N E W G U I N E A R E S E A R C H

B U L L E T I N

Map 1. General location of Situm and Gobari

NEW GUINEA RESEARCH BULLETIN

Number 39

THE SITUM AND GOBARI EX-SERVICEMEN'S
SETTLEMENTS

A. Ploeg

January 1971

Published by the New Guinea Research Unit,
The Australian National University,
P.O. Box 4, Canberra, A.C.T.

and

P.O. Box 1238, Boroko, New Guinea

Australian National University 1971

This work is copyright. Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of private study, research, criticism, or review, as permitted under the Copyright Act, no part may be reproduced by any process without written permission. Inquiries should be made to the publisher.

Printed and manufactured in Australia by
Allans Printers, Canberra

Library of Congress Catalog Card No.79-152824

ISBN 85818 003 0

THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Research School of Pacific Studies

New Guinea Research Unit Committee

O.H.K. Spate, Chairman, Director of the School

J.W. Davidson, Department of Pacific History

A.L. Epstein, Department of Anthropology and Sociology

E.K. Fisk, Department of Economics

Marie Reay, Department of Anthropology and Sociology

Marion W. Ward, New Guinea Research Unit

Editor, New Guinea Research Bulletin
Marion W. Ward

Editorial assistant
Susan Tarua

January 1971

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Preface	xi
Chapter 1 The establishment of the settlements	1
Chapter 2 The block-holders	18
Chapter 3 Intra-block contacts between settlers	41
Chapter 4 Inter-block contacts between settlers	66
Chapter 5 Relationships between settlers and outsiders	108
Chapter 6 Conclusion	119
Appendix Outline of those parts of the Papua-New Guinea Administration concerned with rural resettlement policy	125
Bibliography	129
Index	132
Tables	
1.1 Annual net returns of a twenty-acre coconut block	6
1.2 Combined Ex-servicemen's Credit Board and Development Bank loan for individual Situm and Gobari block- holders	9
1.3 Value of rations and size of cash allowances of holders with Ex-servicemen's Credit Board loans	10
1.4 Combined Native Loans Board and Development Bank loan for individual Situm and Gobari block-holders	11
1.5 Repayment of development loans	12
1.6 Differences between Ex-servicemen's Credit Board and Native Loans Board loans	13
2.1 Occupations of block-holders when granted a block	22

		<u>Page</u>
2.2	Size of <u>wantok</u> groups	23
2.3	Reasons advanced by block-holders for taking a block	25
2.4	Food gardens on a Situm block	31
2.5	Use of houses and garden sites in Robert's hamlet	40
3.1	Composition of the group consisting of Situm and Gobari block-holders and their families, and their assistants and their families	43
3.2	Long-term kin-helpers in 1968	58
3.3	Short-term kin-helpers in 1968	59
3.4	Data concerning labourers in 1968	60
3.5	Assistants of Situm and Gobari block-holders prior to 1968	62
3.6	Relationship between amount of assistance and rate of development and state of maintenance of blocks	63
4.1	Contributions of Situm block-holders to Robert's <u>pilai</u>	85
4.2	Food gifts made by Robert to non- <u>wantok</u> Situm block-holders supporting his <u>pilai</u>	86
4.3	Expenditure on and income from Robert's <u>pilai</u>	89
4.4	Observed and expected numbers of visits to settlers from w/n, w/∪n, ∪w/n and ∪w/∪n	94
4.5	Observed and expected numbers of visits to Robert's block from w/n, w/∪n, ∪w/n and ∪w/∪n	95
4.6	Visits to Robert's block, sub-categorised	96
4.7	Visits to B.h. and ∪B.h.	97
4.8	Single and multiple visits to B.h. and ∪B.h.	97
4.9	Visitors during single and multiple visits to B.h. and ∪B.h.	98
4.10	Single and multiple day-to-day visits and visitors during these visits	98
 Maps		
1	General location of Situm and Gobari	Frontispiece
2	Situm and Gobari, situation beginning 1968	19

		<u>Page</u>
3	Situm and Gobari, situation end 1968	21
4	Food gardens on a selected Situm block	29
5	Buildings in Robert's hamlet	38
6	Robert's hamlet and surrounding area	39

Figures

1	Sketch of the construction of a house in Robert's hamlet	37
2	Plan of the <u>klup</u> in Situm	75
3	Administrative framework of departments and officials involved in resettlement, 1961-70	127

Genealogies

1	Long-term residents on Neville's block	42
2	Long-term residents on Robert's block	46
3	Kin relationships between Margaret's <u>wantok</u>	50
4	Kelvin, his long-term kin-helpers and their nuclear families	56
5	Kin relationships between five block-holders	68

Preface

This Bulletin contains the results of field work in two settlements, Situm and Gobari, in the Huon Peninsula northeast of Lae (see Map 1). The settlements were established as a result of the Administration's rural resettlement policy. They consist of tracts of land, bought by the Administration from the original owners, which have been subdivided into blocks and allocated in leasehold to individual Papuans and New Guineans. Until recently, blocks were allocated only for cash cropping, but are now also available for cattle husbandry.

Field work in the settlements was carried out between January 1968 and June 1969. I made several visits which altogether lasted about six months. Most of the time I lived at Situm in the hamlet of one of the block-holders. The remainder was spent at Lae where I collected further data from Administration files and agricultural and other officials.

The purpose of my research was to study social aspects of resettlement, and the results were to complement research by other field workers of the Australian National University. Since I was concerned with investigating social aspects, I focused on interaction between the settlers themselves, and then on interaction between the settlers and, firstly, relevant members of the Administration, secondly, people in the settlers' home areas, and thirdly, their new neighbours. I further investigated the contexts in which interaction took place and the settlers' comments on their interaction. In order to observe interaction as much as possible, I almost daily walked around in the settlements, visiting settlers and inquiring about their whereabouts, their visitors, their reasons for visiting, and so on. During visits I discussed with the settlers a stock series of subjects. In addition to the home visiting, I tried to follow closely all community events by attending meetings and the religious services which were held in Situm on many Sunday mornings and which were often followed by meetings. Most of my data were obtained during these visits and meetings.

There were several reasons why I chose to work in Situm and Gobari. Firstly, the two settlements were small, and since my intention was to measure interaction, it seemed crucial to get to know the settlers quickly. This was much easier to do on a small settlement than on a large one. Secondly, the Situm and Gobari settlers came from areas where different languages are spoken and consequently settlers from one block often communicated with settlers from another block in Pidgin English. This meant that it was not necessary for me to learn a

vernacular language in order to understand meetings or conversations between settlers. I conducted my inquiries in Pidgin English, which I learnt during the field work. After about six weeks I was fairly fluent in this language, and could follow most conversations. I made no attempt to learn more than a few words in any of the vernacular languages. Thirdly, one of the settlers had previously been the host of a New Guinea Research Unit field workers, so he was acquainted with the type of inquiries social scientists make and the methods they use. Lastly, since the settlements were accessible by road and I could use a university vehicle, I did not need to depend on Administration transport.

My attempts to disguise the names of the two settlements turned out to be futile, given the small number of settlements in Papua-New Guinea which are of the size or peculiar location of Situm and Gobari. I do try to disguise the identity of the settlers by using fictitious names and omitting reference to the area of their home villages and the location of their blocks on the settlements.

The plan of this Bulletin is as follows. Chapter 1 contains an outline of the Administration's rural resettlement policy, which is fairly brief because I intend to deal with this topic in a separate publication. Hence I deal mainly with the considerations which led to the establishment of the resettlement scheme and the provision of credit facilities to settlers.¹

In Chapter 2 I provide data concerning the settlers themselves, their previous occupations and home areas, their appreciation of the scheme and the status it gave them. I also discuss their economic position and financial prospects.

Chapter 3 deals with the groups living on each of the blocks. The resettlement policy was that each block should be developed by one married couple, eventually assisted by grown-up children. However, in Situm and Gobari all holders had assistants, many living on their blocks for longer or shorter periods. In this chapter I am mainly concerned with the relationships between the block-holders and their assistants.

Chapter 4 is concerned with interaction between settlers from different blocks, while Chapter 5 deals with interaction between settlers and other people, primarily relatives living in their home areas, nearby villagers, and Administration personnel.

In Chapter 6 several changes in the resettlement policy are recommended. The chapter is very brief, since I continued by resettlement studies in the West New Britain oil palm settlements and I intend to supplement the present preliminary account with a more analytical, comparative study, based also on data collected in the oil palm settlements.

¹ The appendix contains a brief outline of the functions of those public bodies concerned with resettlement.

Many people have helped me to collect data and prepare the manuscript for publication.

First and foremost I would like to thank the Situm and Gobari settlers whose kind hospitality and willingness to communicate made my field work rewarding and enjoyable.

Many Administration officials gave assistance and information. I would like to mention, in particular, the current and former staff members of the Department of Agriculture in Lae, executive personnel of the Ex-servicemen's Credit Board, and members of the Land Settlement section of the Department of Lands, Port Moresby.

Professor R.N.H. Bulmer, of the University of Papua and New Guinea, and Dr M. Reay and Dr M.W. Ward, of the Australian National University, read and commented upon the first draft of the manuscript.

The statistical section of Chapter 4 owes much to the kind assistance of Mr H. Weinand, Department of Geography, University of Papua and New Guinea.

Mr L. Hannett checked and commented upon the English translation of the Pidgin English text on pp.70-3. Mr E.P. Wolfers commented upon a draft of the appendix on pp.125-8.

My wife accompanied me during part of the field research and, as the cartographer of the Department of Geography, University of Papua and New Guinea, prepared the maps and diagrams.

Chapter 1

The establishment of the settlements

Resettlement policy of the Administration

Rural resettlement is one way in which the Administration is attempting to promote the economic development of Papuans and New Guineans. It is envisaged that, during the five years of the current development plan 1968-73, indigenous plantings of the major tree cash crops will increase by about 145,000 acres, with rural resettlement accounting for 33,000 acres, or about 22.8 per cent, of this increase (Territory of Papua and New Guinea 1968:20-3).¹

The Administration considers resettlement to be especially worthwhile because, firstly, it provides settlers with blocks of cultivable land under individual title similar to the Australian land-holding system. The Administration regards traditional land tenure systems as unsuitable for large-scale cash cropping. According to Mr Hasluck (1960:14), then Minister for Territories: 'It sometimes happens that a young and energetic man who wishes to plant cocoa cannot obtain access to any land under native custom. It may be that a man who has the use of land and plants trees on it has no continuing rights in that land under native custom.' The wide variety of traditional systems also led him to favour the introduction of a uniform system of land-holding of Australian derivation. Secondly, settlers with a secure, lasting and individual title to their blocks are in a better position to obtain credit for their enterprises. Papuans and New Guineans farming on land held under traditional tenure often had difficulties obtaining credit because, until recently, money-lending organisations did not normally accept such land as security, since it was considered to be held communally. Thirdly, rural resettlement can ease population pressures on land. Settlements can be established in areas with little or no population and settlers recruited from heavily populated areas. Finally, since blocks are given out in groups, settlers live in close proximity, and this facilitates the provision of extension services.

¹ The figure is not directly apparent from Table 3.1 in Territory of Papua and New Guinea (1968:20), since the figures tabulated there include replantings. The extent of replantings can be calculated from Tables 3.2 and 3.3 (1968:22-3).

Although I am not concerned here with evaluating the resettlement policy, it must be mentioned that these considerations may be of limited validity. Firstly, since the mid-1950s there has been a tremendous increase in indigenous cash cropping in Papua-New Guinea. Thus traditional land tenure does not necessarily prevent or discourage cash cropping, at least in the short term, although in the long term its suitability for large-scale cash cropping is unknown. Secondly, the Papua and New Guinea Development Bank has recently decided to provide credit by means of the clan land agreement to Papuans and New Guineans living on traditionally owned land.¹ Thirdly, rural resettlement requires a heavy capital outlay: the development of one block may cost as much as \$10,000 (Guise 1967:app. C; Hasluck 1962:18). For this reason, it seems unlikely that it will be feasible to use resettlement in its present form to develop the number of blocks necessary to ease population pressures on land. For the same reason, the team of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development recommended (1965:90, 98, 112) that efforts focus on the development of family small-holdings in villages, which it called 'village concentrations', rather than on resettlement. Although the Administration has only partly adopted this recommendation, the development plan 1968-73 provides for a 49,000-acre increase in 'village concentration' holdings as against 33,000 in resettlement holdings (Territory of Papua and New Guinea 1968:20).

The first settlements were started in the period 1952-58 (Cheetham 1962:63-71) on land obtained by the Administration and leased out by local government councils. The land was advertised and applicants for blocks were interviewed by the Land Board, which would recommend to the Administrator whether the applicant should be granted a lease. These recommendations were usually followed.

In 1958 it was decided to establish a number of settlements for ex-servicemen, both indigenous and expatriate. In Australia, land settlement schemes after the first and second world wars had been part of wider schemes to repatriate and rehabilitate ex-servicemen. In Papua-New Guinea, the first blocks for ex-servicemen were made available in the Popondetta area in 1959. Situm and Gobari were established in 1962; at first all block-holders there were ex-servicemen, but later others also acquired blocks. In Popondetta, blocks of Europeans, Papuans and New Guineans were interspersed, but near Situm and Gobari

¹ See Crellin (1969:28). This agreement is a written declaration by 'clan' leaders that one member of the clan has usage rights over a specific piece of land, described in the agreement. With further certification by an Administration official that the declaration is genuine and authoritative and loan guarantees from the clan leaders and relatives of the clan member concerned, the Development Bank is prepared to provide him with a loan to develop the described piece of land.

only one block was leased to a European ex-serviceman. Because the Administration felt that the European ex-servicemen who were granted blocks had better managerial abilities than the indigenous ex-servicemen, the former obtained much larger blocks than the latter. In the Popondetta area, they were, on the average, more than fifteen times larger (derived from Howlett 1965:14).¹ The Papuan and New Guinean block-holders resented this strongly.

Size of blocks and estimated returns

The size of blocks for indigenous ex-servicemen was investigated by the Land Development Board. It recommended that they be of such a size as could be developed by a nuclear family without outside help to yield a gross annual farm income of \$1,200 or more. An area which had this potential, given a certain type of cultivation, constituted a 'minimum economic area' and the Board calculated that its size for a coconut farm was 20 acres. The main cash crop in Situm and Gobari was copra, and most of the area was considered suitable for commercial coconut cultivation. The mean size of the blocks which were allocated in 1962, 1963 and 1964 was 25.4 acres.

Coconut cultivation²

The coconut palm is a tropical crop which flourishes in areas with an average day temperature of about 85°F and limited diurnal variation. Rainfall may vary widely, from about 40 inches to 175, or even more, but should preferably occur throughout the year. In high rainfall areas, such as the coast near Lae, soils should be well drained. In Situm and Gobari several tracts were unsuitable for coconut cultivation if drains were not dug. Coconuts do not grow well in climates with relatively short periods of sunshine. The palms mature slowly and, from the time of initial planting, it is usually 7 to 9 years before they start bearing coconuts. Depending on the quality of the soil, bearing capacity starts to deteriorate when the palms are about 60 to 80 years old. They bear throughout the year.

On plantations coconuts are often planted in equilateral triangles with sides of 27 to 30 feet. The holdings are thus not intensively used, and the undergrowth in between the palms should be regularly cut down. A cover crop may be grown to keep weeds down and to promote soil conservation. Often leguminous cover crops are grown to fertilise the soil. In Situm and Gobari a leguminous crop, pueraria phaseoloides (in

¹ And personal communication: Director of Lands to R.G. Crocombe, 14 April 1969, Lands Department file 65/169.

² Most of the following data are derived from Child (1964), International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (1965), Shand (1966), and Territory of Papua and New Guinea (1968).

Pidgin English bin or rop), is used. To intensify cultivation in coconut holdings cocoa or coffee trees are often planted in the shade of mature palms. Another method to intensify land use in coconut holdings is to graze cattle there.

The inner cavity of ripe coconuts is partly filled with fluid. It is surrounded by five layers, firstly the kernel, secondly a thin, hard seed coat, thirdly a hard shell, fourthly the husk, a fibrous mass, and fifthly the outer skin. In Papua-New Guinea the kernel is the most valuable part commercially. The fluid is used only for consumption. In some countries the fibres of the husk are used for making mats and bags and so on, but at present this is not done in Papua-New Guinea. The kernel is used primarily for the production of copra. To make copra, the husk has to be removed from the shell which is then cut in halves. Subsequently the kernel is dried, usually either in the sun, which yields a low-grade copra, or in a specially constructed drier. Copra consists of the dried kernel. It keeps well because of the low moisture content. Driers are often inexpensive structures built from bush materials, used drums and corrugated iron.

In many respects copra production provides a more favourable way of earning money for Papuans and New Guineans than other cash crops. It does not require a high degree of technical skill. The establishment of a small holding does not entail great expense, and maintenance even less so. Harvesting need not be done according to a rigid schedule, and this fits the current working patterns of most Papuans and New Guineans. The palms are not particularly prone to diseases and pests, although in Situm and Gobari some palms were attacked by the beetle scapanes australis; this burrows in the buds of young palms, damages the fronds and finally kills the palms. Finally, coconuts can be used both for commercial purposes and for consumption. Marketing prospects for copra are not unfavourable since its commercial uses in the production of margarine, soap and other industrial products are manifold. It seems likely that demand will rise slowly. Moreover, unlike Papua-New Guinea, the major copra-producing countries are faced with relatively large population pressures on land. Hence in these countries opportunity costs of expanding coconut holdings tend to be higher than in Papua-New Guinea.

Copra has been, and still is, one of the major export products of Papua-New Guinea. In 1966, about 577,000 acres were under coconut cultivation, of which slightly more than 50 per cent was held by Papuans and New Guineans. However, commercial production of copra by Europeans was more than double the production by Papuans and New Guineans. The Administration promotes additional planting of coconuts and has planned that, by 1973, about 705,000 acres will be under coconut, with plantings by Papuans and New Guineans accounting for 77.9 per cent of this increase.

Estimated returns of Situm and Gobari blocks

The income the holders at Situm and Gobari can expect is uncertain, since it depends on copra prices and the average yield of copra per acre. Both figures tend to vary widely: before the second world war the copra price was as low as \$11 per ton, while in recent years it has occasionally been slightly more than \$200 per ton. Average yields per acre in some parts of Papua-New Guinea are less than 0.25 tons, while in other parts they are slightly more than 0.50 tons (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development 1965:85).

During my field work, copra production in Situm and Gobari had not yet started and consequently average yields were unknown. However, many of the first palms were bearing and the holders felt that they produced very few nuts. They were afraid that the development of the blocks had not been worthwhile. During a brief visit to the settlements in July 1970, the agricultural officer told me that in some places there was a sulphur deficiency and possibly also a potassium deficiency. Fertilisation trials were being made, but the results would not be known for almost a year. If they are successful, it will be another year before the proper application of the fertiliser yields results. The settlers were very pessimistic about the future of their enterprises. Many had given up hope that they would make much money with copra and said they would have to rely on the revenue of their cattle ventures. Although these views may be too pessimistic, it is possible that even the minimum estimated copra yields mentioned above may not be reached.

Another factor influencing the income the holders will receive from the blocks is whether they are able fully to exploit the profitability of their venture. This point will be discussed below. Assuming, firstly, that they are able to so exploit their blocks, secondly, that copra prices fluctuate between \$100 and \$160 per ton, thirdly, that the average yield per acre, when the palms are in full production, ranges from 0.25 to 0.50 tons, and, finally, that the cultivable area of the blocks varies from 20 to 25 acres, the gross annual income from the blocks may be as high as $25 \times 0.50 \times \$160 = \$2,000$, or as low as $20 \times 0.25 \times \$100 = \500 . Thus the income from these blocks may be well below the minimum level recommended by the Land Development Board.

In 1966 the agricultural officer concerned with the two settlements considered that, given the size of the operating costs, the blocks would present the holders with a very low net income.¹ His estimates of the gross income and operating costs are shown in Table 1.1. Since I am not trained in coconut farm economics, I feel incompetent to judge the accuracy of these figures. However, they are presented here because, on the basis of the agricultural officer's report in which they were inserted, extension blocks were allocated to the Situm and Gobari

¹ Department of Agriculture file 12-3-A4, 1966.

Table 1.1

Annual net returns of a twenty-acre coconut block
(\\$)

Gross returns		700*
Operating costs: freight	42**	
bags, twine, stencil	58***	
building depreciation	48 [†]	
tools	10	
rent	6	
labour	70 ^{††}	
insurance	6 ^{†††}	
Total operating costs	240	240
Net returns		460

* This figure is based on the assumptions that one acre yields 0.35 tons per acre, that the block-holder receives \$100 for one ton of copra and that twenty acres of the block can be brought under commercial cultivation. Although these assumptions are very conservative, the possibility cannot be excluded that they are correct.

** This figure is based on the assumptions that the annual yield is 20 x 0.35 tons = 7 tons, and that freight from the settlements to Lae is \$6 per ton. The latter assumption may be too high: in 1968-69 it cost \$0.10 to transport one bag from the settlements to Lae. One ton of copra consists of fourteen bags, and consequently transport costs, even if the freight doubles, could be as low as 7 x 14 x \$0.20 = \$19.60.

*** This figure is slightly higher than the figure which can be derived from 'Small-holder Sole Coconut Budget' (1965:74). I estimate that with a yearly output of copra worth \$140, \$10 has to be spent on 'bags, etc.'. Assuming that this figure represents the costs of bags and twine, this means that, with a yearly output worth \$700, \$50 has to be spent on these items. The budget mentioned further that a stencil costs \$8, but this is not an annual expenditure.

[†] This figure is 15 per cent of \$320 which represents the value of the block-holder's house and drier.

^{††} This figure is derived as follows: let us suppose again that the annual yield of the block is 7 tons and that coconuts are harvested eight times a year. Hence after harvest $\frac{1}{8}$ ton has to be dried. Since only $\frac{1}{8}$ ton can be handled in the drier and the process of harvesting and drying takes three days, the total number of days spent on these tasks is 3 x 8 x 7 = 168 days. This leaves the block-holder with insufficient time to maintain his block and his food gardens so he is forced to employ labourers. Annual costs of casual labour are estimated at \$70.

^{†††} The insurance covers compensation paid to labourers. The premium depends on the wage level and amounts to \$1.90 per \$100 in wages. There is also insurance of the drier against fire for which the premium is \$6 per \$100 insured. With annual wage costs of \$70 and the replacement value of the drier estimated at \$60 (see Table 1.4) the combined premiums would add up to approximately \$6.

block-holders in 1968. Below I will refer to these blocks as 'extension' blocks and to the initial ones as 'old' blocks. The mean size of the extension blocks was 24 acres, but the holders were advised to reserve about half for food cultivation. If they follow this advice, their annual income may be increased by another \$300 to \$760. These figures are based on the same assumptions as those concerning the income from the old blocks.

About the same time the procedures for granting extension blocks were under way, the agricultural officer decided that the blocks could be used for grazing. In this way they would be more intensively used, returns would be higher, labour would be lessened since the cattle would keep the cover crop down, and finally, the cattle would manure the soil of the block. It was estimated that one head of cattle would require one acre of grazing land. At first each block-holder's herd would consist of 14 head: 10 steers and 4 heifers. The intention was that the block-holders would fatten the steers for one year and sell them the next year, while replenishing and slowly expanding their herd by buying new steers. After the third year the herd would be partly replenished by natural increase. Buying prices for heifers and steers were assumed to be \$60 and the selling price for fattened steer \$120. On the basis of these assumptions, it was estimated that the holders would derive an additional gross annual income of \$480 from the grazing project. By 1969 the plan was put into effect. Those holders who had completely developed and maintained their blocks received cattle, at first only a small number. In 1970 this was increased, in some cases to the intended size of the initial herd, as mentioned above.

In discussing the income which holders can expect, I have so far assumed that they are able to realise the full earning capacity of the block. However, it remains to be seen if this is so. For example, how much copra a holder produces depends partly on maintenance. During my field work several blocks were partly overgrown with bush, which seriously hampered the growth of the palms and in some cases may have caused them to die. Also, in 1967 the agricultural extension officers intervened in a scapanes plague which the block-holders had been unable to control. A number of palms had died before the officers acted. During my stay beetles were still damaging the palms on a number of blocks and I doubt if all holders were able to cope with the problem. Finally, only one of the holders had previously worked on a cattle farm. In 1969 they received instruction in handling cattle, but again it remains to be seen how effective this will be.¹

¹ Finney (1969:53), discussing Gorokan commercial farming, noted 'the gross ignorance of most Gorokans in proper cattle handling procedures', resulting in difficulties in cattle projects. He added that the extension work provided by the Department of Agriculture had not been very effective.

While copra and beef cattle production were the main economic undertakings of the holders, most engaged in other projects which were not directly the concern of the resettlement policy and which I discuss in Chapter 2.

Financing the blocks

Most Situm and Gobari block-holders would have been unable to develop their blocks without credit. Initially credit for indigenous block-holders came from two sources: the Ex-servicemen's Credit Board, established in 1958, and the Native Loans Board, which was established in 1955 but did not provide credit for the development of settlement blocks until 1960 (Cheetham 1962-63:75). The Ex-servicemen's Credit Board lent only to ex-servicemen, while the Native Loans Board lent both to ex-servicemen and other block-holders, but under different conditions. In 1969 the Boards were superseded by the Papua and New Guinea Development Bank which was established in 1967.

Three loans were made available to the Situm and Gobari block-holders: the first one for the development of the old blocks, the second for the extension blocks, and the third for the establishment of the cattle herd. While some holders received the first loan from the Ex-servicemen's Credit Board and other holders from the Native Loans Board, the second and third loans were granted by the Development Bank.¹ The Development Bank granted the second loan as an addition to the first one and on the same conditions, so I will discuss the first two loans together.

The initial loan of the Ex-servicemen's Credit Board depended on the size of the block-holder's family. The maximum amount is shown in Table 1.2. The loans were gradually paid out over a number of years. This length of time, and hence the size of the loan, varied with the number of years it took the main cash crop in a particular settlement to mature. The first year was divided into two: during the first six months, until their food gardens were in full production, settlers received rations in addition to a small cash allowance; during the second half they started to receive the full cash allowance.

Section 24 of the Ex-Servicemen's Credit Ordinance 1958-1963 provided for an 'assistance period' of twelve months during which the borrower received a non-repayable living allowance and was not required to make any loan repayments. The Ex-servicemen's Credit Board was to decide at which stage in development of a block the assistance period should commence. To date, April 1970, no Situm and Gobari block-holders with Ex-servicemen's Credit Board loans had yet entered this period.

¹ Much of the following information concerning the development loans was obtained from the acting executive officer of the Ex-servicemen's Credit Board, from Cheetham (1962-63), Papua-New Guinea Ex-servicemen's Credit Board (1961) and 'Smallholder Sole Coconut Budget' (1965).

Table 1.2

Combined Ex-servicemen's Credit Board and Development Bank loan for individual Situm and
Gobari block-holders
(\$)

Year	Ex-servicemen's Credit Board loan									Assistance period*	Development Bank loan**
	1 (first half)	1 (second half)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Rations	152.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
Cash allowance	34.00	96.00	192.00	192.00	192.00	192.00	192.00	192.00	192.00		0
Fares	30.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
House materials	100.00	0	0	40.00	0	0	0	0	0		0
Tools	100.00	-	-	-	20.00	0	0	0	0		4.00
Contingencies, seeds, etc.	20.00	12.00	24.00	24.00	32.00	0	0	0	0		54.00
Rent, legal fees	6.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00		0
Clearing and burning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		60.00
Spray	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		8.00
Amounts available per year	442.00	112.00	220.00	260.00	248.00	196.00	196.00	196.00	196.00		126.00

* At the time of writing it was not known to me when the assistance period would commence, or how large the cash allowance would be.

** Year omitted because in some cases part of the loan was paid out during the seventh and eighth years.

In some cases much of the additional Development Bank loan was granted during their seventh year, from June 1968 to June 1969, to pay the labourers who had cleared part of the extension block. While the additional loan provided for the payment of labourers, the initial loan did not, a topic to which I return below.¹

The amounts shown in Table 1.2 were paid when a block-holder had a dependent wife and more than two dependent children. The total amount he received over the first eight years was approximately \$2,000. Interest accrued at the rate of 3½ per cent but it was not added to the main sum during the currency of the loan. When a block-holder had less dependants he received a smaller cash allowance. These amounts are shown in Table 1.3. The other components of the loan were equal to those mentioned in Table 1.2. There were no provisions for cases of polygyny.

Table 1.3

Value of rations and size of cash allowances of holders with
Ex-servicemen's Credit Board loans
 (\$)

Block-holder and dependants	First half-year		Afterwards
	Rations	Cash allowance	Cash allowance
Single man*	52.00	26.00	83.20
Man with wife	91.00	32.50	130.00
Man with wife and one child	111.80	32.50	156.00
Man with wife and two children	132.60	32.50	182.00
Man with wife and more than two children	152.00	34.00	192.00

* The ideal was that blocks were developed by nuclear families, and the wife's contribution to development was one of the factors taken into account when the maximum size of the blocks was under consideration; however, some blocks have been allocated to unmarried men.

The loans provided by the Native Loans Board were smaller than those of the Ex-servicemen's Credit Board and did not vary with the number of a block-holder's dependants. The size of the initial loan, with the additional Development Bank loan, is shown in Table 1.4. Again, part of the additional Development Bank loan was paid out within eight years of the initial loan being granted. The initial loan totalled \$1,086, with an interest rate of 4½ per cent. Like the Ex-servicemen's Credit Board loans, the Native Loans Board loans did not provide funds for the employment of labourers.

¹ See p.15.

Table 1.4

Combined Native Loans Board and Development Bank loan for
individual Situm and Gobari block-holders
 (\$)

Year	Native Loans Board loans								Development Bank loan
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Rations	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cash allowance	96	96	96	96	96	24	24	0	0
House material	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tools	40	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Seed nuts	16	16	16	12	0	0	0	0	54
Spray units	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pest control	6	6	8	10	8	8	6	6	8
Drier	0	0	0	0	0	60	12	12	0
Stencil	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0
Bags	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	0
Clearing/burning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Amounts available per year	424	122	124	122	108	104	50	32	126

Table 1.5 shows data on the repayment of loans, which are only estimates because, firstly, the debts incurred by the holders differed considerably. This was not only because of the differing sizes of Ex-servicemen's Credit Board loans, and differences between these loans and the Native Loans Board loans, but also because some holders did not use all funds available in the loan. Several, for example, did not spend the money allocated for house-building materials. Secondly, the Native Loans Board loans were not granted at the same time. Thirdly, the figures concerning the yields of the blocks are estimates. It seems likely that many block-holders started receiving returns from copra during 1970, and hence they have been able to start repayments earlier than anticipated in Table 1.5. The figure of \$1,296 mentioned as the gross annual return from the old block from 1979-80 on is the estimated yield when the block is in full production. The figure is about \$100 higher than the mean of the maximum and minimum estimates arrived at earlier, namely \$1,875 and \$500 respectively.¹ The initial return of the extension block is higher than that of the old block because a large part of it was cleared by contract labour, so planting could proceed more quickly.

According to my calculations, the scheduled 'remainder' to be paid by holders of a combined Ex-servicemen's Credit Board/Development Bank loan will be very small or non-existent. For holders of a combined

¹ See p.5.

Table 1.5

Repayment of development loans
(\\$)

Year	Income from		Total income from copra*	Repayments	
	Old block*	Extension block*		Ex-servicemen's Credit Board**	Native Loans Board**
1971-72***	54	0	0	0	0
1972-73	144	0	0	0	0
1973-74	420	0	0	100	80
1974-75	666	0	0	200	160
1975-76	828	0	0	400	400
1976-77	990	270	1,160	600	500
1977-78	1,134	360	1,496	800	375 plus
1978-79	1,254	450	1,704	800	remainder
1979-80	1,296	540	1,836	remainder	0
1980-81	1,296	630	1,926	0	0

* Estimates by the Development Bank.

** The amounts shown will have to be paid in four quarterly instalments.

*** The period runs from about June to June.

Native Loans Board/Development Bank loan, the remainder may consist of several hundred dollars. This estimate assumes that holders were granted the initial loan on 1 January 1964, and used all the money at the time it became available.¹ While there will be variations in the total amounts the holders have to repay, repayments will in all cases consume a considerable proportion of their income.

The differences between the loan provisions of the two Boards are summarised in Table 1.6. A disadvantage of the Native Loans Board loans was that it often took a long time for applications to be processed and finally granted. Some block-holders received the first instalment of the loan months after they had taken up residence in the settlements. In the meantime, their gardens were not in production and they did not receive food rations.

Which of the two sets of provisions is more favourable would seem to depend on the point of view of the observer. If he considers it important that the holder accumulate a relatively small debt and as a result can reap the benefits of developing his block with relative speed, he is likely to prefer the loan provisions of the Native Loans

¹ I took into account the fact that none of the holders built the drier at the time funds first became available, and that, therefore, expenses on copra bags, stencil and drier depreciation also came later than scheduled. This means that the holders will have to pay less interest.

Table 1.6

Differences between Ex-servicemen's Credit Board and Native
Loans Board loans

Provisions	Ex-servicemen's Credit Board loan	Native Loans Board loan
Size of annual living allowance (\$)	83.20- 192.00	96.00
Total size of loan (\$)	1,250.00-2,066.00	1,086.00
Length of period over which loan money is paid	8 years	8 years
Non-repayable allowances	Allowance during assistance period	None
Reserve for emergencies (\$)	400	None
Allowance for construction of copra drier (\$)	None	84.00

Board. If he considers it important that the holder has a larger amount of cash at his disposal during development, he is likely to prefer the provisions of the Ex-servicemen's Credit Board. The Situm and Gobari block-holders, at least in 1968-69 before they had started repayments, favoured the latter view. The Development Bank, however, seems to favour the former, since it is considering the provision of funds for the initial clearing and planting and a decrease in the size of the living allowance (Johns 1969:8-9), the advantage being the development would be accelerated and hence the holders would receive their first returns more quickly.

