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O le Fale o le Feʻe

Monalisa Saveaali'i Malietoa, Iunivesite Aoao o Samoa

‘Oto‘otoga

O le Fale o le Feʻe, o le fale pou-maʻa, folo-maʻa a ma ʻato-maʻa. Na foa/fau ina ia faafōliga i se Foga’a pou se papa telē i totonu o le moāna sausau, e pu pu totonu ma e nonofo ai feʻe te tetele a taʻua o tao-lä. O le Fale o le Feʻe na nofoia a Auga-Atua Feʻe a ʻafua mai i uluai ʻFōlauga poʻo le Foafoaʻa i se vaitau faaʻitaʻi, poʻo le 3000 BC. O le vaitau na pūlea ai e le Atua o Tagaloalagi Faʻatupunumu u a le Aiga Sā-Tagaloalagi le Vasa Telem. O le vaitau lava lea na ia Aiga Tufuga le Aiga Sā-Tagaloalagi, e pei o Tufuga Tā-vaʻa-Fauʻa-vaʻa, Tufuga Faufale ma Tufuga Ta-Tatuu/Ta-Malu. O Aiga Tufuga ia na iao i latou Tui sa taʻitaʻi a latou ʻautau malolosi. O Tui ia e mua mai ai suafa Tui-Le-Tufuga o Apia ma o latou na faua le Fale o le Feʻe. O ʻauga o le Sofo pei o latou nofoia a suʻesuʻega a le Ausuʻega a Talaʻeli ma le Talatuu o le Fale o le Feʻe, (ii) ina ia faamatalaina sootaga o le Feʻe i le ‘Upolu, Salati’a, pao Aloa, faatasi ai ma na nofoia i le Foga’a i Faleula ma le Aiga Ralaʻa, sa i le Papa-Galagalaga. (iii) ina ia faamatalaina sootaga o le Feʻe o loo ola pe a ola o Faaalupega o ōnapo nei, (iv) ina ia faamatalaina uiga loloto ma uiga nātia o vaogaganaga o loo ʻofoia a le Fale o le Feʻe a o loo ʻofoia a le Fale o le Feʻe, (v) ina ia saʻili se vaitau talaʻeagai na sa fofa ai le Feʻe e āfua mai i le Tui o le Feʻe e āfua mai i loo āfua a o loo āfua a le Fale o le Feʻe.

O le Fale o le Feʻe, o le Fale pou-maʻa, folo-maʻa a ma ʻato-maʻa. Na foa/fau ina ia faafōliga i se Foga’a pou se papa telē i totonu o le moāna sausau, e pu pu totonu ma e nonofo ai feʻe te tetele a taʻua o tao-lä. O le Fale o le Feʻe na nofoia a Auga-Atua Feʻe a ʻafua mai i uluai ʻFōlauga poʻo le Foafoaʻa i se vaitau faaʻitaʻi, poʻo le 3000 BC. O le vaitau na pūlea ai e le Atua o Tagaloalagi Faʻatupunumu u a le Aiga Sā-Tagaloalagi le Vasa Telem. O le vaitau lava lea na ia Aiga Tufuga le Aiga Sā-Tagaloalagi, e pei o Tufuga Tā-vaʻa-Fauʻa-vaʻa, Tufuga Faufale ma Tufuga Ta-Tatuu/Ta-Malu. O Aiga Tufuga ia na iao i latou Tui sa taʻitaʻi a latou ʻautau malolosi. O Tui ia e mua mai ai suafa Tui-Le-Tufuga o Apia ma o latou na faua le Fale o le Feʻe. O ʻauga o le Sofo pei o latou nofoia a suʻesuʻega a le Ausuʻega a Talaʻeli ma le Talatuu o le Fale o le Feʻe, (i) ina ia saʻili se vaitau talaʻeagai na sa fofa ai le Feʻe e āfua mai i le Fale o le Feʻe.

