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We were aware before beginning this study that communal plantations in the Northern District had been a failure. The Research Unit is generally more interested in successful ventures than in unsuccessful ones and this is the only failed experiment to have been included in our current land study programme (which includes more than twenty sample studies in various parts of the country). The reason for this study was that detailed comparative studies were being undertaken with other approaches to cash cropping among the Orokaiva and a full comparison could not be made without the inclusion of the communal experiment.

For assistance in the field I am particularly grateful to Mr. Edric Eupu and Mr. Cromwell Burau as well as to the people of the many villages we visited in the course of the study. Mr. Max Rimoldi kindly assisted with research from early published reports. The co-operation and interest of the District Commissioner, Mr. L. Williams, and other officials, missionaries and settlers is acknowledged with gratitude.
From the beginning of British administration in Papua in 1888, it was policy to encourage Papuans to engage in cash cropping. MacGregor, the first Lieutenant-Governor, advocated cash cropping to those villagers he met in his tours of the country, but such incidental advice by an itinerant official was probably not very influential. The first legislative provision to promote cash cropping was a Native Regulation, introduced by MacGregor in 1894, which provided that magistrates could compel indigenous people to plant coconuts on penalty of a fine. (1) This was extended in 1903 by a regulation which provided for compulsory planting of other economic trees. Native agriculture was not, however, the main plank of agricultural policy for although government staff were trained to "treat natives justly" they were directed "above all to prepare the country for development by Europeans. There is not, and there has not been, any other policy". (2)

Planting under the regulations took place slowly, and only in areas which were under the close supervision of magistrates. It appears that there was little planting of cash crops by Papuans other than under the compulsion of the regulation and at this stage it does not seem to have been a matter of concern to the Administration whether the people planted individually or in groups. It has not been possible to determine which pattern was most frequently followed in practice, though the examples noted in the literature mostly involved planting by village or clan groups rather than by individuals. Coconuts were the main crop planted under the regulations, but rice, rubber, kapok, peanuts and fruit trees were tried in smaller...

---

(1) Native Regulation No. 2, 1894. Miles (1956: 318) regards MacGregor's technique for promoting native agriculture as unusually enlightened, but in fact it seems to have been almost universal in the Pacific at that period, and MacGregor had become familiar with it while serving under Sir Arthur Gordon in Fiji. Similar regulations were introduced by Germany to Samoa and New Guinea, by the United Kingdom to Fiji and the Gilbert Islands, by New Zealand to the Cook Islands and by Holland to Indonesia.

(2) MacGregor to Lamington 4. 10. 1898 (quoted in Healy 1962 : 84).
quantities in some areas. (1)

After the turn of the century less emphasis was given to the policy of expanding indigenous plantings of cash crops and instead Papuans were persuaded to work as labour on European plantations. In 1906 the Lieutenant-Governor stated that not only was staff inadequate to enforce the 1894 regulation, but that where it was enforced the resultant income attracted traders whom he felt to be a bad influence on the Papuan people. Employment on European plantations, on the other hand, was considered to be beneficial. (2) This policy remained until after the first world war, though some Resident Magistrates also applied the regulations in order to extend native plantings.

---

(1) For a more detailed study of the application of these regulations see Miles 1956:319-23.

Native plantations as the mainstay of agricultural policy (1918 - 40)

After the 1914-18 war, a shortage of labour, low produce prices and high shipping costs made it very difficult to attract European settlers to Papua. The emphasis of agricultural policy was therefore shifted and indigenous agriculture was seen as the only hope for the future. "If we cannot attract capital to develop the Territory", the Lieutenant-Governor wrote, "we must develop it without capital - that is, by native agriculture" (P.A.R. 1921-2: 6). He saw two particular advantages in native agriculture over European; it did not require hired labour and it did not require large amounts of capital. It was clear the country would not be developed by the few European plantations then in operation (with a planted area of about 61,000 acres in 1923) and for the next decade at least Murray gave great emphasis to the development of "native plantations".

In the Northern District(1) there had been little planting under the regulations since the turn of the century, but with the outbreak of the first world war the Resident Magistrate gave priority to expanding output by the compulsory planting of coconut, rubber and citrus trees, and 10,000 coconut and other economic trees were planted in 1914-15 under the direct supervision of patrol officers (P.A.R. 1914-15: 49). By 1921 there were 46,404 coconut trees in the Orokaiva area but over half (25,642) had been planted within the previous five years. Almost all the rubber trees had been planted in the previous five years (P.A.R. 1920-1: 48-50).

Although the regulations did not prescribe that planting was to be either by individuals or groups, in all the post-1914 instances we are aware of in the Orokaiva area, each village or cluster of villages was in fact directed to plant as a

(1) The Orokaiva area was included in the Buna and Kokoda Districts of the Northern Division until 1909, then in the Kumusi Division until 1920, and in the Northern Division (later termed the Northern District) since 1920.
Group planting seems to have been the general pattern in other parts of the Territory too. In the Western District in particular, the Resident Magistrate initiated schemes for cash crop plantations being owned and operated by each village as a whole. Profits were to be used for projects which would be of benefit to the village community (P.A.R. 1913-14:12). About fifty such plantations were established under the scheme.

During this post-war drive (and probably in 1920) a government officer assembled the people of the nine villages of the northern branch of the Asigi tribe and instructed them to choose a site and plant an area of coconuts for the nine villages as a whole. (3)

A central site was chosen near Ongoho on land belonging to the Akute'undi sub-clan (most of the members of which lived in Ongoho village), and about 500 coconuts were planted as a community project by the men of the nine villages. (4) They were to be used exclusively for copra making (there were ample coconut trees in the villages for domestic use) and work and profits were to be shared equally among the able-bodied men. Small plots of rubber and citrus trees had been established at Ongoho under the same scheme a year or two earlier. The citrus was intended to be used primarily as a latex coagulant for the rubber, and only secondarily as a cash crop.

(1) In some instances in the coastal villages of the Northern District each individual planted his own trees, but all villagers planted in one "village" block on the land of one man or of one descent group.

(2) Ongoho, Hongorata, Ivisusu, Sowai, Weki, Ondahari, Oere, Girigirita and Heherita. Sowai and Weki were later abandoned and today their populations live together at a new village named Sotokoari. Likewise Girigirita and Heherita have amalgamated and moved to a new site. The new village is called Girigirita.

(3) Data in this section of the report was collected by interview only in the villages concerned during April-May 1963.

(4) The annual reports show that in 1921 there were 518 coconut trees over five years old and 1,287 under five years old in the Asigi area. The nine villages listed above comprise about half of the total Asigi population. The 518 mature trees were probably those planted in the villages. Trees in the community block which did not survive were not replaced, and as the ground has not been cleared since the second world war, many have died. There were 198 trees still standing in 1963.
At the time of planting, copra prices were relatively high (averaging £32.10.0 per ton f.o.b. in 1920) but a fall in overseas prices and the introduction of the Navigation Act in 1921 (which resulted in exports to Europe having to go to Australia first) made copra production uneconomic.\(^1\) No copra was ever made from the community coconut grove at Ongoho, nor were the small stands of rubber and citrus fruits ever exploited. After the war the Akute'undi, as landowners, claimed the trees as their own on the ground that the community project had been abandoned long before. One Akute'undi man claims and uses about half of the trees. His father planted food crops on that part of the land before the coconuts were planted and he now plants vegetables between the coconuts. Each of the resident Akute'undi men claims the right to the produce of several particular trees on the other half. Three trees are set aside for the medical assistant at the local Aid Post, as he is a stranger. Most members of the other sub-clans question the right of the Akute'undi to the exclusive use of the coconuts as all groups participated in the planting. Occasionally some member of the other sub-clans asserts himself and collects nuts from the "community plantation" and the dispute which is normally quiescent flares up again.

Enquiries in fifteen other Orokaiva areas where coconuts were planted under the regulations show that most were never used for copra-making, though a few of those on the coast were so used from time to time. Not one plantation was systematically exploited. The rubber was not tapped as there was no market for the latex, and most plantations were not cleared after planting.\(^2\) The citrus fruits were never exploited commercially, again because there was no market.

---

\(^{1}\) By 1923 average f.o.b. price per ton had fallen to £19.0.0 and by 1930 to £11.10.0. By 1934 the price was £8.0.0 per ton in London or about £4.10.0 f.o.b. Papua, though Papuans had long since stopped selling. The above prices were those paid to exporting traders, and net prices paid to indigenous producers were probably not much more than half those mentioned above.