For the establishment of the cattle herd on their blocks, the Situm and Gobari holders received a third loan. The maximum loan approved for this purpose was \$1,229, of which \$840 was allocated to buy cattle and \$389 to other establishing costs, such as buying a large water drum and fencing materials. Since the initial herds were much smaller than the fourteen head originally planned, by the end of 1969 only a portion of the loan had been made available to the holders. Because they can start selling fattened steers one year after the establishment of the herd, returns are much faster than from the coconut holding. Accordingly the repayment also takes less time.

On the basis of the above assumptions concerning the size of the blocks, copra prices, yields per acre, and farming capacity of the holders, it is estimated that the gross annual income from copra from the old block will vary between \$500 and \$2,000, from the extension block between \$300 and \$760, and the herd on the old block will yield \$480. (I disregard here the possibility of using the extension block also for grazing when the palms have grown sufficiently.) The holders will accordingly receive a gross annual income varying from \$1,280 to \$3,240. Since coconuts reach full production about eleven years after

planting, and since the development of the blocks is not likely to be completed before 1971, the holders cannot expect this income before 1982, twenty years after they started developing their blocks. The repayment of the development loans will not be completed much earlier and until then it will take up a considerable proportion of their income.

Reasons for block-holders' dissatisfaction

The provisions of the resettlement policy, determined entirely by the Administration, brought disappointment and resentment. Most holders maintained that, when they were told about the possibility of applying for a block of land, they were also told that a school and a medical aid post would be built in the settlement. However, a school was not established until 1969 and the aid post is still to be established. Until the beginning of 1969 Situm children had to go to the school in a village to the northeast of the settlement, at a distance of about seventy-five minutes' walk. The Gobari block-holders mostly sent their children to school in Lae. I did not find out whether promises regarding a school and an aid post were in fact made. While it is possible that the ex-servicemen misunderstood what they were told, it may also be that an Administration official inadvertently presented a too favourable picture of what life in the settlement would be like.

Resentments at unequal treatment were inevitable when block-holders compared the size of their blocks with those granted to European ex-servicemen. Borrowers from the Native Loans Board were well aware, too, of the meagreness of their loans compared with those of the Ex-servicemen's Credit Board. Further discontent arose from block-holders' awareness that only European borrowers received their loans in full cash payment whereas they themselves had full access to only the living allowance. When a block-holder wanted to use another allowance, he was provided with a purchase order by the official administering the loan, usually either a lands officer or, as in the case of Situm and Gobari, an agricultural officer. Many holders felt, in my view incorrectly, that the Administration presumed they would foolishly squander the loan money if it was handed out to them. Although I doubt that this would happen to any great extent, it seems to me that, at least in Situm and Gobari, most block-holders lacked the administrative skill to allocate the loan money over about eight years, and might be unable to withstand, for example, urgent requests for money by close kin.

Many block-holders complained that they did not know how much money had been handed out to them and how much was still left. Since the administering officers originally did not make records of the outflow of loan money, the only records available were in Port Moresby. However, when the Development Bank took over the loan administration from the two Boards, the outstanding loan sums were determined and the administering officials were issued with forms on which to record the additional money allocated.

Further, although Mr H. Dunstan, the agricultural officer concerned with the two settlements from their establishment in 1962 until late 1966, had tried to explain to the block-holders how the loan money had been allocated and for how many years the living allowance would be paid,¹ the holders were confused about this at the time of my stay in 1968-69. One told me that they would receive the living allowance for ten years, a few said that they would receive it until their coconuts were bearing, and most simply said that they did not know for how long they would receive it.

As mentioned, a feature of the initial loans which was much disliked by the block-holders was that they did not provide money for the employment of labourers. In this respect also the holders felt themselves placed at a disadvantage compared to the European ex-servicemen settlers who were provided with such funds. Holders felt that it was impossible, or very nearly so, for one married couple to develop an entire block unaided. Mr Dunstan confirmed that they had had to work very hard. The settlers maintained that, if they had employed labourers, they would have developed their blocks much faster and would have received much quicker returns. As mentioned, the Development Bank seems to support this view.

A faster development of the blocks would, moreover, have enabled the holders to repay their loans more quickly. Repayment worried many of the holders since they felt they were becoming old and were afraid of dying before they cleared their debts, thus burdening their children.² Concern over repayments led the holders to welcome enthusiastically the idea of using the blocks for grazing, which they realised would give them quick returns, in sharp contrast to coconut growing. One holder, weary of waiting for his coconuts to bear, told me, 'Kokonas i hambak': 'coconuts, much ado about nothing'. With the profits derived from cattle raising the holders hoped to repay the loan more quickly.

Although the loan did not provide finance for assistance, most holders were able to acquire some help in the development of their blocks. Many assistants resided on the blocks and for this reason I

¹ Personal communication: Mr H. Dunstan, 8 August 1968.

² Most block-holders were not sure of their exact age and I did not make detailed inquiries to ascertain them. Entry into regular employment varied from several years before the second world war reached New Guinea in 1942, until the 1943-45 campaign of the Australian Army against the Japanese strongholds on the New Guinea north coast and the nearby islands. Supposing the holders were in their late teens when they entered employment, the oldest men would have been born about 1918-20 and the youngest about 1924-26. Accordingly their ages at the time of my field study would have varied between about 45 and 50 years of age. These estimates concur with what some holders told me was their age.

distinguish between 'block-holders', those who had been allocated blocks of land, and 'assistants', those who helped the holders develop their blocks and who resided on the settlements. I use the term 'settlers' to refer to block-holders, or assistants, or both. Since assistance was mostly irregular, I feel that the development of the blocks could have been accelerated if the block-holders had employed labourers from the start.¹

Another complaint of many holders concerned the long period of time which elapsed between the end of World War II and the allocation of the blocks. They felt that, at the end of the war, they were promised rewards for the services they had rendered. Barrett (1969:501-2) referred to such promises:

There were...the promises, made in good faith, of help after the war.... Those who made the promises were not of course in any position to see that what they promised eventuated.... Instead the official attitude was to ensure that these men who had risked their lives did not become 'big heads'.

J.K. McCarthy wrote (1964:vii): 'Most of these [promises] were made during farewell speeches.... That the promises were impossibly lavish, incautious and made without any official approval made no difference to the men's beliefs that they would be kept.' The Situm and Gobari settlers thought they obtained their blocks as a promised reward and they did not understand why they had to wait until 1962 and, as they say, to grow old before this reward materialised.²

Finally, some block-holders, seeing the loan as part of the reward, were under the impression that they need not repay the money they received. Of the 21 ex-servicemen block-holders in Situm and Gobari who were receiving a development loan during my field work, 2 told me that they had been sure they did not need to repay, 5 said they had not been sure about this, while 11 said they knew they had to repay. I did not ask 3 holders. By 1968 all were aware that they were receiving a dinau, a loan, and would have to repay the main sum plus interest. They did not know how much money this involved, and this was a source of worry for many of them. I am unable to judge how disillusioned block-holders were when they realised they would have to repay. At the time of my field work most did not seem to feel strongly about it, but two made bitter remarks. One commented upon the better conditions of service of those who had recently joined the army or police, although they had not

¹ See p.61.

² A few holders said that the Administration had decided upon this particular type of reward after it had been noticed that the war damage compensation paid out to villagers was not spent in a productive way. The Administration had initiated the resettlement policy to provide the ex-servicemen with a steady source of income.

fought in the war; the other complained that the Administration was withholding money owing to the settlers.

Block-holders were required to live on their own blocks. Jungle covered most of the area when they started developing them, and this was one reason why several holders initially tried to build their houses in clusters. The agricultural officers found this unacceptable and in 1968-69 all holders but one lived on their blocks. They did not complain about not being able to live in a more concentrated settlement. In several cases neighbours had not used the opportunity to build their houses close together. Moreover, because a considerable number of assistants also resided in the settlements, the groups living on one block were often larger than one nuclear family.

Situm and Gobari block-holders tended to regard themselves as plantation owners and this may have facilitated their acceptance of their dispersed mode of residence, since plantation owners-managers tend to live by themselves on their own land. As will appear in the following chapters, resettling meant for the Situm and Gobari block-holders that they took part in a social movement in the sense of a group venture 'extending beyond a local community or a single event and involving a systematic effort to inaugurate changes in thought, behaviour and social relationships' (King, cited in Brown 1966:154n.); Brown (1966:155) noted that in Papua-New Guinea, 're-siting' and re-building of villages with new architectural styles' has been a common feature of such movements. Preference for residence on one's own block of land has also been reported from land tenure conversion schemes in the Northern District of Papua (Dakeyne 1966:42ff.; Gray 1969:8). It may be that both for the participants in these schemes, and for the Situm and Gobari block-holders, living on their own blocks accentuated their new identity as commercial farmers.

Chapter 2

The block-holders

Physical setting of blocks

Situm and Gobari are located in the Huon Peninsula, on the coastal plain bordering the foothills of the Rawlinson Range (see Map 1). They are about thirteen miles by road from Lae town centre. Before the establishment of the two settlements, the area was covered with rain forest and occasional patches of kunai grass. The traditional owners used it only occasionally, for hunting. At the beginning of field research in 1968, Situm consisted of 22 blocks, one of which had not yet been developed, and Gobari of 8 blocks (see Map 2). Much of the surrounding area was still covered with jungle.

The annual rainfall in Situm and Gobari is unknown. Brookfield and Hart (1966:Table I, stations 14.20, 14.21 and 14.13) mentioned that in Lae, Lae Forest (a station about seven miles inland, west of Lae), and Finschhafen (on the eastern tip of the Huon Peninsula), the mean annual rainfall is 178.41, 168.05 and 168.99 inches respectively; and the south coast of the Huon Peninsula has an annual rainfall of between 160 and 180 inches. Inland the annual rainfall decreases, but since Situm and Gobari are situated on the coastal plain, I doubt if this decrease is noticeable there. On the basis of the annual figures for Lae and Finschhafen, I estimate that the figures for Situm and Gobari are also between 160 and 180 inches.

Travel from the settlements to Lae was sometimes difficult because there was no good bridge across the Busu River until 1966, and the Bupu River was bridged by a causeway only in 1968. The Busu is a swift river, usually difficult to ford; the Bupu can be crossed except after heavy rainfall. Also in 1968 the construction of the internal settlements roads was started. Until then only a number of tracks, which were very muddy during the rainy season, connected the internal blocks with the main roads.

Allocation of blocks

Of the 30 old blocks in Situm and Gobari, 26 were allocated in 1962, 2 in 1963 and 2 in 1964. Two block-holders never took up residence and did not develop their blocks, but most of the others started development themselves, or through managers, soon after the blocks were granted. I

Map 2. Situm and Gobari, situation beginning 1968

am not certain of the mean number of months between the grant and the arrival of the holders, but on the basis of dates of arrival mentioned in a development report of 1966, it would seem to be 5.6 months.¹ While this may be too long, since some holders provided me with earlier, and sometimes much earlier, dates of arrival, their evidence is inconclusive since they were not always precise regarding dates.

During 1962-68 four blocks changed hands. One block-holder died and his block was inherited by his widow. Three other holders, losing interest, sold their leases, in one case to another Situm block-holder, in the other two to newcomers. Consequently, by 1968 the number of block-holders was reduced to 29. Among these was one woman, the above mentioned widow. The enlargement of the settlements in 1968 not only provided the old block-holders with extension blocks, but also made blocks available to newcomers. These were allocated shortly before the end of my 1968 field work in August of that year. There were then five types of blocks (see Map 3):

- (i) 29 old blocks (below I call the holders of these blocks 'old' block-holders);
- (ii) 27 extension blocks (as shown on Map 3, these blocks surround the old blocks; there are fewer extension blocks than old blocks because the two holders who had just bought their leases were not given extensions);
- (iii) 17 blocks allocated to new block-holders (these I call 'new' blocks; five new blocks were allocated to co-resident assistants of old block-holders so the influx of new settlers was not as large as might have been expected);
- (iv) one block for community purposes;
- (v) two blocks held in reserve.

As mentioned, the mean size of the old blocks was 25.4 acres and the extension blocks were 24.0 acres. Hence the old block-holders had, on the average, 49.4 acres. The new blocks were almost twice as large as the old blocks, their mean size being 42.6 acres.

At the end of my field work most new block-holders had started developing their blocks and several had taken up residence in the settlements. Because of the limited time at my disposal, I concentrated my inquiries on the old holders and most of the following information is concerned only with them. For this reason, 'block-holders' refers to the old holders only unless specifically stated otherwise.

Prior occupations of block-holders

At the time the 28 male block-holders were granted blocks, 10 were living in their home villages. One of these had become a luluai, one

¹ Department of Agriculture file 12-3-A4, 25 October 1966.

Map 3. Situm and Gobari, situation end 1968

a tultul,¹ and one had an initially successful agricultural enterprise which collapsed after a number of years.² The others did not play a prominent part in village affairs. Of the remaining 18 block-holders, 6 were in the police force and 12 were otherwise employed. Their occupations are listed in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1

Occupations of block-holders when granted a block

Driver	3
Mechanic	2
Bank clerk	2
<u>Bosboi</u> on plantation	2
<u>Bosboi</u> at airport	1
Switchboard operator	1
Cook	1
<u>Total</u>	<u>12</u>

Twenty-six of the 28 male block-holders were ex-servicemen and, while in the police force or the army, 4 became constable first class, 2 became senior constable and 1 became sergeant third class. To indicate these ranks I use the names used in the police force during 1968-69, although the rank may have been attained in the army and the name of the rank may have been different at the time of actual service. In 1968-69 two holders were still in the force and might be further promoted.

Usually holders were required to live on their blocks and to devote all their time to their development.³ Yet several men who had blocks in Situm and Gobari lived elsewhere in 1968-69 and had other employment. They included the two men who were in the police force, two clerks and one driver. Finally, one block was not leased to an individual, but to a welfare society, based in Lae, which had purchased the lease from the original ex-serviceman/holder.

Of the 29 block-holders, 15 had been granted an Ex-servicemen's Credit Board loan, 8 a Native Loans Board loan, 1 a loan from the company

¹ Luluai were village headmen (see p.44), and tultul their deputies (see p.52). Both officials were appointed by the Administration from among the villagers. During the 1960s they were being superseded by local government councils.

² See p.45.

³ For holders of Ex-servicemen's Credit Board loans these requirements are specifically stated in section 16 of the Ex-servicemen's Credit Ordinance 1958-1963.

for which he was working, and 5 holders had not received loans because, in the judgment of the Boards, they had sufficient private funds.¹ Four of these were in employment and the fifth was the one who had started an agricultural enterprise in his home area. All holders of Native Loans Board loans were also ex-servicemen. This was because the Ex-servicemen's Credit Board provided loans during a limited period of time only and ex-servicemen who applied later were referred to the Native Loans Board.

Home areas of block-holders

Block-holders came from a number of different areas in Papua-New Guinea and had different ethnic backgrounds. They attached great significance to their heterogeneity and categorised themselves according to their areas of origin.² The areas most usually employed for this categorisation were, in the case of block-holders from the Morobe District, clusters or larger groups of villages, and, in the case of holders from other districts, entire districts. I refer to the classes of settlers thus distinguished as 'wantok' (although their members did not always have the same mother tongue), and the areas from which they came as 'home areas'. I use the term 'home area' deliberately since all holders referred to this area as their ples (a Pidgin English term, derived from the English 'place' and meaning 'home'). There were 7 groups of wantok among the Situm block-holders and 4 among the Gobari holders. The home areas of some Gobari holders were the same as those of some Situm holders. Table 2.2 shows the size of the wantok groups.

Table 2.2

Size of wantok groups

Holders	Size of <u>wantok</u> groups from Morobe District	Size of <u>wantok</u> groups from other districts	Number of holders	Number of <u>wantok</u> groups
Situm	5 4 4 2 1 1	4	21	7
Gobari	4*1	2 1	8	4

* That some numbers have been placed in the same columns should not be taken to imply that the holders referred to by these numbers came from the same home areas.

¹ On p.16 I mentioned that 21 holders were receiving a loan. The figure here is different because when I did field work, one holder had sold his lease, after which his loan had been cancelled, and another claimed he did not receive loan money.

² See also p.79.

Occasionally people were differentiated according to other areas of origin which, except when the Morobe District block-holders were classified together, were more specific than the home areas defined above. The smaller categories were most often, but not exclusively, used by wantok to differentiate among themselves. All 7 holders whose home areas were outside the Morobe District had, by 1968, lived for fifteen years or longer in this district, 3 since before World War II. Six had married women from the Morobe District and 2 had each learnt to speak his wife's language.

The block-holders still regarded Situm and Gobari as the ples of the original owners. Nevertheless, since the latter had sold the area to the Administration and since the Administration had paid them the purchase money, the settlers felt they could not be dislodged by the original owners. It seemed to me that the settlers merely granted them rights of identification (Crocombe 1971) over the two settlements.

All block-holders still claimed rights to land in their home areas and many said they would like to return and plant cash crops there after they had developed their blocks. Some said that they were forced to retain rights to land in ples because the blocks were too small to provide all their children with a living. It remains to be seen, however, how many settlers will try to develop land in their home areas and whether their claims to land will be recognised by their former co-residents. I have little information on this last topic, but in one of the home areas I noticed that settlers had gardens which were held in trust for them by close relatives. During my two visits there these settlers harvested betel nuts and coconuts to take back to the settlement. I noticed also that one of the settlers took the opportunity to sell coffee beans picked from the trees he had planted in ples before he went to Situm. These settlers had lived in their home areas immediately before they moved to the settlements. Where settlers have not lived in their home areas for several decades, they did not maintain gardens there, paid only sporadic visits or none at all, and in general their rights to land might be recognised to a lesser extent by their former co-residents than in the case just mentioned.

Their agricultural experience and education

Most holders came from lowland areas and were acquainted with coconut growing when they moved to Situm and Gobari, but only one holder had run a large-scale agricultural enterprise before. Except for the two clerks, all holders had had poor schooling or none at all, and only 11 out of the 29 were literate, or at least semi-literate. Hence, only these two were able to assess the amount of work involved in developing a block and to calculate how much work had to be done per day or per week in order to finish development and maintain the blocks. The ignorance of the other holders in these matters probably added to their feelings of insecurity produced by ignorance of matters such as the repayment of loans and their probable income.

Reasons for applying for blocks

Twenty-six of the 29 block-holders gave their reasons for applying for a block and these are tabulated in Table 2.3. Some holders gave several reasons so that the number of reasons listed is larger than the number of holders queried.

Table 2.3

Reasons advanced by block-holders for taking a block

Administration urged it	10*
To have a <u>bisnis</u> of one's own**	9
To expand one's <u>bisnis</u> interests	1
To provide for one's children	3
To make money or to make more money	4
Insecurity of former job	3
No career possibility in former job	1
To be able to work according to one's own wish	1
Administration promised good conditions in settlement	1
Safeguard in case of failure of present <u>bisnis</u>	1

* Two block-holders added that the Administration owed them a reward for their services during World War II, and that resettlement was the form chosen for this reward.

** The Pidgin English word bisnis does not have the same meaning as the English 'business'. Put briefly, a person does bisnis when he gets money for his work and also works without close supervision. See p.105.

As can be seen from Table 2.3, nobody mentioned individual title to the block as a reason for resettling. Nor did the block-holders mention communal tenure or communal use of the returns of cash cropping as a disincentive to setting up a bisnis in their home villages. Many holders claimed that they and their full brothers had exclusive title to their land there. One holder said that it would be stupid to start a bisnis in one's home village because relatives would want a share in the returns. Others denied this, saying that they would have to share only with those who had helped them, thus providing support for Crocombe's statement (1967:209-10) that usually it is not land tenure but rather work patterns which create claims on income from cash cropping. Some also said that poor communications between their village and the outside world made cash cropping there unattractive, and others maintained that it was only since they had moved to the block that agricultural officers had actively urged people to take up cash cropping.

While most holders apparently intended to maintain the block as a means of livelihood, one, Barney, told me that, after paying back the loan, he might sell his block and return to his home village to start

a bisnis there. Another holder said that he would leave and return to his ples because he was disappointed with the resettlement scheme. I did not believe he really wanted to leave, since much work was still being done on his block. Also, he was not from the Morobe District, had not been to his ples for a considerable number of years and was married to a local woman. It seemed to me that, with the threat to leave, he wanted to impress upon me the depth of his disappointment. I was also told that a few other block-holders disliked life in the settlements and that they only stayed there for the monthly cash allowance. I never heard such statements from these settlers themselves. Even if they were true, I doubt if disappointment with the provisions was the only or the main problem. These men may have found life in a rural area uncongenial in comparison with their experience of town life, or their relationships with other settlers might have been unfavourable.

Development of the blocks and other tasks

In July 1968, when the Situm and Gobari settlers were granted the extension blocks, 17 of the 29 old block-holders had either fully planted their blocks or had been hampered in doing so by special difficulties of the terrain. The agricultural officers considered that only 3 of the remaining 12 block-holders were behind schedule. One of the conditions of the loans was that they had to develop a 15-acre area in four years and hence that each year they had to bring 3.75 acres under cultivation. Many holders were ahead of this schedule. Several had developed more than 20 acres in four years, and one had developed his entire block of 23 acres within two years. Often settlers extended their coconut holdings by interplanting the nuts with food crops in newly established gardens. The Gobari holders had developed their blocks more rapidly than the Situm holders. I am uncertain why this difference occurs.¹

The settlers who, by 1968, had brought their entire blocks under coconuts were not able to plant food gardens there. Consequently some asked a neighbour's permission to plant on his block. Both profited from this arrangement: the guests because they could make their food gardens, and the host because he need not check the secondary regrowth on the tracts where the gardens were made. Settlers also had the opportunity to interplant the food crops with coconuts. Some settlers used the sites of the internal roads, which had not yet been constructed, for food gardens.² A few Gobari settlers used land between their blocks and the Bupu River; others used part of the extension blocks, which had been bought from the traditional owners but not allocated. Finally, some block-holders entered into agreements with the traditional owners

¹ See pp.106-7 for further discussion.

² See pp.28-30 for an example.

of areas around the two settlements to use part of their land for food gardens. I was told about such agreements only by the settlers and it might be suspected that agreements were never made and that the settlers were encroaching upon neighbouring land. Two incidents made this seem unlikely to me. The first occurred in July 1968 after a Situm blockholder had bought a truck. He and the other settlers on his block started to build a garage for the truck outside the settlement alongside the Lae road near the Bupu River. The traditional owners immediately lodged a complaint at the District Office in Lae. Their rights were upheld and the garage was abandoned unfinished. The fact that they did not complain about the presence of food gardens would seem to indicate that they did not object to them. The second incident concerned gardens made by Situm settlers across the Bupu River and outside the settlement area. When I noticed these gardens I was told that approval had been given. This proved to be true and relationships between the owner and the settlers were cordial. Since agricultural officers realised that the same scarcity of land for food gardens would again occur if the settlers brought their entire extension blocks under coconuts, they were advised to reserve part for food crops.

During 1969-70 tasks for the Situm and Gobari settlers accumulated. In addition to the usual task of maintaining their coconuts, they had to extend their holdings, construct a school building and work on the school ground, prepare their old blocks for grazing, and build copra driers.

The loan money to employ labourers to clear the extension blocks, or at least part of them, was administered by the agricultural officer. He employed labourers for this purpose, but only \$4 was allocated for clearing and burning one acre and the workers who found this amount unsatisfactory soon left. Later in 1969 the settlers were allowed to ask relatives to help them clear the extension blocks. For this the relatives were paid, again by the agricultural officer. Since this system began after I had finished my field research, I do not know how satisfactorily it worked.

For the opening of the Situm school in early 1969, the settlers had to meet the requirements of the Department of Education by clearing the school ground, building a two-class school building and temporary houses for the teachers, and establishing their food gardens. They set aside one day per week for this work, which lasted from late 1968 to about May 1969.

At the same time a number of holders had to prepare their old block for grazing. The main task was to surround the block with a strong fence and build fences inside to separate paddocks. Several hundred posts of bush timber were needed for one block. They had to be made by hand by felling a tree, cutting the trunk into logs of about six feet, splitting these lengthwise into several parts, and fashioning the parts into poles. This was a very laborious and time-consuming procedure.

In one case I observed, cutting one pole took about sixty-three minutes. Then the poles had to be carried to the block, a deep hole dug and the separate posts connected by wire. Block-holders rarely assisted each other with this work. While most were helped by assistants, several holders and their wives had to do the work by themselves. The agricultural officer, noticing the amount of labour involved, made a chain saw available for a time to facilitate post-making.

Finally, the holders wanted to start building copra driers. After much deliberation the Administration decided to let each holder have his own drier. The holders themselves did not seem to have strong feelings concerning either individual or some form of joint ownership of the driers. The first one was under construction at the end of 1969, by which time I had left the settlements so I do not know how much labour was invested in it.

At the end of this period, only one holder had received his first income from coconuts, a total of \$15. Hence the identity of the holders was ambiguous. While they were firmly committed to cash cropping, to bisnis, and tended to regard themselves a bisnis men, with one exception they still had not received any returns, and accordingly had not really started their life as bisnis men. The ambiguity was aggravated by the fact that they had started developing their blocks a long time ago and felt they would soon be elderly men. These features of the identity of the holders probably contributed to the poignancy of many of their comments about the resettlement scheme.

Food gardens on a Situm block

This section illustrates how a block of land was sometimes used for food growing by people from several blocks; Map 4 shows the situation in July 1968. The block, marked P on Map 4, was skirted on its northern boundary by the road to Lae. Along its western boundary ran the internal Situm road, which at the time the garden survey was done had not been constructed. Part of its site was then used for gardens. The northern tip of the block was separated from it in 1968. On this tract the meeting house (a) was built and the lease over this area was transferred to the association of Situm settlers.¹ Boundaries of blocks were marked with concrete pegs. Usually pegs were placed on all the corners of a block and halfway along the long sides. On Map 4 are shown only those pegs which were observed while measuring the block. The boundary with the meeting house lot, which measured about 0.05 acres, was not marked on the ground.

The holder of block P lived in house (b). In house (c) lived initially one man, Gavin. He had been a labourer of two Situm block-holders before, but at the beginning of 1968 he was not employed. At the end

¹ See p.74 for a brief description of this association.

Map 4. Food gardens on a selected Situm block

of 1968 he became a kin-helper of Arthur, his father's brother's son.¹ Arthur had been a labourer of the holder of block Q, on which house (c) was built, but in 1968 he became a new block-holder. During 1968 Roy, a kinsman of Gavin, took up residence on the settlements, in Gavin's house. He also became Arthur's kin-helper. Still later Roy and Gavin were joined by the only labourer of the holder of block R. This man had so far lived in house (d), but he had to leave when the holder of block P (who had built the house) obtained assistance from his younger brother who went to live there. This man stayed only a short time, but the labourer did not return to his former house. Besides his younger brother, the holder of block P was for two weeks assisted by his wife's brother.

By July 1968 the holder had almost finished the development of his block. To the southeast of the food gardens a small area was still to be planted. According to the 1968 development reports, this area measured one acre. My wife and I did not manage to check this since the block was not well maintained. South of a line which ran parallel to the northern boundary of the block and which went through the mark X on the eastern border, the block was overgrown with secondary bush which we did not try to penetrate. Coconuts had first been planted in the northeastern part of the block and thereafter in the southern parts. In 1968 the food gardens and the area north of them were planted with coconuts. Only the northern area of the block was well grown with cover crop, mixed with pumpkin. The agricultural assistant attributed the poor maintenance of the block to the failing health of the holder. When he was still in good health, the assistant said, the block had been well maintained.

Data concerning the food gardens and their holders are tabulated in Table 2.4. The men mentioned in Table 2.4 include all adult men residing on blocks P, Q and R except the holder of block R, who had made gardens on his own block. The holders' families are divided into adults and children to give an indication of their food requirements.

Supplementary economic activities

The holders tried to supplement their monthly cash allowance by earning money in several ways. Firstly, most of them sold garden produce at Lae market. People went there by truck early in the morning and returned late in the afternoon. The fare from Situm/Gobari to Lae was 30c per adult or adolescent and 10c for one bag of cargo. They mainly sold traditional indigenous foodstuffs: sweet potato, taro, banana, several kinds of greens, and pawpaw. Harvesting and collecting these usually took one afternoon and often they had to be carried from the garden to the main road across the Bupu River. This still happened

¹ See p.41 for explanations of the terms 'labourer', 'kin-helper' and 'assistant', as used in this study.

Table 2.4

Food gardens on a Situm block

Garden no.	Size (acres)*	Holder	Holder's family	
			Adults	Children
1	0.8	Holder block Q (first wife)	3	5
2	1.2	Holder block P	2	2**
3	0.4	Holder block Q (second wife)***	3	4
4	0.6	Arthur [#]	2	1
5	0.3	Gavin [#]	1	0
6	0.1	Labourer of holder block R	1	0
7	0.1	Gavin [#]	1	0
8	0.1	Roy	2	0
9	Not known	Gavin [#]	1	0
10	0.01	Second labourer of block-holder Q [#]	2	0

* Acreage under cultivation at end of 1968 field work, not amount of land brought under cultivation during 1968.

** I did not include the holder's younger brother among the members of the family.

*** By the beginning of 1968 the holder had completed planting his block with coconuts. There were only old food gardens on this block and new ones were made both on block P and on Q's extension block. The size of the latter garden was about 2.0 acres in August 1968, and was being enlarged.

[#] Gavin's three gardens were of different ages: garden 9 was the oldest and was about to be returned to fallow. Garden 7 was the most recent one, made during June-July 1968.

[#] This man abandoned a larger garden near garden 10. Instead he joined the third labourer of the holder of block Q. This man has also made a food garden on the extension block of the block Q holder. The joint garden was still being enlarged when I left Situm in August 1968. Then it measured 0.5 acres.

after the causeway was built because it was sometimes flooded during the wet season. Returns from market sales were generally small. To gain an impression of earnings during one day at the market I asked several men to record the earnings of their co-residents. The mean of a sample of 75 earnings of people from eleven blocks was \$1.90. This mean was kept down by 11 earnings of people from Neville's block where very young children used to accompany elder children and adults to the market each with their own produce.¹ These children earned very little. When the earnings from this block are omitted, the average was \$2.13. Fares and a 10c market fee left a net earning of \$1.33. Furthermore, people often

¹ See pp.43-4.

spent 20c or 30c on food and drinks in one of the canteens near the market. Men and adolescent boys tended to go less to the market than women and girls. Most men said that their wives and children kept the money they earned, but some added they would buy not only things for themselves with it, but also for the rest of the family, especially food.

Some holders tried to increase their earnings by running a store. In February 1968, at the beginning of my first field trip, there were five stores in Situm and none in Gobari. In May 1969, at the end of the last trip, three of these stores were moribund, while three others had been started, one of them in Gobari. One of the stores was a co-operative run by the Situm settlers. Another was managed by a young man, living in his home area, where he ran several stores on behalf of his wantok settlers in Situm. All the others were run by individual block-holders. Since the operations of the co-operative store are relevant to the social relationships between settlers, data on this store are presented in Chapter 4. The following observations apply only to the other stores.

These stores all had small stocks of a small range of goods, and some had almost completely run out of supplies. Operating costs were very small: stocks were mostly kept in the home of the manager, while he himself, helped by his wife or one of his relatives, acted as store-keeper. Some managers, however, bought their supplies in very small quantities, thus wasting time travelling to Lae. No complete accounts were kept, except perhaps for one store (run by a clerk) which opened just before I left. Consequently I did not follow its operations. Two store-keepers kept the dockets of their purchases and, since I knew the prices at which they sold their goods, I estimated their annual turnover. Their profits were \$65.01 and \$161.26 respectively. It is doubtful, however, that these profits were realised. Settlers told me that in both cases customers made purchases on credit; in one the manager was reputedly often deceived, and in the other the young manager had stopped helping his wantok because they habitually used goods from their own store. Hence T.S. Epstein's remark (1968:73), based on her research among Tolai, that 'many small trade stores must be uneconomic propositions' would seem to apply to Situm and Gobari.

Another way of earning money was to organise a pilai, a feast. This Pidgin English term, which has a wider range of meanings (Mihalic 1957: 107-8), is derived from the English 'play', but in Situm and Gobari it is pronounced with the stress on the first syllable.¹ During a pilai, liquor and cigarettes can be sold and usually entrance fees are charged. There was, however, expenditure on food for guests and food and other rewards for helpers, and it is doubtful if much money could be made in this way.

¹ See pp.82-91 for a detailed description of a pilai held during my stay.

Some settlers earned money by raising and selling pigs. In 1968 twelve block-holders and four other settlers owned a total of thirty-one adult pigs. Settlers who did not keep them said that it was too much work or that it cost too much. Since pigs damaged young coconuts and food gardens if allowed to roam free, owners had to build enclosures and enlarge their gardens in order to feed the pigs.

On the advice of agricultural officers, a number of settlers had started growing pepper. The bushes grew well and most of these settlers harvested some pepper. Since there were marketing difficulties, interest was waning by the time I left the settlements. Pepper cultivation yields per acre are very high and consequently it would be regrettable if this venture were unsuccessful.

Several holders owned vehicles. Two of these had broken down and the owners could not afford repairs. Three other holders owned commercial motor vehicles for transporting goods and passengers. During my stay one of these also broke down and could not be repaired. The second, too, broke down and the owner could not afford to have it repaired, while the third needed occasional repairs. All three owners claimed they were running at a loss. They did not keep accounts so I was unable to check their statements.

Finally, one holder made and sold carvings. He said that for a large carving he might receive as much as \$20, but he did not disclose how many he sold.

These side activities took considerable amounts of time and effort and it might be argued that they diverted resources from the 'main' activities, namely coconut growing and cattle grazing, and hence were undesirable. Apart from the question of whether people, if they did discontinue such activities, would use the resources gained to develop their blocks, there are several reasons why holders were very likely to engage in such activities. Firstly, the idea that a man should concentrate on one venture rather than on several seemed foreign to them.¹ This may be due not only to lack of specialisation in Papuan and New Guinean cultures, but also to the fact that, for example, plantation owners, on whom the block-holders tended to model their behaviour, did not limit themselves to cultivation, but often ran trade stores as well. Secondly, although the returns from these ventures may seem small, they represented a proportionally large addition to the monthly cash allowances of the holders. Finally, and particularly regarding pilai, they were prestigious undertakings. Since it is still too early to say whether the main enterprise of the holders will be successful, and they

¹ This phenomenon has also been reported for other parts of Papua-New Guinea, by A.L. Epstein (1969:82) for the Tolai and Finney (1969:16) for the Gorokans.

consequently have not yet derived any prestige from it, it seems likely that they will try to gain prestige in ways already known to be effective.