O le Fale o le Feʻe, o le Fale pou-maʻa, folo-maʻa a ma ʻato-maʻa. Na foa/fau ina ia faafōliga i se Foga’a pou se papa telē i totonu o le moāna sausau, e pu pu totonu ma e nonofo ai feʻe te tetele a taʻua o tao-lä. O le Fale o le Feʻe na nofoia a Auga-Atua Feʻe a ʻafua mai i uluai ʻFōlauga poʻo le Foafoaʻa i se vaitau faaʻitaʻi, poʻo le 3000 BC. O le vaitau na pūlea ai e le Atua o Tagaloalagi Faʻatupunumu u a le Aiga Sā-Tagaloalagi le Vasa Telem. O le vaitau lava lea na ia Aiga Tufuga le Aiga Sā-Tagaloalagi, e pei o Tufuga Tā-vaʻa-Fauʻa-vaʻa, Tufuga Faufale ma Tufuga Ta-Tatuu/Ta-Malu. O Aiga Tufuga ia na iao i latou Tui sa taʻitaʻi a latou ʻautau malolosi. O Tui ia e mua mai ai suafa Tui-Le-Tufuga o Apia ma o latou na faua le Fale o le Feʻe. O ʻauga o le Sofo pei o latou nofoia a suʻesuʻega a le Ausuʻega a Talaʻeli ma le Talatuu o le Fale o le Feʻe, (i) ina ia saʻili se vaitau talaʻeagai na sa fofa ai le Feʻe e āfua mai i le Fale o le Feʻe.
aumai ai mana ma valoaga. O le Atua Fe’e sa ia pulea le nofoaga faaleagaga o Salefe’ē. O le Atua Ve’a sa ia pulea le nofoaga faaleagaga o Pulotu. O le talitonuga o tagata Samoa anamua, “a maliliu Matai ma tagata faimana, ona ō lea i Pulotu; ae a maliliu tagata e lé o ni Matai ma leai ni ō latou mana, ona ō lea i Salefe’ē” (Geraghty 1993: 343–384). O Pulotu foi, o le Pu e ō iai lotu pōo tatalo pe a manaoamia e tagata ni fesoasoani, e pei ona, logo i Pulotu le mapu a Ta’i i pe o le tatalo a Ta’i na logo pe ta’u i Pulotu ao mapuea ma mapusela i lona pologa.

O le igoa o le Atua o Pulotu, o Saveasi’uleo (Kramer 1994: 103), o le Savea ua toe faaleoina o Sa-Ve’a pōo le Aiga o Ve’a, ao le si’ule o loo mulimuli i tua o le Saveasi’uleo, o loo aumai ai le ō a le ve’aālagi pe a faailo tuumalo o Matai ma le Aufaimana. A ō le ve’aālagi i totonu o se nuu, ona faalologo lea o Toeaina ma Olomatutu, e iloga maota o Tamaalii mai anamua, e malaga a’e ai le ve’aālagi, ona i faataamilo lea i luga o le nuu. E faalologa pea Toeaina ma Olomatutu, aua e tua tele le vaega o le nuu o le a ifo i le ō mulimuli o le ve’aālagi. O le fanu a e iai le ō mulimuli o le ve’aālagi, o iina o le a tuumalo ai se Matai (Alii, Tuua, Augafaaape) pōo se tagata faimana. O le talitonuga lea i mea tau ō ve’aālagi ma ō latou faailo, o loo ope i Samoa i onapo nei. O le Atua Pe’a, o le Atua_lea o Lafai Tao-uluapu e ona le Aiga o Tonea-Tonumaipe’a. O Lafai foi lea na tupuga mai ai le Aiga Sa-Lafa’i, na latou uluai nofoia le motu tele ua faaigoaina o Salafai (Sa-Lafai) pōo le Aiga Sa-Lafa’i. O le suafa La-fai foi, ua faasino i le Atua o le La (Sun) ma ua faaigoaina o le atalii mai le Aiga Sa-Lafa’i (adopted son of the Sun).