\(^{2}\) After 1941 other arrangements were made for use of the rubber plantations. For details see Rimoldi 1964.
The Native Plantations Ordinance

In addition to the post-1918 drive for increased planting under the regulations a new policy was introduced with the dual aim of increasing village production and government revenue.\(^{(1)}\) The old regulations had provided for compulsory planting only, but the new ordinance provided for continuous supervision and compulsory maintenance and harvesting of gardens, as well as processing and marketing facilities. Under the heading "Compulsory labour in the natives own interest", Sir Hubert Murray claimed that "the most obvious, and possibly the only solution is to encourage, or if necessary to compel, the native to work for his own benefit" (P.A.R. 1921-2: 16).

The new policy was embodied in the Native Plantations Ordinance 1918 (and amendments)\(^{(2)}\) which provided for the establishment of community plantations in which both the government and the villagers would participate. Profits were to be shared equally between the government and producers.\(^{(3)}\) The Lieutenant-Governor was empowered to direct that any Crown land could be set aside as a Native Reserve for the purpose of establishing a plantation. Alternatively, with the consent of the land owners "whose property the land remains", plantations could be established on native land.

The earlier Native Regulations which provided for compulsory planting of cash crops were not repealed, but they seem to have been used much less after the new Ordinance became operative in the 1920's.

The available sources give little indication of the reasons for emphasis being placed on group plantations rather than individual plots, though Miles (1956: 323) hazards the view that it facilitated control and inspection, and that the indigenous

---

\(^{(1)}\) For a discussion of the emphasis on raising government revenue see Mair 1948: 88.

\(^{(2)}\) The Ordinance of 1918 was subsequently superceded by the Native Plantations Ordinance 1925-52, extracts from which are contained in Appendix E.

\(^{(3)}\) The Ordinance prescribed that "half or any other proportion" of the crop was to belong to the villagers. In practice villagers were paid half the takings.
people probably preferred it anyway. He gives no evidence for the latter assertion. It seems equally possible that officials of the day considered the Papuan people to be "naturally" adapted to communal patterns of work.

The first action to implement the ordinance in the Northern District was taken in 1921 and 1922 when inspections were made by officials "with a view to plantations being established of such economic plants as will suit the soil and promise a profitable return" (P.A.R. 1921-2 : 23). Similar action was taken in parts of the Central, Milne Bay and Gulf Districts at the same time.

Acquisition of land

In 1921 the Crown began to purchase lands under the Lands Ordinance 1911-22 and to declare them under the Native Plantations Ordinance, as Native Reserves set aside for the purpose of Native Plantations. Between 1921 and 1925, 38 such plantations were declared in Papua (33 of them in 1922-3). Each plantation was to be farmed by a group of neighbouring villages. By 1932, however, 18 of the Orders in Council by which the plantations had been established had been cancelled (there were no cancellations thereafter). Of the remaining 20, 14 were located in the Northern District and the other 6 in other parts of Papua. With the exception of small extensions to several plantations, no further land was bought by the Crown for this purpose after 1925. The plantations established on Crown land in the Northern District are listed in Appendix A.

In 1925 the policy changed to the extent that plantations were only established under the ordinance if people could be persuaded to set aside native land for the purpose. The Crown did not buy the land, and residual ownership was not challenged, but for such time as the land was proclaimed under the ordinance it could only be used as a native plantation for a particular group of villages. We have been unable to ascertain the reasons for this change of policy. Between 1923 and 1936, 75 plantations were proclaimed in Papua under this section of the ordinance. By 1934, 36 of the Orders in Council setting up the plantations had been cancelled. Of the remaining 39, 12 were located in the Northern District. They are detailed in
Appendix B. No further communal plantations were ever established.

Payment for the land purchased by the Crown was made in tobacco, mirrors, belts, knives and axes. The precise cash value of these goods is not known, but the value of twist tobacco at that time was about 3/- per pound, (or 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) pence per stick) and the various goods chosen as payment by different individuals indicate the following values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 mirror</td>
<td>3 sticks tobacco = 4(\frac{1}{2}) pence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 belt</td>
<td>3 sticks tobacco = 4(\frac{1}{2}) pence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 small knife</td>
<td>4 sticks tobacco = 6 pence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 large knife</td>
<td>16 sticks tobacco = 24 pence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 axe</td>
<td>29 sticks tobacco = 43(\frac{1}{2}) pence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 16 blocks listed in Appendix A contained 266 acres of land (with blocks ranging from 10 to 30 acres) and were bought for 23\(\frac{1}{2}\) pounds of tobacco, 21 mirrors, 21 belts, 14 small knives, 6 large knives and 1 axe, or an approximate cash value of £5. 8. 11 or just under 5 pence per acre of land. (1) The payment was divided equally between those persons listed on the purchase documents as the owners.

The officers who negotiated the purchase signed a declaration in each case to the effect that the land purchased was "unoccupied at the time of sale", though in several instances present-day informants have named the families or lineages which were gardening there at the time the plantations project began. As the land was to be set aside for the use of the local people the officers were perhaps less meticulous in this regard than they would otherwise have been, and in one instance signed a declaration to the effect that the land was unoccupied even though it was stated elsewhere on the document that the land had been under crop for some years and remained so. (2)

(1) The first five blocks were purchased by an officer who paid one pound of tobacco per five acres (equivalent to 7d per acre) and the rest within a matter of weeks by another officer who paid in a wider range of goods worth the equivalent of just over 4d per acre. There is no noticeable difference between the lands concerned. These prices are much the same as the Crown was paying for land elsewhere in the Territory at that time.

(2) Amboga plantation No. 26 (extension).
The purchase documents list the names of the vendors, who were described as "sole owners" of the land concerned. (1) There was an average of five "owners" per block, with a range from one to eleven. All of them were men. From the sample checked it appears that not all members (nor even all male members) of the owning sub-clans were included, but rather the heads of the owning sub-clan and of component lineages. Moreover, some heads of neighbouring sub-clans which participated in the project, but were not members of the owning sub-clans, were included. This suggests that the people may have viewed the negotiation as a decision by the signatories and their descent groups to set the land aside for a particular purpose (with the consent of the occupying sub-clan), rather than outright sale by the occupying sub-clan.

Legally the blocks which were purchased belonged to the Crown, but the Orokaiva people do not admit either the sale or any other Crown rights. In the course of field work in 1963 we asked villagers at each of 12 blocks, to whom the land on which the coffee was planted belonged. Invariably we were told that it belonged to one or other of the local sub-clans. In three instances we suggested that it may have belonged to the Crown, but the people reacted so strongly that we did not press the point, (though the strength of their assertion may well have reflected their uncertainty about precise rights to the land).

At the time of purchase the officers concerned no doubt pointed out to the owners that the land would not be taken for use by the government, but would be set aside for the collective use of the villages concerned. The plantations were in fact established and it is understandable that the people consider that the landowners were merely granting joint usufruct to members of neighbouring sub-clans. The government has never asserted its legal rights to the abandoned plantations, and it seems unlikely that it will ever do so.

**Planting under the ordinance**

Whereas the Native Regulations had been implemented by the Resident Magistrates, provision was made in the

---

(1) The vendors were illiterate and signed the documents by the putting of marks.
ordinance for the appointment of officers as "controllers of native plantations". The first of these, Mr. G.H. Murray, was appointed in 1920 to serve the whole Territory (P.A.R. 1920-1 : 28). It was not until 1923 that a permanent officer, Mr. A.T. Dawson, was posted to the Northern District. Neither officer had been trained in agriculture.

The people of the Northern District were reported to be receptive to the idea of having their own plantations and "practically no compulsion" was applied in getting initial agreement to the principle (P.A.R. 1923-4 : 16).

Planting began in 1923 and by 1925 fourteen of the plantations had been planted. Owing to a delay in obtaining cocoa seedlings from Java, 30 acres of cotton were planted in 1925 (P.A.R. 1924-5 : 27). The cotton experiment was a failure and was not repeated. By 1926 there were only 50 acres of cocoa, 10 acres of coffee and 6 acres of oil palm in the district. (1) Eleven of the plantations were of cocoa, one of coffee and two of oil palm. A little rice was also tried. The cocoa, oil palm and rice were soon abandoned by both government and the people owing to a drop in prices, and only the coffee was persevered with.

In 1926 or 1927, a further 116 acres of land were cleared for coffee under government instructions, but the rate of expansion declined markedly thereafter. By 1936 there were 18 plantations totalling 242 acres under coffee in the Orokaiva area. 189 acres were then in bearing and the rest were expected to begin bearing by 1938. Plantings ranged in area from 4 to 30 acres.

Every able-bodied man between the ages of 16 and 36 years who lived within five miles of a plantation (except those employed by government, missions or European plantations) was required, by regulations under the ordinance, to work 60

(1) This figure included some private plantings in addition to those under the ordinance - P.A.R. 1926-7 : 10. Coffee seed was supplied from the government station at Higaturu.
days per year on the plantation of his village. (1) Those who worked 60 days or over were thereby exempted from head tax (then ten shillings per year). Those who did not were liable not only to head tax but also to a fine of £2 or imprisonment with hard labour for a period of three months.