Monetary assets and material possessions

Most settlers professed to be without money, but although it seems to me that their means were mostly very modest indeed, I am not sure they were as modest as many declared. For instance, during my stay one holder bought a truck on a \$300 deposit, which, he said, he and his family had saved from their market earnings. However, this man, Neville,¹ was head of a large extended family whose earning capacity was above average, notwithstanding the fact that the mean earnings of individual members were below average. Other holders had joined a savings and loan club and managed to contribute \$10 per month. Most holders had at least one savings bank account into which their cash allowances were paid. A few holders were not prepared to show me their passbooks, but one showed me three: the first in his own name, the second in the name of his son, and the third showed the deposits of a different savings and loan club of which a number of Situm settlers were members and he was treasurer. Into the first passbook the monthly allowance of \$8 was paid. The amounts shown were alternately \$8.17, \$0.17, \$8.17, \$0.17, showing the deposit and subsequent withdrawal of the monthly allowance. The deposit in the second passbook increased very slowly, at a rate of about \$1.50 per month. When I saw it in June 1968, the total deposit was \$58.91. The holder said that this money was earned at Lae market. The savings and loan club account showed that he and his wife, in separate amounts, had contributed a total of \$10.72. All passbooks I saw had deposits smaller than \$100, but since it is possible that the holders had other accounts, or were members in savings and loan clubs, or simply hoarded money, these figures may be not complete. As in the case mentioned above, the monthly cash allowance was mostly withdrawn very soon after it had been paid into the account.

Comparing the material possessions of the settlers in general with those reported by Hogbin (1951:21, 31) in Busama, a village south of Lae, shortly after the second world war, the settlers appeared to be little better off. It may be that Busama presented a favourable picture of the possessions of New Guinean villagers since, at the time of Hogbin's inquiries, they may have purchased many goods with war damages compensation. The settlers themselves felt their material possessions were poor. They often referred to the future when their blocks would yield revenue and they would be able to buy more and better goods. Sometimes they asked me prices of items of my field equipment such as a chair or stretcher.

¹ See pp.43-5.

All settlers wore inexpensive European-style clothing, often ragged and stained, and most were barefooted. On festive or official occasions men wore shoes and socks and long trousers, and sometimes a neck tie. Many men owned wrist watches, which they did not usually wear. Many people had umbrellas for protection against both rain and sunshine. A few men owned transistor radios. Block-holders who had been employed before they took a block mostly had chairs, benches and tables; others had just one or a few, or did without them. There were very few beds, and most people slept on mats on the floor, covered by a sheet or thin blanket and a mosquito net. Most families owned small hurricane lamps and a few owned pressure lamps; several of the latter were out of order and people could not afford to have them repaired. If they worked, they were mostly used only a special occasions. Usually people sat around in the evenings by the light of one hurricane lamp or the light of a fire.

For cooking open fires were most often used although there were also a few wood and primus stoves. The pots and pans were placed on metal grates. All families owned a fairly large array of saucepans, bowls, basins, plates, mugs, cheap metal cutlery and so on. The diet consisted mostly of traditional food, often supplemented with imported foodstuffs such as rice, tinned fish and meat, navy biscuits, bread and tea. Many men hunted regularly and supplemented their families' diet with possums and other small animals. Wild pigs had been plentiful in the jungle near Situm and Gobari, but as their numbers had decreased with intensive hunting they were shot only very occasionally at the time of my stay.

The holders also owned a considerable variety of tools such as axes, bush knives, hammers and spanners. Money to buy these was included in the development loan. In general, block-holders were better off than their assistants, who, as mentioned, received very small wages or none at all. They often had lived in a village, without a regular income, before they had become assistants, and therefore accumulated very few material possessions.

The loans also contained special allowances for house materials so most block-holders had purchased corrugated iron for roofing, a gutter and a rainwater tank, and timber for floors and walls. Many claimed to have spent more than the allowance. By 1968-69 most holders were living in the second house they had built in the settlement, and several were building their third. Their first houses had mostly been very temporary structures, hastily built of bush materials. Building of more solid houses was done intermittently and might take several months: three Situm houses which were under construction when I first came to Situm in February 1968 were not yet finished when I left in late August.

The following section describes the hamlet of one of the holders and his assistants.

Buildings and gardens in and near
Robert's hamlet

Maps 5 and 6 show the hamlet as it was in July 1968, just before Robert's pilai was held and Christoph transferred his marriage payment.¹ The long-term inhabitants at that time are shown on Genealogy 1.² In preparation for the two events, buildings III, VIII, IX, X and XI had been erected (see Map 5). House II was built in April 1968 for my wife and myself as an extension to house I. By July the hamlet formed the largest collection of buildings on a single block. It was also unique in that it was located near the centre of the block while most others were situated in one of the corners, along a road or a planned road. The buildings which were regularly used for sleeping (I, II, IV, V, VI, VII and X) were on stilts with the floor about four feet above ground level. The three cooking houses (III, VIII and IX) consisted of a roof with a raised floor over part of the interior. Guests sometimes used these platforms for sleeping. If weather permitted, the area between the houses was used for cooking, eating and talking. It was kept clean by the women and girls for whom sweeping was an almost daily task.

For all the houses mostly traditional materials were used (see Figure 1), although the building style has changed since pre-contact days. Only Robert's house (I) had walls made of worn corrugated iron, while part of Christoph's house (IV) was roofed with corrugated iron. Under the lowest side of this roof several drums were placed to catch rain water. The drums were old and, since the water in some of them was considered unfit for drinking, drinking water often had to be fetched from the Bupu River, about fifteen minutes' walk away. The only imported materials used extensively in the buildings were iron nails. Walls were made of roughly hewn bush timber or palm leaves, floors of timber or limbun (black palm bark), and roofs of thatch. Since Robert was supposed to have private funds, he had not received a development loan. Those block-holders who had received a loan had built houses with corrugated iron roofs, sawn timber and a water tank. Robert and his helpers considered these houses superior to their own and they were very apologetic about their dwellings. Robert repeatedly told me that when he received the loan he had applied for he would build a better house, as the other block-holders had done. While it is true that a house with a corrugated iron roof is generally hotter than one with a thatched roof, for the settlers an iron-roofed house was not simply a symbol of wealth and modernity, as Goodenough claimed (1963: 242) it was for the Nakanai of West New Britain. It offered practical advantages since it could provide a better water supply and required less maintenance.

Table 2.5 shows who used the houses and garden sites in the hamlet.

¹ See pp.82-91.

² See p.42.

Figure 1. Sketch of the construction of a house in Robert's hamlet

The sketch shows house X. The walls and roof are sketched only in part in order to show the underlying framework of saplings. The roof was made of thatch, and the walls of long pandanus leaves threaded between horizontal strips of timber. The door made of timber is not shown in the sketch. The house did not have windows. This house was the only one in the hamlet which had a central post. There were two sets of posts, one supporting the floor and, in part, the roof, and the other, including the central post, supported the roof only. Several other houses in the hamlet also had two sets of posts.

Map 5. Buildings in Robert's hamlet

Map 6. Robert's hamlet and surrounding area

Table 2.5

Use of houses and garden sites in Robert's hamlet

Persons	House	Sleeping room	Garden*	Cooking house
Robert	I	b	6	III
Robert's wife and children		a		
Christoph	IV	f	1	IX
Christoph's wife and daughters		e		
Boris	V	k	5	V
Boris' wife, daughter and step-daughter		h		
Boris' step-son	VI	j	3	VI**
Willie, his wife and son		i	4	
Sam and son	VII	m	2	VIII
Sam's wife and daughter		n		
Myself and wife	II	c		II**

* See Map 6.

** In these cases there was no separate cooking house.

Boris was the only man who had a co-resident adult son. The latter had his own sleeping room, while daughters and young sons all slept in the same room as their mother. In accordance with the traditional custom, married men, with the exception of Willie, the youngest one, did not sleep in the same rooms as their wives. The arrangements show the importance of the nuclear family in gardening and food consumption. If cooking was done outside, it was still done by separate nuclear families. Joint meals were held on special occasions only and even then, although the food was prepared and consumed simultaneously, families had their separate saucepans and often ate in separate groups.

Each of the six families had its own latrine and, in contrast to the case in many parts of New Guinea until after the second world war (Hogbin 1958:107), these were used.

Finally, in addition to the food gardens mentioned on Map 6, people had other gardens at some distance from the hamlet. This was partly because there were maturing coconuts near the hamlet, and partly because it was surrounded by kunai-covered land and people preferred to establish gardens in former bush areas.

Chapter 3

Intra-block contacts between settlers

As mentioned in Chapter 1, official resettlement policy, at the time Situm and Gobari were established, was that each block in a settlement should be allocated to an individual as head of a resident nuclear family which could develop it without assistance. The size of the blocks was determined by this ideal.

In Situm and Gobari the Administration policy has not been followed in every respect. For example, several holders did not reside on their blocks. More importantly, all holders secured help to develop their blocks, although they did not receive loan money for this purpose, and did not rely exclusively on their own, their wives' and their children's labour. One reason they could do this was that from 1962 to 1969 the nuclear families of six block-holders grew into extended families as the children of block-holders married. In addition, all block-holders obtained assistance either from other block-holders and their families or from outsiders, that is persons who otherwise would not have lived in Situm and Gobari. These outsiders are referred to below as 'assistants', but within this category I distinguish further between 'kin-helpers' and 'labourers'. Kin-helpers were kin of the holder they assisted, labourers were not. The terminology follows, to some extent, terms used by the Situm and Gobari settlers themselves. In Pidgin English they referred to labourers as lebo or boi. For kin-helpers there was no special word, but holders often introduced them as relatives who had come to help them: Ol i kam bilong helpim mi.

Because of the presence of assistants the number of residents in the two settlements was larger than might be expected. This number in May 1968, before the extension of the settlements, is given in Table 3.1, which also shows the number of absentee block-holders and other members of resident block-holders' families. Members of a family included husband, wife and children, and, if children were married, their spouses and children. Not included in these figures are a small number of short-term assistants, the members of the welfare society who did not live on its block, and the agricultural assistant and his family who lived on one of the blocks. The mean number of residents per block as shown in Table 3.1 was 10.4. The maximum number of residents per block was 41, the minimum 4.

Genealogy 1. Long-term residents on Neville's block
(for key, see Genealogy 5, p.68)

Table 3.1

Composition of the group consisting of Situm and Gobari block-holders and their families, and their assistants and their families

	Residents				Absentees			
	Men	Women	Child- ren	Total	Men	Women	Child- ren	Total
Block-holders and families	25	37	59	121	8	7	31	46
Kin-helpers and families	60	41	41	142				
Labourers and families	23	6	10	39				
Total residents	108	84	110	302				

Assistance with the development of the blocks resulted in a complex set of social relationships. In the present chapter I describe relationships between persons living on the same block, presenting first some case material from several of the blocks and subsequently numerical data and more general observations.¹

Case 1, Neville

Genealogy 1 shows the people living on Neville's block in 1968-69 and their kinship relationships. The group consisted of Neville and all his living siblings and their descendants, while several spouses of members of this group were themselves members of a similar group. It had 28 members and was the largest group of long-term residents living on a single block. Neville and Bruce and their children and children's children lived in one house and shared the same kitchen, so I have shown them as one household. Malcolm and his family lived in another house and cooked separately.

The marriages of Neville's three daughters, Bruce's second daughter and Malcolm's eldest son all took place after the group had settled on the block, shortly after the settlements were established. In all cases the spouse joined the group. Neville told me that he had asked his son-in-law to stay with him in order to help him with his bisnis. In 1968-69 there was close co-operation between the members of the group. In July 1968 Neville bought a truck with money which he and his helpers and accumulated by selling cash crops at Lae market. The members of the group had ample opportunity to go to the market for, since the households were large, the domestic tasks of an absent member could easily be performed by other members. Neville told me they had accumulated

¹ Co-operation between block-holders is discussed in Chapter 4.

about \$300 through the market sales. Two wantok block-holders helped with small sums and another \$300 remained to be paid. The truck was used to transport passengers and cargo in the Lae area. It was driven by Neville's third daughter's husband, while his second daughter's husband collected the fares. When I returned to the settlements in 1969, it appeared that the truck ran at a loss for Neville said that it needed many repairs which he could not afford. At that time the truck was not registered to transport passengers and cargo because Neville was afraid that the police would make him have the truck repaired before issuing him with a licence.

During my stay the group completed planting Neville's block with coconuts. Subsistence and market produce gardens had been made both on the extension block and on a neighbouring old block which was being developed more slowly. Bruce and Malcolm's eldest son unsuccessfully tried to obtain two of the new blocks: the Land Board considered the former too old and the latter too young to develop a block. Neville realised that his two blocks would be insufficient for his and his siblings' children and he said that, when other blocks were made available, he would tell his male kin-helpers to apply for one. Moreover, he claimed to have a large tract of land in his home area which he wanted to use for cattle grazing. His intention was to build up a large family enterprise and Bruce seemed to share Neville's feelings. However, since I talked mostly with these two men, I do not know what their sons-in-law thought about this.

Before he was granted a block, Neville had been a luluai and was active with road construction and bisnis promotion. From what he told me about his work in his home area, it appeared there had been quarrels about the management of a truck he had bought. This may have been one of the reasons which led him to apply for a block. Neville seemed to be the most powerful man among the people living on his block; the men in the first descending generation were all in their late teens or early twenties, while in his own generation his elderly brother, Malcolm, was an aged, very withdrawn man, who rarely left the block and who was usually referred to as 'lapun': 'the old man'. Neville's sister's husband, Bruce, was also a frail elderly man who usually did not assert himself. Since I could not closely follow the interaction of the members of the group, I do not know how far Neville's power extended.

On the whole, relationships within the group seemed amicable, but in 1969 there was a clash between Neville and Bruce over the use of money made with the truck. Bruce said that it was spent on food, but that it would be better to bank it or use it to pay off the loan on the truck. He said he was prepared to return to his village if Neville would pay him for his work on the block. The principle that long-term assistants had to be compensated for their work if they returned to their home area was established in another quarrel which I will present below.¹

¹ See pp.51-2.

The amount of money involved was considerable, and in this case Neville said that he agreed to Bruce's leaving, but as he did not have money to pay him, Bruce would have to wait for compensation. Bruce, who must have realised that Neville was not able to pay him, answered that he did not like this idea, since he might die soon and Neville would never pay. The argument developed into a stick fight and Neville hit Bruce on the brow. The two men had to be separated. This quarrel caused concern among the settlers and a special meeting was convened to settle the matter. Afterwards Neville and Bruce were reconciled, in the customary way, by exchanging money and shaking hands. Later their relationship seemed amicable again and there was no talk of Bruce returning to his home area. As shown below, most quarrels between holders and their assistants concerned either non-payment of wages, or the amount of work done by the assistant. By contrast, Bruce and Neville's quarrel concerned the management of their truck, which seems indicative of the closeness of their interests.

Case 2, Robert

While living in his home area, Robert established and managed an initially successful agricultural enterprise during the late 1950s and early 1960s. This was well known among the settlers and he was often admiringly referred to as the first indigenous person to start a bisnis in the Morobe District. He leased his block when he was still managing this enterprise and first sent his half-brother, Christoph, and his family to the settlement to start developing the block. Later his father's brother's daughter's husband, Boris, his father's father's brother's son's son, Sam, and his father's classificatory sister's son, Willie, were sent with their families (see Genealogy 2). The five families lived in separate houses as separate households,¹ and usually did not work together. Christoph did not know what year he arrived in the settlement, but the other three men said they came in 1964. With Boris came also two unmarried children of the first marriage of his wife, Nora. At first Robert himself came only occasionally, but he settled for a longer period at the beginning of 1966 after his enterprise had collapsed. As far as I know, he did not then intend to settle permanently, for he was trying to start another bisnis in his home area. During the first part of my stay this seemed to interest him more than developing a block. His comments on life in the settlements were sometimes unfavourable. He maintained that all he had to do in the settlement was sindaun toktok: to sit and talk, and that the settlers still led the same life as they had done in the village, 'Ol i sindaun nating': 'they just sit down and have no work'. However, in 1968, the people in his home area tried to revive bisnis without Robert's participation and in April 1969 Robert claimed that he would only develop his two blocks.

¹ See pp.36-40 for the arrangement of the houses on the block.

Genealogy 2. Long-term residents on Robert's block
(for key, see Genealogy 5, p.68)

Nevertheless, during a brief visit to the settlements late in 1969, the husband of Christoph's eldest daughter, who had married a few months before, told me that Robert had asked him to manage a cattle bisnis which he - Robert - wanted to establish in his home area.

On the surface, relationships between Robert and his kin-helpers seemed good, but in fact Boris, Sam and Willie were dissatisfied because they were not paid. They had formerly worked in Robert's enterprise in his home area and told me that then, too, his workers had been dissatisfied with rates of pay and that they had suspected that Robert i kaikai mani: was eating money, in other words that he was keeping too much of the profits for himself. I am not sure if discontent with the wages Robert had paid was as pronounced and general as Boris and the other two helpers suggested, but Robert himself also told me that his workers had been discontented. The three kin-helpers claimed that Robert still possessed money he had made with his bisnis and that he should have paid them with this money. Robert, however, claimed that when the three men went to the settlement, he had opened savings bank accounts on their behalf. This was denied by the other men. Robert claimed further that by 1968 he had spent all his money, in total about \$400, on the development of the block. Because he had private means at the time he had leased the block, he had not been able to obtain a loan, but during my stay he again applied for one to finance the further development of the old and also the extension block. He was finally granted a loan at the end of 1969.

Robert and his half-brother, Christoph, seemed to be on good terms: they had a joint bank account and co-operated closely during my stay. While Robert organised the pilai, Christoph prepared for a traditional ceremony which was held two days after the pilai. The two men helped each other with the preparations. I was reluctant to ask how much was deposited in their joint bank account. Robert spent more than \$100 on provisions for the pilai for which he had withdrawn money from the account. If the deposit was sizeable, it might have embarrassed Robert for me to know about this, since he had told me several times that he had no money left.

Before 1968, Christoph's son had also lived on the block but he had left before my arrival, reputedly because he was not paid by Robert. In 1969 he returned, but did not give much assistance to Robert, trying instead to find casual employment, at one time with a surveyor working in the Situm area. Boris, Sam and Willie also left Robert. At the beginning of 1968 Boris became manager for Sebastian, then a bank clerk working in Rabaul, who had recently taken over a block still partly covered with jungle. Boris, with help from Willie, slowly cleared it. However, at the end of 1968, Sebastian took a job in Lae and when he inspected his block, he expressed dissatisfaction with Boris' work and dismissed him. He claimed that Boris had not planted many coconuts, but only made food gardens so that he could sell garden produce at the market. Although Boris denied this, he did not pursue the matter. He

might have returned to his home area if the school in Situm had not been established. Because of this, several relatives who lived in a village without a school sent their children to him for schooling. Hence Boris stayed in the settlements, co-residing with Willie who had taken up residence on his new block at the end of 1968. Sam had also been granted a new block, but he died suddenly in 1969 soon after he started its development.

During my 1968 stay, while Boris, Sam and Willie were still his co-residents, Robert's block was not well maintained and this was partly attributed to the three men's unwillingness to assist him. During the four months I was there, only six days were spent extending and maintaining the coconut gardens. On these occasions Sam and Willie helped Robert, but Boris did not, although he did not work every day on Sebastian's block. However, I doubt if this amount of work was representative since during this period much time was spent preparing the pilai. Here again Willie and Sam helped Robert more than Boris did. Moreover, a large part of Robert's block was covered with kunai grass and Robert and his helpers considered these tracts unsuitable for coconut cultivation. Many of the young palms planted there had died, while many others grew very slowly and had yellow fronds. Accordingly in 1969 Robert concentrated on developing his extension block rather than his old block. In both years he extended the coconut plantings on his old block on tracts covered with kunai, but on my, admittedly leading, question whether this had been his own idea or that of the didiman, he answered that it had been the didiman's.¹

When I asked Willie why he assisted Robert, he answered that he could not avoid doing this since he lived on Robert's block. When I asked Robert why he had chosen Boris, Sam and Willie rather than other men to assist him, he first gave the reason that they were his kinsmen. Later he added that as Sam's and Willie's parents had died early, the two men had nobody to look after in their village and so could leave more easily. Finally he mentioned that the three men, in contrast to others, had not planted many coffee trees in their home village. If they had done so, they might have wanted to stay.

Robert was also helped by many short-term assistants, both kin-helpers and labourers. In 1965-66, shortly after he had taken up residence on the block, he had employed a number of labourers, whom, he said, he had paid about 50c per fortnight. They had stayed about one year and had left when his money was finished. There had also been kin-helpers, who, Boris, Sam and Willie claimed, had all left in anger over Robert's meanness, after which nobody had been prepared to help. Whatever the veracity of the former part of their claim, the latter part was incorrect, since

¹ The Pidgin English term for staff members of the Department of Agriculture.

in 1968 and 1969 Robert was again helped by a number of short-term kin-helpers. During my 1968 stay which lasted 110 days, Robert was assisted by eleven single men, two married couples and one teenage girl. Taking into account the length of time these people lived on the block, Robert had a mean work force of 4.1 short-term adult or adolescent kin-helpers during this period. Although their own reason for coming was to assist Robert prepare for the pilai, the kin-helpers also assisted him in making food gardens, and Christoph in preparing for the traditional ceremony.

In 1969 Robert asked another of his classificatory sister's sons to help him with the development of the blocks. This man was married with two children and his family also lived on the block. Finally, two close relatives living in his home area each sent two children to live with Robert so they could go to the new school at Situm. Their parents came often, both to see their children and to help make food gardens in order not to burden Robert with the provision of their food.

Case 3, Maurice

Maurice was a bank clerk. He lived in Lae and used to come to his block during leave and on weekends. He was married and had three young children. He started developing his block in 1964 without financial assistance from the Administration and by the middle of 1968 it was fully planted with coconuts. Then Maurice had six labourers, one of whom, Victor, had come in 1964, two in 1965, two in 1966 and one in 1967. For the development of the extension block he said he might employ more labourers. He told me he had taken labourers because he would have had no authority over kin and consequently they might have made unsatisfactory workers. Nevertheless they might have claimed part of the returns of the block. The labourers came from the same area as Maurice, and he had met Victor when he worked for a bank in Rabaul and Victor was a contract labourer in a plantation near Rabaul. Maurice deliberately employed labourers from the same area as himself as, in his view, one of the problems confronting Papua-New Guinea was that people from one area could not accept a man from another area as their superior.

Maurice came to the block most weekends, either alone or with his wife, to look after his assistants and to help them build a new house. His wife and her youngest child also spent several weeks on the block and Maurice was there for two weeks during his leave. He was not sure whether he would be able to complete the development of his blocks while working for the bank, but by the end of 1969 he had not resigned. He was still assisted by the same labourers.

Concerning wages for the labourers, Maurice first told me that he paid Victor \$2 per week and the others \$1, but later he said that he sometimes did not have enough money left and then paid less. He said he had not told them beforehand how much they would earn and it seems

Genealogy 3. Kin relationships between Margaret's wantok (for key, see Genealogy 5, p.68)

there was also no fixed pay day. For example, when Robert's pilai was held, Maurice and his assistants attended. The pilai was held on a Saturday, when Maurice usually paid his assistants. Since he was afraid that they would spend all their money on drinks, he postponed payment until the following Monday. On that day, however, Christoph held a ceremony for his in-laws. There was a traditional dance and Maurice and his assistants attended. Robert still had liquor left over from his own feast so he sold it to the guests. Consequently Maurice's assistants spent most of their wages on beer.

Five of Maurice's assistants were related to each other by kin ties and, although they came from the same area, they were not all from the same village. Maurice came to know them through Victor. The sixth assistant was a distant affinal relative of Maurice's wife. Like other assistants on other blocks, they earned additional income by selling cash crops at Lae market. They cultivated tracts on Maurice's own block, and also on two neighbouring blocks, as a group and shared the money they made at the market.

Case 4, Margaret

Margaret was the only woman block-holder in the Situm and Gobari settlements until the death of Sam whose widow subsequently became holder also. Initially, Margaret's husband had been a block-holder but he died in July 1963, a few months after he had taken up residence on the settlement. Margaret inherited the lease and she was thereafter granted a loan from the Ex-servicemen's Credit Board, smaller than the one her husband had been granted. Because of legal and administrative difficulties concerning the inheritance, the estate was not settled until the beginning of 1966 and payments of loan money commenced even later.

A few months after Margaret's husband had died, his brother Rufus came to the settlement to assist Margaret.¹ In 1968 the last remaining part of the block was planted with coconuts, but by that time Margaret and Rufus were on bad terms. Margaret said that Rufus did not help her any more and used her block only to grow cash crops for Lae market. Accordingly she did not want to pay him part of the monthly cash allowance. Rufus claimed that he had stopped working for Margaret only after she had refused to pay him.

The matter came to a head at the end of May 1968, when I was in Port Moresby. Margaret told Rufus that he should leave the block. Rufus protested against this to the agricultural assistant who called the

¹ See Genealogy 3, which shows not only the people residing on Margaret's block, namely Margaret and Rufus and their children, but also kin links with other wantok settlers. See also p.67.

settlers together in the meeting house. During the meeting Margaret admitted that Rufus had helped her when she had not yet received the loan money. The agricultural assistant said that hence she could only evict him if she indemnified him. He estimated that this might cost her up to \$500, a sum she was not likely to be able to accumulate. In his view, Margaret could prevent Rufus from working on her extension block and thus prevent him from acquiring an interest in this block. He advised both parties to stop quarrelling and urged that Rufus start working for Margaret again and that Margaret share her allowance with Rufus. His remarks were favourably received by the meeting, which tended to side with Rufus.

In 1969 Margaret and Rufus were still on bad terms. Rufus, who was still not paid by Margaret, was building a house on her extension block. This was against her wish, but Robert supported Rufus and Margaret felt unable to stop him. Margaret did not speak to Rufus and in general she did not take part in the affairs of her wantok. Her children, however, did, and although they sided with their mother, on the surface their relationships with Rufus and their other wantok seemed cordial.

Case 5, Alfred

Before he took up residence in the settlement, Alfred lived in his home area where he was a tultul. He developed his block more quickly than most block-holders. In 1969 he was among the first settlers to receive cattle, and the first to sell coconuts and to start building a copra drier. Both he and other holders attributed the quick development of his block to the assistance given by many kin-helpers. Alfred also claimed that he worked harder than other holders and that they were not adept in securing the assistance of their kin. According to my own observations Alfred and his family were very industrious. They did much work on the maintenance of their coconuts, and Alfred was one of the few holders who grew pepper. His wife and children often went to the market and their average earnings per day were \$3.33 compared to the general average of about \$2.¹

Alfred did not pay his kin-helpers because, he said, they were all descendants of his father's father's father and hence close relatives. If they had been more distant kin, he said he would have paid them. He claimed he would later pay his kin-helpers with returns from the copra which he would divide into three parts: one for his former helpers, one for himself, and one to be banked. During my field work he was helped by several short-term kin-helpers who stayed several weeks before returning to their home area. In 1969 Alfred obtained assistance from kin to clear his extension block, again before most other holders.

In 1968 Alfred's eldest daughter married Colin and he asked him to join him in the settlement. That year the young man divided his time

¹ See p.31.

between working on the block and working in Lae, but during 1969 his relationship with his wife deteriorated and he spent more and more time in Lae. Although both claimed they were incompatible, it may be important that Colin had been used to paid employment but was not paid for his work on the block. Alfred's attempt to make Colin live uxorilocally was only part of his efforts to make all his children and his two foster-sons live with him on the block. Jack, his deceased elder brother's son, had a job in Lae and lived there, apparently against the wishes of Alfred, who claimed that Jack would soon return to the settlement. Denis, a son by a previous marriage of Alfred's wife, had lived and worked in Port Moresby since 1954. He married a Papuan woman and they had one child and a foster-child. Denis was a fork-lift truckdriver and his wife a domestic servant. In October 1968 Alfred went to Port Moresby to urge Denis, whom he had not seen since 1954, to give up his job and come to the settlement. Denis first seemed to agree to this, but it was clear that he, and especially his wife, did not look forward to the move. From a purely economic point of view he would lose considerably since in the settlement neither he nor his wife would have a regular income. Moreover, neither had taken part in village life for a considerable time, and his wife did not speak Denis' mother tongue. After Alfred had left, Denis procrastinated over his departure, claiming that his employer first wanted to find a successor before he would let him go. In April 1969, after having urged Denis in several letters to come, Alfred made his wife, who had never left the Lae area, fly to Port Moresby. He said that Denis would bring her back. However, Denis did not want to go to the settlement, since he realised that it would be very difficult for him to leave again, and in the meantime he might lose his job. Hence his mother returned alone.¹

Relationships between Alfred and Denis had become strained. Denis felt that Alfred had tried to make him come to the settlement leaving his wife in Port Moresby. Alfred alternately blamed Denis' own 'big-headedness' and the latter's wife's counsel for his failure to come and help his father. Nora's son told me that before Alfred went to Port Moresby, his wantok had criticised Denis for not helping his foster-father, either financially or in some other way.

Alfred was emphatic that not only his sons, but also his daughters would co-reside with him after they had married. He said that in his home area his daughters would leave him when they married, but that in the settlements they could together work a bisnis. On the other hand,

¹ This happened while I lived in the settlement. My wife and I took part in the events since she accompanied Alfred's wife to Port Moresby after visiting me. When it became clear that Denis was reluctant to return with his mother, I arranged with my wife that she and Denis would bring her to the airport in Port Moresby, and Alfred and I would meet her at Lae airport.

he realised that his two blocks would be insufficient to provide for his entire family and he wanted to start another bisnis in his home area after developing the blocks. In October 1969 the weddings took place between Jack and Rufus' eldest daughter, and between Alfred's second daughter and Rufus' eldest son. Unlike the marriage of Alfred's eldest daughter, these were arranged, and the exchange of women between the two groups was also a traditional practice. I am not sure, however, if such linked marriages always took place simultaneously. Already in 1968 the betrothed girls had spent much time with the households of their future husbands and Alfred could expect the assistance of Jack's wife, his daughter-in-law, and occasionally his second daughter's husband.

Case 6, Charles

Charles was the only block-holder who kept a record of the number of assistants and the length of time they worked for him. During my 1968 field work he lived on his block with his wife, three children and one assistant who had first worked for Harold, another holder and a wantok of Charles. The labourer had left Harold, because, according to Charles, Harold did not pay him. From Charles he received \$3 to \$4 per month, and he had been with him for ten months. He had not broken his relationship with Harold completely and still occasionally worked on the latter's block.

The names, home villages and salaries of the many people who had assisted Charles were listed in a large accounts book. Since Charles himself could not write, he had to go to a classificatory brother in Lae for him to bring it up to date. When I saw the book during my 1968 field work, it mentioned that to May 1968 3 married couples, 13 or 14 men and 36 women had assisted Charles. He claimed that these people were all his kin. According to the entries in the book, he had spent \$395.80 on wages. Charles said that he had paid this money out of his monthly cash allowance and from what he earned at the market. The separate entries had not been totalled. Charles felt this was a deficiency and he was glad I was able to make the calculations for him. When I saw the book again in March 1969 no new entries had been made. Charles said that he would go to his relative in Lae to have it brought up to date again, since in the meantime he had spent another \$16 for assistance. His 1968 kin-helper was again with Harold, building a cattle fence, but two others had recently come from his home area. Charles did not know how long they would stay.

When I asked Charles why he kept these records, he said he felt that he should know how much money he paid to his assistants. I am not sure if he had another motive which may have led him to give fabricated data to his classificatory brother, so I cannot gauge the reliability of the book. Assuming that it is correct and that Charles' information about the wages he paid is correct, it is possible to calculate the mean number of his assistants. Since \$395.80 was spent at a rate of \$4 per

assistant per month or less, Charles paid at least 99 monthly wages. Since the expenditures were made during the 71 months from June 1962 to May 1968, the mean number of assistants employed during this period was at least 1.4. Finally, since at least 99 monthly wages were paid and there were 56 workers, their mean length of stay was at least 1.8 months.

Case 7, Kelvin

Kelvin was a sergeant third class in the police force who lived in Lae with his family. A large group of people lived on his block. In addition to a core of long-term kin-helpers, shown in Genealogy 4, there were short-term kin-helpers and also brief visitors, but I do not know if the latter assisted in the development of the block. The long-term kin-helpers did not all live permanently in the settlement since during part of my 1968 field work several people mentioned in the genealogy were absent. Nicolas and his wife spent $2\frac{1}{2}$ months in their home village, but people said that he rarely went there and that he had only gone because one of his in-laws had died. Other long-term kin-helpers who were absent during part of 1968 were Kelvin's classificatory sister's husband (A) and a classificatory sister's son (B), who both worked on the Lae wharf for several weeks. Three others had gone to their home village to help with the coffee harvest. In 1969 this general picture had not changed. By then there were several other short-term kin-helpers and Eric had become helper of one of the new block-holders, a wantok. I do not know if this arrangement became a long-term one, since the new holder complained that Eric spent little time on his block so he stopped paying him.

Kelvin had leased the block in 1962 when he was posted to New Britain, where he worked until the end of 1967. Until then he spent only a few of his holidays in the settlement, so was unable to direct the development of his block. By the time he took up residence in Lae, it was fully planted with coconuts. During my field work he visited the settlements only twice, both times on official settlement occasions. Nevertheless, Kelvin was not merely the nominal head of the settlers living on the block. In 1968 his kin-helpers did not apply for new blocks, and Eric told me that Kelvin had not liked the idea and would not provide money for the application fees. Kelvin said that he had wanted his helpers first to develop his extension block. He thought that by the time this was finished, it would be possible to apply for further blocks. It seemed that Kelvin was afraid his kin-helpers might neglect his two blocks if they had their own.

