Rakunat. Of the twelve known females in the youngest generation of adult members ten are married, but only one married a Tolai from the Rakunat area. The only female of the ten who uses vunatarai land is the wife of the sawmill employee, so clearly the recent departure from local female endogamy is having a major effect in relieving pressure on the vunatarai's land.

One large set of siblings, comprising a total of nine adult members in 1982, makes only slight use of their vunatarai land. They had lived patrilocally during their childhood at Rabuana, but their father had moved to a West New Britain settlement scheme, where five of the children now live. A brother and sister had married spouses from Rabuana, and live there uxorilocally and virilocally respectively, while an eighth child, a male, has settled in Lae with his wife from the Madang Province. Only the ninth sibling, the eldest and a male who lives at Rabuana where he is the pastor, uses part of the vunatarai land at Rakunat, where he was establishing new cocoa plantings in 1982. Settlement schemes contributed to the relief of land pressure at Rakunat in three other instances, being male members
in the middle generation of adults who are in two cases residing part-time and in one case full-time on schemes in the Kerevat locality. Two maintain residences and all three have cash crops at Rakunat, however. Five males in the youngest generation of adult members are employed outside the Province (at Port Moresby, Lae, Madang, Mt Hagen and Ok Tedi), and make no present demands on vunatarai land, while a sixth male non-occupant lives with his New Ireland wife in that Province.

Known male members of the vunatarai out-number known females by almost two to one. Analysis of the vunatarai members occupying vunatarai land, either full-time or part-time, and for residential and/or agricultural purposes, shows that, first, only nineteen of the fifty-three members were occupants in 1982, and of them, males out-numbered females by almost four to one (see Table G.1). The three main factors producing non-occupancy at Rakunat - female exogamy, wage employment, and residence on settlement schemes - drew off males and females without any necessary sexual distinction, and the only clear factor accounting for the sexual imbalance in the numbers of occupants is the continuing practice of virilocal residence after marriage. Two adult males are residing uxorilocally, but six females live virilocally, and twelve more members occupy land other than their vunatarai's as a result of a mother's (and in two cases a daughter's) virilocal residence. At the same time, eight males are full-time residents on their vunatarai land, as opposed to only one female who, significantly, is a young adult not yet married.

(ii) Non-members

Although precise numbers were not established, it is likely that in 1982 about as many non-members of Rakunat vunatarai occupied parts of the land recorded in its name in 1966 as members. In one case a female member of the Malaguna-based offshoot of Rakunat vunatarai has a residence, cash crops and gardens on Rakunat vunatarai land, and in another the elderly parents of a Rakunat member's wife reside with her and have gardens on vunatarai land, but in all other cases the non-members' occupation is the result of an acquisition. As was seen in Chapters 4 and 5, Rakunat vunatarai has historically been a major disposer of land, and this trend has continued since adjudication. Two members of associated vunatarai acquired parcels (one being used for residential purposes and the other for cash crops), and two more
persons mobilised intra-moiety connections to acquire parcels (again, one being used for residential purposes and the other for cash crops). The most significant connection invoked in acquisitions, however, was that between individuals and their "fathering" vunatarai, for no less than eleven parcels had been acquired for children of male members of the vunatarai. In 1982, individual or multiple children of those males were found residing on six acquired parcels, a child's adopted daughter resided on a seventh, and an eighth was being prepared for residential use. Four parcels had children's cash crops, two their gardens, and one a daughter's trade-store.

Of the thirteen senior male members of Rakunat vunatarai alive in 1966, a child or the children of nine gained land by such acquisitions from their "fathering" vunatarai. One of the four men whose children did not acquire land from their "fathering" vunatarai acquired land from another vunatarai for them, another apparently had no children, and the last two live on settlement scheme blocks. By Tolai customary methods of acquiring land, therefore, the tenure of Rakunat vunatarai's landholdings has been adjusted to provide for the needs of almost all the resident children of senior male members.