Evidence is inconclusive as to how much work was required in practice. Despite the reference to sixty days' work per year, crops like coffee needed constant attention and if only sixty days per year were to be performed by each man, either work days would need to be staggered or workers rostered. At first government officers required 120 half-days, but in most villages once the crops were in bearing all men were required to attend every morning from Monday to Friday throughout the year. (2) None of the foremen had watches and it is impossible to know how long men worked in fact, but informants in widely separated parts of the area claim that they were required to work until noon in the coffee gardens. In addition, men took turns to carry the produce on foot to the government base at Higaturu every Saturday. This involved a walk of about fifteen miles in each direction from the Ongoho (Asigi) community block.

Women took no part in cash cropping, but they did most of the gardening. Men sometimes helped in the food gardens in the afternoons.

Reports of the period contain many references to the peoples' lack of enthusiasm for the scheme and heavy sanctions were applied by government officers to have their programme enforced. In 1925 the Resident Magistrate tried to extend the

(1) Men who had been away as indentured labourers were exempt from this requirement for three months after their return to the village.

(2) At several places near Higaturu people claimed that they were required to work afternoons also during busy periods. After such periods they would be allowed a week or more off with no plantation work. It seems likely that this was done in the villages close to Higaturu which were under closer supervision by the officer in charge of the plantations. In the more distant areas the officer seems not to have delegated any authority to vary the regular pattern. Humphries (1944: 3) notes that the specified period of 60 days (he says three months) was not observed in practice and that "in fact men were called upon to work whenever circumstances required them".
scheme to Ioma and other areas. At Ioma "it was only when faced with the alternative of going to gaol for failure to pay tax that they were induced to work on the plantation .... In other districts the natives elected to pay their taxes in money" (P.A.R. 1925-6:52). The scheme survived, according to Captain Humphries (1944:2) who was at one stage responsible for it, "only because of the gaol that loomed in the background."

The standard penalty for failure to work was three months' imprisonment which was served by working on the government coconut plantations at Buna or Ioma, or on the government rubber plantation at Kokoda. These plantations were worked entirely by prison labour (apart from supervisory and specialist staff) and many of the older men we spoke to had served sentences for breaches of this ordinance. In fact, as Mair (1945:83) notes, the existence of government plantations which had no provision for paid labour acted as an incentive to prosecute for breaches of this and other laws.

Daily work on the community coffee gardens was supervised by the village constables who were thus in a position of considerable authority. Nevertheless, this role may not have been particularly congenial for the constable was as likely as anyone to be punished for failure to keep the work up to standard. There was not a constable for each village, and the constable at Ongoho, for example, was responsible for the nine Asigi villages which worked the Ongoho block. (1) The constables in turn were supervised by Papuan foremen known as "coffee bosses", each of whom was responsible for a number of communal gardens. The "coffee bosses" in turn were responsible to the European Controller of Native Plantations who was based at Higaturu.

Such was the difficulty of getting labour to carry the produce from the factory at Higaturu to the port of Sanananda (near Buna) that a special regulation was passed requiring all able-bodied men to carry produce whenever instructed to do so. (2)

---

(1) For supervision of the plantation and normal police services he was paid ten shillings per year.

(2) Native Plantations (Northern Division Carrying) Regulations 1928.
No payment was prescribed, and none was made for carrying from the plantations to the depot at Higaturu. Sometimes payment was made for carrying produce the 16 miles from Higaturu to the port (usually in twist tobacco according to informants), but at other times persons convicted of breaches of the ordinance were required to carry as punishment. Mules were later introduced to carry the produce from the factory to the port, and in the late 1930's a truck was acquired to transport it from Popondetta to Sanananda. The mule train was still used between Higaturu and Popondetta until 1940.

Official reports of the period consider the reluctance of the villagers to have been due either to a lack of understanding of the benefits they would derive from the scheme or to innate laziness. C.T. Wurth, who was Resident Magistrate in 1926, considered that the people "had not grasped the advantages of the plantation and the benefits they will eventually reap" and noted that many men from the villages with plantations had gone off to work as labourers elsewhere (P.A.R. 1925-6 : 50). His successor described the "toil and disappointments" entailed in supervising the plantations and stated that the village people "have to be driven to it by the fear of gaol". (1) He was aware that there was no cash return during the first four years after establishment of plantations and hoped that attitudes would change as soon as the trees came into bearing and income was derived.

As noted on page 7, half the produce of the plantations was to belong to those who produced it and the other half to the government. But in practice in the Northern District, producers were required to deliver all produce to the government depots at Higaturu, Popondetta and Buna. (2) The half of the

(1) P.A.R. 1926-7 : 53. A later magistrate followed a policy of "incessant talking to the village councillors ... for even if they do not think his [the magistrate's] advice worth following, they may be glad to take it as the only means of keeping him quiet" - P.A.R. 1933-4 : 29.

(2) The main depot was at Higaturu until 1941, but in that year new machinery was installed at Popondetta to handle pulping, drying and hulling. (Since 1933 the coffee had been shipped in the parchment stage to Port Moresby where it was hulled at the government rice factory). Before the Higaturu depot was closed, however, war broke out and all three depots were destroyed.
proceeds to be retained by the government was paid into the Native Taxation Account (which was composed of revenue from head tax and native plantations). Average annual government revenue from the plantations was £1,082 and from head tax £14,003. After costs of collection had been met the balance remaining in the Native Taxation Account was transferred to two funds which were entitled, somewhat inaccurately, the Native Education Fund and the Native Benefits Fund.

Hulling, marketing and administrative costs incurred in running the plantations scheme were paid from the Native Education Fund. The same fund provided a coffee pulping machine for each of the plantations which was more than about two hours walk from Higaturu, the produce of the closer gardens being pulped at Higaturu Station. In fact no money was spent directly on native education in the Northern District, though some small subsidies were granted to mission schools. The Native Benefits Fund provided for the salary of a Government Anthropologist, medical services, bonuses to large families and other miscellaneous expenses. Only about a quarter of the money in the two funds was spent on education (all in the form of subsidies) and much was simply left to accumulate. When the war broke out there was an unspent balance of £26,199 in the Native Education Fund. The whole plantations scheme (including Native Education and Native Benefits) was administered by the Director of Native Taxation.

The producer's half of the income from the coffee was paid, not on delivery, but at the end of each year. The official in charge of the scheme visited each village to make the payments. The ordinance required that payment was to be made in proportion to days worked and, as the village constable who was in charge of the plantation was almost invariably illiterate, some of them kept an "attendance stick" for each man. A notch was cut in the stick for each day of absence other than that caused by illness or the death of a close relative. When the government officer visited the village to make the payments the constable produced the attendance stick of each man as he came up for payment. Some constables relied on memory to inform government officers of absentees, but the few literate ones (e.g. at Sombo) were provided with attendance books.
Production and income

While official reports give laziness or misunderstanding as the reason for the lack of willing co-operation with the scheme, the reason given today by the people themselves is that the income was inadequate for the effort required.

Table 1 shows the total production of coffee from plantations established under the ordinance in the Orokaiva area for the ten year period 1931-40, and the amounts paid to producers for it. The price per pound has been calculated and ranged from 4.5 pence (in 1932) at the highest to 2.1 pence (in 1938) at the lowest. The average price for the period was 2.6 pence per pound. (1)

Table 2 shows that output per acre of land planted in coffee under the scheme averaged 681 pounds, which is a relatively high yield. At 2.6 pence per pound this would have given an income of £7.7.5 per acre. The total work force on all the plantations is estimated to have been about 700, so payment would have averaged £1.11.0 per worker per year, or less than 2 pence per day worked. The 15½ acres of coffee in the Ongoho block (2) would, assuming average yields, have given an annual income of £114.5.0, or just over £1.0.0 per worker, but informants today maintain that payment at Ongoho was usually 8/- to 12/- per man per year with young lads being paid 5/-. Only on one or two occasions did the payout exceed £1. The total labour force in the nine villages which participated in the Ongoho block was probably close on 100 and yields per acre were apparently lower than average. Enquiries at other communal plantations show that higher prices were paid in places where a smaller labour force was working an equally large area. In Hohota, for example, £6 to £9 was paid per man in some years, but there the hours of work are said to have been 6 a.m. to noon six days a week, plus afternoon work at harvest-

(1) The world trade depression had begun about the time the first coffee was coming into full production. The crop was marketed in Australia where it met strong competition from Java coffee.