In 1968 a trade store was opened on the block and in this enterprise also Kelvin took a leading part. The initial capital was assembled by him and his kin-helpers on the block. Profits were to be deposited in a savings bank account of which Kelvin held the pass book. The trading licence was in Kelvin's name. He made the purchases for the store with the two store-keepers. The latter said that they had not been paid for their work so far and that this was a matter for Kelvin to decide.

Genealogy 4. Kelvin, his long-term kin-helpers and their nuclear families (for key, see Genealogy 5, p.68)

Kin-helpers and labourers

The dichotomy between kin-helpers and labourers was not completely clearcut. In one case a holder had employed a labourer for several years. This man said that he did not intend to leave the holder, who was sometimes referred to by other settlers as his 'father'. The labourer was unmarried and settlers told me that the holder was likely to help him accumulate a bride price if he wanted to marry. Hence it would seem that the labourer was being 'converted' into a kin-helper. Tables 3.2 and 3.3 contain data concerning long- and short-term kin-helpers respectively in 1968. In most cases, relationships between holders and kin-helpers seemed fairly good, although in the last two cases in Table 3.2 they were definitely strained.

The quality of relationships within the groups of block-holders and their kin-helpers is only one of the influences on the further existence of these groups. Kin-helpers may decide to return to their home village, for example for cash cropping, to get a block of their own, or they may leave to seek a job in town.

Table 3.4 shows information concerning labourers. There were a few short-term labourers, but I have not shown them separately. In the cases I investigated, short-term labourers were, firstly, men who had broken their relationships with the block-holder owing to dissatisfaction over wages; and secondly, wantok living and working in Lae who came to the settlements for a weekend or a similar short period. Lester especially had a number of such assistants. I do not know how many people helped the holders in this way and because of the short periods of time they spent in the settlements, I have not listed them in Table 3.4

Tables 3.2 and 3.3 show that, in mid-1968, 15 of the 29 block-holders, or 51.7 per cent, were assisted by long-term kin-helpers, while 11 holders, or 37.8 per cent, were assisted by short-term kin-helpers. Eight of these 11 were also assisted by long-term helpers. The mean number of adult long-term kin-helpers per block-holder was at that time $\frac{28 + 23}{29} = 1.8$. I cannot make an exact calculation of the mean number of adult short-term kin-helpers since I do not know how many short-term helpers assisted Kelvin. Using the figures of Table 3.3, in which these helpers are not accounted for and which are therefore conservative, the mean number was $\frac{32 + 18}{29} = 1.7$. Hence the total number of adult kin-helpers was 3.5. The figures in Table 3.4 also do not take all short-term labourers into account and for that reason the mean number of labourers was slightly more than 1.0, the figure which can be derived from the table.

Of the 29 block-holders, 22 were assisted, 15 by kin-helpers only, 4 by labourers only, and 3 by both labourers and kin-helpers. There were more kin-helpers than labourers and among the labourers there were

Table 3.2
Long-term kin-helpers in 1968

Block-holders			Kin-helpers					
Name	Residential status	Closest ancestor in common with assistant*	Men	Women	Children	Married couples	Length of assistance	Condition of relationship with block-holder
Neville	Resident	F	3	6	7	3	6 yrs	Continuing
Kelvin	Absentee	M, MM kin	6	6	6	4	6 yrs	Continuing
Edward	Resident	F	1	0	0	0	6 yrs	Continuing
Ivan	Resident	F	1	1	0	1	6 yrs	Continuing
Tommy	Resident	WF	3	3	5	2	Not known	One family to move to new block
Harold	Resident	WF	1	1	0	1	5 yrs	Family to move to new block
		FF	1	0	0	0	3 yrs	Continuing
Clarry	Resident	F	1	0	0	0	2 yrs	Continuing
Wallace	Resident	F	1	0	0	0	Not known	Continuing
Sebastian	Absentee	F	1	0	0	0	6 mths	Continuing
John	Absentee	F	1	0	0	0	6 yrs	Helper returned to home village, maybe temporarily
Charles**	Resident	Not known	1	0	0	0	10 mths	Helper later worked for Harold
Cecil	Resident	FF	1	1	5	1	Not known	Family lived part-time in own village, part-time on Cecil's block
		WF	2	0	0	0	4½ yrs	One man to marry daughter of another block-holder
Roland	Resident	F	0	1	0	0	1 yr	Continuing
Robert	Resident	M	1	1	3	1	4½ yrs	Continuing
		FF	(1)	(1)	(3)	(1)	4 yrs	Helper became manager for Sebastian***
		FFF	1	1	2	1	4 yrs	Family moved to new block in 1969
		FFF kin	1	1	1	1	4 yrs	Family moved to new block in 1969
Margaret	Resident	HF	1	1	4	1	5 yrs	Continuing
Total			28	23	33	16		

* The symbols in this column have the following meanings: F, father; M, mother; W, wife; H, husband. These symbols are used in conjunction with the term 'kin' where I do not know the kin relationship between holder and assistant although I do know the first steps along which the holder traced his relationship to his assistant. These relatives are indicated with the appropriate symbols. Where the holder was assisted by a married couple, with or without children, I tabulated the relationship with the husband.

** See pp.54-5. Charles was the only holder who paid his kin-helpers.

*** Not included in the total number of kin-helpers in this table, but listed among the labourers in Table 3.4.

Table 3.3

Short-term kin-helpers in 1968

Block-holders			Kin-helpers				
Name	Residential status	Closest ancestor in common with assistant*	Men	Women	Children	Married couples	Length of assistance
Roland**	Resident	WF	4	0	0	0	A few days
Cassius	Resident	F, WF	2	0	0	0	A few weeks
Harold**	Resident	W	1	1	0	1	A few days
Charles**	Resident	F	0	1	0	0	A few days
Wallace**	Resident	FF, WF	0	4	Not known	0	Approx. one month
Alfred	Resident	F, FF, FF kin	5	3	5	2	A few weeks
Kelvin**	Absentee	Not known	Not known	Not known	Not known	Not known	Not known***
Robert**	Resident	Not known	13	3	3	2	A few weeks to a few months [‡]
Margaret**	Resident	F	0	1	0	0	A few weeks
Edward**	Resident	Not known	7	2	0	2	Not known
Barney	Resident	Not known	0	3	0	0	A few months
Total			32	18	8	7	

* The symbols in this column have the following meanings: F, father; W, wife. These symbols are used in conjunction with the term 'kin' where I do not know the kin relationship between holder and assistant, although I do know the first steps along which the holder traced his relationship to his assistant. These relatives are indicated with the appropriate symbols. Where a holder was assisted by a married couple, with or without children, I tabulated the relationship with the husband.

** Also received long-term assistance from kin-helpers. See Table 3.2

*** There were a number of kin-helpers on Kelvin's block, but I do not know how many or how long they stayed.

[‡] These kin-helpers came to assist Robert with the preparation of his pilai, and Christoph with the preparation of the traditional ceremony.

Table 3.4

Data concerning labourers in 1968

Block-holders		Labourers							
Name	Whereabouts	Men	Women	Children	Married couples	Home area*	Length of assistance	Condition of relationship with block-holder	Wages per fortnight
Lester	Resident	1	1	1	1	<u>D</u>	6 yrs	Labourer to move to new block	**
		1	1	3	1	<u>D</u>	2 yrs	No changes	Nil
		1	1	1	1	<u>D</u>	6 mths	To follow first-mentioned labourer	Nil
		1	0	0	0	<u>D</u>	3 mths	Arrived during my stay	Not known
Maurice	Absentee	6	0	0	0	S-D	4 yrs (1 labourer) 3 yrs (2 labourers) 2 yrs (2 labourers) 1 yr (1 labourer)	No changes	One labourer usually \$4, the others \$2
Roland***	Resident	1	0	0	0	<u>D</u>	1 yr	Left Roland late in 1968 to work for Charlie	\$2
John***	Absentee	3	0	0	0	<u>D</u>	8 mths	No changes	\$4
George	Absentee	7	2	2	2	S-D (5 labourers) S-D (2 labourers)	6 mths	Two of the original 5 labourers left and were replaced by 2 others. Situation changed again in 1969	#
							1 mth		
Benjamin	Resident	1	0	0	0	<u>D</u>	6 mths	Left suddenly	\$4
Sebastian***	Absentee	1	1	3	1	<u>D</u>	6 mths	Dismissed early 1969	\$3
Total		23	6	10	6				

* D means labourer and block-holder from same district, S-D from same sub-district; underlined symbols mean they did not come from Morobe District.

** Lester and his labourer told conflicting stories about wages: Lester said that, before his own arrival at the block in 1965, he had paid him \$6 per fortnight, and after that he started paying him \$3 and his wife 50 cents. Since, according to Lester, the couple had worked less and less, he then paid first \$2 per fortnight and later nothing. Lester's labourer told me that he had never received more than \$2 per fortnight and later nothing. He said he intended to claim part of the returns of the copra.

*** Also had kin-helpers. See Tables 3.2 and 3.3.

Also conflicting reports about wages: George claimed that he had promised and paid his labourers \$1 per fortnight. His labourers claimed that for four months they had only once been paid \$2.50, whereas they had been promised \$12 per fortnight.

many more unmarried men than among the kin-helpers. Labourers were often bachelors of marriageable age; in three cases they seemed to me to be beyond the usual age of marriage. However, this can be an impression only, since I do not know the cultural background of these men. Labourers tended to come from the same district as the block-holders for whom they worked, and in many cases from the same area.

During my 1969 field work, the number of long-term assistants had slightly decreased because several had become block-holders. Three of the four block-holders who had lost assistants in this way had acquired new assistants. There was still the same movement of short-term assistants.

Table 3.5 shows additional data concerning assistants prior to 1968. These data are incomplete and cannot serve as a basis for calculations, yet they may give a better idea of the amount of assistance and some of the problems accompanying it.

Table 3.6 shows a strong, positive correlation between the rate of development and state of maintenance of a block and the amount of assistance a holder received. I classified as 'good' blocks those in which planting of coconuts had been completed or virtually completed and where secondary regrowth and/or cover crop were regularly cut down, and 'bad' blocks as those where this was not done. I omitted 5 intermediate cases. Application of this test in 1968 and 1969 yielded identical results. The amount of assistance a holder received did not depend solely on the number of his assistants, but also on the quality of his social relationships with them. This was apparent in Robert's case. He was the only holder with many assistants whose block was classified as 'bad' in Table 3.6, Part A. The figures in Part A show that some block-holders who received little assistance had nevertheless managed to develop their blocks well. This implies there is no perfect positive correlation between the two variables. In that case, and supposing the amount of assistance is the independent variable, the distribution would have been as shown in Table 3.6, Part B. The degree of correlation between the two variables can be expressed by means of the ϕ coefficient, which equals $\sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{N}}$ (Ferguson 1966:236-9). In case of perfect positive correlation, ϕ would have reached its maximum value, in this case 0.92; in case of absence of correlation, it would have been zero, since in this case χ^2 equals zero. In case of the distribution shown in Part A, ϕ amounts to 0.68.

The settlers themselves considered the amount of assistance to be a crucial variable in the rate of development and state of maintenance: the more money a holder disposed of, the better the state of his block, since with his money he could employ more labourers. However, since I am unaware of the exact incomes of the settlers, I cannot test this hypothesis.

Table 3.5

Assistants of Situm and Gobari block-holders prior to 1968*

Block-holder	Assistants and wages (where known)
Lester was assisted by	: a number of <u>wantok</u> labourers for periods varying from one weekend or a few days to several months. He paid no wages.
Cassius	: some labourers who left after one or a few months when they realised wages were poor.
Frank	: a number of labourers. He claims to have paid \$150, mostly savings from his former job.
Maurice	: one labourer, later employed by Roland.
Benjamin	: at least three labourers who left because of dissatisfaction over wages.
John	: one full brother, who stayed for several years, and one labourer.
James	: one brother with his son, who helped him for one month. He paid no wages.
Bandy	: two labourers for 2½ years. He paid about \$1 per fortnight.
Tommy	: several affinal kin-helpers.
Barney	: eleven kin-helpers. He paid no wages.
Ivan	: five kin-helpers. He paid no wages.
Dick	: one kin-helper and ten labourers. He claims to have paid \$450, most of which were the savings from his former job.
Wallace, a <u>wantok</u> of Charles	: had kept incomplete accounts for 1965 and 1966 showing he spent \$151 on wages for assistants. The separate entries were added up, but some of the calculations were incorrect. Wallace said he had been assisted by women only and that their wages had been \$1 per fortnight. He said he had earned this money at Lae market.

* See also the case studies of Robert (pp.45-9), Alfred (pp.52-4), Charles (pp.54-5), and Kelvin (pp.55-6).

Table 3.6

Relationship between amount of assistance and rate of development
and state of maintenance of blocks

	Little assistance	Much assistance	Total
A. Observed distribution			
'Good' blocks	3	13	16
'Bad' blocks	8	0	8
Total	11	13	24
B. Distribution in case of hypothetical, perfect positive correlation with the amount of assistance as the independent variable			
'Good' blocks	0	13	13
'Bad' blocks	11	0	11
Total	11	13	24

Assistants usually earned money selling cash crops at Lae market. For most kin-helpers, who, as mentioned above, did not receive regular wages, this was their only source of income. While short-term helpers did not have their own food gardens, they were often allowed to sell crops harvested from the gardens of their hosts. Most block-holders also paid the travel costs of their kin-helpers from their home area and back, and lent them tools during their stay. Since many assistants went to the market once a week, they spent one and a half days per week harvesting crops and selling them. Many also had their own food gardens and the time they spent establishing and maintaining these further reduced the amount of assistance they could give to their block-holder/employer.

Numerous quarrels occurred between holders and their assistants, mostly concerning insufficient remuneration (especially wages), insufficient work, or both. These quarrels relate to Gluckman's suggestions (1965:199-201), based on his work among the Barotse in Central Africa, and on incidental references by other anthropologists to other peoples, concerning the moral quality of social relationships in societies with simple technologies.¹ There contractual relationships are regarded in the same light as status relationships such as those between relatives,

¹ See, for example, ter Haar on Indonesian customary law (1948:131-2, 139), Bohannan on the Tiv (1957:131), and Fortes on the Tallensi (1945:245).

whose behaviour towards each other is measured against elaborate moral standards which require people to act in ultimate good faith (Gluckman 1965:172, 182-4). Complaints by one party are phrased by the other party as failures to comply with these standards. These observations refer to contractual relationships concerning objects, such as sale and barter, but since Gluckman sees their specific nature conditioned by the social setting in which they occur rather than by the type of prestations which they entail, it seems justifiable to apply them to contractual relationships concerning labour.

In Situm and Gobari conditions of labour were not clearly defined and, in the case of labourers, wages were often not fixed in advance. This perhaps indicates that the parties expected each other to behave in good faith. However, several holders, talking about their labourers, told me: 'I first look and see how the boy works and then I pay him accordingly.'¹ This statement seems to indicate that such holders were sceptical of the good faith with which their assistants would implement their obligations. On the other hand, other holders told me that they had employed labourers several times but that they had left when they discovered their wages were very low. This seems to indicate that the labourers did expect, or were at least hoping for, a reasonable payment without explicitly demanding it when they started work. In two cases, wages varied with the state of finances of the holder/employer: this suggests the generosity which, according to Gluckman, is part of the moral code likely to prevail in these relationships. Hence, although there may be a greater wariness among block-holders, greater than Gluckman's suggestions seem to imply, the stress on morality was apparent in relations between holders and labourers.

The 1968-69 quarrels between holders and assistants may well be intensified in future years when the blocks are producing and the block-holders are perhaps financially better off. Quarrelling might become very intense between holders and unpaid kin-helpers who appeal to kinship obligations when claiming part of the returns of the block. A number of holders told me that they would share the returns with their kin-helpers. If this occurs generally, difficulties may arise if yields are smaller than expected.

The presence of many assistants on the blocks may well frustrate one of the principal aims of the resettlement policy: to provide a nuclear family living in a rural area with a sizeable income. This frustration has been reported by Cheetham for the Popondetta settlements.² Another

¹ 'Boy' is a term by which many expatriates in Papua-New Guinea refer to and address male Papuans and New Guineans of whatever age. The Situm and Gobari settlers tended to use the term to refer to male Papuans and New Guineans in subordinate positions.

² See Crocombe (1967:209-10).

threat to this aim was the fact that the families of a number of block-holders had grown into extended families, and especially threatening was the way in which this was taking place. From 1962 to 1969, 8 marriages took place between children of settlers and outsiders and 4 between children of settlers. Among the 8 former marriages were 6 marriages of daughters of block-holders, but in all 8 cases the spouses took up residence in the settlements. If this trend persists, the number of people who will earn their income from the blocks will increase greatly. The aim of the block-holders, who were the heads of these families, seemed to be to build up large family enterprises. However, it is not certain that they will be able to expand their undertakings sufficiently to provide for all members of their families.

In Situm and Gobari there was a felt economic need for assistance. To a certain extent this need could have been lessened if the blocks had been cleared and planted before the holders arrived, or if they had helped each other more in developing their blocks. Such co-operation could have provided an additional spur to work, since the inactivity of a block-holder not only led to his failure to develop his block, but also to his failure to meet obligations to his fellow holders. Communal work parties were not easy to organise, however.¹ In addition, the economic need for assistance may have resulted from the incapacity of holders to assess the amount of work involved in developing their blocks. This incapacity is difficult to overcome. Finally, especially among holders who lived in their home area immediately before taking up residence in the settlements, there may have been a felt need for the company and co-operation of close relatives. One way to provide for this need to be near close kin could be to allow members of an extended family to resettle as a unit on a group of blocks. Such allocations could be made alongside allocations to separate nuclear families. In Situm and Gobari it seems that Neville's and Kelvin's families might have profited from such an arrangement.

¹ See pp.102-4.

Chapter 4

Inter-block contacts between settlers

Inter-block contacts between settlers are analysed in six sections. In the first I discuss relationships between the settlers at the time Situm and Gobari were established, and the development of inter-block relationships from 1962 until 1968. The next three sections, on the situation in 1968, consist of an outline of inter-block contacts, a statistical analysis of interaction between settlers, and a description of two feasts held in the settlements. The fifth section deals with post-1968 developments, while in the last I mention factors which may have influenced the pattern of inter-block relationships between the settlers.

Inter-block relations, 1962-68

Before the establishment of Situm and Gobari in 1962, most of the future block-holders knew some or even many of the other holders. It is difficult to judge, however, how close such relationships were. All but one were ex-servicemen and many had met while they were in the service, or after they had left and had taken up employment in Lae. The ex-servicemen there formed a branch of the Papua-New Guinea Ex-servicemen's Association which in the 1960s established a fully licenced and much frequented club in Lae. Many settlers maintained their membership of the association and took a lively interest in its affairs while living in the settlements.

The block-holders also came from a limited number of home areas, and wantok settlers were often kin. For example, Robert and the other four holders from his home area all came from three neighbouring villages. Most of their assistants came also from these villages. All these settlers were related by kinship ties and most took part in the business activities Robert stimulated or managed before he left for the settlement. I do not know why the block-holders came from these villages only: carriers and servicemen had also been recruited from the other villages in the area, but for some reason did not want to take up blocks. Genealogy 3¹ includes kin relationships between Robert and his wantok.

¹ See p.50.

The genealogy shows only close links. One wantok holder, Barney, who, as far as I know, had no close links with the other members of the group, is not mentioned in the genealogy, which furthermore shows only a small proportion of the assistants. In 1968-69 new links were established by means of the intermarriages of Rufus' and Alfred's children. A third marriage was contracted between one of Cecil's kin-helpers, a younger brother of his wife, and Barney's eldest daughter. The groom, however, left shortly afterwards for Port Moresby to find work there, claiming he wanted to divorce his wife. It might be supposed that these arranged marriages were deliberate attempts to strengthen the links within the group of wantok, but I could not elicit explicit statements to this effect.

Another example of kin ties between block-holders is presented in Genealogy 5. Of the five block-holders included in this genealogy, Roland, Cassius and James claimed to have maintained close relationships before 1962. Roland and Cassius worked in Lae, James in Wau. The latter told me that he had heard about the availability of blocks near Lae from the other two men. Frank did not maintain contacts with the other men. He was not from the Morobe District, but had lived there since the second world war. Before he took up residence on the settlement he worked near Finschhafen. Sebastian was not an ex-serviceman and was not one of the original block-holders. He obtained his block by buying the lease from the original holder who did not want to develop it. At the time of the purchase, Sebastian was a bank clerk, and he and the original holder were both living in Rabaul, where they came to know each other because they were both from the Morobe District. According to Sebastian, he had heard from Maurice, another Situm block-holder and also a bank clerk who had formerly worked with him in Rabaul, that the original holder had not developed his block. This is the only case I heard about future block-holders knowing each other through employment in private enterprise.

Most block-holders took up residence on the blocks during 1962 and 1963. In accordance with the land resettlement policy, they were required to live on their own blocks. There are some indications that the settlers thought that they should not only live by themselves, but also that they should not help each other in developing their blocks. Mr H. Dunstan, the agricultural officer who was the first supervisor of the settlements, told me that it was very difficult to get the settlers to co-operate;¹ another agricultural officer, Mrs M. van Schilfgaarde (then Miss M. Mason), who investigated social interaction among the women settlers, reported that the women maintained that they interacted very little, and only worked on their own blocks.² They said they did this on instructions of Administration officials. Some men made the

¹ Personal communication, 8 August 1968.

² Department of Agriculture file 33-1-A(20), 5 October 1965.

Genealogy 5. Kin relationships between five block-holders

Key for genealogies 1 to 5

same claims, although communal work did occur at this period.¹ During the investigation it appeared also that many women not only did not know each other's names, but also did not recognise each other from photographs. Mrs van Schilfgaarde attributed this to a large extent to the lack of a general lingua franca. Less than half the women knew Pidgin English and during her inquiries she had to use eight languages. In 1968-69 this situation had changed markedly: very few women did not know Pidgin English, while most had at least a working knowledge of it, and several used it fluently.

Mr Dunstan actively promoted the social interaction of the settlers. In 1963 he made an inquiry into the pattern of social relationships in the two settlements, particularly to find out which settlers would be accepted as leaders by the others. The aim was to find men who could act both as spokesmen for the settlers, communicating their problems to the agricultural officers, and as spokesmen for the agricultural officers, communicating their plans to the settlers. The establishment of these positions meant that for the first time the settlers had to manage affairs in common, since the resettlement policy had not provided for such affairs. For his inquiry Mr Dunstan employed a questionnaire technique, then used experimentally by the Department of Agriculture. He first asked each settler questions such as, 'Who is the best male worker in Situm and Gobari?', 'To which settler would you go to discuss your problems?' and so on. The questions were formulated in such a way that in each answer one particular person was to be indicated. It could then be calculated how many times a particular person was indicated and by whom. From the distribution of these indications conclusions were drawn concerning the existence of sub-groups and the most influential men among the settlers. I doubt if this method will always produce the correct result, since it takes into account only what people say they will do in a number of hypothetical situations, whereas they may act in a different way when the situation actually occurs. However, it seems likely that agricultural officers compare the results with their own observations of interaction among the investigated group.

The inquiry resulted in the nomination of three outstanding block-holders, two from Situm and one from Gobari. All three were still prominent in 1968-69. Frank had then become a councillor of the Huon Local Government Council, Julius was president of the Lae branch of the Papua-New Guinea Ex-servicemen's Association, but Alfred had become dissatisfied with the other settlers, and refused to hold a number of official positions.² From the beginning Alfred's and Julius' blocks were among the best developed and maintained ones in the two settlements. Frank's block was well maintained in 1963, when he still had the money to employ labourers, but it was badly neglected by 1968. The three men

¹ Personal communication: van Schilfgaarde, 18 July 1969.

² For reasons discussed on p.73.

were all fluent orators. Alfred and Frank were two of the eight Situm block-holders who regularly contributed to discussions during the meetings of Situm settlers. Frank considered himself the best speaker of all and he prided himself on his ability to be articulate in front of Europeans, especially important visitors to the indigenous ex-servicemen's club in Lae. Despite his lack of formal education, he could be very communicative and sophisticated in his views. He felt, for example, that the Administration had to favour European over indigenous businessmen, since Europeans paid much more tax money and hence the Administration was dependent upon their continued prosperity. On another occasion he told me that the Administration was reluctant to provide the indigenous settlers with money to employ labourers for the development of their blocks because they would enter into competition with the European employers; this would displease the latter, since, in Frank's view, labourers would prefer to work for indigenous employers. To give an impression of his eloquence, I include the following speech which Frank made on 30 March 1969 in the meeting house in Situm. Shortly before, he had been elected a member of the Huon Local Government Council and he said he intended making similar speeches during council meetings. Several times he asked me to play the tape recording of the speech (which he himself had requested that I make) in the presence of other settlers to convey to them how he would represent their interests in the council.

Frank spoke without any preparation, and little hesitation. The subdivision into ten paragraphs is my own in order to facilitate comparison of the Pidgin English original with the English translation.

1. Mipela i gat liklik wari long wok bilong mipela, long sevis man. Mipela i kamap na kisim wok long 1962 long Jun. Mipela ronim wok i kam nau, painim seven yia nau. O i go...disela 69 i go kamap bai painim gen et yias nau long Jun. Tasol wok bilong mipela em i no kamap gut, long sevis man. Olsem, na mipela i tinktink yet.	1. We, servicemen, are a bit concerned over our work. We came and started the work in June 1962. We kept working until now, for seven years now. Oh, this year 69 goes by and we will now start the eighth year in June. But the work of us, servicemen, does not come to much. Thus we are thinking.
2. Ol Yuropian save wokim wok olsem wonem long sevis man na mipela, Papuan na Nuginian, i save wok olsem wonem? Na wok bilong mipela, em i save westim taim. Na mipela i no holim profet yet na mipela i stat yet long seventies, na i kam nau.¹	2. In what way do the Europeans make the ex-servicemen work, and we, Papuans and New Guineans, in what way do we work? Well, our work wastes time. We have not got returns and we now begin the seventies and [returns] come now.¹

¹ This translation may be incorrect. I interpreted 'returns' as the subject of the last clause, but it also could be that 'the seventies' is the subject.

3. As bilongen em i olsem: wanwan man, wanwan meri, bisnis i no inap i ken kamap gro gut.¹ Wan yias yu ken putim wan handet kokonas, na yu go narapela yia, yu ken putim wan handet kononas moa, na narapela yia gen yu ken putim wan handet kokonas. Em i no ken kamap wankain.
4. Fis yia yu putim em i kamap hai, karim. Na sekon yia yu putim, em i kamdaun, i no yet. Na namba tri yia yu putim, em i kamdaun liklik, namba fo yia, em i kamdaun liklik tumas. Disela kain namba yumi ken painim bisnis olsem wonem?
5. Fis kokonas bai mi salim, na narapela em i redi, na narapela em i liklik yet, narapela em i liklik yet. Mipela pilim dispela em i no gut. Taim mi wok i go pinis, mi kam bek gen long klinim behain, na blok pastaim em i stap, bikas em i samting bilong wanwan man; em i no stret. Na mi go bek gen long pastaim na blok bihain nu bus kalamapim gen.²
3. The reason for this is: with one man, one woman the bisnis cannot possibly get going well.¹ In one year you can plant 100 coconuts and then the next year you can plant 100 more coconuts, and the next year you can again plant 100 coconuts. They cannot grow evenly.
4. Those you planted the first year have grown high and bear. And those you planted the second year are not so high, those you planted the third year are small, those of the fourth year are still smaller. With this sort of amounts, how can we establish a bisnis?
5. [From] the first coconuts I can soon sell, and the next are ready and the next are still small and the next are still [very] small. We feel this is not good. When I have finished development, I come back again to clear the extension block, and no work is done on the first block, because it is [the work of] one man; this is not right. And [then] I go back to the first block and the extension block is again covered by new bush.²

¹ The rendering of the last clause is hypothetical, since it was spoken with great rapidity and I could not closely follow it.

² This part of the text is not entirely clear to me. In the above translation 'blok bihain' is taken to refer to the extension block, and 'blok pastaim' to the old block. However, the sentence Mi kam bek gen long klinim bihain does not seem to fit very well in this translation, since this indicates that he went back again there, whereas he had not yet started work on this block. Alternatively blok pastaim may mean the first developed part of the old block, and blok bihain the last developed part. Then, however, it would be unclear why Frank would have to clean first the last developed part of the block and subsequently the first developed part.

6. Sapos yumi kisim to tri man, em i orait. Mi ken sanap, to tri man wantaim mi wokim i go, samting i ken kamap gro wantaim.
7. A tink Yuropian sevis em i wokim narakain. Na gavman, taim em i kamap i laik kisim wok, na gavman i ken gipim mani olgeta. I stap long poket bilongen, em yet i pe lebo, na em yet i pe liklik kar bilongen, ruskar bilongen,¹ na ronim bisnis i ken kamap wan yia. Na tu yias em i gro nau, tri yia em i redi nau.
8. Na bikos em i klinim oltaim, em i gat big lain, em i save wok bisnis, em i ken klinim, na mipela wanwan man i no inap. Olsem, na dispela i hevi i stap long mipela, na mipela laik... mas tokim gavman long disela samting.
9. Yuropian em i kirapim narapela kain, na yumi, Papuan Nugini, kirapim narapela kain. Bisnis em i no gat pe. Yuropian em i ken sindaun gut, bisnis bilongen i ken gro kwik. Na mi tupela, Papua Nugini, stil wokim yet.
10. I go taim mi tupela i dai, bihain bai pikinini i kamap, gavman bai i gat narapela kwestion long pikinini. Tis we, na mipela olgeta sevisman
6. If we would take two, three men that would be alright. I can stand up, two or three men do the work with me, and [the coconuts] can grow evenly.
7. I think the European servicemen work in another way. And the government; when he turns up and wants to start work, the government can give him all [his loan] money. He has it in his pocket, he himself pays all his labourers, and he himself buys his small car, his rusker¹ and runs his bisnis which can be established in one year. And in the second year it grows, the third year it is ready.
8. And because he can clean them continually he has a big group [of labourers], he is able to work bisnis, he can clean. And we, by ourselves, cannot cope. Thus, and this problem I think stays with us, and we like... must tell the government about it.
9. The Europeans establish one kind [bisnis], and we, Papuans and New Guineans, establish another kind. [Our] bisnis does not yield returns. The Europeans can live well, their bisnis can grow quickly. And we, Papuans and New Guineans, have not yet finished development.
10. By the time we two [man and wife] die, afterwards the children will come; the government will have another problem with the children. This way [it goes]

¹ Frank may refer here to two cars: first to a sports car, for the planter's personal use, and secondly to a cargo vehicle (personal communication: H. Dunstan, 9 June 1970).

nau mipela tinktink planti
yet. Mipela mas askim gavman
long disela samting.

and all of us, servicemen, we
are still thinking a great deal.
We must ask the government about
this.

After their nomination in 1963 the three men were referred to as komiti, committee men. Judging from the information I collected in 1968, their most important task was the organisation of communal work parties. In Gobari, people worked together in one group; in Situm, in three. There the three groups comprised neighbours, but, since people holding neighbouring blocks were often wantok, the groups contained also a high proportion of people coming from the same home areas. Both in Situm and Gobari communal work was discontinued, firstly, because some holders had one or a few assistants while others had not, so the latter were offered more help than they could return; and secondly, some holders were said to have been unwilling to return the help they had been given by other holders. Van Rijswijck (1967:224) reported that, in the Bakoiudu resettlement, a communal work system broke down because of, among other things, the 'uneven contributions of work, aggravated by the absence of co-ordinated supervision'.

In Situm an executive committee was formed with Frank as chairman, James as secretary, an agricultural assistant as treasurer, and Alfred as deputy chairman. The Situm settlers started also to pool money, firstly in small amounts. This money was held by Frank, who deposited it in a savings bank account. In 1965 it was decided to build a club and to establish in this building a trade store to be managed by the association of settlers. The building could also be used for secular and religious meetings. The settlers agreed to pool money collected on the basis of \$10 per male adult settler, whether block-holder or not, and \$6 per female adult settler. Most block-holders and their wives paid the whole of these amounts, but most of the other settlers only part. At about the same time Frank resigned over a financial controversy. I was told that he had been too authoritarian and had tried to force the settlers to work. The same was said of Alfred who resigned a year later. The two men themselves said that the other settlers had been unwilling to work hard, and Alfred was dissatisfied with them because they would not listen to his suggestions while he was a komiti.

The construction of the club building went ahead and its official opening was marked by a large feast, a pilai, attended both by settlers and outsiders. Subsequently a trade store was established. The building, referred to by the settlers as klup, was situated along the main road in Situm (see Map 4). It measured eight by ten yards and was the largest building in the settlements and among the best built. It was designed and constructed by the settlers themselves (see Figure 2 for a plan of the building). The roof consisted of corrugated iron, the floors and parts of the walls of sawn timber and other parts of the walls of woven reed strips. The building contained three rooms, one for meetings, one for the trade store, and one for various purposes

such as storage and accommodation for guests. The meeting room was accessible from two sides. In the meeting room along the outer wall of the building, a wooden bench was constructed with woven jalousies over the bench. The interior wall opposite the bench had a hatch from the store and a blackboard. Over the hatch was a photograph of Queen Elizabeth. When both men and women were present, the men sat down on the bench, and the women against the opposite wall on the floor, or on the steps outside. Very occasionally after a meeting, when only a few people were present, a woman sat on the bench. During the monthly visits of the ante-natal nurses, when only women and their small children were present, women did use the bench. The club was called the Sigubum settlers' club, a title derived from the names of the three settlements near Lae: Situm, Gobari and Bumbu,¹ but the building was used mainly by the Situm settlers.

In the following pages I refer to an association of Situm settlers. I conclude that such an association existed because there were meetings, office bearers, elections, pooling of money in a savings bank account and so on. However, the association did not have a name (until almost the end of my field work I mistook the name of the club for the name of the association); as far as I know, it was not started at a specific point in time, and it did not have explicit aims.

During the first year of its existence, the store was managed by an agricultural assistant and yielded a good profit. However, there were difficulties finding a good store-keeper. Within two years five successive appointments had to be made. All five store-keepers were in their late teens or early twenties. Two were dismissed because they were considered to be dishonest, and one was forced to resign by his father, Charles, when the latter resigned as chairman of the settlers' association. The fourth store-keeper, who was married, resigned because he disliked being away from his family. A fifth store-keeper was appointed in February 1968 and he still had the job when I left the settlement in May 1969. After the agricultural assistant was reposted and management was taken over by one of the settlers, the store languished until the end of 1968.