Comparison of the foregoing data on residence of vunatarai members and occupation of vunatarai land yields two main conclusions, one relating to the settlement pattern of the vunatarai membership, and the other to settlement at Rakunat generally. Of the fifty-three adult members thirty-four (almost two-thirds) are making no current demands on the vunatarai land. With only six exceptions all these non-occupants are resident outside the Rakunat neighbourhood, either occupying customary land elsewhere in the Tolai area, in formal employment themselves or living with husbands in employment, or residing on land settlement schemes. Of the nineteen adult members currently using vunatarai land, fifteen reside in the Rakunat neighbourhood (nine on vunatarai land) and are full-time occupants, and the other four live elsewhere in the Tolai area using the land only occasionally. Clearly there is a close correlation between residence of members at or near Rakunat and occupation of vunatarai land.

In the absence of a systematic survey of the land needs of all adult vunatarai members resident in the Rakunat area, and of the land available to them from all sources, it is more difficult to establish a connection between occupation of vunatarai land and members' land
needs, although the survey results provide some evidence that the nature of the rights exercised is related to the particular needs of the individual members. Thus the two male members in formal employment but residing on vunatarai land had neither cash crops nor gardens there, and of the four occasional occupants the three males had only cash crops and the female had only gardens on their vunatarai land. Their livelihood requirements were apparently met mainly from other sources (wages and the production from other customary land or settlement scheme blocks), thereby reducing their dependency on vunatarai land. There is also clear evidence of differential usage by males and females. Thus four males resided and had both cash crops and gardens on vunatarai land, three more had only cash crops, and one had only gardens, while only two females both resided on and cultivated vunatarai land, in both cases having only gardens there. Males are making greater demands on their vunatarai land than females, who apparently concentrate more on their husband's land.

The first main conclusion, therefore, is that vunatarai land has been allocated among the membership in accordance with present needs, and that the current state of occupation reflects those needs in both the extent and the nature of that occupation. From this interpretation it follows that as needs change over time the allocation of land for different purposes will be adjusted. Although some two-thirds of the adult membership make no demands on vunatarai land, many of them (particularly those absent for employment reasons) can be expected to return in the future and revive their claims. For such persons their renewed use may be mainly residential, and major demands on land associated with raising children will often by then be past.

The second main conclusion also relates to land distribution, but here it is the needs of non-members of the vunatarai that are met. As a result of a series of transactions since adjudication, plots of vunatarai land have been disposed of to members of other vunatarai. Eleven of these transactions resulted in the acquisition of plots of land formerly owned by Rakunat vunatarai by either a single child or the children of a total of nine senior male members of the vunatarai. Five of these plots were being used for residential purposes in 1982, and the others mainly for cash crops and/or gardens. Thus while allocation of vunatarai land was being managed to satisfy the internal land needs of its membership, the tenure was also being adjusted to
respond to the land needs of the wider Rakunat community. It is probable that the land needs of Rakunat vunatarai members settled on customary land elsewhere in the Tolai area are similarly being met by acquisitions of land from locally-based groups. As internal land needs inevitably increase, the inclination to respond to the needs of non-members (in particular, those "fathered" by the vunatarai) may diminish, but this raises the broader question of a Tolai male's divided loyalty between vunatarai members and children, which is taken up in the text of Chapter 6.

It remains to relate these conclusions drawn from the data on residence of the membership and occupation of vunatarai land in the case of Rakunat - a vunatarai of median land availability - to the other two land availability types - Vunatoboai of low and Nekupia of high land availability. As was mentioned in the introduction to this appendix, although data on these latter two vunatarai were analysed as in the foregoing treatment of Rakunat vunatarai, only the general manner of their variation from Rakunat's settlement pattern will be indicated here.

Vunatoboai, the segment of a larger group which broke away from Tinganabalbal vunatarai with its own separate landholdings in the 1950s (see Chapter 3), comprised a total adult living membership in 1982 of eighty-five, of which forty were males, forty-one females, and for four their sex was unknown at Rakunat. Only five members are residing on vunatarai land at Rakunat, three males full-time, one female full-time and another part-time. The other eighty members either reside on neighbouring customary land at Rakunat or in the Nodup locality, at other Tolai villages, on settlement schemes, or at their own or their husband's place of employment. More than a quarter of the membership (twenty-four persons) live outside the Tolai area, and the reasons for absence from vunatarai land generally correspond with those observed for Rakunat vunatarai. On the eight blocks recorded as owned by Vunatoboai in 1966 (of 6.68 hectares total area), one of the three males in full-time residence also has gardens on the block where he resides and cash crops on another block, and the two females residing on their vunatarai land (one part-time) also have cash crops and gardens on that and other vunatarai land. One further male member and two more females who are living in the Rakunat area but not on vunatarai land nevertheless cultivate it, the male and one female with cash crops, and the other female member with cash crops.
and gardens on one block and only cash crops on a second. Apart from these eight members, only three other persons are using Vunatoboai vunatarai land - two women who have been given temporary rights to garden, and a male member of Tinganabalbal vunatarai, who has gardens on a part of one block the ownership of which is being contested between these two segments of the original vunatarai.