O Atua o uluai folauga ma le foafoaga, o Tui faimana malolosi. A feagai ma tagata, ona faa i le ō latou Tuīgā Ulufe’e, Uluve’a, Ulupe’a, Ulumoa, Ulupa’a, Ulutuna, Ulupili ma isi. O Atua faituīgā nei, e mafua ai le upu Tuīgā, o Tui foi nei latou te taitaia autaupu a itumalo ma tafa-itumalo (sub-districts). O ō latou tuīgā e faailo ai ō latou faasinomaga faa-Atua ma faataitaiau pe a tutū autaupu a itumalo ma itumalo o Samoa. Sa malu ma saogalemu ai tagata i ō latou mana, ō latou malolosi ma le matautia o ō latou autaupu. O ō latou faasinomaga faa-Atua, sa mafua ai ona āuaso iai tagata (tulou), e faatupu ai o latou mana pe a toatele agaga o tagata e talialo ai. O Atua nei, sa iai ō latou nofoaga faalemafauau e faa-Atua ma faailo ai ō latou faasinomaga faa-Atua, sa iai ō latou nofoaga faaepea, sa o o PUIPA’a i Faleata. O le Atua Pe’a sa nono i Le-Pe’a pōo Lepea ina onapo nei. O le Atua Ve’a sa nono i Le-Vi i Sa-Le-Imoa ma Iona Tia ua faaigoaina o Tia-Vi i gauta o le Vaimauga. O le Atua Tuna sa nono i Pesega o Vai i Faleata. O le Atua Pa’a sa nono i Puipa’a i Faleata. O le Atua Kata pōo le Tafa’igata sa nono i Tafa’igata i Faleata. O le Atua o le Foafoaga, o Tuī-Mana’u ai Manu’u. O Suli o le Segera lea na latou nofoia le Mauga Ólosega o loo i ga’uta o Malie ma o loo tuaoa i S’usega ma Nu’u. O le Atua Moa sa i Apia ma le Papa-Galagala, ma o suli o Tagaloalagi e tupuga mai ai le Aiga Sa-Moā, e mafua ai le igoa o le atunu o Samoa.
O le vaitau lava lenei o uluai folaua ma le foafoaga, na pulea ai e le Aiga Sa-Moā ma lo latou Tui-Manu’a le tele o atumotu o le Vasa Tele (Tui-Manu’a, Website). O le Tui-Manu’a poo le Tui-Moa e faapea, o le Atua Tagaloalagi lava lea o le foafoaga, na liutino ifo mai le lagi ma taape solo lona Aiga Sa-Tagaloa i le Vasa Tele. O le Aiga Sa-Tagaloa lea, sa iai ē latou Aiga Tufuga Fau-fale, Tufuga Tavai/Fau-va a ma Tufuga Ta-Tatau. Na sosolo mai ē latou tomaia ē le latou faatufugaga i le Vasa Tele e aofia ai ma Samoa. O le vaitau foi lea, faapea na fafasii ai e Pulotu le motu o Papatea, ona sosola mai lea o Tui-Tapuitea ma lona auaiaga i Samoa ma latou nofoia Falealupu (Kramer 1994: 103). O le Aiga Sa-Tapuitea lava lea na sosolo mai i le Papa Galagalaga, na pei ona iai Paepea ma Moata o Tui-Tapuitea (Freeman 1944). O le Aiga Sa-Tapuitea lea, o tagata tetea, e papa’emā, eena ē latou laulu ma e lē tau i ao, ona e segaia ē latou mata i le la. Na fōūa e Tui-Tapuitea ma ana autau le malo o Tui-Manua, ona auina mai ai lea o Tui-Pili ma ana autau e le Tui-Manu’a, ma faatoilalo le malo o Tui-Tapuitea.

O Tui-Pili o le atalii o le Atau o Tagaloalagi ma o le Atau o le Aiga Sa-Pili, peitai, o Pili foi, o le atalii o Tagaloalagi o le suli o le Atua Moa. O Tui-Pili o le isi ona igoa o Polu, na faaopopo mai le ‘U’taulagi i lona igoa, ona maau lea o lona igoa atoa o ‘Upolu. O le U-taulagi lea, na pei o A-taulagi o Ā-‘Ana ma Ā-Tua ma isi. Na avea Tui-Pili ma Tui-Upolu ma na ia nofoio le Papa-Galagalaga, ma le ogaelele o Upolu o loo ia toēga o le Fale o le Fe’e, faatasi mai isi vaega o Samoa ma lē o ta’ua i lenei pepa. O le igoa o lona auaiaga poo ana autau, o le Aiga Sa-le-‘Upolu ma ua faasino i Faga-o-ali (Fagalii), Vailele, Letogo ma Laulii, i le mea tonu o loo iai le Papa-Galagalaga. Ina ua fanafanau le Aiga Sa-le-‘Upolu, ona sosoo lai le vaega i Sasa’e o le Vaimauga ua ta’ua nei o Fua-i-‘Upolu. O aso anamua, sa faaaoa vaitafe o tosi ai tuaoi; o Sa-le-‘Upolu o āfuai mai Laulii se’ia pāia le vaitafe o Vaivasive i Faga-oali. O Fua-i-‘Upolu o āfuai mai le vaitafe o Vaivasive se’ia pāia le vaitafe o Loimata o Apaula ma le itu i Sasa’e o le Mauga o Vaea. O loo tu i ga’uta o Fuaiupolu le ogaelele o loo ta’ua pea i onapo nei, o ‘Upolu poo Salatia’ia poo Ālaoa ma le nofoia lea o Atua Fe’e, pei ona iai toēga o le Fale o le Fe’e.