During the period 1965-68 the association suffered further setbacks. A number of officials resigned after their proposals were rejected by other members of the association. Charles and Maurice, the successors of Frank and the agricultural assistant, resigned when they could not convince the other settlers that prices in the store should be increased in order to raise profits. I do not know the specific reason why a third treasurer resigned. When I asked him, he answered: 'Ol i toktok tumas.' This expression might be translated as: 'They speak too much' or 'They want to have things their own way only'. I heard the same expression used by other settlers when complaining about the association.

¹ Bumbu was the smallest of the three settlements and closest to Lae. I did not visit it.

Figure 2. Plan of the klup in Situm

Several plans formed by the association did not eventuate. For instance, a proposal to pool money to buy a truck was accepted but only \$10 was collected. Another plan was to obtain a liquor licence for the association and for this purpose a separate lease was obtained for the land on which the club house was located. However, the people decided to postpone the application for a licence, since they wanted to rebuild the club and preferred to obtain the licence afterwards. The new club was to be built in the community centre of the two settlements. The centre was being established during the first half of 1969, but the construction of the new club had not started.

When I arrived in 1968, community life on the Situm settlement was at a low ebb and during my field work the situation became worse. The club store remained a failure. There were few goods in stock, so revenue was small and few new goods could be bought. The settlers distrusted the secretary of the club committee who had taken over the store management, after a treasurer had been suspected of dishonesty. The secretary argued that the store could not make much profit since the turnover was so small, while the operating costs, primarily the salary of the store-keeper and transport costs of the goods, were high. He tried to keep accounts of store transactions and operating costs, but since he did not know how to add the separate entries up, this was of little avail. Moreover, he did not ask the store-keeper to record the sales. Since he had kept the dockets of the purchases for the store, I could find out how many goods had been bought, for what prices and on what dates. Since I knew the selling prices and apparently complete records were kept of the operating costs, I could thus calculate gross and net profits. Assuming that in May 1967 there was no money in hand, which is probably a conservative estimate of the then financial position of the store, and taking into account all income and expenditure, I calculated that in May 1968 approximately \$130 should have been in hand. The actual amount, however, was \$37.12. Hence it does seem that the store was mismanaged, through dishonesty, incompetence in dealing with money, or a liberal provision of credit. According to the settlers, this last practice was very frequent and led to correspondingly big losses. They considered that persons with no debts could buy on credit, but objected to repeated purchases on credit. It was impossible to find out exactly how much credit had been given. I did not try to investigate this in 1968, but in 1969 the store-keeper had made a list of purchases on credit. According to this list, the total amount outstanding was \$7.80. The maximum amount owed by one person was \$2.60 and other settlers considered this a serious matter. The amounts mentioned in the list and the concern about a debt of \$2.60 seem to indicate that the settlers exaggerated the amount of sales on credit and the losses possibly resulting from them. However, it may be that the store-keeper, realising that he might be criticised for selling on credit, had not mentioned all such transactions in his list. While it is true that his accounts were checked by the agricultural assistant, I do not know how accurate he was. The young store-keeper found it difficult to refuse

credit, especially to block-holders much older than himself. He said that he did not know how to counter the argument which prospective buyers sometimes used that since the store was established with the money of the settlers, they should have the right to buy there whether or not they were temporarily out of cash.

Block-holders played a more important role in the association than assistants. Only holders, referred to as papa bilong graun: the 'fathers of the land', held positions and they took the most prominent part in the discussions during meetings. Eric (see Genealogy 4), who was literate and sometimes led lotu,¹ was the only assistant who often took part in discussions. The most frequent speakers were Frank, Robert, Alfred, Maurice, Charles, Cassius, Benjamin and Lester. All had been, or were still in 1968-69, office bearers. Speeches by assistants were tolerated, but bad speakers among them were slightly ridiculed. Once, while an assistant was speaking during a meeting, I overheard Frank whisper, 'That is enough now, do sit down'. On another occasion he told an assistant that he should stop speaking and make tea for the men who had come for the meeting as he had done during previous meetings. Women were not permitted to speak. In a few cases I heard them interjecting, which led to vehement replies from their husbands that women were samting nating, of no account, and could not speak in public meetings.²

In 1968 none of the settlers was able to inspire the others by proposing a programme for the conduct of common affairs which they were prepared to endorse, in other words there was no leader around whom the settlers could rally. The functions of the executive committee were then narrower than they had been when Frank was the chairman. In 1968 its only task was looking after the club building and it did not concern itself with the organisation or supervision of work on the blocks. In February 1968 it was decided to reintroduce this supervision through the election of a komiti bilong graun, a committee man for the work on the blocks. For this position Roland was elected. Since Roland's block was badly neglected and he was not held in high regard, I doubt if the Situm settlers at that time really wanted to have an effective komiti bilong graun. Roland was ineffective, partly because after a quarrel with another block-holder he retired from public life. Roland also used to lead the lotu, but after the incident he discontinued this and few services were held, thus reducing the number of occasions on which the settlers could meet. I observed elections only during my 1969 field work.³

¹ Religious services held in the club on most Sundays.

² Although they did vote in elections, see p.101.

³ See p.101.

In addition to the committee of the meeting house, which had three members, and the komiti bilong graun, there was a committee to look after the land on which the meeting house was built. This committee also had three members, although it had very little to do. The only time I noticed its existence was when the rent over the meeting house lot had to be paid. There were also two komiti bilong stoa, who were inactive after a disagreement over the way the store was managed. The only komiti who spent a sizeable amount of time on his official work was James, the secretary of the meeting house committee, who also ran the store.

The failure of the association to provide a framework for community activities was, in the view of the Situm settlers, accompanied by a deterioration in their social relationships. Most quarrels had arisen in relation to the association. Apart from some minor quarrels mainly resulting from pigs venturing outside their owners' blocks and one drunken brawl during a party, I heard about only one other case of trouble between settlers from different blocks. This originated when a few non-Morobe settlers, coming from a district which I will refer to as the Z District, had told one of the daughters of Neville, a Morobe settler, that she was very good-looking. In a crude reference to the bride price, they had asked her how much she might cost. Neville took this as an insult. He said that, if one of the men had been really interested in marrying his daughter, he would not have treated her, as he put it in Pidgin English, olsem pikinini pig: as the young of a pig, but would have approached him, her father, to talk it over. Against this, the Z District people held that they had not been serious but that Neville and his wantok could not distinguish earnest from joking. On Robert's initiative money was exchanged in early 1967 in an attempt to settle the animosity between the Morobe settlers and the non-Morobe settlers, which resulted partly from this quarrel, and partly from the difficulties in the settlers' association. It was also decided to abandon the practice of distinguishing people according to their home areas and instead to regard them as fellow settlers. This decision was, of course, difficult to implement and during my field work a person's misdemeanor or supposed misdemeanor was still often attributed to his coming from a specific area.

Robert and his wantok formed a separate group among the settlers in which primarily Robert himself, but also Alfred, played a prominent role. The group held several ceremonies and meetings together on Robert's block. Its members helped Robert build a house for me and prepare his pilai; they assembled hurriedly when Cecil became ill and had to be transported to the hospital in Lae. After the meeting held in the meeting house to discuss the trouble between Margaret and Rufus,¹ Robert said that he had not attended because settling the quarrel was

¹ See pp.50-2.

a matter for wantok. A settlers' meeting, he argued, was only required if there had been more serious trouble, for example if blood had been spilt. After the meeting in the meeting house there had been another one, convened by Alfred and himself, on his own block, during which they had discussed the matter again. Robert said he disapproved of Margaret's action and wanted to protect Rufus against her. Although I lived on Robert's block and therefore could observe his social relationships more intensively than those of the other settlers, I doubt if other wantok groups in the settlements showed the same degree of cohesion. Nor was there such a dominant individual as Robert in these groups. Even so, not all his wantok participated in the group activities to the same extent; Barney, for instance, was often absent. He was criticised for this and considered to be a 'bighead'. Margaret also was usually absent after she had failed to evict Rufus.

While sometimes settlers were classified according to their home districts, they might be further distinguished according to their home areas within the districts, or to particular villages or sub-areas of origin.¹ The drunken brawl mentioned above was described by the settlers as a fight between two groups of settlers from two different areas within the Morobe District. It would be an exaggeration to speak about a segmentary system with three taxa, since often people from Z District were contrasted, not with Morobe settlers as a whole, but with a group from a particular area in the Morobe District. Finally, settlers classified themselves sometimes as man bilong bus and man bilong nabis, people from inland and people from the coast. This criterion was often used to indicate which settlers were lazy, viz, the coastal people, and which were industrious.

Kinship terms were most often used between wantok only, but occasionally I heard non-wantok address each other in such terms. This is possible because of the extensive applicability of the terms. For example, several times I overheard a non-Morobe settler, married to a Morobe woman, being addressed as tambu (brother-in-law) by settlers from the Morobe District who said that such usage was acceptable because they were married.

While the Situm settlers were in a sombre mood about their communal undertakings and about life in the settlement in general, in Gobari the situation was more favourable. Here the communal work system had also been discontinued, but unlike Situm, the Gobari settlers did not seem to regard this as a failure. I was told that the system had simply turned out to be unworkable and for that reason had been abandoned. In Gobari there had been no efforts to establish a settlers' association. Julius, the komiti who was appointed in 1963, had remained in office. His job amounted to little, since there were few communal undertakings and few quarrels among the Gobari settlers. Since I lived in Situm I

¹ See pp.23-4.

had less opportunity to study Gobari and hence am cautious about presenting conclusions about this settlement. My impression is there were fewer tensions among the Gobari settlers and that the quality of the social relationships among them, in their own opinion also, was much better than among the Situm settlers. This was also Dunstan's observation in the 1962-66 period.¹ The settlers themselves were aware of these differences between the two settlements. Van Schilfgaarde mentioned, moreover, that at the time of her 1965 inquiry, there was more interaction among the Gobari than among the Situm settlers.² Finally, the Gobari settlers had been more successful in developing and maintaining their blocks. These contrasts between the two settlements constitute a problem to which I will return in the final section of this chapter.

Outline of inter-block contacts in 1968

During my 1968 field work which lasted for sixteen weeks, 8 lotu were held in Situm, 6 during the first eight weeks, before Roland retired, and 2 afterwards. There were no lotu held among the Gobari settlers, and they did not attend the Situm lotu. The lotu were followed by meetings during which points of current interest were discussed. Sometimes these meetings were formal in the sense that they were led by a chairman and that agenda points might be announced beforehand. Sometimes they consisted of informal discussions running from one subject to another. In addition, five other meetings were held. Three were in expectation of visits by officials concerned with the two settlements, the fourth was convened by the agricultural assistant to discuss a quarrel between the settlers, and the fifth was convened by the settlers themselves to discuss the management of the store. One of the first three meetings was also attended by the Gobari settlers. As far as I know, they held two other meetings in Julius' house in Gobari. Among the topics discussed during the Situm meetings were the store management, the construction of an extension to the meeting house, the construction of a chapel, the provision of a drum of kerosine for the school teacher's lamp so he could study at night, the purchase of a money box to lock up money collected during the lotu, and the prohibition on individual settlers selling goods in the club store. The issues were discussed at length, sometimes for two meetings, and often no decision was taken. During the meetings held before the Administration officials visited, people discussed aspects of the resettlement policy, especially those they disliked.

The Situm and Gobari settlers went together to Lae to be interviewed by the Land Board and many took part in the Anzac Day memorial march

¹ Personal communication, 16 July 1969.

² Department of Agriculture file 33-1-A(20), 5 October 1965.

and the accompanying festivities.¹ Most settlers also went to Lae market once a week. They travelled together on one of the bisnis trucks and occupied the same corner in the market place.²

As far as Situm was concerned, inter-block interaction for economic purposes was very limited. I heard of about fourteen working parties in which men from different blocks participated. There may have been a few more, but if so, these were very small. The Gobari settlers denied they held such parties, and I did not observe or hear about any. Five of the 14 Situm parties were organised by Robert to build my house, 3 again by Robert to prepare for a feast, 3 by different block-holders again for house-building purposes, 2 by the agricultural assistant to promote the development and maintenance of the blocks, and 1 by a block-holder for the same purpose. Only the 2 parties organised by the agricultural assistant included block-holders from different home areas. Seven of the 8 parties organised by Robert included people from his home area only, and for the eighth he asked another block-holder to send him six labourers. The same procedure was followed by the organiser of the last-mentioned party. The other three house-building parties also comprised only people from the same home areas. Hence, co-operation in working parties was most pronounced among settlers from the same home areas, and occurred least among block-holders from different home areas.

During my 1968 field work, settlers also met at two pilai and one traditional dance, and I organised a farewell party in the meeting house. Of these four parties, the Gobari settlers attended only the last one. A pilai is a gathering organised by one or a few men assisted by their wives and adult children and by kin-helpers and labourers. It is held mostly in an enclosure and those attending have to pay to enter. Inside string bands play, there is dancing, and drinks are for sale. In many ways the pilai I observed resembled the feast witnessed by Crocombe among the Orokaiva (Crocombe 1966), but there are two important differences. Firstly, it is an institution in which people from different ethnic groups actively participate. While van Schilfgaarde reported³ that the settlers greeted her suggestion that they 'unite for a singsing' with 'amazement and distrust', they do readily join a pilai, which forms

¹ These are held each year on 25 April to remember the Australian military personnel killed in war action. The name and date of the celebrations refer to the landing in Gallipoli of the Australian New Zealand Army Corps on 25 April 1915.

² Van Schilfgaarde reported that even in 1965 the settlers did not use the same corner, but tended to sit down together with their wantok from their home areas. She felt that, at that time, settlers went to the market to meet their wantok rather than to earn money (personal communication, 18 July 1969).

³ Department of Agriculture file 33-1-A(20), 5 October 1965.

a new, common element in their cultures. This is also true with regard to the music and dancing: string bands may include people from one or several areas, but the music they play is considered the same and people do not distinguish dance styles on the basis of home areas. Secondly, pilai have a strong economic orientation. While Crocombe (1966:78) suggested that the organiser of the Orokaiva feast wanted to 'reaffirm his prestige and reinforce his stake in the village of his residence', a Situm settler organised a pilai not only to raise his prestige but also to make money. When talking about pilai they stressed especially the financial motive. Pilai were seen as bisnis ventures. I use the Pidgin English version of the term deliberately, since the English 'business' refers to related but not identical phenomena. Bisnis, for many settlers, comprised not only running a trade store or planting and selling cash crops, but also working as an agricultural officer or as a pastor. In this context I will not present an exhaustive analysis of the concept, but mention only that ideas about bisnis and doing bisnis are also new elements common to diverse New Guinea cultures. The successful bisnis man enjoys high prestige, basically because of his proven ability to establish a bisnis venture. He is admired and envied for the money he makes, by means of which he can finance further bisnis and ultimately gain a way of life exemplified by a good house, good furniture, good food, seeing places and events, and so on.

Most settlers said they did not know the origins of the pilai, although some said it had been introduced from early developed areas, such as parts of Papua and the Gazelle Peninsula. One man added that its organisation was modelled upon that of the shows held in many of the towns in Papua-New Guinea. To give an example of a pilai and the way it is organised, I present the following description of the pilai held by Robert.

Robert's pilai

The pilai was held on 27 and 28 July 1968, and was prepared in conjunction with a traditional ceremony held by Robert's half-brother, Christoph, on 29 and 30 July. Christoph was one of Robert's four long-term kin-helpers (see Genealogy 2), but he was the only helper with whom Robert was on good terms.¹ The preparations took several months. When I arrived in Situm on 11 April 1968, Robert was already being visited by a number of short-term kin-helpers, one of whom told me that he had come to assist Robert prepare his pilai. However, the first activities I noticed in preparation of the two events took place on 16 May, when people started the construction of a house to accommodate guests coming from their home area for the ceremony to be held by Christoph. Until then Robert's guests had assisted him with the preparation of food gardens.

¹ See pp.47-9.

The construction of the guest house was completed by 27 May. Simultaneously other preparations were made. On 17 May Robert organised a working party to clear the area where the pilai was to be held, which was about 200 yards from his and his assistants' houses. During this party Robert was assisted not only by his long- and short-term kin-helpers, but also by his wantok settlers, namely the settlers from his home area living on other blocks. On 22 May the first firewood to be used during the pilai was collected and brought over in large bundles to the houses of the settlers. During the following ten weeks more and more firewood was collected. During May the men were also busy making food gardens. Most of the food to be consumed during the two feasts was already planted, however, while the food planted with the help of the guests during my stay was either consumed later or sold at the Lae market. During June the preparations continued with the construction of two cook houses, one for Robert and one for Christoph. The guest house and cook houses were built almost entirely with bush materials. On 12 June a second working party was held to finish clearing the pilai ground. Again Robert was assisted by both his wantok settlers and his guests. Three days later the first yams to be eaten during the festivities were harvested. In Robert's home area yams were and still are the most highly valued root crop, eaten on special occasions only. Initially the yams were stored in the houses, but in late June a special platform was built and the tubers were placed on top, covered with leaves.

Robert did not own pigs and, to be able to provide pork during the pilai, he had to spend much time and effort buying one. On 16 June he went to a neighbouring village in an unsuccessful attempt to obtain a pig. He spent from 20 June until 26 June in his home area, primarily to investigate the reported suicide of one of his near relatives, but simultaneously trying to buy a pig, again without success.

On 10 June and 26 June he sold large quantities of sweet potatoes at Lae market to obtain cash, which he needed to buy food stuffs such as rice and meat for the pilai. Both times he sold about twenty bags, each containing about twenty-five pounds of potatoes. His guests helped his wife carry the bags to the Bupu ford where they were picked up by one of the bisnis trucks. I estimate that the sweet potato sales yielded about \$20.

On 5 July Robert and his short- and long-term helpers widened the track which led from the main road to their houses and which was to be used by the feasters. Three days later a third and final working party was held, attended not only by many of Robert's wantok, but also by the six labourers of Maurice, a nearby block-holder. That day the banis, the fence enclosing the feasting ground, was built. It was roughly ninety feet square and consisted of saplings, coconut fronds and other bush materials. Lavish meals of rice, tinned meat or fish, tea, sugar and bread were offered during each of the three working parties.

Judging from the amounts consumed during one of the meals, I estimate that they cost Robert \$5 each.

On 11 July a bar to serve drinks was built in the banis. The next three days Robert and most of his wantok went to their home area to attend a pilai held there on 13 July. Most people returned the next day. The following week several fom, coarse tables and benches, were made and placed inside the banis, a few rubbish pits were dug and a number of food platforms were erected. Finally, two latrines were dug. On Saturday 20 July, Willie, one of Robert's long-term kin-helpers, shot a wild pig. Most of the pork was smoked and preserved for the pilai.

The next day a lotu and a meeting, both organised for the occasion by Robert, were held on his block. Normally lotu and meetings are held in the meeting house. The service proper was led as usual by Roland. Afterwards, during the meeting, Robert made a speech stating he was about to hold the pilai and explaining the reason he had organised it, namely his wife's recovery from an operation. He invited the settlers to help him hold the pilai, which implied that he asked them for financial support.

On 23 July Robert left again for his home area to buy a pig. This time he was successful and he returned the next day. The following few days were spent making the final preparations.

Guests coming from Robert's home area to attend one or both of the coming festivities started to arrive during the week. Ultimately there were about eighteen adult guests. I am not sure how many children they brought with them. Guests stayed with the families of Robert and his four long-term kin-helpers, but mostly with Robert and Christoph.

The pilai started on Saturday 27 July at about 8 p.m. and lasted until about 7 a.m. on Sunday 28 July. That particular Saturday was chosen because the previous Thursday was pay-day for the Administration employees, so it was supposed they would have money to spend. Christoph held the traditional ceremony the following Monday. It was followed by a traditional dance which lasted about the same length of time as the pilai.

The two festivities were held during the wet season and the preparations were hampered by rain. For example, during the 25 days from 1 to 12 July and 15 to 27 July there were 8 days of almost continual rain and 10 more during which it rained part of the day. The day before the pilai it had rained and on the day itself there was rain until about 2 p.m. and again during the pilai, and attendance was poor because of the bad weather. That morning it seemed very much as if the feast would have to be postponed. Since it was dry during the afternoon, and many guests and visitors had already come and announcements had been made, Robert decided to go ahead with the feast. His decision to hold the pilai in the wet season was covertly criticised.

On the day of the pilai and the following day, a number of food and money transactions took place. On the morning of the pilai, Robert asked Sam, Willie and me each to make lists of all the contributions his own and Christoph's supporters had given him. He dictated the amounts of the contributions and the names of the supporters, instructing us to distinguish between contributions towards his own pilai and those towards Christoph's ceremony. We had to distinguish further between contributions of his wantok, regardless of whether they lived in the settlements or in their home area, and block-holders from other home areas. Assistants of these block-holders did not make contributions. Christoph was supported only by wantok. Like Robert himself, the fourteen block-holders supporting him came from Situm. Their contributions are shown in Table 4.1. Robert's wantok guests all supported him with money: there were eight contributions varying from 50c to \$12. Christoph had eight supporters whose contributions varied from \$1 to \$20. Some men supported both Christoph and Robert.

Table 4.1

Contributions of Situm block-holders to Robert's pilai

Block-holders	Contributions
4 holders from Robert's home area	2 contributed \$2*
16 holders from other areas	8 contributed \$1 each
	1 contributed food
	1 contributed food and one carton of beer
<u>20 total blockholders</u>	<u>6 did not contribute**</u>

* The two holders who did not support Robert supported Christoph.

** Four of these were absentee holders.

During the day Robert and Christoph presented their supporters with gifts of food. Wantok and non-wantok were clearly distinguished. Before noon the wantok received non-traditional food, uncooked rice and tins of fish. Later, at about 1 p.m., the non-wantok block-holders who had supported Robert were presented with parcels of food, as listed in Table 4.2.

The distribution proceeded in the following way: the parcels of food were first laid out on banana leaves. Then Robert asked me to call out the names of each of the non-wantok block-holders who had supported him and who I had entered on my list. Robert said to follow this procedure to ensure that none of the supporters would be passed over. Each holder whose name I called out came to collect a parcel. All left almost immediately afterwards, taking the parcel with them and leaving only Robert's wantok behind.

Table 4.2

Food gifts made by Robert to non-wantok Situm
block-holders supporting his pilai

Contents of parcel	Approximate value (cents)
20 pounds sweet potato	35
4 pounds taro	15
4 pounds yams	Not known
4 navy biscuits	5
2 pounds white rice	20
1-15 oz. tin mackerel	20
Pork	Not known
Total value	95+

At about 2.30 p.m. Robert and Christoph started to distribute the ingredients of a traditional meal to their wantok, including yam and other tubers, greens and pork. When presented, the food was ready to cook and it was prepared immediately afterwards and eaten by the recipients. I did not follow this distribution closely and I do not know how much food each received.

The statements of the Situm settlers make clear that they had fairly uniform ideas about how a pilai was to be conducted and in fact the four pilai I attended showed many identical features. All four were held on a Saturday night following the gavman fotnait, the pay-day for Administration personnel. Not only local people attended, but other from further afield came also, often by truck. During the Situm pilai many guests came from Lae. On principle everybody was welcome, but there were no expatriate visitors other than my wife and myself. At three of the four pilai there was an entrance fee of 20c which was charged until about 12.00 p.m. or 1.00 a.m. Afterwards entrance was free. At the fourth pilai a banis had not been constructed and there was no entrance fee. However, the price of the beer sold at this pilai was initially fixed at 40c per bottle, which most people considered too high. The feast ground was dimly lit with one or two pressure lamps and a few smaller lamps in the bar.

In all four cases the feast began very slowly. At first the proportion of small children, especially boys, was very high, but later more and more adolescents and adults arrived. Many more men than women entered the banis, while the number of middle-aged and elderly women was very small. During one of the pilai I noticed that many women were sitting in small groups outside the banis so they could hear the festive sounds inside.

A number of tim, string bands, were present at each pilai. Some were specially invited and expected to be provided with benches to sit and play on. They consisted of about ten young men, some with guitars,

some with ukeleles, a less costly but also less versatile instrument. They sang to their own playing. Musicians could attend the pilai paying sometimes a reduced fee, sometimes no fee at all. The bands played successively, in a fixed order. They had very limited repertoires and often repeatedly sang the same tune with different words.

The feasters danced to the music. Most people danced by themselves. To me their dancing seemed either directly or indirectly fashioned on the 'twist'. Crocombe (1966:76) reported that during a modern Orokaiva feast people attempted modern-style Polynesian dancing. Since I do not know this type of dancing, the same may have been the case during the four pilai. Only a few women danced, most in a stiffer manner than the men. Women sometimes danced together. Very occasionally a man danced with a woman. Young boys were especially enthusiastic dancers.

At the bar many alcoholic beverages were available. Beer was most in demand. At three of the four pilai it cost 30c per 12 oz bottle. At the fourth the price was initially 40c but to stimulate sales it was lowered to 30c. Other drinks, mostly rum, gin and sherry, were served in quantities costing 10c, 20c, 30c and 40c. From one normal-sized bottle, containing 26 oz, about 59 10c nips were served. Most people drank 10c nips, sometimes in rapid succession, although the size of the drinks increased progressively with the price. There was a limited supply of glasses or plastic mugs in the bar, but people often finished their drink in one gulp and returned the mug immediately.

Since the main attractions of the pilai were the drinking and dancing, and women rarely took part in either, it was understandable that many women did not enter the banis.

During one of the four pilai food was served before people entered the banis; with the other three the wives and daughters of the organiser and his assistants went around offering food a few hours after the feast had started. There was both traditional food such as taro, yam, pork and game, and European-type food such as rice, bread and tea.

As a pilai was usually attended by people from different areas, the organisers were well aware that after people had been drinking, fighting could start, especially between different ethnic groups. In three cases a speech was made by a man belonging to the organising group in which he stressed that fighting was wrong and should be avoided. Objections against fighting were partly for practical reasons: it was felt that during and after fights people would drink less than if the feast proceeded in an orderly manner, and that, therefore, profits would be lower. Of the four pilai, only the one held in Robert's home area was interrupted by a large fight in which the principal parties were a group of people from a local village and a group of highlanders working at a nearby agricultural station. During my absence, in September 1968, a pilai was held in Situm where a fight occurred between two groups of Situm settlers, each from a different home area. At two of the pilai I attended, members of the local government council were present to try to prevent brawling.

The pilai ended at about 7.00 a.m., so the attendants 'saw the dawn in'. The usual Pidgin English expression ran: 'Mipela bringim tulait': 'We brought the daylight'. Twice I noticed that guests broke the banis when leaving the pilai. They did this to signify that the pilai had ended.

Before discussing further aspects of the pilai, I will describe the traditional ceremony organised by Christoph. It was concerned with the transfer of a payment to his wife's kin. In Robert's and Christoph's home area, two types of payments were made in the course of a marriage. The first payment was a counter-prestation for the transfer of the bride and was made on the occasion of the wedding or shortly afterwards. The second was made after children were born and was a counter-prestation for the fact that - by ceding their female relative - a man's wife's kin contributed to his becoming a father. This second prestation was made in the abode of the husband. On this occasion Christoph's wife's siblings, both male and female, had come, with their spouses and many of their children, and also his wife's mother's younger brother, with his wife and children. The prestation consisted of two adult pigs, both belonging to Christoph himself. These were killed by Christoph in the morning and brought to his house where his in-laws dressed and cooked them. Part of the pork was consumed on the spot, and part was taken away to be distributed to relatives in the home area. It seems to be for the husband to decide how many pigs he would offer. He may also make the prestation more than once. The institution was still of great interest to the people and I was often told about it.

During the evening and night a traditional dance was held, for which most of Christoph's male wantok who lived in Situm had made kangar, ornamental poles tied to the back of the dancer. They may be several yards high. The dance, a traditional sequel to the transfer, was a present to the man who made the transfer. He should officially not know about it. Hence the kangar had been made in secrecy. At the end of the afternoon the men had disappeared to complete them and to put them on. At about 8.30 p.m. they returned, and the dance started immediately. It was held in the yard between the houses of Robert and his assistants. I witnessed the dancing from its beginning until 2.30 a.m. and from 6.00 a.m. until its end at 6.50 a.m. At that time Christoph took part although I had not seen him participating previously. Just before the end of the dance people were very sad and some cried at the prospect of having to part soon.

Except for Barney, all Robert's wantok block-holders attended. The number of non-wantok present was much smaller than at Robert's pilai. They came mainly from four Situm blocks. Robert used the occasion to sell the liquor left over from the pilai.

In Table 4.3 I have listed the expenditure and returns of Robert's pilai. Several of the figures presented are rough approximations, partly because I did not have time to observe all the preparations

closely, and partly because Robert acted very much according to his own judgment and did not always let me observe his transactions.

Table 4.3

Expenditure on and income from Robert's pilai
(\\$)

Expenditure

Three meals offered during working parties	15.00
Three further small meals offered during the preparation for the <u>pilai</u>	6.00
Purchase of one pig	40.00
Transport of the pig from place of purchase to Situm	12.00
Food provided during the day of the <u>pilai</u>	31.75
Price of drinks for sale during the <u>pilai</u>	79.95
Price of cigarettes for sale during the <u>pilai</u>	5.46
Total expenditure*	<u>190.16</u>

Income

Entrance fees	24.00
Drinks sold during <u>pilai</u>	60.26
Cigarettes sold during <u>pilai</u>	5.70
Sweet potato sold in the Lae market	20.00
Drinks sold during dance held for Christoph	44.70
Total income	<u>154.66</u>

Repayable gifts received

Financial support from <u>wantok</u>	52.30
Financial support from non- <u>wantok</u> block-holders from other home areas	8.00
Support in kind from these block-holders	7.45
Total repayable gifts	<u>67.75</u>

* I do not take into account the opportunity costs of the traditional food either offered by Robert to his assistants and guests or harvested and consumed by them. Otherwise, Robert might have sold it at Lae market. As indicated in Table 4.2, these costs may have been considerable.

According to the figures presented in Table 4.3, Robert lost about \$35 on the pilai. This was, firstly, because few people had attended due to the bad weather. The area inside the banis had remained half empty. Secondly, Robert had allowed one of his wantok block-holders to build a second bar and to sell the beer left over from the pilai held on 13 July in his home area. This second bar was closer to the

main groups of people inside the banis and much more beer was sold there than at Robert's own bar. Moreover, it is doubtful if the organisation of a pilai allows a large profit to be made. Even if more people had attended, this would not have implied increased returns from liquor sales, since Robert was able to sell the left-over liquor during the dance held for Christoph. However, he would have received more, say \$20, on entrance fees. I doubt if he could have decreased the amount of food distributed, thus reducing costs, but instead of buying an adult pig, he might have bought a piglet and raised it. Supposing the price of a piglet was \$10, he could in this way have increased the income from the feast by about \$30. Thus he might not have made a loss of about \$35 but a profit of about \$15. However, in this case the labour component in the organisation of the pilai would have increased, given the necessity of growing additional food to feed the pig.

I collected data on income and expenditure of one other pilai. Here attendance had been good, and there were few costs for the meat offered during the feast since most of it was procured by hunting. Yet income and expenditure were about equal. Three bottles of strong liquor were left over and the organiser hoped to be able to sell these. If he was able to do this, he may have made a profit of about \$15.

Many Situm settlers told me that by organising a pilai a man could make \$50 to \$100. These statements were based on impressions only since settlers were not able to keep precise accounts of income and expenditure. Since the organisation of pilai seemed to follow much the same lines, I doubt if the organising costs can be much lower than they might have been in the two cases mentioned, and similarly the returns cannot be much higher. Hence the impressions of the settlers about the profitability of these ventures may well be wrong.

My data are not precise enough to calculate how many man-days were spent on preparing the pilai. Firstly, I did not observe many preparations since I had to spend much time on other blocks talking to other settlers. For many days, therefore, I do not know exactly how many people assisted Robert and how many hours they spent on their tasks. Secondly, much of the work, such as collecting firewood and preparing house-building materials, was done away from the block and I did not observe these activities. Thirdly, much work had been done before I went to live in Situm since most of the food consumed during the feast had already been planted by that time. Fourthly, preparation for the pilai and for the transfer of the marriage payment were made simultaneously, and I am unable to determine which proportion of the preparations were necessitated by the organisation of the traditional ceremony.

Given the amount of work implied by the organisation of a pilai (food production, clearing the feast ground, construction of a cook house, construction of the banis, and widening of the access track) and

the amount of work implied by the organisation of the traditional ceremony (food production, construction of a guest house and a cook house, preparation of the kangar), it seems likely that in this case the modern feast was at least as time- and labour-consuming as the traditional one. During the preparations Robert's block was rather neglected, but, as mentioned,¹ this should be attributed to his opinion that much of the block was unsuitable for coconut cultivation rather than to the amount of time it took him to prepare for the pilai.

While it may well be that the Administration officials have mixed feelings about these side activities, Robert himself claimed that they favoured it, since, as he said: 'Mi bihainim gayman, mi kirapim bisnis': 'I do what the Administration wants, I start bisnis.'

Statistical analysis of settlers' interaction in 1968

In the discussion of inter-block contacts between settlers in Situm and Gobari during my 1968 field work, I dealt with contacts between settlers in the context of the settlers' association and during parties or feasts. In this section I continue the discussion with a statistical analysis of interaction between settlers from different blocks.

As mentioned above, I attempted to collect quantitative data concerning the interaction of settlers by calling on them and recording whether they had visitors from other blocks. I also recorded who these visitors were and their reasons for visiting. I refer to my own 'visits' to settlers as 'calls' and use the term 'visit' exclusively for interaction between settlers. I did not try to follow one of the settlers closely to observe how he used the network of social relationships in the settlements to reach particular goals. This would have been very time-consuming and I am not sure if it would be possible to gain a complete picture other than in exceptional cases. This is because either the investigator, if he follows the observed person closely, may influence his behaviour, or, if he tries to reconstruct the interaction pattern of the person under investigation by questioning him, and others, on past events, he may not be given a complete account. The method I used can only lead to the establishment of certain very general trends, which show up as over-all characteristics of the sample of observed visits.