Comparing the Rakunat and Vunatoboai settlement patterns in terms of the two main conclusions reached with respect to the former, the evidence strongly suggests that, in the circumstances of the latter's low land availability, its members have been obliged to seek their access to land elsewhere than from their own vunatarai landholdings, which, in the absence of any land dispositions, have been largely retained since 1966 for the benefit of a small minority of the vunatarai membership.

The comparatively high land availability of Nekupia vunatarai would be even higher, if the membership of the spurious segment based originally at Malaguna but attached since early this century to Nekupia and occupying its landholdings (see Chapter 3) were excluded. Nevertheless, its impact on the vunatarai's land availability has been significant (particularly through dispositions of its land), so for the purpose of examining the Nekupia settlement pattern the two remaining adult members of this segment (one male and one female) have been included. With two more males and seven females in the genuine Nekupia segment, the total adult living membership of the vunatarai in 1982 was eleven. Only two members are residing on vunatarai land, a male (the present lualua) at Rakunat and a female on vunatarai land at adjoining Matalau. The male and female members of the Malaguna-based segment live outside the Tolai area, the three daughters of the woman residing on vunatarai land at Matalau also live outside the Tolai area, and one woman resides virilocally at Rabuana, together with her two daughters (both married to non-Tolai) and a son.

Nekupia was recorded in 1966 as owning five blocks, but in Chapter 5 it was identified as a major disposer of land since adjudication. The male member resident on vunatarai land at Rakunat also has cash crops and gardens there, and the only other adult male living in the Tolai area (at adjoining Matalau, patrilocally) has cash crops on two blocks of vunatarai land. All seven females in the genuine Nekupia segment (even the three living outside the Tolai area) have cash crops on their vunatarai land, with two of them having
gardens as well. Turning to occupation by non-members, three males, three females, and four sets of unspecified siblings all have cash crops on land recorded in 1966 as owned by Nekupia, in each case as a consequence of a post-adjudication acquisition from the vunatarai. In only one case did the transaction involve persons acquiring land from their "fathering" vunatarai (the present lualua acquired a parcel for his children), but the occupation of the other non-members was based on a total of eleven transactions (some persons having acquired more than one parcel), and in every case a relationship with one of the three groups which in recent generations have interfered in Nekupia vunatarai's land affairs was involved.

In Part II these intruders were identified as the Malaguna-based segment which attached itself to Nekupia, its associates from Pila Pila including Vunatabun vunatarai, and ToKubo vunatarai to which two of the Pila Pila-based group were connected by marriage. Thus one male who is occupying a parcel acquired for his children is married to the daughter of ToIsaea, the leader of the Malaguna-based segment, another male occupying a parcel acquired for his children is a member of Vunatabun, a female occupant is the daughter of a Vunatabun member, and another female (occupying two parcels) is the daughter of a catechist long resident at Rakunat, who had on his arrival there from Pila Pila mobilised the Nekupia-Vunatabun connection (he was regarded as matrilineally related to the latter vunatarai) in order to plant the land concerned to coconuts. Two further parcels were acquired for the children of two male Vunatabun members. A son and daughter of ToLiaser, the former lualua of ToKubo, also occupied land in consequence of an acquisition from Nekupia, and the children of the latter female and her husband (a ToKubo member, the marriage being between cross-cousins) occupied a further block.