(2) Our measurement of the planted area shows it to have been just over 15½ acres, though the area gazetted was only 15 acres.
Table 1

Production of coffee in the Orokaiva area from plantations established under the Native Plantations Ordinance for ten years 1931 - 40 (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1931</th>
<th>1932</th>
<th>1933</th>
<th>1934</th>
<th>1935</th>
<th>1936</th>
<th>1937</th>
<th>1938</th>
<th>1939</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Yearly average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weight (lbs)</td>
<td>9,630</td>
<td>22,652</td>
<td>67,470</td>
<td>60,645</td>
<td>61,425</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>127,000</td>
<td>171,595</td>
<td>187,300</td>
<td>163,319</td>
<td>994,036</td>
<td>99,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payout (2)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>2,102</td>
<td>10,821</td>
<td>1,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pence per lb (3)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Derived from Territory of Papua reports 1932 - 41.

(2) Net payment to producers in £ Australian.

(3) Calculated to the nearest tenth of a penny.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1936</th>
<th>1937</th>
<th>1938</th>
<th>1939</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Yearly average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total output (lbs)</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>127,000</td>
<td>171,595</td>
<td>187,300</td>
<td>163,319</td>
<td>772,214</td>
<td>154,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output per acre (lbs)</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>681</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Derived from Territory of Papua reports 1936 - 41. Acreages for the years 1931-5 are not available.
ing time. Humphries (1944: 3) estimates the annual payment per man to have ranged from a few shillings to £4 per year.

At that time some of the young single men were going out to work on plantations in return for food, accommodation and a cash wage of £6 per year. All plantations had to supply tobacco, soap, sugar and meat each week-end, and some paid wages every month (usually 10/-). But payment in cash and kind was not the only incentive to taking employment outside the district. Perhaps the main reason was the experience involved, for it seems to have become a necessary prerequisite to manhood that a youth should have been away to work. The income acquired was used at least partly to supply his bride-wealth on his return.

From discussions with many Orokaiva people who were involved in the plantations it seems that they regarded the scheme as an imposition whereby the people were required to plant coffee which the government commandeered and sold to its own profit. The annual cash payment was not viewed as a price per pound but as a token payment by government for their labour. (1) Official reports (e.g. P.A.R. 1933-4: 27) noted that the people "complain loudly" when the payment was not up to expectations and in 1939 a demonstration occurred when the money paid out at Higaturu was thrown on the ground by the recipients.

The plantations were undoubtedly overstaffed and workers should not have been under any strain to complete their tasks. With 700 workers for the 242 acres of coffee there was an average of nearly three workers to the acre, though allowance must be made for their having to carry the produce to the depot and in some cases to pulp it also. At Ongoho there were six to the acre, though walking to and from the job must have

(1) It is still quite widely held that produce prices are fixed by government, and that in the same way as Europeans are paid higher wages, they receive higher prices for their coffee. Humphries (1944: 2) noted that the people regarded "working for the government" on native plantations as much less remunerative than working for a planter.
taken as much time as the work itself for some of them. (1)

Under ideal conditions each worker could probably have handled one to two acres working mornings only. Such, however, was the government's enthusiasm for instilling regular work habits (or at least regular attendance at the place of work) that no roster system seems to have been worked out to ensure that workers attended for the minimum time necessary to complete their tasks. It is not difficult to understand that, though fear of imprisonment kept the project going, there was little enthusiasm for it in the villages.

(1) Girigirita and Oere were about an hour's walk each way from the coffee block.
Post-war community plantations (1945 - 62)

Shortly after the outbreak of war with Japan, government services were reduced to a minimum, coffee buying ceased and the community cash crop gardens were soon abandoned. The Orokaiva area became the scene of intense fighting between Japanese and Australian-American Forces during 1942 and 1943 and civilian government was not restored until 1945. No further Commissioners for Native Plantations were ever appointed but towards the end of 1944 an Agriculture Officer (Mr. F. Shaw) was posted to Higaturu. One of his tasks was to get the pre-war plantations into production again. Most informants today say they had no wish to resume work on the plantations owing to the low payments made pre-war, which they assumed would continue. Their association with American forces had led them to consider their labour to be worth considerably more than pre-war rates. However the military administration (A. N. G. A. U.) was then still in charge of the Territory, and they were instructed to recommence work on the plantations.

The pre-war system whereby every man worked on the coffee each morning from Monday to Friday was resumed, though supervision was transferred from the village constable to a "coffee boss", one of whom was appointed by the government to oversee each plantation.

Penal sanctions were less severe than pre-war, the usual punishment for failure to attend work being one month's imprisonment instead of three, but before long the sanctions were relaxed and few people were convicted. Income was higher, for whereas before the war the villagers were paid only half of the proceeds of the crop, after the war they were paid the full price. (1) Ongoho people inform us that annual payouts after the war were £6 to £9 per man per year, and in addition

(1) The Native Plantations (Papua) Ordinance of 1952 provided for the total value of the crop to be paid in cash to the producers. In practice, the policy had been followed for several years before that.
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The men who carried the coffee to Higaturu each Saturday were each given a stick of tobacco. By 1950 the basis of payment had been changed and producers were paid immediately and in cash for their produce.

The post-war drive did not last long and when official pressures were relaxed production dropped markedly. During 1949-50 extension staff made a further attempt to revive the scheme: seven plantations in the Higaturu area were fully rehabilitated and similar work was proposed for the plantations east of Popondetta. New processing equipment was purchased and a new coffee factory built at Higaturu, but it was hardly completed when Mt. Lamington erupted early in 1951 destroying the factory and many of the plantations as well. Production from the plantations scheme ceased as a result of the eruption, but it is doubtful whether it would have continued for long in any case. The price was low, (1) no external sanctions were imposed (and the people were not permitted to impose their own sanctions) and in many instances there was dispute over the shares to be given to landowners, supervisors, and others. In 1955 extension staff made a third and final attempt to revive the scheme, but it too met with little long term success.

No precise production figures are available for the plantations scheme in the Northern District, but as this scheme produced most of the coffee exported from Papua, total exports from the colony give an indication of the pattern which applied in the Northern District. These are listed in Table 3 below.

---
(1) In 1950 coffee was being bought in cherry at 2d per pound which is equal to about 10d per pound for parchment coffee. Data published in P.A.R. 1949-50 : 17 show that 40,160 man-hours were worked on the 56 acres of coffee then in production and that £767.12.3 was received from coffee sales. Making no allowance for establishment costs, this represents 4½d per hour worked.
### Table 3

**Coffee production in Papua 1939-63**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tons</th>
<th>Notes and Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1938-39</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>(Of which 84 tons came from Orokaiva native plantations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>(Marketing and supervision affected by war)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-41</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>(Marketing and supervision affected by war)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-42</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>(Japanese occupation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942-43</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>(Japanese occupation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943-44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Australian military occupation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944-45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(First attempt to revive scheme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(First attempt to revive scheme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(First attempt to revive scheme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(Second attempt to revive scheme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-51</td>
<td>13 cwt.</td>
<td>(Owing to Mt. Lamington eruption)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-52</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$ ton</td>
<td>(Owing to Mt. Lamington eruption)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53</td>
<td>$\frac{3}{2}$ tons</td>
<td>(Owing to Mt. Lamington eruption)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-54</td>
<td>2$\frac{1}{2}$ tons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Third attempt to revive scheme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Third attempt to revive scheme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(Includes first exports of coffee from individual plots sponsored by agricultural extension on land registered under Higaturu Council land registration scheme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>24$\frac{1}{2}$ tons</td>
<td>(Including 7 tons from indigenous producers in Northern District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(Including 24$\frac{1}{2}$ tons from indigenous producers in Northern District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(Including 26 tons from indigenous producers in Northern District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-63</td>
<td>49(?)</td>
<td>(Including 41 tons from indigenous producers in Northern District)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) These figures had to be derived from a variety of sources, for the Annual Reports for Papua do not include exports made via Lae in New Guinea. They must be taken as approximate only.
After 1958 most of the coffee produced by indigenous growers in the Northern District came from plots which were planted by individuals (largely as a result of agricultural extension services) and registered under the Higaturu Local Government Council land registration scheme. The communal project was formally abandoned in 1960 with the repeal of the Native Plantations Ordinance.\(^1\) Crown lands reverted to the Crown and native lands to their owners. The Government has treated the Crown lands as reserves for the local people and has not taken any action to restrict their use as communal plantations. Today, however, only 9 of the 16 pre-war plantations which we visited are producing at all, and they at only a fraction of their potential output.

We traced the history of the Ongoho community block in detail in a series of separate interviews at each of the villages which had participated in the project.\(^2\) The collapse of the project there was caused by disagreement over land rights, apportionment of work and distribution of income. The disputing parties were the various sub-clans which had participated in the project. The sub-clans may be roughly equated with villages.\(^3\)

Before the war, strict control by the Administration precluded the emergence of these particular problems: the land had been demarcated and the trees planted under close supervision, fixed patterns of work were imposed, and the money was paid to each man by a government official. By the late 1940's however, the sanctions for failure to work were not in fact being exercised, and attendance was irregular. The Ongoho "coffee boss" who had been responsible for local supervision from about 1945 found the dissension too much to control and resigned in 1948. Little work was being done and the govern-

\(^{1}\) The Native Plantations (Papua) Repeal Ordinance 1960.