O le Fe’e o loo masolomia i le Fale o le Fe’e, o le Fe’e sa tapuai ma ositaulaga iai Āfoulau poo Mulifanau i Ā’ana talu mai le amataga. E mafua lea manatu, ona o le tele o talatuu o le Fale o le Fe’e, e iai lava le laina faapea; “o le Fee na tafi mai i Ā’ana ona o lona sauā”, na ona le Fale o le Fe’e, ma e toatasi lava le Fe’e na tafi mai Ā’ana agai i ‘Upolu/Salatia’īĀlaoa. O onapo ia e toafā Tui-Ā’ana sa iai i Ā’ana; (i) o le Tui-Ā’ana o le Malae o le Vavau, na āfuai atu i Tufulele e o o i le Malae o le Vavau (Leulumaega). (ii) o le Tui-Ā’ana o le Mulifanau, na āfuai atu i Satapuala ma Faleatui, e o o Manono-uta ma Apolima-uta, (iii) o le Tui-Ā’ana o Falelātai, e āfuai atu i Sa-Matau e o o Matatūa ma le Faga-i-Ōfu, ma le (iv) o le Tui-Ā’ana o le Mauga o Māfafa e o o i Vailu’u-uta poo Faga—a mai le Mauga o Māfafa ma Vailu’u-uta Lefaga, e toe tosi faaālavai mai ai e le Vai o Sina le aualu o le Aiga Sa-Tui-Vailu’u, se’ia pāia Vailu’u-tai o loo iai pea i onapo nei. O le va o Fasitoo-Tai ma Vailu’u-Tai, o loo tato ai le ālavai o le Vai-o-Sina, faatoa sua pe a afā ma timuga Samoa. O Tui-Ā’ana ia sa puipuia tuā’ai nei e fā o Ā’ana mai ē latou fili ma sa maloeli ē latou autau.

O le avea o Tui-Pili poo Tui-Upolu, sa ia nofoia vaega eseese le Upolu. O le vaitau lea o le logologoā o tala o le ‘Afa-pusi o Sī’usei’ā i ‘Apolima. O le ūsuga lona lua a Tui-Pili, na usu ai iai Sina-le-i-āsā le alo o Sī’usei’ā, ona fanau lea le Tofulafe. O le Tofulafe lea e tupuaga mai ai Fe’e epo ma Fe’eao (tagai i le Gafa), o Fe’eao na faaaaua ai suli o le Atua Fe’e o Afolau Mulifanau, au Fe’e epo na faaaaua ai suli o le Feepo i le Tuamasaga. O lalo ifo o auva mauga o Mauga Afolau ma Mauga Lauti o Afolau Mulifanau, o iina na faatu ai le isi malae o le Aigofie Leatiogie ma le maota foi lea le Atua Fe’e.
mai anamua. O le uiga o le igoa Foga’a, o papa tetele i totonu o le sami lototo, e pu pu totonu ma e nofo ai fe’e tetele ua faaigoaina o taolā, ona latou te tataōā vaa failā ma gogoto ai.