Comparing the Rakunat and Nekupia settlement patterns it emerges that, in the circumstances of the latter's comparatively high land availability, all members residing in the Rakunat locality, whether on vunatarai land or not, are able to exercise their rights to cultivate vunatarai land, and even the absentees are able to retain cash crops there. The only persons excluded are the two remaining members of the spurious segment of the vunatarai, both of whom reside outside the Tolai area, neither being expected to return to Rakunat. The vunatarai's comparative land surplus has been exploited by many persons who, though being non-members, are related by kinship
connection to one of the three groups historically associated with Nekupia, and thereby the land needs of the wider Rakunat community have been accommodated.
APPENDIX H
THE TENURE OF ACQUIRED LAND

1. INTRODUCTION

For the purpose of establishing the character of tenure in land parcels acquired by Tolai customary methods of securing secondary settlement of land, I concentrated during fieldwork on the state of tenure on the forty-one blocks entered in the Adjudication Record in 1966 as individual-owned. With respect to the forty-two transactions since 1966, although the parties involved were interviewed as to their perceptions of the nature of the tenure created by the acquisition, the advantage of concentrating on land acquired during the earlier period was that the length of time which had elapsed since acquisition by the early 1980s (over fifty years, in some cases) allowed more reliable interpretation of the character of tenure from developments on the land. In Chapter 4 I noted that of the forty-one acquired blocks fifteen were recorded as owned by single individuals, and the other twenty-six as owned by multiple individuals. In Table 4.5 I broke up this latter category of ownership into kinship groupings of the individuals concerned, and I foreshadowed confirmation in Chapter 6 of the manner of recruitment to the land-owning groups, for which purpose this examination of tenure developments on the forty-one acquired blocks by 1982 is being undertaken. I also indicated that even the fifteen blocks recorded as owned by single individuals would transpire to be group-owned.

2. MULTIPLE INDIVIDUALS

Looking first at the character of tenure on blocks recorded in 1966 as owned by a multiplicity of individuals, I will proceed in order of the six sub-categories identified in Table 4.5.
Female and her children

In ten of these twelve acquisitions the members of the original group for whom the land had been acquired were still in occupation of the land in 1982. In five of these ten cases the original group of a woman and her children were the only occupiers of the land, but in four more cases the children of daughters (but not of sons) were also in occupation. The last of the ten cases involved a parcel acquired jointly by a woman for her children and by an adopted son of the woman for his children, and the two sets of children were the only persons found in occupation. While the occupancy of these ten blocks is consistent with the land-owning group being characterised as a matriline segment (or two such segments, in the last case), for a number of them the evidence is still not conclusive. Developments in the next generation of occupants will clarify the picture, but present occupants indicated their expectation that only the children of females would be entitled to remain on the land, unless by a further transaction the children of males gained such an entitlement.

In two of the twelve cases of acquisitions for a female and her children the land in question was no longer occupied by the acquiring group in 1982. In one case the land had originally been part of an exchange, whereby a Nodup-based vunatarai which had members resident at Rakunat acquired the subject land from a Rakunat-based vunatarai of the same moiety, in exchange for some land owned by the Nodup-based vunatarai at Baai, where a segment of the Rakunat-based vunatarai were resident. The exchange had later been confirmed by an ikulia payment for the land at Rakunat, but by 1982 the Rakunat-based vunatarai had moved to recover the subject land, apparently claiming that the land at Baai had been recovered. An offer of the partial return of the ikulia payment had not been accepted, but the husband of the female who had acquired the subject land for herself and her children stated that he wished to withdraw their claims, because he feared retaliatory sorcery against his wife. In the other case the land had been acquired for a woman and her three adopted children, but in 1984 the children were no longer resident at Rakunat, and the land was being used for cash-cropping and gardening by the woman's brother and sister and their children, all members of the same matriline segment - the brother having married his sister's daughter.\footnote{A scandalous incest between a woman and her maternal uncle, the overlapping relationships of father-child and maternal granduncle-sister's daughter's child occasioned much ribald comment during interviews.}
(ii) Siblings

Of the five acquisitions in this sub-category one was for female siblings, three for male and female siblings, and one for only male siblings. The female siblings case involved two sisters. By 1982 one sister had settled in Port Moresby, and the land was occupied by the other sister and her children.