The data were collected during fourteen weeks in 1968. I made 441 attempts to call on settlers, and on 234 occasions I was successful insofar as I found the settler in or near his house. During these calls the settlers I called on had a total of 142 visits from co-settlers. In addition I observed 184 visits to Robert's block, where my own house was. By 'visits' I refer to cases in which settlers went to another block and met one of the inhabitants of that block. Hence, when I

¹ See p.48.

called on a settler and found he had two visitors, I recorded this as two visits, disregarding the interaction between the visitors themselves. This circumscribes more narrowly the types of interaction taken into consideration.

Moreover, since I mainly called on men, the analysis is limited to interaction between male settlers. My impression was, however, that there was much less interaction between women than between men. Since short-term male settlers visited each other to a very limited extent, I further restrict the analysis to long-term residents, i.e. to settlers who had been in residence for approximately six months or longer. A difficulty in collecting the data was that the settlers themselves supposed that I primarily wanted to see block-holders. Hence, if a block-holder was home when I tried to call on him or one of his co-residents, I had to speak to him, and if I wanted to speak to his assistants, I had to do so in the holder's presence. As a result, calls on block-holders were over-represented in the total number of calls.

In this section I refer to the long-term residents by 'Settlers' with capital 's'. In Situm there were 58 Settlers, in Gobari 15. Among the Situm Settlers there were 16 block-holders, among the Gobari Settlers 7. Since these figures do not include absentee block-holders, I refer to the Settlers/block-holders by B.h. The other Settlers are referred to by ~B.h.

There was little visiting of Situm Settlers by Gobari Settlers and vice versa. In the sample of 326 visits, there were 2 Situm-Gobari visits, 308 Situm-Situm visits, and 16 Gobari-Gobari visits. Consequently I regard, as far as the interaction under discussion is concerned, Situm and Gobari as separate communities. When I speak about a person's co-Settlers, I refer only to the other Settlers in his own community. The number of intra-Gobari visits is too small to be used for statistical analysis. The number of intra-Situm visits is also smaller than desirable. While the mean number of observed visits per Settler is 5.3, the median is zero since there are 40 Settlers for whom I did not record any visits. On the other hand, I recorded 184 visits to the block where I myself lived. However, because the collection of these quantitative data was only part of my research, I could not spend more time and effort on it. I might have employed assistants, for example some of the literate settlers, to record by whom they were visited, but it would have been very difficult to gauge the reliability of the results, which, moreover, would have been obtained from a much smaller sample of settlers.

The first question considered here is whether there was significantly more visiting between wantok¹ and between neighbours than between non-wantok and non-neighbours. A Settler's neighbours are defined as those

¹ For definition, see p.23.

Settlers whose houses were closest to his own along the roads and tracks leading away from his own house. I disregard here one track which was poorly maintained and not often used.

The analysis of this question presents several problems. Firstly, to a certain extent blocks held by wantok form clusters, so for most Settlers there are wantok among his neighbours. Therefore I distinguish four categories of co-Settlers: wantok/neighbours, wantok/non-neighbours, non-wantok/neighbours and non-wantok/non-neighbours, below referred to by w/n , $w/\sim n$, $\sim w/n$ and $\sim w/\sim n$ respectively. Secondly, I observed more visits to Robert's block than to all others. Given the location of my house in Robert's hamlet (see Map 6), the great majority of these visits were either to Robert or to Robert and Christoph. The specific pattern of visits to Robert's block may influence the pattern of visits to the others. That the pattern of visits to Robert's block is different is the more likely because Robert prepared for and held his pilai at the time of my survey, while among the other Settlers only one, Neville, held a pilai which, moreover, was much smaller than Robert's. Thirdly, the figures of observed visits to the other blocks are so small that it is not possible to analyse them for each block separately. Hence I analysed the distribution of the total amount of observed visits taking into account the proportions of w/n , $w/\sim n$, $\sim w/n$ and $\sim w/\sim n$ for each Settler and also the number of times I observed each Settler was visited. Supposing this number is disregarded, and it is found that there are more visits by w/n , $w/\sim n$, $\sim w/n$ and $\sim w/\sim n$ per Settler, it cannot be determined to what extent this derives from the possibility that Settlers with many w/n , $w/\sim n$, $\sim w/n$ and $\sim w/\sim n$ among their co-Settlers receive more visitors than Settlers with few. Hence I calculated the mean proportions of the four categories of co-Settlers as:

$$\bar{p}_j = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^S \frac{r_{ij}}{c-S_i} v_i}{v}$$

in which: S is the total number of Settlers living on all blocks but Robert's;

r_{ij} is the number for each Settler of his co-Settlers in each of the four categories distinguished;

$c-S_i$ is the number for each Settler of his co-Settlers;

v_i is the number of observed visits to each Settler, excluding those living on Robert's block; and

v is the total number of observed visits to all blocks but Robert's.

The expected number of visits per category of co-Settlers, v_j , equals

$$\bar{p}_j \cdot v. \text{ Hence } v_j = \sum_{i=1}^S \frac{r_{ij}}{c-S_i} v_i. \text{ These numbers are shown in Table 4.4,}$$

and are compared with the distribution of the observed visits.

In the calculation, and also in the applications of the χ^2 test below, I used Yates' correction for continuity.¹

Table 4.4

Observed and expected numbers of visits to settlers
from w/n, w/√n, √w/n and √w/√n

	Observed distribution		Total	Expected distribution		Total
	w	√w		w	√w	
n	24	18	42	5.95	9.87	15.82
√n	41	41	82	11.30	96.88	108.18
Total	65	59	124	17.25	106.75	124.00

df = 1

$\chi^2 = 164.77$

p < 0.005

Rates of divergence:* w/n : 4.03

w/√n : 3.63

√w/n : 1.82

√w/√n : 0.42

* Expressed by the number by which the expected number of visits has to be multiplied in order to obtain the observed number.

When one compares the observed and the expected distribution by means of the χ^2 test in Table 4.4, it appears the divergence is highly significant. Table 4.4 also shows the rates of divergence for each of the four categories. These rates show that, while the number of visits from √w/√n is less than half that expected, the number of visits from √w/n is almost double, and those of w/n and w/√n are about four times larger than expected.

Application of the same tests to the observed visits to Robert's block yields comparable results, shown in Table 4.5. In Robert's case also, the divergence of the observed from the expected distribution is highly significant. Likewise the rates of divergence for w/n, w/√n and √w/n are > 1, and for √w/√n > 1, while the divergence for w/n and w/√n is larger than for √w/n. The very large divergence for w/n can be attributed to the close relations of Robert with Alfred, his only wantok/neighbour who often came to see him. Both Tables 4.4 and 4.5, however, seem to indicate that, among Situm Settlers and at the time of my survey, traditional kinship ties were stronger than non-traditional neighbourhood ties.

¹ See Ferguson (1966:207) for an explanation of Yates' correction for continuity.

Table 4.5

Observed and expected numbers of visits to Robert's block
from w/n, w/~n, ~w/n and ~w/~n

	Observed distribution		Total	Expected distribution		Total
	w	~w		w	~w	
n	21	41	62	3.53	31.85	35.38
~n	81	41	122	31.85	116.77	148.62
Total	102	82	184	35.38	148.62	184.00

df = 1

 $\chi^2 = 202.39$

p < 0.005

Rates of divergence: w/n : 5.95

w/~n : 2.51

~w/n : 1.29

~w/~n : 0.36

The total number of visits to Robert's block can be subdivided into, firstly, visits on account of working parties, secondly, day-to-day visits and, thirdly, visits for large-scale ceremonies. The first category concerns events for which people were specifically invited to assist Robert and his assistants. The second category consists of visits of individuals or very small groups of people who usually came on their own initiative, while the third concerns extraordinary events to which people received a general invitation. The working parties were all held in preparation for Robert's pilai, and the large-scale ceremonies were the pilai itself, the preceding lotu and the dance following Christoph's transfer of a marriage payment. The only visits which could not be classified in any of the three categories were those for a traditional ritual held in Robert's block to mark the beginning of the garden-making season. It was celebrated only by Robert and his wantok. The nine visits on this occasion are not included in the data presented in Table 4.6, dealing with the sub-categorisation of visits to Robert's block. Application of the χ^2 test shows that in all cases the divergence of the observed from the expected distribution is highly significant. In the case of the day-to-day visits, the proportion of visits by wantok, whether neighbours or not, was much higher than in the case of the large-scale ceremonies. In other words it seems that non-wantok came to Robert's block with more ease for an extraordinary event such as a pilai than otherwise. On the other hand, among the people Robert invited to work for him was an even higher proportion of wantok than among the day-to-day visitors to his block. Most of the visits of non-wantok to Robert's block in this category were those of Maurice's six labourers, who helped Robert build the banis for the pilai ground, after Robert had asked Maurice whether he was agreeable to this.

Table 4.6

Visits to Robert's block, sub-categorised

I Working parties w $\sim$ w Total				II Day-to-day visits w $\sim$ w Total			III Large-scale ceremonies w $\sim$ w Total		
A. Observed distribution:									
n	3	6	9	14	8	22	3	27	30
$\sim$ n	16	2	18	36	10	46	21	29	50
Total	19	8	27	50	18	68	24	56	80

B. Expected distribution on the basis of the distribution in A.I:

n	7.56	15.11	22.67	8.89	17.78	26.67
$\sim n$	40.30	5.04	45.34	47.40	5.92	53.32
Total	47.86	20.15	68.01	56.29	23.70	79.99
$df_2 = 1$			$df_2 = 1$			
$\chi^2 = 11.87$			$\chi^2 = 107.83$			
$p < 0.005$			$p < 0.005$			

C. Expected distribution on the basis of the distribution in A.II:

n	16.47	9.41	25.88
$\sim$ n	42.35	11.77	54.12
Total	58.82	21.18	80.00

df = 1
 $\chi^2 = 75.27$
p < 0.005

D. Rates of divergence of observed and expected numbers of visits:

I over II		I over III		II over III	
w/n	1.85	0.34		0.18	
w/ $\sim$ n	0.89	0.44		0.50	
$\sim$ w/n	0.53	1.52		2.87	
$\sim$ w/ $\sim$ n	1.98	4.90		2.46	

During my survey I noticed many more visitors with B.h. than with $\neg$ B.h. Hence I supposed that B.h. were more often visited than $\neg$ B.h. To test this hypothesis, Tables 4.7, 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10 are presented. In the figures tabulated, visits to Robert's block are omitted, given their large number. Table 4.7 shows the distribution of visits. The total of 215 in Table 4.7 is the number of times I called on Situm Settlers and found them in or near their homes. The two-way classification indicates, firstly, whether I called on a B.h. or a $\neg$ B.h. and, secondly, whether or not they had visitors. Application of the χ^2 test shows that the divergence of the observed from the expected distribution is not significant. Hence the discrepancy in the number of times I observed Settlers being visited may result mainly because I called more often on B.h. than on others. Taking into account the number of visits during my calls, there is a difference between B.h. and $\neg$ B.h. since for $\neg$ B.h. I did not record multiple visits, i.e. I did not observe more than one visitor during any of my calls to $\neg$ B.h. By contrast, B.h. were often visited by more than one visitor during my calls. The distribution of single and multiple visits is shown in Table 4.8. On the

Table 4.7

Visits to B.h. and $\neg$ B.h.

	Observed distribution			Expected distribution		
	With visitors	Without visitors	Total	With visitors	Without visitors	Total
B.h.	43	122	165	39.14	125.86	165.00
$\neg$ B.h.	8	42	50	11.86	38.14	50.00
Total	51	164	215	51.00	164.00	215.00

$df = 1$
 $\chi^2 = 1.63$
 $0.20 < p < 0.30$

Table 4.8

Single and multiple visits to B.h. and $\neg$ B.h.

	Observed distribution			Expected distribution		
	Single visits	Multiple visits	Total	Single visits	Multiple visits	Total
B.h.	26	17	43	28.67	14.33	43.00
$\neg$ B.h.	8	0	8	5.33	2.67	8.00
Total	34	17	51	34.00	17.00	51.00

basis of the expected distribution shown in Table 4.8, I calculated the expected distribution of the 124 observed visitors during single and multiple visits, taking into account that the mean number of visitors per multiple visits was 5.294. The observed and expected distribution of visitors is shown in Table 4.9. Application of the χ^2 test shows that the divergence of the observed from the expected distribution is highly significant. The divergence favours the number of visitors to B.h.

Table 4.9

Visitors during single and multiple visits to B.h. and $\sim$ B.h.

	Observed distribution			Expected distribution		
	Single visits	Multiple visits	Total	Single visits	Multiple visits	Total
B.h.	26	90	116	28.67	75.86	104.53
$\sim$ B.h.	8	0	8	5.33	14.14	19.47
Total	34	90	124	34.00	90.00	124.00

df = 1

$\chi^2 = 16.65$

p < 0.005

Table 4.10

Single and multiple day-to-day visits and visitors during these visits

	Observed			Expected		
	Single visits	Multiple visits	Total	Single visits	Multiple visits	Total
A. Distribution of single and multiple day-to-day visits						
B.h.	26	6	32	27.20	4.80	32.00
$\sim$ B.h.	8	0	8	6.80	1.20	8.00
Total	34	6	40	34.00	6.00	40.00

B. Distribution of visitors during single and multiple day-to-day visits

B.h.	26	17	43	27.20	13.60	40.80
$\sim$ B.h.	8	0	8	6.80	3.40	10.20
Total	34	17	51	34.00	17.00	51.00

df = 1

$\chi^2 = 3.182$

0.05 < p < 0.10

Tables 4.8 and 4.9 included visits for working parties and one pilai. Since these entailed multiple visiting, they strongly influenced the figures in these tables. Table 4.10 shows the distribution of single and multiple day-to-day visits and of visitors during these visits, excluding those for working parties and pilai. In this case, the mean number of visitors during multiple visits amounts to 2.833. Application of the χ^2 test to the figures for the distribution of visitors during single and multiple day-to-day visits shows that the divergence of the observed from the expected distribution has a low level of significance. Again the divergence favours the number of visitors to B.h. This result indicates that the greater number of visitors to B.h. was to a large extent due to the occurrence of working parties and pilai, which B.h. alone organised.

Post-1968 developments

Several interesting developments took place after I had finished my 1968 field work in August. Firstly, the Administration started to build a causeway across the Bupu River, the missing link in the road connection between Lae and Situm. Secondly, the construction of the internal roads on the settlements was started. Thirdly, the Department of Agriculture undertook to establish an extension station on the block set aside for the community centre. Fourthly, at approximately the same time, the supervision of the settlements by the Department of Agriculture was reorganised so that only one agricultural officer would deal with the settlers. The number of agricultural assistants was increased. The officer was to live at the extension station in Situm. His lively interest in the affairs of the settlers led to further change when he started to reorganise and supervise the club store. Here he was assisted by an agricultural assistant temporarily living in the club house. The reorganisation was very successful: during the 49 weeks from 1 June 1967 to 10 May 1968, \$487.85 worth of goods was bought for the store, but during the 17 weeks from 8 January until 20 May 1969, \$783.17 was spent on stocks, more than half during the last six weeks of this period. Stocks were slowly increased and diversified. By April 1969 the store was very well supplied and people outside Situm and Gobari started to buy there. Sixthly, the holders of the blocks which were fully developed and well maintained were told that they would shortly receive cattle and were to fence in their blocks. The first cattle arrived in April 1969. Seventhly, the two settlements were included in the Huon Local Government Council area. In early 1969 Frank was elected councillor for Situm, Gobari and two neighbouring villages. Initially the settlers had resisted the inclusion of Situm and Gobari in the council area, mainly because they objected to paying council tax. They had argued that they should not be taxed before they had started producing copra. Later they agreed to the inclusion. A very low tax of \$2 per adult man and \$1 per adult woman was fixed. During my 1969 field work the prominent members of the Situm settlers' association welcomed the establishment of the council since they thought that through the

councillor the lo bilong bigpela kaunsil: the rule of the big council, would be established in the two settlements. They thought that, in contrast to the office bearers of the association, the councillor would have the authority to impose his will upon the other settlers and thus could promote unity and co-operation between them. Eighthly, the Department of Education decided to establish a primary school in early 1969. Finally, in April 1969 while I was doing further field work in the settlements, it became known that Australian veterans, who had fought near Lae during the second world war, had donated \$3,000 to the construction of a permanent school building. This money was collected from many veterans who revisited Lae on the twenty-fifth anniversary of its recapture from the Japanese.¹ In May 1969 the construction of this school building was started.

The settlers saw these developments as great improvements in their conditions, especially the establishment of the school, the improvement of the roads, and the realisation of the cattle project. Since they had taken up residence in the settlements in 1962, they had repeatedly asked for a school and for better road connections with Lae, which they felt they had been promised when they were first told about the resettlement scheme.² They had felt frustrated at their inability to insist that the Administration live up to these real or imagined promises. To account for this sudden turn of events, the settlers supposed that, shortly after my return to Port Moresby in August 1968, I had submitted a very favourable report about their development of the blocks, thus - as they put it - shaming the Administration and compelling it to take action.

The council elections had taken place before I returned to the settlements in March 1969. Consequently I had to try to reconstruct what had happened, and this was as difficult as the reconstruction of Roland's election as a komiti bilong graun. This was partly because I probably followed a wrong strategy by asking people first why there had been majorities for Frank and Robert rather than for whom they had voted. Before the council election a preselection was held in Situm and Gobari to decide who was to be the settlers' candidate to compete with the candidate of the neighbouring villages. For the preselection three candidates were nominated: Frank, Tommy, and Keith, a new block-holder. Keith was nominated because he was fluent in English, which people considered a distinct advantage for a local government councillor who has

¹ During the advance to Lae, several army units passed through the area where Situm and Gobari are now located (Dexter 1961:327, 349-50). It may even be that they crossed the Bupu River, which in Dexter (1961) seems to be confused with the Burep, at a place not far from the present causeway and the school grounds.

² Dunstan informed me that subdivision roads were in fact promised (personal communication, 16 August 1969).

to deal with Europeans. Tommy was an old Gobari block-holder and one of the most enterprising men among the settlers. Frank's candidature was proposed by Ross, also a new block-holder and, with Keith and the former agricultural assistant, one of only three new holders who took an active part in communal affairs. Later Ross told me that many settlers had criticised him for nominating Frank, so he had been surprised when Frank had won the preselection. This result was probably influenced by the fact that many of Tommy's wantok and neighbours were away in Lae at the funeral of an official of the Returned Services League (R.S.L.), an association of primarily Australian ex-servicemen. While a number of settlers expressed disappointment with the result, others were merely surprised at my interest in the reasons people had chosen Frank to be the candidate. They said that the matter was not so important because the councillorship was only temporary, so if Frank did not make a good job of it, he would not be re-elected, and they added, 'Mipela traiim tasol': 'we try him out only'. Some settlers said that Frank himself had wanted to be a councillor, seeming to imply that for this reason people had voted for him. Similar arguments were advanced in respect of Roland's election. In the actual council election Frank defeated the candidate elected by the villagers. Although most settlers seemed to appreciate the fact that a settler, and not a villager, had become their councillor, the agricultural assistant, who had been present at the vote, said that several settlers had supported the village candidate.

The council preselection and election had been organised by Administration officials and people had voted by whispering the name of the candidate of their choice in the presence of an official. The officers of the settlers' association were usually elected by show of hands. Some people voted for more than one candidate nominated for one office, and during an election I saw the agricultural assistant and the school teacher asking people to vote only for one candidate for each office. This advice was not understood or not heeded by all people present and double voting continued. However, not all persons voted for more than one candidate and those who voted for two did not necessarily vote for all candidates. Hence it may be that people, by showing their hands, did not indicate who they preferred to be elected, but merely the candidates of whose election they would approve. Only men spoke during meetings and only men were office bearers, but women did vote because, the men told me, women should participate in communal affairs.

On my return in March 1969, the settlers, at least in Situm, showed a much greater appreciation of life in the settlement. Co-operation between the settlers had been promoted by the establishment of the school, since it is the policy of the Department of Education that, if a school is to be established in a village, the villagers themselves should clear the school grounds, build the school premises and, if necessary, temporary quarters for the teachers. In Situm and Gobari working parties were organised for this purpose and the District

Inspector of Education in the Morobe District was impressed by the amount of work done.¹ The school was opened in February, but during March and April parties were still clearing the school grounds. Then the same difficulties arose as a few years earlier, insofar as some men attended less regularly than others. This had so far led to discontent only, and the system had not broken down. It was, on the contrary, extended to the work on the blocks. This happened after the Department of Agriculture had announced that small herds of cattle would be established on the blocks, but that initially only 10 of the 29 original block-holders would receive cattle, since the other blocks were not yet well enough maintained or developed. When this announcement was made, there were strong protests from the settlers who were passed over, but later, during my stay, they did not complain about the decision and described their working together as an attempt to speed up clearing the blocks of weeds and regrowth. That clearing was the primary goal of the communal work is also indicated by the fact that only the Situm settlers undertook it: for 3 of the 21 Situm holders and 7 of the 8 Gobari holders were initially to receive cattle.

Much effort was exerted in the organisation of the communal work. Again three groups of workers were formed, this time two groups comprising the original block-holders and one of the newcomers. Each group was headed by newly elected komiti whose task was to arrange on whose blocks the work was successively to be held and to ensure that people participated. The communal work on the blocks was referred to as wok bilong kaunsil: council work, as if the council had imposed it upon the settlers. In case they withdrew from their obligations, the komiti were to report to Frank, the councillor, or to Robert, who was elected as Frank's representative in Situm. These two men could then, it was supposed, enforce compliance.

It was further decided that a block-holder with several assistants should send at least two workers to each of the parties. Frank, the councillor, was not required to join the parties because of the work he had to do for the council. His block was to be worked by parties consisting of both groups of the original Situm block-holders.

Communal work was to last tupela bero, in other words people would work both in the morning, from about seven or eight o'clock until noon, and in the afternoon, from about one or two o'clock to about four. At noon a meal was provided, mostly by the man on whose block the group was working, although other workers did contribute. The meal was often quite lavish, both in quantity and quality. It always included food which had to be bought for cash. The cost of one meal was about \$3 to \$5, or about 20c per adult male worker. Yet the meals had not become as costly as those following communal work in the Bakoiudu settlement

¹ Papua-New Guinea Press Release no.156, 'Primary T school at Situm settlement', 1969.

where they might cost as much as \$30; these became such a financial burden that the settlers decided to discontinue them (van Rijswijk 1967:206ff.).

The frequency of communal work was officially set at two days per week for work on the blocks; and later, when the work for the school was finished, three days per week.

The way the day of communal work was divided resembled more the division of the day on a plantation, as described by Howlett (1967:88), than the traditional organisation of communal work. I noticed also that Charles, one of the komiti, referred to himself as a bosboi, as if he were managing a group of plantation labourers. After parties had worked on the blocks of all the holders in his group, he offered a carton of beer and a flagon of wine to the workers to apologise, he said, for ordering them around. However, he may have unduly emphasised or exalted his own role in the success of the scheme, which resulted more from the willingness of the other block-holders than from the authority wielded by the komiti.

The settlers' attitude towards communal work was ambivalent. Since the settlers were inclined to model their behaviour on that of plantation owners, they wanted to develop their blocks by employing labourers and they repeatedly asked the Administration to provide them with funds to do this. These efforts had been unsuccessful as far as the original blocks were concerned and, given the further difficulty of getting sufficient assistants, the settlers resorted to communal work as the next best method. Although they considered it to be a gutpela pasin bilong tumbuna: a good custom of their ancestors, the fact that it was practised on the settlement emphasised to the settlers their lack of success in obtaining funds to employ labourers. However, the settlers attached great importance to living in harmony and many seemed to view their co-operation as symbolising this harmony. During his party, Charles made a speech stressing that people should settle their differences and be friendly with one another. He said that the success of their enterprise depended upon this. The same argument was put forward by other settlers, and I am not sure whether the association between mutual friendliness and success in bisnis was made merely for practical reasons - because it was supposed that work would progress better when done by working parties - or whether the settlers saw also a mystical relationship between success and living in harmony.

The communal work system had operated for only 4½ weeks when I left the field. By that time both groups of original block-holders had started a second round and had in total worked eleven times. Much work had been done and the blocks were generally in a better state than before the communal work had started. Some difficulties had already arisen, mainly over failures to return the help which had been given. In one case the komiti, rather than Frank, had persuaded the block-holder to rejoin the other workers. The other cases occurred just before I left and I do not know what action, if any, was taken.

In addition to the 22 wok bilong kaunsil, 6 communal works were held on the school ground during the nine weeks of my 1969 field work. During this period lotu were held every Sunday, led by an elderly man from a nearby village. The settlers were not greatly pleased with his preaching and said that they would like to have another pastor or catechist. The lotu were again followed by meetings of varying formality. In addition, two meetings were held on week days: the first discussed the arrangements for the working parties, and in the second Frank reported on his first local government council meeting. There were also discussions concerning what complaints about the resettlement scheme should be brought before the council. Frank intended to continue holding such meetings.

The other occasions on which the settlers met each other in 1969 were much the same as during 1968. There were two pilai, many settlers went to the Anzac Day celebrations, and many met on their way to or in the market.

Influences on inter-block relationships

The most important centrifugal force in Situm and Gobari was the heterogeneity of the two groups of settlers. The settlers came from many different home areas which set them apart in small sub-groups. Against this there were several centripetal forces. As will appear below, these are more concerned with the block-holders than with the settlers in general, but since the block-holders played a more prominent role in the settlements and assistants were to some extent identified with the block-holders they helped, relationships between the holders seem to be more crucial in bringing about a community of settlers than those between and with assistants.

The first of these centripetal forces was the fact that almost all block-holders were ex-servicemen. They often referred to themselves as servicemen,¹ and to the settlements as kemp or plantesin bilong sevis: the 'camp' or the plantation of the servicemen. Assistants, although not ex-servicemen, also used these terms. I heard it used, for example, by one of Robert's kin-helpers after I had brought him to the Lae hospital. The receiving nurse asked him where he lived, and he answered merely: 'Mi stap long sevis': 'I live among the servicemen'. Being ex-servicemen provided the holders with a measure of common identity and a sense of self-importance, not only because they contributed to the success of the Australian and American military operations, but also because their exploits demonstrated that Papuans and New Guineans were capable people deserving better than the maltreatment they felt the Australians had accorded them until then.

Their feelings of common identity were further enhanced by the fact that they had taken up a block of land for cash cropping and hence had

¹ As Frank did during his speech, see p.70.

become bisnis men. To them this marked them as active, enterprising and progressive men. They often contrasted themselves with the inhabitants of the neighbouring villages, on whom they looked down and who, the settlers claimed, thought only about growing their own food, did not work bisnis, and spent their days in idleness.

Finally, the block-holders were all subject to the regulations and arrangements of the rural resettlement policy in Papua-New Guinea.

However, these three features in the identity of the block-holders did not incorporate them into a social system. They did not define clearcut standards of conduct between them such as obtain, for example, between the members of a kinship group. Even so, the mentioned features were identical for each of the block-holders insofar as they were all bisnis men, participants in a resettlement scheme, and - with one exception - ex-servicemen. Hence they seem to point to the equality of the holders, and they did not provide criteria by means of which one holder would have authority over another. It remains to be seen if the recent inclusion of the settlements in the local government council has changed this situation.

Furthermore, the three features did not require the settlers to organise themselves in an association or to co-operate. On the contrary, as pointed out, the settlers themselves thought that they were not to co-operate. However, since they disliked several of the regulations and arrangements of the land resettlement policy, they were provided with a common cause, namely the elimination of these arrangements. This objective formed a large part of their discussions during meetings. Because the relationships between the settlers were not regulated by a system of rights and obligations, or by the sharing of traditional programmes of action, their communal undertakings were dependent upon their mutual agreement and goodwill. Reaching agreement often seemed to tax the goodwill of the settlers, as is shown by the expression quoted: 'Ol i toktok tumas'. It would also seem that achieved personal relationships were less able to withstand the impact of quarrels and tensions than the ascribed relationships of, for example, a kinship system.

A further difficulty for the Situm settlers was that their communal undertakings required skills they did not possess. This applied, for instance, to the running of the store. Here they lacked the knowledge necessary to be able to check the transactions of the manager and the store-keeper. Consequently they were dependent upon outside help. The same lack of knowledge meant that people could not check the financial manipulations of the office bearers of the association. This created distrust of the store-keeper, the manager, and office bearers in general, and made the management of the association more difficult. It made the settlers lose interest in it and only an outside impetus, the developments of late 1968 and early 1969, led them to reactivate the association.

The important element of the renewed co-operation was the communal work system, although I doubt if this was viable. One of the difficulties was that the original setting of the system was a village or parish community, before the establishment of the Pax Australia; for people in such a community there were less alternative courses of action open than there were for the Situm and Gobari settlers. Hence in the settlements there were more excuses not to take part in communal work. For instance, on a day set aside for communal work, the settlers may have had, or claimed they had, to go to Lae to buy tools or seed coconuts, withdraw their monthly allowance, or they may have claimed they had urgent work to do on their own blocks.

Other failures to take part on communal work were because settlers were visiting their home areas, mostly for a funeral or a feast. In a traditional community such absences did not occur, and as feasts and deaths were events which concerned most people, the holding of work parties could be deferred. In the settlements these events concerned only a small group, did not lead to deferment, but only to the absence of the group from work.

Another danger to the viability of the system was that the settlers attempted to make all settlers participate, even those unwilling to do so. Several times these men did not return the help they had been given. This was likely to create discontent among the others. A breakdown of the communal work system may well have adverse repercussions on the over-all co-operation of the settlers in the association.

Social relationships between the settlers in Situm and those in Gobari were strikingly different. The Situm settlers were interested in co-operation and communal undertakings, were frustrated when these did not succeed, and renewed their efforts when stimulated by outside forces. Further failure may provide fresh frustrations. The Gobari settlers, on the other hand, seemed indifferent to communal undertakings. They did not try to form an association, did not pool money and seemed not to have been frustrated by the discontinuance of communal work.

This sociological contrast was accompanied by an economic contrast: the Gobari blocks were developed more quickly and were better maintained. Consequently the Gobari settlers seemed to be both sociologically and economically better off than the Situm.¹ I find it hard to account for

¹ Dr G.N. Appell (personal communication, 9 December 1969) drew my attention to a remarkable parallel with the just mentioned contrasts between Situm and Gobari described in Orth (1963). This book was unfortunately not available in the southwest Pacific at the time I prepared this manuscript. In Appell's words: 'Orth...describes the reactions of two incoming classes to the Harvard Business School. One class...focused on the immediate problem of how to successfully complete their course and the social arrangement in that class evolved from this

these differences. Perhaps the Gobari settlers in 1963 chose a more congenial komiti than did the Situm settlers who seem to have been antagonised by their two komiti. However, it may equally well be that Julius, the Gobari komiti, had less reason to prompt his fellow settlers to work than had the two Situm komiti, because, as Dunstan put it, they were 'nearly all more work-orientated'.¹

The life histories of the Gobari block-holders were not markedly different from those of the Situm holders. Furthermore, although most Gobari holders had several assistants which may account for the good state of their blocks, there were at least two who had only occasionally been assisted and their blocks were also well developed and maintained.

An alternative hypothesis to account for the contrasts between the two groups of holders is that the personalities of the Gobari holders made them better workers and better adapted to life in the settlements. I have no means of testing this hypothesis which is based only on the very phenomena it should explain. Dunstan, however, concurred with it, and also pointed out that, because Gobari was much smaller than Situm,² there was less room for disagreements and organisational difficulties.

1 (continued)

goal. The other class, however, got bogged down in attempting to develop social mechanisms and social controls for the organisation of their class and therefore did not achieve as good a record in their performance at the school, as did the first class. In other words the situation described by Orth seemed almost identical with the situation you were describing in your two resettlement areas.'

¹ Personal communication, 16 July 1969.

² Ibid.

Chapter 5

Relationships between settlers and outsiders

In this chapter I am mainly concerned with those settlers who intended to make a living off the blocks, in other words with block-holders and some long-term assistants. The outsiders I am mainly concerned with are, firstly, wantok of settlers living in the home areas, secondly, inhabitants of the villages near the settlements and, thirdly, officials concerned with the two settlements. The relationships of the settlers with these three categories of people were greatly influenced by the significance to them of developing a block of land. As mentioned in Chapter 4, the settlers sharply distinguished between the way of life in the settlements, with its emphasis on money-making, and the way of life of villagers,¹ with its emphasis on food production. They considered settlement life far superior to village life. The fact that they formed a community of ex-servicemen made it easier for the settlers to emphasise the contrast they saw between themselves and villagers. They realised that this view was a stereotype and not generally applicable, since they knew that the inhabitants of many villages engaged as extensively in commercial ventures as they themselves did, while in others people were eager to start such ventures, but had much less opportunity than they themselves had been given. At the same time, however, the specific arrangements of the resettlement policy meant that settlement life did not attain the ideal they had had in mind, and many of their dealings with Administration personnel and other officials sought to narrow this gap.

Settlers and their home areas

Many settlers maintained contact with their home areas. There were many visitors, mainly short-term assistants. Settlers regularly met wantok at the Lae market and most visited their home areas to attend ceremonies, to help relatives, following the death of close relatives, or for some other purpose. For example, during my field work Robert

¹ I use this term for convenience to refer to Papuans and New Guineans in their home areas, whether they actually live in villages, hamlets, dispersed homesteads or some other form of residence.

visited his home area five times. The first time he said he simply wanted to show me where he had lived. He may have had an ulterior motive to go, but I could not ascertain this. The second time he went with Alfred to investigate the reported suicide of one of his close relatives, about which he had heard from wantok at Lae market. He used this opportunity also to look for a pig for his pilai.¹ The third time he went to buy a pig, and the fourth time he attended a pilai and discussed the financial aspects of reviving bisnis activities in his home area. The last time he went to discuss the possible transfer of coconut and betel palms he had planted on land subsequently purchased by an expatriate planter. This amount of visiting was above average since Robert needed to travel to prepare for his pilai. At the other end of the scale were the non-Morobe settlers, many of whom never went to their home areas. Some maintained contact through correspondence and one of the new block-holders recruited a number of kin-helpers in this way.