O le Gafa

E tusa ai ma fuataga o vaiatu le-iloloa a le Au-Tusitala-Faasolopito (Historians), o le fuataga e fua iai tausaga faataitai e umia ai e se tagata se suafa Matai—e tolusefulu (30), peitai, o lea fuataga ua le o aofia ai tausaga na soifua ai le tagata. O le Gafa ua lōmia ua faaoga ai le fuataga faataitai e faapea; e taionosefulu (60) tausaga na soifua ai tagata ma le loo tai i totonu o lea 60 tausaga, le 30 tausaga e matai ai ma le 30 tausaga faaopopo and soifua ai. O lea faiga, ua mafai ai ona tatala i tua le Gafa o le Tui-Tuamasaga ma le Malietoa, pei ona faaiga ai ona totonu o lea 60 tausaga, le 30 tausaga e matai ai ma le 30 tausaga faaopopo and soifua ai. O lea faiga, ua mafai ai ona tatala i tua le Gafa o le Tui-Tuamasaga ma le Malietoa, e pei ona fautuaina e Gunson. E le gata i lena, ae ua mafai ai foi ona faatausaga faaonaponei ma ua faigofie ai ona iloa vaiatu na soifua ai tagata ma tutupu ai mea o le a faamatalaina. O tausaga ua faaaogaina ua na o ni tausaga faataitai.

165 BC–105 BC Tui-Upolu Pili - Na usu faalua ia Sinalei’asā le alo o Si’usef’o poo Sa’umani Afaese o Apolima/Manono, ona fanau lea o Tui-Tuamasaga Tolufale.


45 BC–25 AD Tui-Tuamasaga Moetûpapa - Na usu ia Sinalogonanu le alo o Tui-Lafai Taoulupoo Tofetofé, ona maua lea o Tui Tuamasaga Fuailolo’u poo Fuailolo’o.

25–85 AD Tui-Tuamasaga Fuailolo’u - Na usu ia To’oā Sinalalovasa le alo o Leiataua i Manono, ona maua lea o Tui-Tuamasaga Fuafuamea.

85–145 AD Tui- Tuamasaga Fuafuamea - Na usu ia Sina-Laulelei le alo o Tui-Ūēā Maatū, ona maua lea o Tui-Tuamasaga Fogaatele.

145–205 AD Tui-Tuamasaga Fogaatele - Na usu ia Sina-Āleisā le alo o Tui-Aana Taupega’afa o Afolau, ona fananau lea o le masaga o Tui-Ā’ana Fe’eao ma Tui-Tuamasaga Fe’epo.

205–265 AD Tui-Tuamasaga Fe’epo - Na usu ia Sinalei’apa’itele o le afafine o Niuafolau (Tui-Afolau/Mulifanua), ona fananau lea o Tui-Tuamasaga Le-Ātiogie, o Malalatea (tama) ma Sina-Lautea 1 lea na usuia e Tui-Manu’a Folasatele.

265–325 AD Tui-Tuamasaga Le-Ātiogie - Na usu ia Sinatava’iupolu le afafine o Ale i Toāmua, ona fanau lea o Malietoa Sāvea ma ona uso and toalima ma Iona tuafafine and toatasi.

Ina ua avea Malietoa Sāvea le Tupu o le Tuamasaga, ona faasolo lea o le Gafa i le suafa Malietoa. O le tualai mai o le suafa Malietoa, o loo atagia ai le le toe faaaoaaina (mamate) o Atua Fee e toatolu mai nofoaga e tolu; Afolau Mulifanua, Foga Tuamasaga ma Upolu/Salatia/Alaoa.

325–385 AD Malietoa Sāvea - E lua ana usuga. (i) na usu ia Amaamaula, le alo o Sa’ena i Tuana, ona fanau lea o Malietoa Le’upoluasāvea. (ii) na toe usu ia Luafatāsaga, le alo o Tui-Taemanutava’e o Sili, ona fanau lea o Malietoa Gagaasāvea (Faigā). O tama ia e toalua, na nofolua i le suafa Malietoa, ona faasolo lea o le Malietoa i le atali e toatasi o
Malietoa Leupoluāsāvea, ae totofi le Fale-Ono o Le-Āti-Āgaga i le fanau a Malietoa Gagaāsāvea. O Malietoa Gagaāsāvea, na ia nofoia Fogaa le nofoaga o le Fe’e, ao Malietoa Leupoluāsāvea na ia nofoia Malie ma Vaitoelau, o le nofoaga patino i le Tama a le Tuamasaga poo le Malietoa (Tui-Tuamasaga).