Of the three cases where land was acquired for both male and female siblings, in one case it has emerged quite clearly that the land-owning group is a matriline segment. The land had been acquired for a brother and sister, but in 1981 the brother declared that only his sister's children could remain on the land, and that his own children had no interest. They had to get land "from their mother", while the block in question would be held by his sister's matrilineal descendants. In a second case land had been acquired for a brother and sister, but the sister had apparently died childless (she was "murdered" by her husband), and the current tenure status of the land could not be determined. The third case involved one of the blocks of land leased to the Education Department for teacher's housing, which had by 1982 reverted with improvements to customary tenure. It had been acquired from Rakunai vunatarai by a brother and two sisters, but by 1982 the brother (an elderly man) was very sick in hospital at Lae, one sister had already died, and the second was virilocally resident at Tavui. Possibly because of their vulnerability, and the valuable improvements on the land, Rakunai vunatarai leaders were said to have recovered the land "by force", so the current occupation of the land does not assist in identifying the manner of recruitment to the land-acquiring group.

In the last of the five siblings acquisitions five brothers were involved, but, as they had no sisters, again the ambiguity over manner of recruitment could not be conclusively resolved. In 1981 the brothers were using the land in rotation, but Rakunat informants, on being questioned, clearly perceived problems over the future entitlement. When asked whether children of the brothers could take over after their father's death, the answer was, "No, they will not be able to come inside the land of the vunatarai". It was generally agreed that if one of the brothers wanted to "give" the land to his children, he would have to consult with the lualua of the vunatarai.
which had originally disposed of the land. Thus while a matriline segment was not conclusively proven, it is clear at least that in these circumstances the land-acquiring "group" was not a patriline segment, for had it been then no such complications over the children's rights would have arisen.

(iii) Siblings and children

Four acquisitions fell into this sub-category, one being for the benefit of two sisters and their children, another for two brothers, a sister and a daughter of another sister, a third being for a male, his two sisters and the children of the sisters, and the last being for four brothers, two sisters and the children of the sisters. The recorded ownership itself is strong evidence that a matriline segment was involved in all four cases, and tenure developments observed in 1982 confirmed the impression that recruitment to the groups was governed by matrilineal descent. In the case of the acquisition for the two sisters and their children only those children were in occupation of the land in 1982. The parcel acquired for the two brothers, a sister and a daughter of another sister was clearly regarded as owned by their vunatarai, or more precisely that segment of a vunatarai which had originally been based at Tavui but was now permanently settled at Rakunat. The parcel acquired for the male, his two sisters and the sisters' children was still occupied in 1982 by that original matriline segment which had acquired it some twenty years before, although many of the resident children of the sisters were now adults. In the final case the matriline segment of four brothers, two sisters and the sisters' children had by 1982 discontinued its settlement at Rakunat, and they had disposed of the acquired parcel to a cross-cousin of the siblings.

(iv) Female and her daughter's children

The three acquisitions in this category were all in favour of the same persons. Post-acquisition developments clearly confirmed the existence of a matriline segment, and elaborated its character, for in 1982 not only were the children of the woman's daughter in occupation of the parcel, but also the daughter herself, the daughter's sister and that sister's children. On asking the daughter about the nature of
the tenure she stated that while her and her sister's sons could remain on the land (they are members of the matriline segment), the sons' children (who are not members) would have to seek land elsewhere at adulthood.

(v) Male, his daughter and her children

In 1966 one acquisition in favour of this kinship grouping was recorded, but during investigations it transpired that inclusion of the woman's father in the ownership was mistaken, for he had acquired the parcel from another vunatarai (i.e., not his own, as mistakenly recorded) for his daughter and her children, in reciprocation for having kept her bridewealth. The ownership should, therefore, come under the first kinship grouping above - a female and her children. In 1981 the parcel was occupied by that woman and her children.