While sometimes settlers commented that in their home areas there was little opportunity for cash cropping or other economic ventures because of inaccessibility or lack of extension services,² they were usually more critical and said that their wantok were simply not interested. Neville complained about this when he related his efforts to promote bisnis in his village before he went to the settlement.³ Ross said that he wanted to apply for a block in 1962, when he was still in the police force, but was not able to because he could not find a relative interested in bisnis who could act as a manager.

Settlers and villagers

Villagers were often referred to as kanaka⁴ and although settlers denied that this term was used in a pejorative sense, in many cases this denial seemed hardly tenable. For example, in May 1969 a medical team visited the settlements to take X-ray photographs of the settlers. There was some confusion about the date on which the photographs would be taken. Alfred, after having waited in vain for a whole morning, commented that he would not come the next day, saying, 'Long hia i ples bilong bisnis, i no ples bilong kanaka. Bigpela wok i stap': 'We do

¹ See p.83.

² See p.25.

³ See p.44.

⁴ Kanaka, a word of Polynesian derivation, was widely used by expatriates in Papua-New Guinea to refer to the indigenous population. In their mouths it often carried strong, racially biased, notions of the supposed inferiority of the indigenes. The term can, or could, be used without this overtone, especially by Papuans and New Guineans themselves, who, by saying, 'Mi stap kanaka': 'I live as a kanaka', indicated that they were living, for example, in a native village or hamlet and were not employed in any way (Mihalic 1957:54).

bisnis here, we are not kanaka. There is a lot of work to be done'. It may be that he was afraid and wanted to avoid examination. The important point, however, is the argument by means of which he tried to effect this. On another occasion, after a public quarrel between two block-holders, Keith made an impassioned speech, saying that the settlers should not act as kanaka but, like Europeans, settle their differences and be unanimous, so they would co-operate and their bisnis would prosper.

The criticisms levelled against the villagers nearby, on whose land the settlements had been established, were much more open than those against wantok villagers in the home areas. That the local villages had sold so much of their land instead of using it for business made a bad impression upon the settlers, although they themselves had gained by this transaction. They were confident that the villagers could not get their land back, since they had sold it to the Administration and they had been paid for it. Nor did the settlers seem to think that the villagers were ill intentioned towards them, unlike the Northern District where some block-holders in settlements ravaged by pests and disease¹ believed that the original owners of the land have brought these misfortunes by magical practices.² Several block-holders in Situm and Gobari, when asked whether they thought the presence of the scapanes damaging their palms could be the result of magic by the nearby villagers, considered it unlikely because scapanes were a regular occurrence in coconut palms.³

In 1968 there were few contacts between settlers and villagers, but after the council elections in 1969 the settlers started to take a more active interest in the affairs of the villagers. On one occasion Frank and the settler komiti visited to urge them to elect their own komiti and to start doing bisnis. Robert, one of the komiti, commented, 'These people cannot go on just chewing betel nut'. In the village Frank told a gathering of men that what he had heard about their economic activities was unfavourable and he maintained that, since the local government council had become a multi-racial one, 'a big change' had occurred which would result in a more active bisnis promotion. Unlike the settlements, the village had formed part of the council area before, and a number of villagers told me that previous councillors presented similar arguments

¹ J.D. McCarthy in Papua-New Guinea Post Courier, 1, 2 and 3 April 1970.

² S. Lawson: personal communication, 1968.

³ After I had finished my research in Situm and Gobari, one of the new block-holders, Sam, suddenly died after having started clearing his block. Boris' son (see Genealogy 2), then in Port Moresby, reacted to the news with the remark that this was the work of the masalai, the spirits of the forest, who did not want the land cleared. This remark also illustrates the lack of apprehension that neighbouring villagers might have ill intentions.

but that both council and councillor remained inactive. Notwithstanding their scepticism, they began to discuss how they had tried to establish bisnis ventures. It then became apparent that the village was riddled with quarrels and factionalism. Although it was clear that they had not stopped their efforts to start bisnis, their accounts only confirmed the settlers' ideas about the incapacity of the villagers.

The exhortations of the settlers that the village should start bisnis seemed to me to be an interference in the affairs of the villagers. They, however, did not show any annoyance. Nor did they seem to resent Frank's statements about his role in settling village disputes. During the discussions he mentioned that the village committee men should try to settle such quarrels. If they were unsuccessful they should refer the matter to him, but he would not allow them to bypass him and bring matters straight to the kiap.¹ This, he said, was a denial of his authority for which he would bring them in his turn before the kiap. This also seemed to me an interference in village affairs, especially since the villagers had previously chosen councillors from among themselves.

A few weeks later, trouble arose in the second village. A husband had beaten his wife, who went to the settlements to report the matter to Frank. She also claimed that her husband had threatened her with divorce. On this particular day Charles had organised the party to compensate his workers,² and Frank and two of the komiti were present at the party. They decided that the husband should come to the settlements to be heard. On their request I brought the two komiti in my vehicle to the village where they asked for the husband and told him to come with them. He and other villagers present argued that the woman was the main cause of the trouble and that she should come back to the village. The husband said that he had not threatened her with divorce, but had told her to go back to her parents to be better trained. On this occasion also, and against my expectations, the villagers did not show annoyance that they had to justify themselves vis-a-vis the settlers. The komiti accepted their statements and returned without the husband. Frank thereupon decided that the woman should return to the village.

Shortly before we left for the village, and while the settlers present all knew about the dispute, Charles had made a speech again stressing that quarrelling was wrong and that it endangered the success of the settlers' bisnis. After our return, during the party, there was much discussion about the quarrelsome nature of the villagers. Frank maintained that councillors should not have to spend much time settling troubles since, he said, 'em i kounsil bilong bisnis, em i no kounsil bilong trabel': 'the council is for bisnis, it is not for trouble'.

¹ The term which Papuans and New Guineans, and often many expatriates, use to refer to Administration officers.

² See p.103.

A few days later the case was tried at a formal session in the meeting house in Situm, and Frank found that the woman was the cause of the trouble. He urged the couple to live in amity and told them to go back to the village. There were several villagers present whose evidence Frank followed in arriving at his decision. They again seemed to accept that a settler was entitled, or supposedly entitled, to solve this quarrel, but perhaps they would have taken the matter less easily if Frank had ruled against their evidence.

The sharp contrast made by the settlers between their own way of life and that of the village differs markedly from the similarity in outlook of urban Hula living in Port Moresby and rural Hula in their traditional villages, as described by Oram (1967, 1968). Oram commented (1968:33):

When Hula migrants reach Port Moresby they step into another Hula community, and wherever they live in town they associate with other Hula people.... Their involvement in a modern monetary economic system is greater in the town than in Hula Village, but this is a matter of degree. The situational change which Hula experience when they migrate from their village to Port Moresby is slight and there is little conflict of norms.

The difference perceived by the settlers between village and settlement life stemmed from a difference in economic orientation, which influenced social relationships with family members much less than those with members of wider groupings of which they formed a part, such as all being settlers, all ex-servicemen, or all inhabitants of the Morobe District. With their bisnis undertakings the settlers sought to acquire prestige by competing with members of these wider groupings. They realised and intensely disliked the poor position they were in to compete with Europeans, which they saw as based on iniquitous provisions of the resettlement policy. For this reason the settlers attempted to change these provisions and in this way their bisnis orientation also played an important role in their relationships with government officials.

Settlers and the Administration

Those officials with whom the settlers were most involved were the didiman, the members of the Department of Agriculture, Stock and Fisheries. They had trained the settlers in coconut cultivation, administered the loan money, and reported back about the development of each block by its holder. In addition, they had suggested that the blocks be extended, estimated the costs of developing the extension blocks and of establishing a herd of cattle, and had submitted applications for credit based on these estimates. With one exception all agricultural officers concerned with the two settlements were expatriates.

An additional factor influencing the relationships between didiman and settlers was that the Department of Agriculture in Lae was understaffed. Therefore its members could not spend as much time with the settlers as they wished, and it was not possible to allocate the work to one officer only. One of the officers expressed the hope that, with the enlargement of the scheme to forty-six block-holders, it would be possible to appoint an agricultural officer concerned exclusively with Situm and Gobari. This, however, has not happened so far and is not likely to happen since in the oil palm scheme in West New Britain, for example, there are approximately 200 block-holders per agricultural officer.

Moreover, in 1968 the didiman considered that, given their long residence, the settlers should be acquainted with coconut cultivation and should not need many extension services. Shortly after the establishment of the settlements, there were extensive contacts between didiman and settlers as the latter received training in planting coconuts for commercial purposes and in growing other cash crops such as soya beans and peanuts. This contact was promoted by the personal interest of the officers concerned: Mr Dunstan told me that he sometimes went to the settlements on weekends to become better acquainted with the settlers. In 1968, however, the didiman visited the settlements only in connection with the extensions. On their blocks the settlers had contacts only with the agricultural assistant. This official helped the settlers to develop the blocks and also compiled data for the quarterly reports to the central administration. Most contacts between the settlers and the agricultural officers took place in the latter's offices in Lae. Since they administered the loan funds, the settlers had to see them each time they wanted to use loan funds, for instance for buying seed nuts or house-building materials. These contacts were very time-consuming because it took the settlers one day to go to Lae and come back to the settlements, and sometimes the didiman were absent or occupied with other affairs.

Apart from the small number of contacts between didiman and settlers, the flow of communications sometimes did not run smoothly. There were several reasons for this. Firstly, since the settlers lived some distance from Lae, it was sometimes difficult for the didiman to inform them about events in which they were to participate. Information could be conveyed by contacting a settler at the Lae market, or in the District Office, or by sending a messenger to the settlements, but this system did not always function. For example, in July 1968 an official of the Lands Department was expected to visit the two settlements to show the precise location of extension blocks to the holders. The first message the settlers received was that this official would come on Monday, 15 July. The Gobari settlers thought he would first come to Gobari and the Situm settlers thought he would come first to Situm. Both groups of settlers convened, each in its own settlements, but the official did not come, I heard later, because of bad weather. It was then rumoured that he would come on the Tuesday. Again both groups

convened, but the official again did not come, this time because his vehicle had broken down. On Wednesday, I went to Gobari in the morning and the settlers were again waiting for the official who, they believed, would first come to Gobari. He actually came that day, but went first to Situm and spent the whole day there, and came to Gobari only on Thursday. On Wednesday morning the Gobari settlers were exasperated that they had wasted so much time. They blamed the Administration for the confusion and maintained that it had been by no means the first time.

Another breakdown in communications occurred when the Land Board sat in Lae to interview the applicants for the extension blocks and, in the case of assistants, new blocks. The Board sat from Monday, 8 April, to Wednesday, 10 April 1968. The settlers had been told that they were to be in Lae by Monday and transport had been organised for them by the didiman. However, that day they came for no purpose, since the Board had a large number of applicants to interview. The settlers were not interviewed until Wednesday. This was in accordance with the schedule the Board had drawn up and which, it seems, had been communicated to the Department of Agriculture, but not to the settlers.

Communications were further hampered by the complicated nature of some parts of the resettlement policy which the didiman had to explain to the settlers. I mentioned before that although Mr Dunstan tried to inform the settlers about all aspects of the loan arrangements, by 1968 settlers were ignorant about these things, either because they had not understood from the start or because they had forgotten. How easily settlers misunderstood administrative procedures appeared during my 1968 field work when decisions concerning the applications for extension blocks and new blocks were communicated to them. This happened in the meeting house in Situm, where, without any comment, the agricultural officer and the assistant distributed letters from the Land Board to all applicants regarding the grants. The settlers thought that receiving a letter implied that their applications had been granted and nobody opened the envelopes. Moreover, if the settlers had considered that it was essential to read the letter, only one would have been able to, since all correspondence between settlers and central administration was in English and only one settler could read English. Only later during the meeting, when the settlers inquired which blocks they had been allocated, was it apparent that three applicants had been unsuccessful. It is likely that they would have been less disappointed if they had been told this at the beginning of the meeting. In its letter the Land Board did not state the reasons for its recommendations, nor did the didiman, who possibly had not been informed, tell these reasons to the settlers.

To improve communications with the settlers, the didiman had been urging that an extension centre should be established in the settlements, which would also provide accommodation for an agricultural officer. As mentioned, this centre was built in 1969 and the supervision of Situm and Gobari was undertaken by one officer. Communications fortunately

improved because the settlers needed more supervision at this time with the establishment of the cattle herds on their blocks.

Communications would also be improved if official letters to the settlers and lease and loan documents handed out to them were written in Pidgin English, rather than in English. This would not be an easy task, given the complexity of some of the information to be conveyed, yet it would be worthwhile, since many settlers were concerned that they could not read official letters and they often turned to Maurice or myself for explanations. If the letters had been written in Pidgin English and worded in a less complex way than many of the English ones were, a minority of the settlers would have been able to read and understand them. This situation did not only affect the Situm and Gobari settlers: Oeser reported (1969:5) that indigenous inhabitants of Hohola, a Port Moresby suburb, complained that they could not understand the 'difficult English legal language' in which lease agreements were written.

In general, relationships between the local didiman and the settlers were not unfavourable, in contrast to the attitudes of the settlers towards the central Administration. This became very clear, for example, during the meeting when the didiman spoke about the extension blocks. The Lae staff members of the Department of Agriculture were willing to have part of the land cleared by contract labourers, and the loan budgets, submitted to the Development Bank, contained provisions for this. The intention was that the labourers would be contracted and paid directly by the Administration. This arrangement was much disliked by the settlers who themselves wanted to employ their labourers and after the didiman had left a wave of resentment broke forth. People felt especially displeased by the fact that the Administration could decide, and make arrangements, for them. The occasion was used to review all the objectionable aspects of resettlement and again several settlers compared their own situation with that of the European settlers who received their loan money in a lump sum and were free to decide how to use it. One settler, Roland, especially deplored the fact that he and the other settlers had had little education and hence were now dependent upon others. People showed considerable insight into the hierarchical structure of the Administration. They agreed that local officers were often willing to listen to their arguments and were sympathetic to them, but that these men did not really make the decisions. This, the settlers felt, was done by their superiors in Port Moresby, with whom they could not communicate so as to make them change their minds. Hence the meeting ended with a pervading feeling of powerlessness and frustration. In 1969 the labour scheme was implemented but proved unworkable because the funds allocated for payment of labourers were so low that most left. Several settlers argued again that they themselves should be able to select labourers or paid kin-helpers, whom they could accommodate and feed; they would spend more time on the settlements and could be paid less. Again they felt they were powerless to make the Administration adopt this arrangement. However, after I had completed my field work

in May 1969, the labour scheme was changed to the way the settlers had suggested, although the payments were still made by the didiman rather than by the settlers themselves. I do not know what effect this change has had on the attitudes of the settlers towards the central Administration.

The didiman were not the only people through whom the settlers tried to improve their conditions. Frank told me that he would take the matter up with Mr Michael Kaniniba, the local member of the House of Assembly. However, when I left the settlements in May 1969, he had not yet done this. Frank also wanted to use his membership in the Huon Local Government Council to exert influence on the Administration to change the resettlement policy. This is very clear from his speech¹ and his efforts to let the other settlers know what he intended to say during meetings. He thought he would have no difficulty in finding topics to speak on, since, as he put it, 'Mi gat planti supia bilong siutim gavman': 'I have plenty arrows to shoot the government with'. His views are noteworthy, firstly, because he did not seem to distinguish separate spheres of competence or concern for local and central government. Secondly, they remind one of Wolfers' observations (1968:53) concerning the 1968 House of Assembly elections:

The results of the 1968 election provide considerable evidence for the growth of the idea of the member-as-protestor, and applicant-of-pressure-against-authority in the New Guinea islands over the last four years. In other words, action, and results gained through pressure, are expected of their member by many New Guinean coastal and island voters, while highlanders voters are still largely unclear as to their member's actual powers.

While Wolfers discussed attitudes of voters, I am not sure if they were general among the settlers/voters. Frank, however, seemed to think that his co-settlers expected him to apply pressure and he appeared to model his behaviour accordingly.

Settlers and other outsiders

As mentioned, my own relationship with the settlers was influenced by their idea that I might promote their interests in Port Moresby. This was very apparent in March 1969 when I came back to Situm and Gobari² and again during the farewell speech made by Frank, shortly before my departure, two months later. Then he stressed that my report on the settlements would be submitted to the House of Assembly in a few days' time. Yet another opportunity to let the outside world know about the settlers occurred when two Gobari block-holders were interviewed as part of a radio programme concerned with rural resettlement. However,

¹ See pp.70-3.

² See p.100.

the two had told the reporter that the settlers were very happy with their blocks and the provisions of the resettlement scheme. At the end of the meeting during which the letters containing recommendations of the Land Board were distributed, these statements were discussed and the settlers felt that this opportunity to voice grievances had been completely mishandled. Accordingly the two block-holders, who had left the meeting early, were sharply censured.

Finally, an important avenue the settlers used to further their interests was provided by the fact that many of them were ex-servicemen. As mentioned, the indigenous ex-servicemen were united in an association which managed a licenced club. It was closely associated with the Lae sub-branch of the R.S.L. of which only expatriate ex-servicemen were members. When important visitors from Australia came to Lae and visited the R.S.L. Club, the indigenous ex-servicemen were also given the opportunity to meet them. In their discussions with these visitors, among whom was the Minister for External Territories, the settlers asked for further information about the provisions of the resettlement scheme and made complaints known. They also pressed for the extension of their blocks during R.S.L. meetings, but, while R.S.L. officials did inform the settlers of the forthcoming extension,¹ I do not know what the actual role of the R.S.L. in this matter was.

In April 1969 Julius, the president of the indigenous ex-servicemen's association, attended the Anzac celebrations in Melbourne as the guest of a local R.S.L. sub-branch. This enlivened the interests of the settlers, and of the members of the association in general, in seeking support from Australian ex-servicemen. Shortly before Julius' departure to Australia, a special meeting was held in the ex-servicemen's club in Lae and the most important issue discussed was how to use Julius' visit to its greatest advantage. Cassius remarked that now at last one of them could go to Australia and tell the Australians there about the difficulties of the Papuan and New Guinean ex-servicemen; so far they had been limited to discussing these matters with Australians in Lae, which, he said, had turned out to be fruitless. Julius was told to say in Melbourne how the ex-servicemen in Lae had started their club and what their present problems were. Frank and another man, not a settler, stressed that he should be tactful and not antagonise the Australians. On the other hand, the meeting felt that all local ex-servicemen should be association members, since a small association could not expect much support. It was also emphasised that the members should be financial so as to indicate that they themselves also invested money in the association. This point was also to be illustrated by Julius' account in Melbourne of how the ex-servicemen had spent money and effort in establishing their association and club.

¹ Lands Department, Ex-servicemen's Credit Board file E612, 1967.

In the settlements the same issue was on the agenda of several meetings. Here the matters of membership and payment of contributions were raised and it was especially stressed that, if the settlements were to profit from money made available by Australian ex-servicemen, then as many settlers as possible should be members, and financial members, of the association. While only former servicemen could become full members, other persons could be allowed to become associate members. As a result, several settlers joined the association while others paid contributions in arrears.

In the Lae meeting, general needs of indigenous ex-servicemen had been primarily discussed, such as financial support for widows and orphans of ex-servicemen or for people in hospital. It was also hoped that money could be made available to children of ex-servicemen who attended school. In the settlements, the special needs of the settlers came more to the fore. It was suggested that money be found, either as a loan or as a gift, to buy a truck for regular transport to Lae and back. Others hoped money could be obtained to buy a refrigerator for the new meeting house in the community centre, and then to get a liquor licence. In this matter also the bisnis orientation of the settlers was apparent, since the availability of cold drinks and other provisions was seen not merely as an improvement in the standard of living in the settlements, but also as a means to do bisnis.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

The success of particular resettlement schemes can be measured in many ways. Here I regard a settlement as successful when it gives the settlers the opportunity to lead a life which, for them, is a satisfactory alternative to their previous life. The definition centres on the perception of the settlers themselves and omits from consideration several factors, such as the financial costs of establishing the settlement and their relationship to the resulting benefits. I also disregard the issue of whether the social and economic organisation of the settlement accords with the wishes of the administering authorities. But while the definition takes into account the subjective judgments of the settlers, it is also concerned with objective conditions, such as the physical and organisational setting, because these influence the goals which the settlers can attain. For example, the size of the blocks and the principal economic activity condition the income level of the settlers and this level is likely to be one of the factors which affects their satisfaction with resettlement.

Before discussing the issue of the success of Situm and Gobari, I emphasise that settlements have to go through a transitional period during which the settlers can establish satisfactory social relationships, among themselves and with outsiders, and their economic activities can come to fruition. Since, in the case of Situm and Gobari, few coconut palms had started bearing during 1968-69 when I did my research, it is premature to characterise these settlements as successful on the basis of my data.¹ It is possible, however, to assess the likelihood that they will become successful and this approach is the more feasible since success depends also on objective conditions which occur during the transitional period.

¹ In its Twenty-third Report, the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Assembly (Papua-New Guinea Standing Committee on Public Accounts of the House of Assembly 1970:16) called Situm and Gobari successful, without, however, stating any reasons. When the Committee visited the settlements in April 1970, few palms were bearing; probably it based its conclusion on the fact that most old blocks were fully planted with coconuts.

Resettling was positively valued by the block-holders because it meant that they could become bisnis men, primarily by owning and managing a commercial agricultural enterprise. They felt the need to become bisnis men, because in this way they could achieve prosperity and play a part in the new society which, in their view, was slowly developing in Papua-New Guinea since the second world war.¹ The holders felt also that to hold and develop a block raised them above the majority of Papuans and New Guineans who, they considered, were content with merely providing for their subsistence needs. Moreover, almost all holders were ex-servicemen and they felt this gave them a prominent status in society. Accordingly they regarded being a block-holder as a public symbol of their prominence.² On the other hand, the provisions of the resettlement policy were seen by the holders as favouring the expatriate ex-servicemen and this was a source of dissatisfaction for them.³

Nevertheless, the economic development of Situm and Gobari has proceeded with relative speed. The block-holders went to live in the settlements and started work there soon after they had been allocated their blocks and most completed development ahead of schedule. This contrasts sharply with other settlements where many settlers did not take up residence at all, or were very slow to do so, or developed their blocks for subsistence purposes rather than for cash cropping. I am inclined to ascribe the favourable development partly to the bisnis orientation of the ex-servicemen/holders, and the following factors were also involved.

Firstly, while the two settlements did not have facilities, such as a school and an aid post, when they were established, these were readily accessible in either Lae or the home areas of the settlers. Furthermore, most settlers could easily maintain relationships in their home areas and many were assisted by kin in the development of their blocks. While this stimulated development, it may result in claims on the future revenue of the settlers. To counteract this, I argued that, instead of relying exclusively on the nuclear family as the unit of production, allowance should also be made for the allocation of large blocks, or groups of blocks, to the members of extended families.⁴ An argument along comparable lines is advanced by Ward (1968:19).

Secondly, because of their proximity to Lae, settlers could sell food crops at Lae market to earn additional money,⁵ an opportunity which did not exist in many of the home areas. Although this activity meant there was less time available for coconut cultivation, I doubt if this time would have been so used, if production for the market had not taken place. On the other hand, such production stimulated the

¹ See Ploeg (1971).

² See p.104.

³ See p.14.

⁴ See p.65.

⁵ See pp.30-1.

development of the blocks, because it increased the acreage under food crops and consequently, because young coconuts were interplanted with other crops, the acreage under coconuts.¹

Thirdly, at the time the blocks were allocated there was, in the opinion of the settlers, little opportunity in their home areas for cash cropping because of the lack of agricultural extension services, or access roads, or both.² It is true that Robert's enterprise flourished at this time, but discontent with wages³ may have encouraged his wantok to try to earn more money by developing a block. Especially in the initial stages, the perceived lack of alternatives in the home areas may have contributed to the development of the blocks.

Fourthly, according to the settlers, extension services in the first years of the settlements had been very good. Although most holders had been acquainted with coconut growing, none had done so on a large scale and they had to learn the techniques of planting in equilateral triangles and of planting a cover crop.

There were, however, a number of factors which limited the pace of development. Firstly, until 1969 settlers were not instructed in how to allocate time over the various tasks involved in operating a twenty-five-acre coconut block. Since their schooling was mostly poor, it was very difficult for the holders to assess the size of these tasks, for example, the amount of work in keeping the cover crop short, and consequently, to determine how much time per day or per week should be set aside for them. Ignorance in these matters is likely to have made the settlers feel uncertain about their capacities as bisnis men. This is not to say that the settlers themselves saw a need for a more rigorous allocation of time and, consequently, this extension task might well be a very difficult one.

Secondly, services were also hampered by the fact that until 1969 there was no resident agricultural officer in the two settlements. If Situm and Gobari had been larger, e.g. if they had comprised about 200 blocks, they could have been the exclusive concern of one agricultural officer; he would then have been more easily stationed on the settlements themselves. However, an increase in size might have had its accompanying disadvantages, as mentioned below.

Communications between officials and settlers would have been improved if official correspondence was written in Pidgin English (rather than in English) and expressed in simple terms.⁴

Development would probably have been faster if part of the blocks had been cleared before the holders arrived. This was the case in the

¹ See p.30.

³ See p.45 ff.

² See p.25.

⁴ See p.115.

oil palm settlements in Cape Hoskins, West New Britain, where early development has progressed very quickly. The clearing of the blocks has to be rapidly followed by the planting of seedlings so that secondary regrowth does not become a problem. In Cape Hoskins the activities of the various Administration departments were coordinated, so that access and internal roads were ready, and extension, educational and medical services could be provided when the holders and their families took up residence. These facilities probably were an additional stimulus to the fast early development of these settlements. Rapid development is desirable because of the ambiguity of the holders' status while they are cash croppers who do not yet receive an income from their crops.

Not all block-holders in Situm and Gobari had developed their blocks in a satisfactory manner,¹ although none of them had lost his block for this reason. In 1968-69 their blocks were in a poor state and I doubt if any marked improvement will occur. If they did lose their blocks, several might have difficulties resuming their previous jobs and hence they would be worse off than if they had not resettled. While such unsatisfactory settlers require more supervision than the others, it may be a waste of effort. Moreover, given the limited resources available for extension services and development finance, it seems inappropriate to spend these on block-holders who are unlikely to make good use of them. Hence it seems advisable to decide as early as possible which holders have made unsatisfactory progress and have to lose their blocks.

Lastly, the possibility that the soil in the two settlements may not be suitable for commercial coconut cultivation is a sharp threat to the economic viability of the scheme. Also if the fertiliser trials² give positive results, the first substantial income the settlers receive will be delayed by at least two years. Situm and Gobari are not the first settlements in Papua-New Guinea to be hampered by difficult soil conditions: comparable problems occur or occurred in Warangoi (Cheetham 1962-63) and Vudal (Salisbury 1970:97n.), both in the Gazelle Peninsula; in Girua, near Popondetta; and in Sowam, west of Wewak (Papua-New Guinea Standing Committee on Public Accounts of the House of Assembly 1970:17). This implies that better soil surveys are needed before areas are designated for resettlement.

Turning now to social aspects of life in the settlements, it appeared to me, and the settlers themselves, that social relationships among the Situm settlers were less favourable than those in Gobari.³ This was partly because, as Situm was the larger of the two settlements, the probability of clashes was greater. In addition, the Situm settlers frequently failed in their organisation of common affairs, whereas the Gobari settlers did not attempt to organise many common affairs and hence they were not in a position to experience similar frustrations. This means that if settlers join together in an association or society,

¹ See p.61.

² See p.5.

³ See pp.80-2 and 104-7.

its affairs need some supervision to prevent possible collapse. This is the more desirable since once the settlers realise, through the management of such affairs, that they do indeed have interests in common, they might more easily overcome minor disagreements and quarrels.

The establishment of community sentiments is likely to be a problem on any new settlement uniting people from socially disparate villages. The fact that the Situm and Gobari block-holders were ex-servicemen is likely to have contributed to the emergence of some feelings of solidarity. Moreover, most holders had lived in non-traditional communities while they were in the police or the army, in other words during a period of their lives which they considered very prestigious, and this may have helped them to adapt to life in the settlements. In addition, the bisnis orientation of the holders may have strengthened their feelings of solidarity.¹

Similarity of ethnic background might also raise the level of solidarity. For this reason Lewis argued (1964:301) that settlers in a settlement should preferably 'be of similar social background, i.e. speaking the same language, if there are language differences, or belonging to the same tribe, or coming from the same group of villages'. In Papua-New Guinea this policy has been followed on several settlements. The situation in Situm and Gobari indicates that the mixing of settlers from different home areas need not necessarily lead to disruptive conflicts between them. Here there are several factors involved. Firstly, holders were recruited from a relatively large number of home areas and the groups of wantok were accordingly small.² This reduced the possibility of their developing into hostile blocks, each large enough to form a 'guard' of young men who, in case of strife, might be easily inclined to use violence against other groups of settlers. Secondly, only Robert's wantok were to some extent united around a leader, Robert himself,³ and he was more intent upon maintaining peace than provoking or kindling animosities. It can be argued that, especially in larger settlements, the mixing of settlers introduces a greater risk of conflicts and consequently makes the success of the settlements more precarious, and that little is gained by bringing together settlers with different cultural backgrounds.

The resettlement policy as followed in Papua-New Guinea was devised by the central Administration. The Situm and Gobari block-holders disliked several aspects of the policy and they attempted to bring about changes; most of these failed and subsequently they felt frustrated by their lack of power.⁴ Hence it would seem advisable to allow maximum

¹ See pp.104-5.

² See p.32.

³ See p.78.

⁴ See p.115.

possible adaptability in the policy to give the settlers a greater say in settlement affairs. An example of such adaptability was mentioned above when, after attempts to employ labourers had failed, the didiman employed relatives of the holders to clear the blocks.¹ However, it is possible that resettlement cannot easily adapt to settlers' wishes, and this would make it a less attractive policy to raise standards of living among the rural population.

¹ See p.27.

Appendix

Outline of those parts of the Papua-New Guinea Administration concerned with rural resettlement policy

Since the second world war the structure of the Administration of Papua-New Guinea has been changed continually. Firstly, its size and scope have been increased considerably. This accompanied a corresponding increase in public expenditure, partly financed by Australia. While in the financial year July 1946 to June 1947 public expenditure was \$6,900,000, 68 per cent of which was financed by an Australian grant in aid, in the financial year 1968-69 the budgeted public expenditure was \$147,900,000, 59.3 per cent of which was financed by the Australian grant. Secondly, Papuans and New Guineans have gained more and more say in the conduct of public affairs, on both central and local levels. The first Legislative Council established after the war had 29 members, of whom 26 were appointed and 3 elected. The latter 3 were Australians and they were elected by expatriate residents of Papua-New Guinea. There were 3 appointed indigenous members. By 1968 the Legislative Council had been replaced by a House of Assembly with 10 appointed and 84 elected members. The 10 appointed members were all Australians. Most were Directors (heads of administrative departments) or District Commissioners (heads of the districts or administrative areas into which the country is subdivided). The great majority of the elected members are Papuans and New Guineans. There is universal suffrage and Papuans and New Guineans and expatriates are entered on a common electoral roll. While the chairman of the Legislative Council was the Administrator, the head of the Papua-New Guinea Administration, the Speaker of the House of Assembly was a Member of the House and elected by the House. He was a Papuan.

When the resettlement policy was formulated in the late 1950s, the influence of Papuans and New Guineans in the Administration was still slight and that of the Canberra Department of Territories large. Parker, writing in 1966, commented (1966a:256) that although in legislation 'the situation remains essentially one in which the Australian government has committed itself to securing the agreement of [Papuan and New Guinean] representatives', important powers still rested with the Australian government. In this report I use the term 'Administration' deliberately to stress its dependence. Firstly, the Australian government could decide upon the size of financial aid to Papua-New Guinea and the extent

of public spending, and hence the rate of social and economic development was greatly dependent upon this aid. Accordingly the budgetary powers of the House of Assembly were limited (Meller 1968:61). Secondly, with one or two exceptions the senior members of the Administration were still Australians. While elected members of the House of Assembly were appointed Ministerial Members and Assistant Ministerial Members, it remains doubtful if their role in policy formulation has so far been a considerable one. Thirdly, the Department of External Territories in Canberra closely directed the Papua-New Guinea Administration, which consequently lacked administrative discretion.

Figure 3 shows the organisation of the main Administration departments concerned with rural resettlement. This organisation existed from 1961 until 1970 when the two Assistant Administrator positions were merged into the new position of Deputy Administrator. Most concerned with resettlement were the Departments of Agriculture, Stock and Fisheries and of Lands, Surveys and Mines, in this report called the Department of Agriculture and the Lands Department respectively.

Resettlement has not been the subject of a separate ordinance, although members of the now defunct Legislative Council repeatedly requested the Administration to promote rural resettlement, and subsequently in the House of Assembly the way in which it had been promoted has been discussed several times. Since a number of settlements have by no means been successful, the discussions were often very critical. As a result, a parliamentary committee went to Malaysia in 1967 to study its resettlement policies and, later, a Malaysian expert in resettlement matters was invited to visit Papua-New Guinea to advise the Administration on ways to improve rural resettlement. The invitation resulted from a recommendation in a minority report (Guise 1967) tabled by one of the indigenous members of the parliamentary committee in which he dissociated himself from the report prepared and tabled by its expatriate chairman.

An important part in the formulation of the policy may have been played by the Land Development Board. This is a non-statutory body, in other words it is not established by law or ordinance, which in 1968 had the following members: the Assistant Administrator (Economic Affairs), Chairman, the Directors of District Administration, Agriculture, Lands, Forestry, and Public Works, and the Executive Officer Policy and Planning.¹ While the composition of the Board has changed little over the years, in the late 1950s its members were of similar administrative seniority.² Then all members were expatriates and this was still the case in 1968. Then the functions of the Board were officially formulated as follows:

¹ New Guinea Annual Report (1967-68:73).

² New Guinea Annual Report (1957-58:45).