\(^{2}\) This was necessary because the issue is still very contentious and feelings about the disputes over the community gardens are still strong.

\(^{3}\) In fact each village is regarded as being that of a particular sub-clan, despite the existence of smaller enclaves of other sub-clans in most of them. Marriage is usually (but not exclusively) between sub-clans and almost invariably within the Asigi tribal group.
ment coffee pulping machine was withdrawn. Supervision of the coffee was taken over by the village constable (who had been in charge of the coffee before the war) but no records of attendance were kept. Later, at the constable's suggestion, a Patrol Officer is said to have appointed one Haruma (who is a classificatory brother of the constable's wife) as coffee boss. This must have been an unofficial appointment as he was not paid. There was by this time a continuing dispute about the distribution of income from the coffee.

The Hoiwo'undi sub-clan, on whose land the Ongoho coffee was planted, claimed a larger share of the proceeds because the land was "theirs". As no agreement was reached, the Hoiwo'undi forbade members of other sub-clans to enter the coffee gardens. This prohibition was respected even though many people felt it to have been unjust. Legally of course neither Hoiwo'undi nor any other sub-clan had any right to the land, because the whole garden area had been purchased by the Crown in 1922 and set aside as a reserve for the purpose of a native plantation in 1923. But security of tenure is dependent much more on beliefs than it is on law and in fact the people do not concede the government's right to the land. All are agreed that it is Hoiwo'undi land, though the other sub-clans consider that as everybody cleared the bush and planted the trees, it is unjust that Hoiwo'undi should have denied them access. Nobody, however, seems to deny their right to do so. In fact Hoiwo'undi people had been using the front part of the area for a food garden before the community coffee plantation was established. One family of Akute'undi sub-clan had also been gardening there with the approval of Hoiwo'undi. The coffee boss (Haruma) was also the leader of the Hoiwo'undi sub-clan.

For a time the community garden was abandoned altogether, but later some Hoiwo'undi people harvested coffee there spasmodically. The income was shared within Hoiwo'undi. No weeding, pruning or other maintenance work was carried out at this period. At the time of the Mt. Lamington eruption in 1951 all work ceased. The government coffee factory and buying centre was destroyed and so were several of the community plantations. (1) Due to the trauma caused by the disaster

---

(1) In fact the coffee trees grew again from seed which had been lying in the ground and which was not affected by the eruption. These self-sown trees have not been tended or thinned, however, and their productive potential today seems to be very low.
and a lack of buying facilities, no coffee was picked at Ongoho until 1952.

In that year a local company (R.F. Bunting & Co. Ltd.) began buying coffee. The market price was higher than it had been when the government was buying (i.e. up to 1951) and it continued to increase. Some Hoiwo'undi resumed harvesting coffee from the Ongoho community block, but there was constant tension between them and the other sub-clans, Akute'undi in particular. Only a little of the coffee was picked, most of it by the village constable and the coffee boss and their close kin. (1) In 1953 they took two sacks of coffee to the Department of Agriculture in order to buy a coffee pulping machine worth £21.0.0. The machine did not function properly and after several years a passing Patrol Officer took it to Popondetta for repair. The Patrol Officer was later transferred and the machine was never located again. The owners still harbour a grievance on this account.

Agricultural extension services in the district were expanded during 1955-6 at the same time as the Higaturu Local Government Council was being formed. (The council area embraces all except one of the community plantations). Although agricultural policy at that time was to encourage future planting by individuals rather than groups, efforts were made to increase production from existing community plantations. Extension workers visited every community plantation and wherever possible enlisted local co-operation to have undergrowth cleared and trees pruned. Not all the people at Ongoho worked, but factional differences were sufficiently contained for several sub-clans to work together under the supervision of extension workers. Once the major task was completed and the

---

(1) The village constable was a member of Akute'undi sub-clan but was married to the most senior woman of Hoiwo'undi sub-clan. She has a very forceful personality, is married within her own village and is the only member of her family to have borne children. They will therefore acquire some land rights from her. The land on which the community coffee is planted was previously used for gardening by her father and her brothers. Her husband was village constable and he and his lineage pick coffee, but other lineages of his sub-clan do not and he is as forceful as his wife in denying their right to do so. In fact the constable and the coffee boss (who is a classificatory brother of the constable's wife) seem to have co-operated throughout to maximise their joint advantage.
extension staff left, the internal tensions re-asserted themselves.

The people made an attempt to keep the garden working as the price of coffee was then 3/3 per pound. Persons from several sub-clans participated in harvesting, pulping and drying and a consignment of coffee was taken on foot to Popondetta (a distance of about seventeen miles each way by the paths then in use). For the first time women and children helped with the harvesting. The income from sales was distributed by the coffee boss, but disputes arose over the proportions due to the "landowners" for the use of the land and to the coffee boss for his supervision, as well as the relative shares to be given to those who had done the work, for some had not worked as many days as others. Members of other sub-clans again withdrew from the project. The coffee boss himself and some members of Hoiw 'undi sub-clan occasionally harvested a little coffee to provide money for particular needs, but most of it was left untouched. No further maintenance was done. When the Higaturu Council and its supervising officer, Mr. Normoyle, strongly advocated planting by individuals rather than groups, a number of people took seeds from the community garden and established their own individual coffee plots.

When the Higaturu Council erected a coffee factory in Popondetta late in 1959, councillors were encouraged to maximise coffee production in their areas. The Ongoho councillor (who is a half-brother of the ex-village constable)\(^{(1)}\) was able to persuade some people to start harvesting again. On this occasion each family was to be allowed to harvest, process and sell whatever coffee its members picked.\(^{(2)}\) People were to be allowed to pick anywhere and at any time. No maintenance was done except on one occasion at the beginning when all people worked together to clear the undergrowth. This system

\(^{(1)}\) When the council was formed all village constables were compulsorily retired.

\(^{(2)}\) The produce was still taken to Popondetta on foot. The Higaturu Council provided a tractor and trailer to collect coffee from various points along the main Saiho-Popondetta road, but Ongoho was about eight miles from the nearest point. As a flat rate of one penny per pound was charged for the service, the Ongoho people did not use it. They used to leave Ongoho at dusk and carry all night and arrive at the factory early the following morning.
operated for several months but broke down when the Hoiwo'undi, who felt that they were entitled as landowners to some extra share of the proceeds, again forbade members of other sub-clans to enter the coffee garden.

Since that time only the coffee boss and his family have ever picked the coffee, and they only occasionally. No maintenance has been carried out for some years. The Hoiwo'undi people say they would like to take full control of the block and divide it into individual plots - one for each of the six men in the sub-clan. They would be prepared to grant a portion of the block to the related Akute'undi of Ongoho village who were planting food crops on some of the land at the time the coffee project was started. Some Akute'undi claim that the land is, in fact, theirs exclusively. The other sub-clans want separate and equal divisions for each of the participating sub-clans, arguing that all cleared and planted the coffee. It is unlikely that agreement will be reached.

We subsequently paid brief visits to sixteen other plantations which had been gazetted pre-war to determine the nature of the problems which had led to their abandonment. As time did not permit of detailed investigations, we regard the results as indicative rather than definitive. Details of the situation are set out in Appendix A.
Community rice and cocoa projects

In 1948, the Christian Co-operative Movement was formed by Father Clint of the Anglican Mission at Gona. The movement spread spontaneously throughout the Orokaiva country, though most of the co-operatives were only nominally linked to the mission. (1) The main activity of the co-operatives was the growing of rice, but some grew subsistence foods also, and others made copra. Although the movement was referred to as a co-operative, its agricultural activities were in most cases communal: all participants were supposed to work at the same time and to undertake whatever work was allotted to them by the group leaders, and the benefits derived were to have been shared equally. Moreover, at least some villages required all resident adult males to participate in the scheme.

In most instances the village worked as the unit of production, but in some cases several neighbouring villages worked together. Some large villages were divided into one or more groups for the purpose of the community rice garden. Each group had a committee of management and a chairman.

In general Monday and Tuesday of each week were set aside for work on the community gardens. Official patrol reports noted that the movement had taken on many aspects of a cult. All stages of work were associated with an unusual amount of religious activity and the tools and buildings of the co-operatives were treated with great veneration. Keesing (1952: 7) speaks of an "absorbing mystical context" and of rumours that Europeans would leave Papua as a result of the co-operatives. An official observer stated that the people considered "mere participation in the co-operatives would, magically or mystically, quickly raise their status in all respects to that of Europeans". Orokaiva people have pointed out to us that cash cropping projects initiated by the government had invariably failed. They felt that a mission project might be more successful. Moreover, whereas they were uncertain of the government's motives they felt the mission to be "on the side of the people", for by introducing them to co-

(1) The co-operative movement in this area is described in more detail in Dakeyne, 1963.
operatives they had given them the key to European prosperity.