(vi) Male and his children

The single acquisition in this category is the only instance of recruitment to the land-owning group apparently being based on patrilineal descent. A lengthy interview was conducted with the man concerned, Amos Tamti, in the presence of a number of senior Rakunat males, who recognised the singularity of the tenure to the parcel and speculated at length upon its implications. The exceptional state of the tenure may only be explained by the unique historical circumstances of the parcel. Of 3.77 hectares, it was the largest block recorded in 1966 as owned by individuals, being Amos Tamti and his eight children then living. Two parts of the block were acquired separately from Darairat vunatarai, one acquisition being effected by ToBola and the other by Tamti Emos, the father of Amos Tamti. Both men were members of Tabururuk, a vunatarai which settled originally at Matalau just south of Rakunat. ToBola was the Nodup "chief" whose approach to Brown in 1875 to establish the first missionaries on the Gazelle Peninsula mainland was related in Chapter 3. He was succeeded as lualua of Tabururuk three generations later by Tamti Emos, a Paramount Luluai and, in the words of one Rakunat informant, "a very influential person".

Tamti Emos married a woman from Kuraoko vunatarai, also based at Matalau, and they had thirteen children, of whom when its genealogy
was compiled by the LTC in 1963 only two sons and a daughter were still living. The elder of the two sons, ToRebon, was then the lualua of Kuraoko, and Amos Tamti was the other surviving son. Amos himself achieved prominence in local affairs, being a coast-watcher during World War II and later President of Rabaul Local Government Council. Before his death some time in the 1950s Tamti Emos apparently recorded that he wanted his two sons to have the block. ToRebon had married twice, to a Matupit woman who died without issue and to a woman from Lungalunga, near Cape Livuan on the western outskirts of the Tolai territory. ToRebon died before adjudication, apparently leaving the field clear for Amos Tamti to claim Block 5 (which amalgamated the two acquired parcels) as his own, having it recorded in 1966 in the names of himself and his children, who are members of the Rakunat-based Vunatoboai vunatarai.

There has thus been two instances of entitlement to this land being based on patrilineal descent, the first by Amos Tamti and ToRebon from their father, and the second by the children of Amos Tamti. I have no doubt that the historical connections of influential big-men - Amos Tamti's paternal ancestors - with this parcel, as well as Amos' own prominence, largely explain the fact that in 1981 his and his children's tenure of Block 5 was accepted without objection by anyone in the Rakunat community, including apparently the members of Rakunai (the successor of the vunatarai which originally owned the land), Tabururuk (whose big-men had acquired it) and Kuraoko (of which Amos and ToRebon were members, Amos being the current lualua in 1981). But the block's tenure is seen by the Tolai themselves as anomalous - even experimental - and misgivings were expressed over the ability of Amos' children to reconcile the claims of their children to the land. Amos' death in November 1984 (after completion of fieldwork) will have raised the question whether his vunatarai has accepted the disposition of the block on his children, but only the future occupation of the parcel will show whether recruitment to the land-owning group (which in recent generations has comprised Tamti Emos, his son Amos Tamti, and the latter's children) is in fact being governed by patrilineal descent.
3. SINGLE INDIVIDUALS

Attention will now be turned to the tenure developments on the fifteen blocks recorded in 1966 as owned by single individuals. In Chapter 4 I foreshadowed a claim that, from the history of occupation of these parcels since their acquisition, it is not valid to regard their tenure as having been individualised. This claim will now be verified.

(1) Individual males

Eleven blocks were recorded as owned by single males. In one case no conclusions can be drawn, for the block was acquired immediately after adjudication for Boisen High School. In another case the block-owner was ousted from the land by a member of a vunatarai which had incorporated the land-disposing vunatarai just before the death of its last-surviving member. Although he was not in occupation in 1981, the male who was recorded as owner stated his intention that his children should take the block after his death (he died in 1982), and that eventually the land would be held by his daughters' children, not his sons' children. The matrilineality of the intended group of beneficiaries is apparent.

In four cases although only a male was recorded as owner, there are strong grounds for believing that the man was acquiring the land immediately for his children, who have occupied the blocks in question ever since the acquisition. Their occupation should not be seen, therefore, as the consequence of inheritance, but whether the descent group they comprise can be characterised as matrilineal or patrilineal must await future tenure developments. In two other cases the evidence was quite clear that the man recorded as owner had in fact acquired the land for his children. In one of the cases it was asserted that the man in question had bought the land together with his wife for their children, and while the children's rights were recognised, the possibility that the wider vunatarai of which they were a segment could claim the land upon their mother's death was distinctly entertained. In the other case the position was complicated by the fact that the acquiring male had two wives. After his death both spouses and their children shared occupation of the land, but at least with respect to one of the two groups the matrilineality of the segment was apparent, for a son had transacted a further acquisition,
in order that his children could remain on the land. Had it been a patrilineal (or even cognatic) descent group, such a further acquisition would not have been necessary.