Figure 3. Administrative framework of Departments and officials involved in resettlement, 1961-'70

- A. The board is the competent body to advise on all matters relating to land use, settlement and subdivision.
- B. Its method of operation will be:
 - (i) To draw up a program and allot priorities for reconnaissance and subdivisional surveys each year based on settlement demands from the public and on the Administration's policy on the development of certain crops. It will be guided by the principle of making available first the best type of agricultural and pastoral land provided that the proposed land use has economic prospects.
 - (ii) On the basis of information by land surveys and from other sources, to consider all questions of land use and to recommend a plan or pattern of development and subdivision for particular areas of Administration land or land about to become Administration land.

Whatever the role of the Land Development Board in framing the resettlement policy, it is possible that its proposals had to be referred to the Canberra Department of Territories. Parker concluded his discussion of the main planning and coordinating bodies in the Administration, of which the Land Development Board is one, as follows: 'it seems safe to assume that Port Moresby cannot, as a coordinating or planning centre, seriously purport to challenge the more closely knit Department of Territories' (Parker 1966b:200).

Another body which has an important role in the implementation of the resettlement policy is the Land Board, chaired by an official of the Lands Department. Its functions are described in Section 36 of the Land Ordinance 1962-1967:

The Land Board shall hear in public all applications for Administration leases and shall recommend to the Administrator the persons (if any) to whom leases should be granted, and may make such other recommendations to the Administrator in connexion with any such application as to the Board seems proper.

Since all block-holders lease their block from the Administration, they have all appeared before the Board and have had to satisfy its members that they possessed the necessary qualifications. Generally the Board prefers to recommend for a block young men of over about twenty-five years of age with a family, because it considers they are more likely to develop the land than elderly men, for whom the task may be too heavy, or younger unmarried men, who can more easily decide to take on something else.

Bibliography

- Barrett, D., 1969. 'The Pacific Islands Regiment' in The History of Melanesia, The University of Papua and New Guinea, Port Moresby, and the Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University, Canberra, pp.493-502.
- Bohannon, P.J., 1957. Justice and Judgment among the Tiv, Oxford University Press, London.
- Brookfield, H.C. and Hart, D., 1966. Rainfall in the Tropical Southwest Pacific, Department of Geography Publication G 3, The Australian National University, Canberra.
- Brown, P., 1966. 'Social change and social movements' in New Guinea on the Threshold (E.K. Fisk, ed.), The Australian National University Press, Canberra, pp.149-65.
- Chéetham, R.J., 1962-63. 'The development of indigenous agriculture, land settlement, and rural credit facilities in Papua and New Guinea', The Papua and New Guinea Agricultural Journal, vol.15, nos 3 and 4, pp.67-78.
- Child, R., 1964. Coconuts, Longmans, London.
- Crellin, K.G., 1969. 'Land tenure in relation to the provision of credit', Journal of the Papua and New Guinea Society, vol.3, no.2, pp.25-31.
- Crocombe, R.G., 1966. 'A modern Orokaiva feast' in New Guinea Research Bulletin, no.13, pp.69-78, Canberra.
- 1967. 'A Canberra view of economic development in New Guinea', The Australian Journal of Agricultural Economics, vol.11, pp.208-10.
- 1971. 'An approach to the analysis of land tenure systems', Anthropological Perspectives on Land Tenure in Oceania (H. Lundsgaarde, ed.), University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu. In press.
- Dakeyne, R.B., 1966. 'Changes in land use and settlement among the Yega' in New Guinea Research Bulletin, no.13, pp.27-52, Canberra.
- Dexter, D., 1961. The New Guinea Offensives, Australia in the War of 1939-1945, Series 1, vol.6, Australian War Memorial, Canberra.
- Epstein, A.L., 1969. Matupit. Land, Politics and Change among the Tolai of New Britain, The Australian National University Press, Canberra.
- Epstein, T.S., 1968. Capitalism, Primitive and Modern. Some Aspects of Tolai Economic Growth, The Australian National University Press, Canberra.
- Ferguson, G.A., 1966. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, McGraw-Hill, New York, second edition.
- Finney, B.R., 1969. 'New Guinean entrepreneurs. Indigenous cash cropping, capital formation and investment in the New Guinea Highlands', New Guinea Research Bulletin, no.27, Canberra.
- Fortes, M., 1945. The Dynamics of Clanship among the Tallensi, Oxford University Press, London.
- Gluckman, M., 1965. The Ideas in Barotse Jurisprudence, Yale University Press, New Haven and London.
- Goodenough, W.H., 1963. Cooperation in Change, Russell Sage, New York.
- Gray, G.G., 1969. 'Land tenure conversion in the Northern District', unpublished seminar paper, New Guinea Research Unit, Port Moresby.
- Guise, J., 1967. 'Minority report by John Guise M.H.A. Milne Bay open electorate, of the Parliamentary Mission's visit to Malaysia to examine land resettlement schemes', roneod.

- Hasluck, P.M.C., 1960. 'Land tenure in Papua and New Guinea', Australian Territories, vol.1, no.1, pp.12-15.
- 1962. 'The economic development of Papua and New Guinea', Australian Outlook, vol.16, no.1, pp.5-25.
- Hogbin, H.I., 1951. Transformation Scene. The Changing Culture of a New Guinea Village, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- 1958. Social Change, Watts, London.
- Howlett, D.R., 1965. 'The European land settlement scheme at Popondetta', New Guinea Research Bulletin, no.6, Canberra.
- 1967. A Geography of Papua and New Guinea, Nelson, Melbourne.
- International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 1965. The Economic Development of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea, John Hopkins Press, Baltimore.
- Johns, G., 1969. 'A lender's problems in Papua and New Guinea - a banker's approach', unpublished paper read at Third Waigani Seminar, 1969, Port Moresby.
- Lewis, W.A., 1964. 'Thoughts on land settlement' in Agriculture in Economic Development (C. Eicher and L. Witt, eds), pp.299-309.
- McCarthy, J.K., 1964. 'Foreword' in Road Bilong Cargo, by P. Lawrence, Manchester and Melbourne University Presses, Manchester, Melbourne, pp.v-ix.
- Meller, N., 1968. 'Papers on the Papua-New Guinea House of Assembly', New Guinea Research Bulletin, no.22, Canberra.
- Mihalic, F., 1957. Grammar and Dictionary of Neo-Melanesian, Mission Press, Techny, Illinois.
- Oeser, L., 1969. 'Hohola: the significance of social networks in urban adaptation of women in Papua-New Guinea's first low-cost housing estate', New Guinea Research Bulletin, no.29, Canberra.
- Oram, N.D., 1967. 'Social and economic relationships in a Port Moresby canoe settlement', New Guinea Research Bulletin, no.18, Canberra.
- 1968. 'The Hula in Port Moresby', Oceania, vol.39, no.1, pp.1-35.
- Orth, C.D., 1963. Social Structure and Learning Climate: the First Year at the Harvard Business School, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, Boston.
- Papua-New Guinea Ex-servicemen's Credit Board, 1961. 'Ex-servicemen's Credit Scheme. Loans to native ex-servicemen', memo dated 24 January 1961.
- Papua-New Guinea, Standing Committee on Public Accounts of the House of Assembly, 1970. 'Twenty-third report on the Development and Marketing Division of the Department of Agriculture, Stock and Fisheries', roneod.
- Parker, R.S., 1966a. 'The advance to responsible government' in New Guinea on the Threshold (E.K. Fisk, ed.), The Australian National University Press, Canberra, pp.243-69.
- 1966b. 'The growth of Territory administration' in New Guinea on the Threshold (E.K. Fisk, ed.), The Australian National University Press, Canberra, pp.187-221.
- Ploeg, A., 1971. 'Some indigenous views on the social and economic development of Papua and New Guinea', Journal of the Papua and New Guinea Society, vol.5, to be published.
- Salisbury, R.F., 1970. Vunamami, Economic Transformation in a Traditional Society, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne.
- Shand, R.T., 1966. 'Trade prospects for the rural sector' in New Guinea on the Threshold (E.K. Fisk, ed.), The Australian National University Press, Canberra, pp.80-102.
- 'Smallholder sole coconut budget', 1965, The Papua and New Guinea Agricultural Journal, vol.17, pp.72-5.

- ter Haar, B., 1948. Adat Law in Indonesia (E.A. Hoebel and A.A. Schiller, eds), Institute of Pacific Relations, New York.
- Territory of Papua and New Guinea, 1968. Programmes and Policies for the Economic Development of Papua and New Guinea, Government Printer, Port Moresby.
- van Rijswijk, O., 1967. 'Bakoiudu: resettlement and social change among the Kuni of Papua', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, The Australian National University, Canberra.
- Ward, R.G., 1968. Reshaping New Guinea's Geography, the University of Papua and New Guinea, Port Moresby.
- Wolfers, E.P., 1968. 'The 1968 elections', New Guinea, vol.3, no.3, pp.50-9.

Index

- Absentee block-holders, 22, 41, 43, 47, 49, 55
- Administrator, role in resettlement, 2, 128
- Agricultural extension services, see Extension services
- Agricultural extension station, establishment at Situm of, 99
- Agricultural officers, see Didiman; Dunstan, H.; van Schilfgaarde, M.
- Aid post, 14, 120
- Alcohol: at pilai, 81, 84, 86, 87, 89-90; at traditional ceremony, 88
- Alfred, 69, 73, 77, 78; attempt to build family enterprise, 53-4; attitude to settlement, 109-10; bisnis interest in home area, 53; kin-helpers, 52; market earnings, 52; relations with kin, 52-3; state of block, 52, 69
- Anzac Day celebrations, settlers' participation in, 80-1, 104
- Appell, G.N., 106n.
- Arthur, 29, 31
- Assistance: problems of, 65; relation to development, 61; variety received, 41
- Assistants, 57, 62; defined, 15-16, 41; identification with ex-servicemen, 104; income from market sales, 63; material possessions, 35; outside activities of, 63; payment of, 44-5; residence, xii, 16; role in settlers' association, 77; work of, 28; see also Kin-helpers, Labourers
- Australian ex-servicemen: donation for school building, 100; settlers' expression of grievances to, 117
- Australian grants, 125
- Australians (in New Guinea), see Europeans
- Bakoiudu, 102-3
- Bands, see Music
- Barney, 67, 78, 88; interest in home area, 25-6
- Benjamin, 79
- Bisnis: meaning, 25, 82, 104-5; orientation of settlers, 105, 112, 118, 120; quarrels seen as threat to, 111; settlers' encouragement in village of, 110; settlers' interest in for home areas, 54; see also Pilai, Supplementary economic activities
- Block-holders: age, 15n.; agricultural experience, 24; as ex-servicemen, 23, 66; attitude to cattle venture, 5, 15; attitude to co-operation, 105; attitude to original owners, 24; attitude to resettlement, 17, 120; attitude to size of blocks, 3; attitude to villagers, 105; change in attitude to conditions, 100; common features of, 104-5; defined, 16; dissatisfactions of, 14-16, 24, 26, 44, 45, 70-3, 105, 120; education, 24; equality, 105; home areas, 23-4, 44, 45, 66; inexperience, 65; insecurity, 24; kin-helpers, 57; kin ties between, 66-7; labourers, 57; land rights in home areas, 24, 25; loans received by, 22-3; occupations when granted blocks, 22; outside employment, 23, 49; pessimism about future of copra, 5, 15; previous acquaintances, 66-7; quarrels among, 78; reasons for taking block, 25-6, 44; relations with each other, 66, 69; relations with kin-helpers, 44, 47, 57, 58, 59; relations with labourers, 60, 64; residence, 22; role in settlers' association, 77; view of themselves, 17, 28, 120; visits to, 97-9; see also Absentee block-holders
- Blocks: allocation of, 15-16, 18-19, 21; development of, 18-19, 26, 61, 106, 120-2; inadequacy of, 44; maintenance of, 7, 48; size of, 3, 20
- Boris, 40, 45, 47, 48
- Bruce, 43, 44, 45
- Bupu River, 26, 31, 36, 83, 100n.; construction of causeway across, 18, 99
- Busama, 35
- Busu River, 18
- Cape Hoskins, oil palm settlement, xii, 113, 121-2
- Carvings, as source of income, 33
- Cash allowances, 26, 33, 54; see also Loans
- Cash crops: and land tenure, 1, 2; expected increase during Five-Year Plan, 1
- Cassius, 67, 77
- Cattle project, 99, 102; block-holders' attitude to, 5, 15; block-holders' inexperience for, 7; estimated income from, 13; loans for, 8, 13; preparation of blocks for, 27-8; reasons for, 4, 7; size of herd, 7
- Charles, 54-5, 77, 111; as komiti, 74, 103; kin-helpers, 54-5; on importance of harmony, 103
- Christoph, 40, 45, 51, 82
- Christoph's traditional ceremony, 82, 84, 85; labour involved in preparations for, 47, 49, 90-1; reasons for, 88; sale of liquor at, 88; support from wantok, 85, 88; traditional dance at, 88

- Clothing, 35
- Club, 73-4
- Club store, establishment, 73; failure, 76; financial position, 76-7; management difficulties, 74, 105; operations, 74, 76; revival, 99
- Coconut cultivation, 3-4; settlers' training in, 112, 113
- Coffee, 4, 55
- Communal work: absence in official policy, 67, 69; achievements, 103-4; differences between Situm and Gobari, 79, 81, 106; difficulties in, 65, 73, 102, 103, 105-6; for Robert's pilai, 95, 99; meals during, 102; misunderstandings about, 67; organisation of, 102, 103; promotion of, 73; settlers' attitude to, 103
- Conditions of labour, 64
- Cooking arrangements, 40; on Neville's block, 43
- Co-operation, 65; increased, among settlers, 101-2; lack of, among block-holders, 28, 67; promotion by local government council, 100; see also Communal work
- Co-operative store: see Club store
- Copra: advantages in Papua-New Guinea of, 4; block-holders' disappointment with, 5; means of producing, 4; prices, 5; production by Europeans and indigenes, 4; yields per acre, 5
- Copra driers, construction of, 4, 27, 28
- Costs, of operating block, 5-6
- Council tax, 99
- Cover crops, 3, 30
- Credit: and land tenure, 1, 2; in trade stores, 32, 76-7; see also Development Bank loans, Ex-servicemen's Credit Board loans, Native Loans Board loans
- Crocombe, R.G., 25, 82
- Dancing, at pilai, 81, 87
- Department of Agriculture, 7, 69, 102, 112; Lae branch, 113, 115; see also Didiman
- Department of Education, 27
- Department of Territories, 125-6, 128
- Development Bank loans, 8, 9, 10-11; administration of, 14; credit through clan land agreement, 2; for cattle herd, 8, 13; payment of labourers, 15, 115; possible changes in, 13, 15; provisions of, 9, 10-11
- Didiman, 5, 7, 14, 16, 26, 27, 30, 33, 41, 48, 51, 74, 77, 80, 81, 99, 101, 112, 113-14, 121
- Diet, 35
- Discrimination between indigenes and Europeans: in size of blocks, 3, 14; in size and nature of loans, 14, 15; settlers' attitude towards, 112, 115, 120
- Disputes: see Quarrels
- District Office, Lae, 27, 113
- Drinking water, 36
- Dunstan, H., 15, 69, 79, 107, 113, 114
- Eating arrangements, 40
- English: settlers' difficulties with, 114
- Epstein, T.S., 32
- Europeans: as agricultural officers, 112; ex-servicemen settlers, 2-3, 15; production of copra by, 4; settlers' attitude to competition with, 112; size of settlement blocks, 3
- Ex-servicemen: block-holders, 22, 66, 104; distinction between European and indigenous, 2-3; settlements, 2
- Ex-servicemen's Credit Board loans: advantages of, 13; delays in granting, 51; granted to block-holders, 22; interest on, 9; provisions of, 8-10, 12-13; repayment of, 12, 14; size of, 8, 9, 13
- Extended families; growth of, 65; recommended allocation of blocks to, 120
- Extension blocks: allocation of, 18-19, 114; clearing of, 27; estimated income from, 7; size of, 7, 20
- Extension services, 2; at Goroka, 7n.; establishment of centre at Situm-Gobari, 114; settlers' opinion of, 121
- Family enterprises on blocks: attempts to build, 44, 53, 65
- Fencing, 27
- Fertilisation trials, 5, 122
- Finschhafen, 18
- Five-Year Plan: cash cropping in rural resettlements, 1; provision for resettlement holdings in, 2
- Food distributions, 85-6
- Food gardens: of assistants, 63; various arrangements to use land for, 26-7, 28-30, 40
- Frank, 67, 77, 110, 117; as komiti, 73; as local government councillor, 69, 70, 99, 101, 102, 104, 111; role in settlers' association, 77; role in settling village disputes, 111; speech of, 70-3; state of block, 70; view of author's report, 116; view of role, 116
- Freight costs, estimated, 6
- Furniture, 35
- Game hunting, 35
- Gavin, 28, 31
- Gazelle Peninsula, 82, 122
- Girua resettlement, 122
- Gluckman, M., 63-4
- Gobari: assistants at, 107; communal work, 73, 79, 81, 101-2, 106; development of blocks, 26, 106, 107; food gardens, 26; interaction within, 92; lack of participation in social activities, 81, 106; long-term residents, 92; lotu, 80; meetings, 80; settlers' attitude to

- Administration, 114; social relationships, 123; trade stores, 32; see also Situm-Gobari
- Guise, J., minority report of, 126
- Harmony, importance to settlers of, 103, 110
- Harvard Business School, 106n.
- Hasluck, P., 1
- Hohola, 115
- Home areas: communal work by settlers from same, 81; interest in bisnis in, 32, 44, 54, 109; lack of cash cropping opportunities in, 109, 121; land rights in, 24, 25; settlers' contacts with, 106, 108-9, 120; see also Wantok
- House of Assembly, 116, 125, 126
- Housing, 35-6
- Hula people, urban and rural, 112
- Huon Local Government Council, 69, 70; inclusion of Situm-Gobari in, 99; opposition to, 99; support for, 99-100; see also Council tax, Local government council
- Huon Peninsula, xi, 18
- Income: from cattle, 7, 13; from copra, actual, 28; from extension blocks, 7, 13; gross estimated, 13-14; see also Supplementary economic activities
- Income from blocks: estimates of, 5-7, 11-12, 13-14; factors involved in, 5, 7; Land Development Board's recommendation of, 3
- Indigenous participation in: copra production, 1, 4; government, 125-6
- Inter-block contacts, 81, 91-9
- Inter-group activities: see Pilai
- International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 2
- Interplanting, 3-4, 26
- James, 67, 73, 78
- Julius, 69, 80; Gobari komiti, 79, 107; president of ex-servicemen's association, 69, 117; state of block, 69
- Kanaka, 109-10, 109n.
- Kaniniba, M., 116
- Keith, 100, 110
- Kelvin, 65; absentee block-holder, 55; kin-helpers, 55, 57; trade store, 55
- Kin-helpers, 30, 43-4, 45, 47-9, 51, 52-3, 54, 57; assistance with Robert's pilai, 82, 83, 84; defined, 41; dissatisfaction of, 47; household arrangement of, 43, 45; long-term, 55, 57; numbers of, 57; payment of, 44, 47, 48, 52, 54-5; relations with block-holders, 47-8, 52-3, 57; short-term, 48, 52, 55, 59
- Kin ties, 65, 94
- Kinship terms, use of, 79
- Kitchenware, 35
- Komiti, 73, 110; Gobari, 79; Situm and Gobari compared, 107
- Komiti bilong graun, 77-8
- Komiti bilong stoa, 78
- Labourers, 29-30, 48, 49, 57, 60; advantages of, 15; as kin-helpers, 57; assistance with Robert's pilai, 83; defined, 41; numbers of, 57, 61; (non-) payment of, 10, 11, 15, 27, 48, 49-50, 54, 103, 115-16; relations with block-holders, 60; short-term, 57
- Lae, xi, 14, 18, 28, 32, 34, 52, 55, 67; anniversary of recapture from Japanese, 100; provision of facilities at, 120
- Lae Forest, 18
- Lae Market, 30, 34; as meeting place, 104, 108, 109, 113; proceeds from food sold at, 31, 34, 43, 52, 54; production of food for, 31, 47, 51, 52, 83, 120; sale of produce by assistants at, 51, 63; sale of produce by labourers at, 51; social groupings at, 80-1
- Land Board, 44, 80; administrative delays, 113-14; communications difficulties, 114; functions, 128; selection of block-holders by, 2, 128
- Land Development Board: composition and functions of, 128; recommendation on size of blocks, 3, 5
- Land tenure, traditional: Administration attitude to, 1; and credit difficulties, 1; effect on cash cropping, 2, 25
- Lands Department, 113
- Latrines, 40
- Leaders, absence of, 77; see also Komiti, Local government councillors
- Legislative Council, 125
- Loans, 8, 22-3; administration of, 14-15, 26, 113; allowances, 15, 35; conditions regarding development, 26; confusion over, 15, 114; differences between, 10, 12, 13, 14; for cattle herd, 13; repayment of, 11-12, 14, 15, 16; see also Development Bank loans, Ex-servicemen's Credit Board loans, Native Loans Board loans
- Local government council: elections, 100-1; perceived role of, 102; settlement land leased by, 2
- Local government councillors, 67; see also Frank
- Lotu, 77, 80, 84, 95, 104
- Luluai, 20, 44
- Magic, belief in, 110
- Malaysia, parliamentary study of resettlement in, 126
- Malcolm, 43, 44
- Management deficiencies, 14, 55, 121
- Margaret, 51-2; loan, 51; relations with kin-helper, 51

- Market, see Lae market
- Marriages, 43, 52-3, 65, 67, 78; among settlers, 53-4; arranged, 67; traditional payments, 88
- Material possessions, 34
- Maurice, 67, 77; absentee block-holder, 49; as komiti, 74; labourers, 49-50
- Meetings, 80; participants at Situm, 70; topics discussed at, 80, 105; see also Lotu
- Minister for External Territories, 117
- Monetary assets, 34
- Morobe District, 45; block-holders, 67; settlers, 23, 79
- Motor vehicles, see Trucks
- Music, at pilai, 82, 86-7
- Nakanai, 36
- Native Loans Board loans, 8; advantages of, 13; granted to block-holders, 12-13, 22; interest on, 10; provisions of, 10, 12; repayment of, 12, 14; size of, 10-11
- Neighbours, interaction with other settlers, 92-5
- Neville, 31, 34, 65, 78; as leader, 44; criticisms of wantok, 109; family enterprise the aim of, 44; interest in business in home area, 44; pilai, 93; purchase of truck by, 43-4; relations with kin-helpers, 43-4; residents on block of, 43
- New blocks: allocation of, 18-19; development of, 20; size of, 20
- Non-Morobe District: block-holders, 67; settlers, 24, 26, 78
- Northern District: residence pattern on land tenure conversion scheme in, 17; settlers' attitude to original landowners, 110
- Nuclear family: as unit for development, xii, 3, 41; growth into extended family, 41; importance of, 40
- Orokaiva feasts, 81, 87
- Papua-New Guinea Ex-servicemen's Association, Lae branch, 66, 69, 117, 118
- Peanuts, 113
- Pepper, cultivation of, 33
- Pests, scapanes plague, 4, 7
- Pidgin English: investigation conducted in, xi-xii; knowledge among settlers of, 69; recommended for official correspondence, 115, 121
- Pigs, as source of income, 33
- Pilai, 51, 73, 81-2, 93, 99, 104; Administration attitude to, 91; as bisnis, 32, 91; as prestige undertaking, 34; dangers of fights at, 87; defined, 32; earnings expected, 90; economic orientation of, 82; general features of, 86; in Robert's home area, 84; origins of, 82, participants in, 86; see also Robert's pilai
- Ples, 23, 24, 26
- Polygyny, no provision in loans for, 10
- Pooling of money, 73
- Popondetta, ex-servicemen's settlements at, 2-3, 64
- Population pressures, and resettlement, 1
- Port Moresby, 53, 67, 112
- Public Accounts Committee, 119n.
- Quarrels, 51, 77-8, 110, 111; between block-holders, 78, 79; between block-holders and assistants, 44-5, 51-2, 63, 64; settlement of, 78
- Radio programme on settlement, 116-17
- Rawlinson Range, 18
- Recommendations, 121-2
- Relatives, demands of, 25
- Research, purpose of, xi
- Resettlement policy, xii, 1, 41, 125-8; attitude of block-holders to, 120, 123-4; deviations from, 41; limitations of, 2; need for flexibility in, 123-4; settlers' departures from, 22; threats to, 64
- Residence pattern, 16, 17, 41, 65, 67, 69
- Returned Services League, Lae branch, 101, 117; settlers' relations with, 117
- Roads, internal settlement, 18, 26, 28, 99
- Robert, 52, 77, 78, 102; attitude to settlement, 45; attitude to villagers, 110; bisnis in home area, 45, 47, 66, 109; dominant role of, 78, 123; garden ritual, 95; hamlet of, 36-8; poor state of block, 48, 63; relations with home area, 45; relations with kin-helpers, 47-8; relations with labourers, 48; visits to, 91, 93, 95-6; visits to home area, 109; workforce of, 48; working parties organised by, 81
- Robert's pilai, 51, 82-9, 109; attendance at, 84; dancing at, 87; drinking at, 87; expenditure for, 88-9; food eaten at, 87; food transactions during, 85-6; income from, 88-9; labour spent in preparing, 90; money transactions during, 85; music at, 86-7; preparations for, 47, 48, 82-4, 90, 95; provision of meals for helpers, 83; purpose of, 84; reasons for failure of, 89-90; role of women at, 87
- Roland, 67, 77, 115; as komiti bilong graun, 78, 100, 101
- Roy, 29, 31
- Rufus, 51, 52
- Sam, 40, 45, 47, 48
- Savings, 34
- School, 14, 27, 48, 49, 100, 120
- Sebastian, 47, 67
- Settlers: as ex-servicemen, 108; attitude to author, 100, 116; attitude to villagers, 109-10, 111-12; bisnis orientation, 112; contacts with home areas,

- 108-9; criticisms of wantok, 109; defined, 16; different home areas, 104; dissatisfactions, 115-16; expression of grievances, 116-18; relations with Administration, 112-16; self-image, 103; statistical analysis of interaction among, 91-9; view of village life, 108, 112; see also Assistants, Block-holders
- Settlers' association: difficulties in, 74; election of officials for, 101; failures, 76; Gobari disinterest, 79; management difficulties, 105; participants, 77; revival, 105
- Situm: communal work, 73, 81, 101-2; interaction within, 92; long-term residents, 92
- Situm-Gobari: compared, 26, 106-7; development of blocks, 26; distance from Lae, 18; establishment, xi, 2; estimated rainfall, 18; lack of interaction between, 92; location, 18; number of blocks, 18; reasons for studying, xi; success, 119; trade stores, 32; travel to Lae, 18, 30; traditional owners, 18
- Sleeping arrangements, 43
- Social relationships, 63-4; Gobari, 80; Situm 78; Situm and Gobari compared, 106, 122-4; see also Assistants, Block-holders, Harmony, Quarrels
- Soil deficiencies, 5, 122
- Sowam resettlement, 122
- Soya beans, 113
- Spokesmen for settlers, see Komiti
- Store-keepers, payment of, 55
- Supplementary economic activities, 30-3; reasons for undertaking, 33-4
- Tools, 35
- Trade stores, 32, 55; see also Club store
- Traditional ceremonies, see Christoph's traditional ceremony
- Traditional dance, 88, 95
- Traditional garden ritual, 95
- Traditional marriage exchange, 54
- Trucks, 27, 33, 34, 43; disputes over, 44; mechanical difficulties, 33
- Tultul, 21, 52
- van Schilfgaarde, M., 67, 80, 81
- Village concentrations, 2
- Villagers: attitude to settlers, 110-11; settlers' attitude to, 109
- Visiting, between settlers, 91-9
- Vudal resettlement, 122
- Wages: assistants, 44-5, 47; disputes over, 47, 51, 63; fixing of, 64; kin-helpers, 52, 54-5; labourers, 48, 49-50, 64
- Wantok: criticised for lack of interest in bisnis, 109; defined, 23; gifts of food to, 85-6; interaction with other settlers, 92-5; relations within, 52; settlers' assistance with pilai, 83, 85
- Warangoi resettlement, 122
- Wau, 67
- Welfare society, 42
- Willie, 40, 45, 47, 48
- Women, 74; as block-holder, 19; lack of interaction among, 67, 92; lack of participation in pilai, 86, 87; lack of public role, 77; voting in council elections, 101; see also Margaret
- World War II, 24, 34; blocks as reward for service during, 16, 25; near Situm-Gobari, 100n.

New Guinea Research Bulletins

Bulletin No. 1	The Erap Mechanical Farming Project by R.G. Crocombe and G.R. Hogbin, April 1963	\$1.50
Bulletin No. 2	Land, Work and Productivity at Inonda by R.G. Crocombe and G.R. Hogbin, August 1963	\$1.50
Bulletin No. 3	Social Accounts of the Monetary Sector of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea, 1956/57 to 1960/61 by R.C. White, January 1964	\$1.50
Bulletin No. 4	Communal Cash Cropping among the Orokaiva by R.G. Crocombe, May 1964	\$1.50
Bulletin No. 5	A Survey of Indigenous Rubber Producers in the Kerema Bay Area by G.R. Hogbin, October 1964	\$1.50
Bulletin No. 6	The European Land Settlement Scheme at Popondetta by D.R. Howlett, April 1965	\$1.50
Bulletin No. 7	The M'buke Co-operative Plantation by R.G. Crocombe, August 1965	\$1.50
Bulletin No. 8	Cattle, Coffee and Land among the Wain by Graham Jackson, December 1965	\$1.50
Bulletin No. 9	An Integrated Approach to Nutrition and Society: the Case of the Chimbu, ed. E. Hipsley, January 1966	\$1.50
Bulletin No.10	The Silanga Resettlement Project by Olga van Rijswijk, February 1966	\$1.50
Bulletin No.11	Land Tenure and Land Use among the Mount Lamington Orokaiva by Max Rimoldi, April 1966	\$1.50
Bulletin No.12	Education Through the Eyes of an Indigenous Urban Elite by Karol van der Veur and Penelope Richardson, August 1966	\$1.50
Bulletin No.13	Orokaiva Papers: Miscellaneous Papers on the Orokaiva of North East Papua, November 1966	\$1.50
Bulletin No.14	Rabia Camp: a Port Moresby Migrant Settlement by Nancy E. Hitchcock and N.D. Oram, January 1967	\$1.50
Bulletin No.15	Bulolo: a History of the Development of the Bulolo Region, New Guinea by Allan Healy, February 1967	\$1.50
Bulletin No.16	Papuan Entrepreneurs: Papers by R.G. Crocombe, W.J. Oostermeyer and Joanne Gray, J.V. Langmore, April 1967	\$1.50
Bulletin No.17	Land Tenure Conversion in the Northern District of Papua by David Morawetz, May 1967	\$1.50
Bulletin No.18	Social and Economic Relationships in a Port Moresby Canoe Settlement by N.D. Oram, July 1967	\$1.50
Bulletin No.19	A Benefit Cost Analysis of Resettlement in the Gazelle Peninsula by S. Singh, September 1967	\$1.50
Bulletin No.20	New Guinea People in Business and Industry: Papers from the First Waigani Seminar, December 1967	\$1.50
Bulletin No.21	Teachers in the Urban Community by Penelope Richardson and Karol van der Veur, January 1968	\$1.50

Bulletin No.22	Papers on the Papua-New Guinea House of Assembly by Norman Meller, January 1968	\$1.50
Bulletin No.23	Mixed-race Society in Port Moresby by B.G. Burton-Bradley, March 1968	\$1.50
Bulletin No.24	The Organisation of Production and Distribution among the Orokaiva by E.W. Waddell and P.A. Krinks, September 1968	\$2.00
Bulletin No.25	A Survey of Village Industries in Papua-New Guinea by R. Kent Wilson, November 1968	\$1.50
Bulletin No.26	The Contribution of Voluntary Aid Organisations to the Development of Papua-New Guinea, 1966-67 by Micheline Dewdney, January 1969	\$1.50
Bulletin No.27	New Guinean Entrepreneurs by B.R. Finney, February 1969	\$1.50
Bulletin No.28	Namasu: New Guinea's Largest Indigenous-owned Company by I.J. Fairbairn, March 1969	\$1.50
Bulletin No.29	Hohola: the Significance of Social Networks in Urban Adaptation of Women by Lynn Oeser, June 1969	\$1.50
Bulletin No.30	Inter-tribal Relations of the Maenge People of New Britain by Michel Panoff, July 1969	\$1.50
Bulletin No.31	Inter-ethnic Marriage in New Guinea by Andrew W. Lind, August 1969	\$1.50
Bulletin No.32	New Guinea Social Science Field Research and Publications, 1962-67 by Susan C. Reeves and May Dudley, October 1969	\$1.50
Bulletin No.33	The Rigo Road: a Study of the Economic Effects of New Road Construction by Marion W. Ward, January 1970	\$1.50
Bulletin No.34	People and Planning in Papua and New Guinea: Papers by D.J. van de Kaa, J.M. Stanhope, T.S. Epstein, N.H. Fry, and C.L. Beltz, April 1970	\$1.50
Bulletin No.35	The Indigenous Role in Business Enterprise: Three Papers from the Third Waigani Seminar 1969 by A.J. O'Connor, T.S. Epstein and G. Nash, May 1970	\$1.50
Bulletin No.36	Australia and the United Nations: New Guinea Trusteeship Issues from 1946 to 1966 by W.E. Tomasetti, July 1970	\$1.50
Bulletin No.37	Port Moresby Urban Development by J.V. Langmore and N.D. Oram, September 1970	\$1.50
Bulletin No.38	Land Tenure in West Irian: Papers by K.W. Galis, J.V. de Bruyn, J. Pouwer, J.W. Schoorl and J. Verschueren, December 1970	\$1.50
Bulletin No.39	The Situm and Gobari Ex-servicemen's Settlements by A. Ploeg, January 1971	\$1.50

The above bulletins are available at the prices listed from the A.N.U. Press, The Australian National University, P.O. Box 4, Canberra, A.C.T., 2600, Australia, and the New Guinea Research Unit, The Australian National University, Box 1238, Boroko, New Guinea.

For bulletins published from 1970 on, an annual payment of \$7.00 entitles the subscriber to all bulletins issued in the year.