O Sootaga o le Gafa i Atua ma le Fale o le Fee

Ina ua tuumalo Malietoa Savea (325–385 AD), ona nofolua lea o lana fanau tama e toalua o Malietoa Le’upoluāsāvea (385–445 AD) ma Malietoa Gagaāsāvea (385–445 AD) i le suafa Malietoa. Ua mafua lea aga, ona o le finagalo o le Tuamasaga e faapea; o loo fou le suafa Malietoa ma se’i tau vaai poo ai o le toalua lea e faasolo ai le Gafa o le Malietoa. O onapo ia ua fo’i mai lo là uso taufeagai o Polule-uli-gaga (385–445 AD) mai Toga ma aumai ona tuafafine taufeagai e toalua, o Ala-i-nuanua ma Pate (385–445 AD). Na aumai Alainuanua faanofo ia Malietoa Le’upoluāsāvea, ae ave Pate faanofo ia Malietoa Gagaāsāvea. O lo la uso taufeagai o Poluleuligaga, na faasinio iai le pito o Sale’imoa e nofo ai ma sa fau ai lona maota i ga’uta le le pí’oga o loo sosoo ma Mālua. O Malietoa Gagaāsāvea, o le tasi lea Malietoa Faigā sa iai, ona e faigata ana agar faa-Fe’e e pei ona ia ona aso tagata (tulou). Sa tagatasi uma Atua o anamua, i le aga lea o le fai o o lātou aso tagata. O Iona uiga e le na o le Fe’e sa fai ona aso tagata, sa faapena foi le Pa’a, Tuna, Pe’a, Moa, Pili ma isi.

O Atua Fe’e o augatupulaga esese, sa faailo o lātou avea ma Atua Fe’e, i lo lātou nofoia o nofoaga sa patino i Atua Fe’e, e pei o Foga’a i Fale’ula ma ‘Upolu/Salati’ā/Ālaoa. O o lātou igoa foi e pipii iai le upu Fe’e e pei o Fe’e’epo ma Fe’e’ao, ma igoa i pipii iai le upu Foga’a, e pei o Sina-Foga’a ma Taatia-i-Foga’a (Sa’onalau). Peitai, sa nofoia foi e Leātiogie Foga’a, ma o le uiga le le igoa Le-āti-o-Gie, o le paepae poo le pa o agaga poo atu. O le igoa Leatiogie, e le o pipii iai le upu Fe’e poo le upu Foga’a, ae faailo Iona avea ma Fe’e i lona nofoia o Foga’a. E le gata i lena, ae faaili lona lātu o le Foga’a. O latou igoa foi le latou tomai i le fauga o ia alia-tau, alia-folau i ataga; ma faapitoa foi o latou igoa, sa faapitoa i le tele o agaga i loo tāula iai. O le atali lona tolou o Leātiogie, na faaigoaina ia Le-āti-āti-o-Gie, ua faaualuaina ia le malosi ma le telē o le paepae poo le pa o agaga poo atu. O le tasi lea vaiga i tagata sa avea ma Fe’e na lātou nofoia Foga’a o Atua Fe’e.

O toēga o le Fale o le Fee, o loo atagia ai se Foga’a poo se Fale-papa, e pei o papa tetele o loo i totonu o le moana sausau e nonofo ai Fe’e poo taolā tetele. O le Tufuga o Tui-Le-Tufuga, o le Tufuga e suli mai i ulua Tufuga Faufale a le Aiga Sa-Tagaloalagi o ulua folauaga ma le foafoaga. O Tufuga ia na ēmai ai fai ma ulua Tufuga e suli mai ai Tufuga Ta-vaa ma Fau-vaa, sa faapitoa o lātou tomai i le fauga o alia-tau, alia-folau ma soātā. Sa faapitoa foi o lātou tomai i le lalagaga ma le ‘āuli o lā’afa ma lāfala o alia. Sa iloga o lātou faiva alofilima ma ua fai fai ona iai Tui-Lima ma le Aiga Sa-Lima. O le lātou mata’aliaina āva e ofi mai ai alia-tau ma alia-folau i totonu o Taulaga o Vaa. Sa faapitoa foi o lātou tomai, i le to’oga o alia i totonu o le āva ma le tatāāga (talaiga) o lātai ma faatutu e faasavili. O lea faatinoga, ma fai fai ona iai Tui-Le-Tufuga, o le Tufuga nei, sa iai o lātou tomai faapitoa i le seūliga o alia-folau ma alia-tau i luga o le sami. ae maise pe a
lutaluta le gataifale ma sa faamoemoe iai autau a Saleupolu ma Fuaiupolu i luga o le sami.