Local enthusiasm was strong and a large acreage of rice was grown. However, no marketing facilities had been provided and although the mission had promoted the crop mainly to supplement traditional subsistence foods, most Orokaiva seem to have regarded it as a cash crop. They already had a plentiful range and volume of subsistence foods, and rice was not only harder to grow but also more difficult to prepare than the existing crops. Most of the rice grown was neither sold nor eaten, but was left to rot in the storehouses.

It is interesting to note that at Ongoho, despite the unfortunate experience with other community crops, all inhabitants of the same nine villages came together to plant a single rice plot. The project was organized by Haruma, the coffee boss, and the rice was planted on the land of the Akute'undi sub-clan. The crop was planted in 1949, and the rice was stored in a house built for the purpose. None of the rice was sold, a little was used for food, but most was left to rot. The experiment was not repeated. When asked why everyone combined to grow the rice instead of growing it individually, the people claimed that they had not realized at that time that cash crops could be grown by individuals. This view may seem incredible to a European, but we have heard it quoted in many parts of the Orokaiva area. Their whole experience of cash cropping had been of large scale enterprises, whether private European plantations, government plantations (which were established adjacent to many district headquarters), compulsory plantings under the regulations, or communal plantations under the ordinance. The introduction in 1955-6 of the concept of cash cropping by individuals was in a very real sense revolutionary. (1)

The idea of community economic activity was again given a boost in 1949 when war damage compensation was paid out. A small proportion was paid in cash, but most was deposited in savings bank accounts. Many government officers then in the area noted that the money was being used to buy

---

(1) It must be pointed out, however, that among the Orokaiva food gardening had always been undertaken by individuals.
foods stuffs and for ceremonial exchanges and some urged the people to deposit their compensation money in a central fund for use by the community as a whole. Many leaders took this advice and collected large sums for the co-operatives. Some of the money was kept in the villages, but some was contributed to central funds which were held on a tribal or sub-tribal basis.

Few of the leaders had the technical knowledge to know how to handle the funds or to apply them to productive projects, and much of the money was dissipated in unproductive activities. About 1950 government Co-operative Officers were sent to assist the establishment of formal co-operatives and to save the many existing informal co-operatives from disintegration with consequent public loss of faith. The officers were able to make headway in some instances, but in other cases the funds were already exhausted and the people disillusioned. In cases where the funds remained, the government insisted on their being handed back to the original contributors before any official co-operative was formed (Belshaw, 1951: 250).

Efforts to increase indigenous participation in commercial agriculture in the Northern District in the post-war decade had met with little success and in 1954 the Department of Native Affairs resumed pre-war patterns of promoting commercial agriculture. Additional police were stationed in the area, particularly on the inland side of the Kumusi River but to a lesser extent among the Orokaiva also. One policeman was based at each of a number of villages and each village was required to clear a community garden for cocoa planting.

The Department of Agriculture staff did not favour any extension of community planting and put its emphasis on individual cash crop gardens but, in the early stages at least, this action was strongly opposed by both the mission and the patrol staff. Missionaries who were involved feared that individual cash cropping would lead to abandonment of the villages as each individual would probably want to live near his own cash crop garden. They felt that this would result in a reduction of religious and educational activity and may lead to a resurgence of non-Christian practices. Patrol staff too opposed individual plantings at that time, in some instances it seems because of an erroneous notion that traditional agriculture was
a communal task. (1)

Most of the communal cocoa gardens in this area were later abandoned. Some (such as Hojavasusu) were divided into individual lots and continue to produce. A few others are still functioning to a limited degree, but none are now operated on a communal basis.

(1) By about 1956 the new patrol staff had come to favour individual plantings and this policy has been followed by both departments since then.
Conclusions

All the attempts to promote communal cash cropping among the Orokaiva have been economic failures. There is no evidence to suggest that they have been successful in any non-economic sense. Each of the ventures has been associated with problems of land tenure, work organization, income distribution and motivation. We will deal with each of these problems in turn.

Problems of land tenure: When a sub-clan or other descent group has set aside land for use by a larger body which includes other descent groups, the donor descent group is recognized in terms of traditional culture as having residual rights to the land. These rights may still be recognized by the community even if they have been abolished by legal action in terms of administrative procedures (see pages 10 and 25). (1) This is particularly so in cases where the setting aside has been the result of a degree of persuasion which appears to the people as compulsion. Strict government supervision can protect the legal rights but, if none of the parties are particularly anxious to have them protected, the supervision needs to be constant and strict to be effective. Even then the results are unlikely to justify the effort required to effect the controls, for supervision by force results in very high overhead costs and seldom motivates workers to maximise output.

We do not know of any instance of communal planting of cash crops by a single descent group on the land of that descent group. Traditionally all planting was organized at the level of the primary household, with some reciprocal assistance from other households for specific tasks at irregular intervals. If, a single descent group did undertake clearing, planting and harvesting of cash crops jointly, tenure problems would be un-

(1) A similar phenomenon was observed in the Ambenob scheme near Madang where the Administration purchased land from the villagers and leased it to the Local Government Council for sub-lease to individual farmers for cash cropping. The purpose of the scheme was to give security of tenure to the individual, but as both vendors and sub-lessees recognized some degree of residual right as remaining with the vendors, a sense of security has not been achieved. This is one reason why sub-lessees are in fact planting their cash crops more on their traditional lands than on their sub-leases.
likely to emerge. Problems of work organization and income distribution may nevertheless arise. (1)

Problems of work organization: The communal plantations almost all involved several unrelated descent groups which traditionally recognized no single leader. The Orokaiva did occasionally form larger ad hoc groups for warfare and sometimes for forest clearing, but these were temporary associations directed to the achievement of a short term goal. This of itself does not preclude the formation of new and larger groupings with unitary leadership provided there is either a strong desire for group action (and the necessary institutions to direct it), or strong external sanctions to enforce it.

The earliest communal plantings of coconuts and rubber by the Orokaiva were carried out under instructions from officials and sufficient pressure was exerted to ensure compliance. The pressure was not, however, maintained and the coconut and rubber trees were little cared for after planting. Nor was harvesting for market enforced. Prices were low; the coconuts were seldom made into copra and the rubber was never tapped until the time of the war. (2)

The working of the coffee planted under the Native Plantations Ordinance was strictly supervised. A village constable was in charge of each local group, the European officer in charge patrolled the area regularly, and defaulters were severely punished. The communities regarded the whole operation as one of oppression by the government. During the period that government sanctions were reduced and finally withdrawn, coffee prices were high (more than ten times higher than immediately pre-war). Many people therefore wished to continue working the coffee gardens, but the community was not traditionally equipped with adequate sanctions to ensure that individuals did their share of work, and the law specifically forbade the exercise of sanctions by any indigenous individual or group.

(1) Since writing this we have been informed of a small (3 acre) communal tobacco-growing project which began at Soroputa in 1948 on the land of a single descent group. It was reported to have functioned efficiently until it was destroyed by the Mt. Lamington eruption in 1951.

(2) For details of the war-time rubber-tapping scheme see Rimoldi, 1964.
As Mair (1948: 85) has noted, the fact that officials could fall back on compulsion gave them no encouragement to considering any alternative approach. The European officer's link with the people was through the village constable, and from what the Orokaiva tell us this line of communication operated in one direction only, for most constables felt that it was improper to query instructions given by Europeans, or to make suggestions to them. Not only was no attempt made to create local institutions which could have carried responsibility for community projects, but the imposed organizational structure did not provide the people with an acceptable model on which to fashion any new local institution. The vesting of all powers of sanction in the central government, moreover, forestalled the possibility of their spontaneous emergence.

Problems of income distribution: While the Administration paid each individual separately, no overt problem arose, but when government ceased buying and the coffee was sold to a trading company a lump sum was given to the person or persons who brought it in, usually the local coffee boss. Relatively few Orokaiva were literate (among the Asigi there were none) though it may have been possible to have made equal payments to all persons. However, as the community was unable to enforce equal work this was not feasible. Had there been a sufficient standard of literacy it may have been possible to operate on co-operative rather than communal lines (i.e. making payment in terms of work contributed) but in fact few people had the necessary degree of literacy and almost none had any knowledge of book-keeping.

Problems of motivation: The Orokaiva were never willing participants in any of the communal schemes (with the exception of rice growing in 1949). Some of them may have begun some of the projects willingly, but continued operation was only achieved by force. The money incentive was quite inadequate: most of the schemes produced no income at all, and those that did gave less (in cash and kind) than employment elsewhere. As already noted in the section on work organization, there was no social incentive to continued production.