In two more cases ownership by a group based on matrilineal recruitment was apparent. In both cases the sisters and sisters' children of the male recorded as owner were clearly regarded as entitled - in one the male had completely abandoned any claim in their favour; in the other the male used the land jointly with them, but as he had no children of his own the evidence of matrilineality is not so strong. The last of the eleven blocks recorded in the names of single males is the only one which suggests existence of a land-owning group based on patrilineal recruitment, but the circumstances are special. The man recorded as owner is the only child of the couple from Rabuana and Kokopo localities, who had left their home areas for Nodup in consequence of their moiety-incestuous marriage. The man's father had acquired the block for him, and in 1981 he was living on it with his children. The children's entitlement might, on present indications, be seen as based on patrilineal descent, but there is no-one in the Rakunat locality who could base a claim on matrilineal descent, and it must remain an open question until entitlement in the next generation is settled whether in fact recruitment of the land-owning group is based on patrilineal descent.

(ii) Individual females

Four blocks were recorded as owned by single females. The tenure of one of these blocks has had a long and complicated history, and remains the subject of a dispute predating adjudication. In the LTC inquiry into the draft Demarcation Plan in 1966 the dispute arose between the woman who was eventually recorded as owner and a member of the land-disposing vunatarai. For present purposes it is not necessary to relate the details of the dispute. Although some members of the vunatarai which originally owned the land continue to deny the woman's ownership, she was still in occupation of the land in 1982 together with her children. A second block had been acquired for the female owner by her father from his vunatarai, in consequence of his having retained her bridewealth. In the text of Chapter 6 I indicate that a daughter in such circumstances acquires the land in her capacity as a member of a matriline segment, and this was reflected by her occupation of the block in 1981 together with her children.
The third female-owned block may have been acquired in similar circumstances, for a woman by her father who was from the Duke of Yorks. In 1981 the land was occupied by the woman and her children. The female recorded as the owner of the final block was the same woman who, together with her three adopted children, was recorded as owning land in the last case of ownership by a female and her children dealt with above. By 1984 the woman had died, the adopted children were no longer resident at Rakunat, and this block was also being occupied by the woman's brother (who married his sister's daughter) and sister and their children — all members of the same matriline segment.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In Chapter 6 I indicated that the relationships between individuals participating in a land transaction, their underlying intergroup associations, who made and who received the ikulia payment, and the source and ultimate disposition of the payment, are all factors which qualify the tenure gained by an acquisition, but the clearest indicator of the character of tenure is the history of occupation of the land in question after acquisition. The views of parties to a land transaction are, of course, indicative as well. These were sought both with respect to particular acquisitions and as a matter of general understanding, and the overwhelming impression gained was that all land transactions were regarded, by both the land disposers and the land acquirers (whether single or multiple individuals), as the exchange of land from a vunatarai to a matriline segment of which the new land owners were representative.

The existence and character of the new land-owning group may take some generations of occupation to materialise, but the foregoing analysis of occupation of all forty-one blocks recorded in 1966 as individual-owned (whether by a single or a multiplicity of individuals) shows two clear factors in the progressive elaboration of ownership:

(i) all acquired land is perceived as owned by kinship groups;
(ii) recruitment to these groups is being governed by matrilineal descent.

Regarding the first factor, the existence of close kinship groups was already apparent in the case of blocks recorded as owned by a multiplicity of individuals, and post-acquisition developments on the blocks merely confirmed their existence. Developments on blocks
recorded as owned by single individuals generally showed either the immediate involvement of a group, or the existence of a nascent group of which the individual owner was the present single member. In the light of these findings I maintained in Chapter 4 that all Tolai customary land is owned by descent groups, that inheritance has no application to the question of tenure, and that the critical question is the manner of recruitment to the descent group concerned.