O Malietoa Le’upoluāsāvea ma Ala’inuanua, e toafa (4) la la fanau teine ae uii le tama o Galoā’itofo; ao Malietoa Gagasāsāvea ma Pate, toalima la la fanau tama. E taunuu mai Poluleuligaga ma ona tuaafafine, o sasao āūgā-āso o Malietoa Gagasāsāvea ma le Fe’e lea na ia nofoa Fogaa (Faleula) i lea vaitau. O le taimi foi lea, sa saaso mai ai āūgā-āso o le Fe’e i Afolau Mulifanua ma le Fe’e tonu lea o loo tuliloaina ona tala. I lea faaumu e uiga auga-aso nei; muamua, o tu lava ia ma aga faa-Atua—o le auaso tagata (tulou). Lua, o tagata ia na faasolo mai i auga-aso, o latoia ia na faalataina Samoa i vaitau o pulega a Tui-Toga Talaifeiki. Talu ai ona ua mutia le ala o Tui-Toga Talaifeiki i le Gafa o le Malietoa, na mafua ai ona tilialo Poluleuligaga i auga-aso o Malietoa Gagasāsāvea.

O le vaitau tonu lea na faatoa fanau ai le atalii e toatasi o Malietoa Le’upoluāsāvea ma na faatoa fanau ai le atalii e toatasi o Malietoa Le’upoluāsāvea ma ona sasao āūgā-āso o Malietoa Gagasāsāvea ma le Fe’e lea na ia nofoa Fogaa (Faleula) i lea vaitau. O le taimi foi lea, sa saaso mai ai āūgā-āso o le Fe’e i Afolau Mulifanua ma o le Fe’e tonu lea o loo tuliloaina ona tala. E lua mau e uiga i auga-aso nei; muamua, o tu lava ia ma aga faa-Atua—o le auaso tagata (tulou). Lua, o tagata ia na faaso lo mai i auga-aso, o latoia ia na faalataina Samoa i vaitau o pulega a Tui-Toga Talaifeiki. Talu ai ona ua mutia le ala o Tui-Toga Talaifeiki i le Gafa o le Malietoa, na mafua ai ona tilialo Poluleuligaga i auga-aso o Malietoa Gagasāsāvea.
mai e ala i ā ma talanoaga e tele na faa. O le mau a Sāveaālīi Malietoa, o la’u mau foi lea.

Peitai, i le faaiuga o le Pepa lenei, e mafai ai ona maua se talitonuga tau talafeagai—pe moni o le Fe’e o loo masalomia e ona le Fale o le Fe’e, afai e leiai, o lē fea la Fe’e e ona le Fale o le Fee?

**O ‘Upolu, Salati’a, Ālaoā**

O tuasivi o atumauga o loo tafe ifo ai Úlu esseee e tolu o Vaisigano, ma e āfuauai iina ogaaleee e Upolu poo Salati’a poo Ālaoā. O Upolu sa nofoia e Polu poo Pili ma ona auaiaga ma ana autau. O le ‘auga o lea nofoaga, e nanā ma tausi ai Tui ma Toa malolosi o le Vaimauga ma le Tuamasaga. O le matautia o le malolosi o ia autau na mafua ai le isi igoa o Upolu, o Salati’a ma o le igoa Salati’a ua faamatalaina faapea, sala—o le to ese (tulou) ma le ti’a—o le ao, ma o le igoa faatagata-o-taua. O Tui ia na fesoasoai i le vaaiaga i le Taulaga o Vai i Āpia ma le Taulaga o Vai o le Papa-Galagala o loo i Vai eleti a Leoto. O lo latou nofoaga sa faasaagaaga ina ia faigofie ona feosofi agai i Tiāvī, Siimu ma Safata. Sa iai o latou taitoalua ma fanau ma o ā latou nifo i le aai i le sau o le Malietoa, o Salati’a ma o le igoa faatagata—o le to eso (tulou) ma le ti’a—o le ao, ma o le igoa faatagata-o-taua.