It has been suggested that the pre-war community projects were merited in that they introduced the people to the
agricultural techniques of cash cropping and to regular patterns of work. It is true that most of the individual plantings of coffee since 1956 were made with seeds taken from the old community blocks where the techniques of coffee husbandry had been learned, but it was there also that the people had acquired their distaste for cash cropping.

The fact that all attempts at developing communal cash cropping among the Orokaiva have failed does not necessarily mean that communal planting is never practicable. What it does indicate however, is that to be successful, communal farming like any other farming system, must be coupled with appropriate organizational structures, sanctions and incentives as well as with extension, processing and marketing facilities. (1)

(1) Individual small-holdings do not of themselves lead to higher output. Since 1956, the nine Asigi villages which participated in the Ongobo community block have been encouraged to plant individual cash crop gardens. To date only 33 gardens have been planted (all of coffee). They cover only about 9 acres of land and contain 4,209 trees. Most are little better tended than the community block and fifteen are completely abandoned. Low price, distance to the market and lack of extension services seem to be responsible.
### Appendix "A"

**Plantations established in the Northern District on Crown land under the Native Plantations Ordinance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area a.r.p.</th>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Villages participating</th>
<th>Sub-clans</th>
<th>Present use</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Reasons given for stoppage(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bowera (Ioma)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tabara (Ioma)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wadi (Ioma)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These four plantations were never operated. They were cancelled in 1932.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Poho (Ioma)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sasembata</td>
<td>10.0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Not visited)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Garombi</td>
<td>10.0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Not visited)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Isivita (Pereteambari)</td>
<td>10.0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Not visited)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Isivita (Koropata)</td>
<td>10.0.0</td>
<td>Rubber</td>
<td>Koropata Kiorota Egaturu Tambore</td>
<td>Berikipa Oitopa</td>
<td>Still being tapped</td>
<td>Owners of individual trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Wasida</td>
<td>10.0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Not visited)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Reasons given by the villagers. In places where only brief visits were made these may be incomplete.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Villages participating</th>
<th>Sub-clans</th>
<th>Present use</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Reasons given for stoppage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Huvivi (New Mongi)</td>
<td>20.3.8</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Huvivi, Hingoturu, Onjahambo, Ahamba, Koganata</td>
<td>} Sokepa, } Honinapa</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mongi (Hangeriterari)</td>
<td>20.0.0</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Mongi, Pengipejari, Baiwaturu, Oteindarituru</td>
<td>} Unjekapa, } Darahepa, } Koreapa, } Akeopa</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Soputa (1)</td>
<td>20.0.0</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Soputa, Hinhota</td>
<td>( Paratapa, Kovenopa, ( Wasiripapa, Asinapa, Humotapa, Soupa, Asepa, Pangaripa, Tigasepa, Angorapa</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Dispute over land rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sombo (Sangara)</td>
<td>15.1.30</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Sombo No. 1 &amp; 2, Egaturu, Tunana, Seondeturu, Hangeturu, Sehamo, Huisata</td>
<td>} Horeopa, Embupa, } Pangaripa, Sorupa, } Homberepa, Heurupa, } Heregapa, Dihumapa, } Horipa, Besupa, } Hirikipa, Hatopa, } Okaipa, Sivavapa, } Hounyapa, Umbahapa, } Anetapa, Kogorapa</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Any Sombo people not killed in eruption</td>
<td>Destroyed by Mt. Lamington. Individual plots planted before community plot rejuvenated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Location later changed from Crown land to Native land.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Villages participating</th>
<th>Sub-clans</th>
<th>Present use</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Reasons given for stoppage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Imanituru (Old Higaturu)</td>
<td>30.0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Not visited)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Andemba</td>
<td>22.2.0</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Andemba, Kewana, Kuruta, Opapata, Hamuni, Ogapoegarota, Hamumuta</td>
<td>Horeopa, Huaepa, Heregapa, Sindapa, Pakuhopa, Jujapa, Warupa, Punahopa, Suarapa, Haujepa, Noerapa</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>AnyAndemba people not killed in eruption</td>
<td>Destroyed by Mt. Lamington Individual plots planted before community plot rejuvenated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ambogo</td>
<td>22.2.0</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Ambogo</td>
<td>Komotepa, Serigepa, Hurepa, Oripa, Moinapa, Sigorepa, Hinjopa, Sohopa, Hatopa, Sehopa, Sehopa, Haujepa, Embatipa</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partly destroyed by Mt. Lamington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hamburata (Huhurundi)</td>
<td>20.2.0</td>
<td>Oil palm then coffee</td>
<td>Hamburata ....</td>
<td>Herepa, Boutepa, Iohipa, Ombarapa, Seharipa, Oripa, Barunapa, Bakopa, Berehobari, Irinapa, Ingikipa, Atupa, Bangaripa, Embesepa, Haunapa, Oretapa, Huhurupa, Hauro, Heregapa, Pakopa, Sindapa, Hihinepa, Jiregapa, Aukapa, Huepa, Akutepa, Oisopa, Jega</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Price inadequate - coffee trees later destroyed by flood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Crop</td>
<td>Villages participating</td>
<td>Sub-clans</td>
<td>Present use</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Reasons given for stoppage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ahora (1) (Huhurundi)</td>
<td>20.0.0</td>
<td>Cocoa</td>
<td>Ahora</td>
<td>Hurupa Gambe</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Price inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>then coffee</td>
<td>Arova, Omba</td>
<td>Gambe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Kanari</td>
<td>12.0.0</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Kanari, Ajase, Iwori, Waru, Jajau</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Dispute over land rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ongoho</td>
<td>15.0.0</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Ongoho, Sotokoiri, Ivisusu, Hongorata, Ondahari, Oere, Girigirita</td>
<td>Akute'undi, Pnomoni'undi, Hoiwo'undi, Sahuru'undi, Kajumba'undi, Hature'undi, Urumo, Baruna</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>1 family (ex coffee boss)</td>
<td>Disputes over land rights, income distribution and work sharing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Rescinded 2.12.1929, but land legally remained as Crown land.

The above plantations were all gazetted on 7.2.1923, but an addition of 4 acres (making 20 acres 3 roods 8 perches in total) was made to Plantation No. 20 on 6.2.1929.
Appendix "B"

Plantations established in the Northern District on Native Land under the Native Plantations Ordinance (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year established</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Villages participating</th>
<th>Sub-clans</th>
<th>Present use</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Reasons given for stoppage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Doboduru (Beuru-Perombata)</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>12.0.0</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>(Not visited)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Kakendeta</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>9.0.0</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>(Not visited)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Haugata (Hamburata)</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>12.2.0</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>(Not visited)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Enatutu</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>31.0.0</td>
<td>(Not visited)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Kiorota-Hohota (Meamburari)</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>15.0.0</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Hohota, Kiorata</td>
<td>Jau'undi, Havirusa, Kaguhaha, Andirihaha, Suaru-undi</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Former landowners</td>
<td>Dispute over work organization and income distribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) These are in addition to the lands listed in Appendix A, which covered those acquired by the Crown and set aside as Native Reserves. Plantation No. 22 (Soputa) was transferred from Crown land to Native land in 1930 - see Appendix A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year established</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Villages participating</th>
<th>Sub-clans</th>
<th>Present use</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Reasons given for stoppage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Hegata-Pendereta (Hururu)</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Hegata</td>
<td>(Bevehupa, Baratapa, (Eherapa, Okaipa, (Endehipa, Waraupa, (Angoropa Sesengipa Ribumipa, Gasipa, Horiwapa)</td>
<td>Still Picking</td>
<td>2 Hegata men (the former landowner and one other)</td>
<td>Still working. The non-owner gives the landowner a share of proceeds from sales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Banguho Creek (Perombahambo)</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>(Not visited)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Tunana</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td></td>
<td>Damaged by Mt. Lamington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Beuru</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>(Not visited)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td></td>
<td>Damaged by Mt. Lamington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Hegau (Kanari-Jajau)</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Dispute over land rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Heherita (Kogonata)</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Girigirita, Epa, Heherita Pomoni'undi, Jahaki'undi, Urumo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not resumed after Mt. Lamington eruption. No reason given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix "C"

A sample of community plantations established in the Northern District of Papua since 1947 (not related to the Native Plantations Ordinance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year started</th>
<th>Area (approx.)</th>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Villages participating</th>
<th>Sub-clans</th>
<th>Present use and user</th>
<th>Reasons for stoppage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hojavasusu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coffee (originally cocoa)</td>
<td>Hojavasusu</td>
<td>Seho, Uhoru Ererehaije, Holhane, Kindarahaije</td>
<td>Sub-divided about 1956 into individual plots. (Well kept. Land belongs to Seho sub-clan but no dispute over use by individuals of all clans).</td>
<td>Not stopped. (Use rights confirmed by registration with Higaturu Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajeka</td>
<td></td>
<td>1½ acres</td>
<td>Cocoa</td>
<td>Ajeka</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spasmodic, mainly by landowners</td>
<td>Dispute over land rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivepe</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Sivepe</td>
<td>Jegase, Seho, Timumu</td>
<td>Divided into individual plots in 1958.</td>
<td>(Registration with Higaturu Council applied for)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gewoto</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>3 acres</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Garara</td>
<td>Somboba, Ijipa, Undaripa and 2 others</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Dispute over land rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Native Regulation No. 121(1)
(Providing for compulsory planting of economic trees)

Coconuts and other useful trees and plants

(1) It is a good thing to plant coconuts and other useful fruits and trees, and all coconuts and trees planted under this regulation shall belong to the person that plants them and to his heirs, and every able-bodied man shall from time to time plant coconuts and other useful trees and plants. The Magistrate shall fix the number of trees or the area of land as the case may be that the able-bodied men of each district or village shall plant, and coconuts shall be properly planted at a distance not less than five fathoms from tree to tree.