Regarding the second factor, in dismissing inheritance as irrelevant to land tenure I do not deny that a person acquiring land may have some authority over the ultimate disposition of the land. His or her authority will be qualified by considerations such as the interpersonal and intergroup relationships underlying the acquisition, and the source and disposition of the ikulia payment, but to the extent that a choice exists it is confined to indicating the descent group intended to benefit from the acquisition. In cases where land was acquired by single females no difficulty is presented in identifying the new land-owning group as one recruited by matrilineal descent, comprising the woman, her children, and sometimes other close matrilineal kin. Where land was acquired by single males, however, the usual common occupation by the acquiring male during his lifetime and by his children gives the impression of a group recruited by patrilineal descent, just as his children's occupation after his death misled expatriate administrators into identifying a Tolai trend to patrilineal inheritance. But the fact of the children's contemporaneous occupation with their father shows that their interests are not suspended until his death, and the emerging occupation pattern on such acquired blocks shows that it is the father who is the transient participant in block ownership, for after his death the land is occupied by the matriline segment comprising his children and their matrilineal descendants.

Not all acquired blocks allowed the unambiguous identification of a matriline segment from their occupation history, and, indeed, in one case the existence of a patriline segment seemed indicated. Another case saw a son of a male acquirer effect a further acquisition to allow his own children to remain on the subject land. In claiming that

\[\text{I have no published authority, but during discussions with Land Titles Commissioners in the 1970s their view that such a trend existed, and that they should promote it, was evident.}\]
the influence of matrilineality in Tolai society continues to assert itself in their developing land tenure I do not ignore the importance of other factors - implicit understandings arising from the relationships underlying transactions, the history of occupation of the land since acquisition, and the behaviour of the land-acquiring group towards the land-disposing vunatarai. To these and other factors must be added the ever-changing political scene in the community. Forceful individuals (including sorcerers) may prevail during their lifetimes, and alliances will grow and diminish over time with changes in the leadership and numerical strength of vunatarai. To recognise that political forces may counteract the primacy of matrilineality in Tolai land tenure, however, is only to confirm the inherence of Tolai social organisation in their customary tenure. Thus far, on the Rakunat experience, matrilineality still exerts a determining influence on the quality of Tolai land tenure.
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GLOSSARY

Apiktarai: localised segment of a vunatarai
Balaguan: feast or ceremony, especially in memory of deceased ancestors
Balaure: to look after, e.g., by a lualua, in respect of the vunatarai membership. Cf. kure
Bar niuruna: members of the same moiety, related by kinship connection and/or associated by common settlement
Bar tamana: a man and his children; nowadays, the nuclear family
Dukduk: the "child" of the tubuan; the "male" masked figure of the tubuan society
Gunan: inhabited place
Ikulia: the securing of secondary settlement of land by payment
Iniet: a secret society, whose magical powers are greatly feared
Kakalei: claim to land based on matrilineal descent from its original occupants
Kakang: segment of an apiktarai
Kure: to manage, decide, e.g., by a lualua, in respect of the landholdings of the vunatarai. Cf. balaure
Kutu tabu: to distribute tabu, especially during funeral ceremonies
Loloi: coil of tabu
Lualua: leader of a vunatarai, usually its genealogically senior male member
Luluai(obs.): fight leader; a village official
Madapai: plot of land where the ancestors of a vunatarai first settled in a locality, and with which its membership is identified
Maravot: a meeting-ground of the iniet society
Matanoi: site on the shore where the ancestors of a vunatarai first landed in a locality

Moramoro: a meeting-ground of the iniet society

Nauvana: cross-cousin, i.e., father's sister's and mother's brother's children

Nidok: a tabu fee, e.g., at initiation

Nila(obs.): destruction, especially following an intra-moiey incest

Pakanagunan: segment of a paparagunan

Pakan pia: plot of land

Pal a vat: magical stone

Paparagunan: territory around an inhabited place

Pia: land

Tabu: shellwealth, made of small Nassa shells threaded on strips of cane

Taraiu: meeting-ground of the tubuan society

Tinabar: gift

Tinur guvai: associations of members of the same moiety attached to a big-man for a business enterprise

Totokom: payment for the short-term use of land

Tubuan: a secret male society; the "female" masked figure of the society

Urur: a territorial subdivision of the village

Vunatarai: a group whose members trace their matrilineal descent from a single known common ancestress, or from a number of known ancestresses whose common descent is assumed