(2) All men will not have to plant the same number of coconuts and other useful trees, on the same area of land because some men have little land and some have much and some places are not good for planting trees.

(3) It shall be the duty of the village constable to see that this regulation is obeyed in such villages as the Magistrate directs, and if he fails or neglects to do so he shall on conviction be liable to a fine not exceeding Two shillings and sixpence or in default of payment to imprisonment for any period not exceeding Seven days, or to imprisonment in the first instance for any period not exceeding Seven days.

(4) The Magistrate shall also, where deemed desirable, order the people to plant and cultivate useful food trees along the village road so that they may all enjoy the shade and eat of the fruit.

(5) The Government may provide the people from time to time with young trees or seeds to plant, and the Magistrate will direct the people where to plant them.

(1) Native Regulation Ordinance 1908-30.
(6) If any native who has been ordered to plant and cultivate a certain number of trees or a certain area of land by the Magistrate wilfully neglects or refuses to do so he shall on conviction for a first offence be liable to a fine not exceeding Five shillings or in default of payment to imprisonment for any period not exceeding Six weeks, or to such imprisonment in the first instance; or, for a second or any subsequent offence to imprisonment in the first instance for any period not exceeding Three months.

Sub-clauses (7) to (9) cover minor points of detail and have been omitted.

This regulation was amended in 1946 such that planting could be forced thereafter only in the event of serious food shortages.
Appendix E

Extracts from Native Plantations Ordinance 1925-52

and subsidiary enactments

"4. (1) The Lieutenant-Governor may ... direct that any land acquired or resumed under the provisions of the Land Ordinance 1911-24 ... shall be a native plantation ....

(2) The Lieutenant-Governor with the consent of the native owners may ... direct that any land shall be a native plantation ... and shall remain so until the Lieutenant-Governor otherwise orders but the land shall remain the property of the native owners.

4. (A) The Lieutenant-Governor may appoint officers to carry out the provisions of this ordinance. Such officers shall be known as controllers of native plantations ....

5. (1) Statutory workers¹ shall work for such number of days each year as may be prescribed ....

(2) For cultivation work ... the Lieutenant-Governor may ... remit tax.²

8. (1) Of the total annual produce of each native plantation one half or such other proportion as the Lieutenant-Governor may order³ ...

¹ Defined as "every able-bodied male villager" aged between 16 and 36 years excepting government or mission employees and indentured workers.

² Order in Council of 2.7.1924 ruled that no tax would be payable by any villager who worked for two months per year on the plantation.

³ No proportion was ever gazetted but it is understood that one half was invariably taken.
(a) may be distributed in kind by the Government among the villagers . . .

(b) may be sold by the Government on account of the villagers . . .

(c) may be purchased by the Government from the villagers . . .

9. The remainder of the annual produce of each native plantation . . . shall be the property of the Crown".

Native Plantations Regulations 1926, made under the above ordinance, prescribed that statutory workers had to work sixty days per year on their plantation. It also provided that "supervision and regulating native plantations and the cultivation thereof" was vested in the Director of Native Taxation.

Order in Council of 20.9.1926 made the following provisions for the distribution of the villagers' share of income derived from native plantations:

"1. That each one-half or other proportion of each year's produce which is the property of native villagers . . . shall be divided among the statutory workers and voluntary workers in the proportions that the number of days which each of them respectively has worked during the year bears to the aggregate number of days which all of them have worked on the native plantation in the cultivation thereof . . . .

Provided that where any statutory worker (who has by death or age ceased to be such) or where any voluntary worker (who has ceased to be such or has died) has previously worked on a native plantation for any time during any year during which the prescribed plant cultivated thereon has not come into bearing or is unproductive then he (or, in case of his death, his widow, or in case of her death, his child or children whilst under the age or apparent age of sixteen years) shall be entitled to receive
during the first productive year of the native plantation such part of the produce thereof as is the property of the villagers as the proportion which the number of hours he worked (in his first year of work) whilst the native plantation was unproductive bears towards the total number of hours which all statutory workers and voluntary workers worked in that year and so on yearly mutatis mutandis until he (or his widow or children as the case may be) has received such part of the produce in respect of each unproductive year he worked on such native plantation.

2. That instead of allotting the proportion of the annual produce of a native plantation in the manner set out in the proviso to Paragraph 1 hereof the nearest Resident Magistrate... may be required by the Director of Native Taxation to confer with the villagers in their village and ascertain what other scheme of allotment of such annual produce they themselves consider to be preferable.... The Magistrate shall report the result of such conference to the Director who shall forward it with any observations he desires to make to the Lieutenant-Governor who may approve the scheme preferred by the villagers with or without modification whereupon that scheme of allotment as approved shall be followed in relation to such annual produce instead of the scheme ordered in the said proviso.

Officers to be instructed to adopt 2 when practicable."

Native Plantations (Papua) Ordinance 1952 provided that the villagers would own the whole of the produce of the plantation instead of half as formerly. This ordinance also did away with the earlier requirement that villagers work 60 days per year on the plantation, and cancelled the provision whereby persons who worked on plantations for two months were exempt from tax.
Appendix F

The Orokaiva villager's experience of cash cropping

While the writer was conducting research into communal plantations in some villages, an assistant, Mr. Edric Eupu, visited others. The following brief extracts from two of his preliminary reports indicate the nature of the villager's experience of cash cropping, and help to explain the current lack of enthusiasm on the part of many Orokaiva for further experiments.

Ahora Communal Garden

Before the war there were four cash crops planted at Ahora: coconut, cotton, cocoa and coffee. The coconut was planted on two clans' land. The names of the two clans were Huruba and Gambe. There were three villages took part in the work. The names of the villages and clans who took part in the work were ....

They planted coconuts but did not make any copra. [There was no market for it at the time]. The coconut was ready to make copra, but the Government officer at Buna told the people to plant the cotton. The cotton was planted on Gambe clan's land ...... The people worked one year for the cotton without pay .... When the cotton was ready .... they picked it and took it to Buna (government station) .... and they got paid. The pay was 1/- for each man in the three villages for the work they had done for the cotton. After they got the pay the work on the cotton stopped.

Then government told the villagers to plant the cocoa and they planted. It was planted on Gambe clan's land. The cocoa bore and they took the pods to Buna. Government paid for the pods [but the pay was insufficient] .... Then the coffee was planted on Huruba clan's land .... The people used to work every day .... The pay for the coffee was about 5/- to every man each year. While they were still doing this the war came. After that they did not work until Mt. Lamington erupted.
Before the war there were four cash crops planted at Hamburata: rice, coconut, palm oil and coffee. The rice was planted on Atupa clan's land. Five villages took part in the work .... There were 29 clans .... The villagers worked for the rice for one year without any pay. The rice was harvested in bags .... The people brought the bags of rice to Buna but the government did not pay them for the work they did on the rice. They worked for the rice for one year only ....

The second crop planted at Hamburata was coconut. The coconut was planted on land of Atupa clan .... The coconut plants were still young when the villagers were told by the government to plant another crop. The crop was palm oil .... The palms were planted on Haumepa clan's land. The villagers planted the oil palm and looked after them for one year and the government told the people to plant another crop. The other crop was coffee.

The coffee was planted on Seharipa clan's land .... They worked every day .... They got pay once in every year. The government officers used to come to the village. The government used to send police to the village to look after the people to work on the coffee .... When the war was near the government did not send the police to the village for this work. After that all the people in the village stopped work .... After the war they did not work on the plantation until the Mt Lamington eruption. The coffee was near the Ambogo river so the river was flooded and washed the plantation away ....
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