E le gata i lena, ae sa faafaga foi i le sau o le Malietoa (sua ma taumafotia o āsiga). O lea faatinoga e mafua ai le alagaupu, e fai’ai Malietoa ae tali’ai Ālaoā. Sa fai foi upu a le Tuamasaga e faapea—“Tainoino e, i le nuu o Salatia, e ā? E lē o magiagia ā latou nifo i le aai i le sau o le Malietoa?”. O mata o le vaiata o Vaisigano, ua faaigoaina o Īulu; peitai, o le upu Īulu, e faaigoa ai soo se Īulu o soo se vaiata i Samoa. A pā mai Īulu o le Vaisigano, ona sua eeleleia lea ma taafea mai ai otaota esseee, e mafua ai le isi alagaupu patina i le Vaisigano; e Īulu tāfega ae selefutia ai Vaisigano. E tolu Īulu esseee o le Vaisigano, o le Īulu muamua i le itu i Sasa’e, e maua ai le Afu o So’aga, o le Īulu lona luma o le Vaisigano, o le Īulu ogatotonu, o loo tafe i faiata o le Fale o le Fe’e, ao le Īulu lona Īulu i le itu i Sisifo, e maua ai le Afu o Tapu. O le igoa o le Afu o Sō’aga, e mafua mai i le Lupe a Upolu/Salati’a/Ālaoā, e igoa o le Lupe-o-le-Sō’aga; e lanumeamata atoa, peti ma lapo’a, ona o le lupe-po’a. A vaevae lona igoa igoa ona maua lea o upu so’a ma le g-a e faanauna ai le upu so’a. O loo atagia mai i lona igoa, le faatinoga o lana galuga faalupepo’a, a lelei ona faatino lana galuga i lupe-fafine, ona fofoa mai ai lea o Lupe o Fōāga e tele, pono tamai lupe e tele. O vaitau ia o seugalupe a Samoa, ma o loo tumu Upolu/Salati’a/Ālaoā, i fogātia na faafelelei ai Lupe Māūnu. Sa ‘a’ami foi ma tālia ai lupe fafine o fuifuiupe latou te āfea togavao o Upolu/Salati’a/Ālaoā. O ia lupe fafine ua faaigoaina, o Lupe-tali-‘a’ami ma o pā’aga foi ia a Lupe-so’a pono Lupe o le so’aaga.

O le igoa Vai-sigano, ua mafua mai i fua o tama’i fata pono fasaa niiia ua faaigoaina o sigano. O sigano e ola i fataa i ma sa taatele i na onapo le faaaoa o fua manogi o laau, e faamanoa o lau-fīsoa sa taele ai tagata. O fīsoa o isi ā latou igoa, o moli, e ‘ōā ae leh manogi. Ina ua ‘omi, o Papiagali ma a latou moli-tāmea ma moli-tāle, na matauina e ā latou tagata, e ‘ōā, ona ave tonu lava lea iai o la latou upu, moli-e faaigoa ai moli a Papalagi. E tu’i le fua o le sigano ia pala, ona afiifi faatasi lea ma laufisoa i totonu o pulu taele, e faa’oa o le fīsoa pono le moli ae faamanogi e le sigano. Peitai, è leh na o le sigano sa faamanogi ai taelega a Samoa, e iai foi lau-āsia, lau-ūsia ma moso’īi ma isi. O nutiga laufisoa pono moli nei, e taafea ma to’a i futi-āfu, e mafua ai le alagaupu, ua atoa moli i futi-āfu e tasi.

O le aganuu o mea tau taelega ma mea tau vai, e tupu mai ai le tapu (sā) lenei o vaitafoa ma soo se vaii e taele ai tagata i aso anamua. O le tapu e faapea—e sā tamaitai ona taele i mata o vai. O le
mēf Fonu, na froamai ma le Aiga Sa-Malie malie aia e foa i Apia faatinuia e suli Tagaloalagi mai le Taulaga o Vaa. O le uiga i ia upu, faga i pēpee—a faafana a latou fai'ai i'a, matuā la'u lava lea o ī'a e faafai'ai ma tufā, ona o nuu e mamao ese ma le sami, e seāseā ona ō e fagogota. A ō'o ina ō e fagogota, ona āūta, e nanā ai faiva; auā e matagā i le faasamoa le faaaliali fano atu a fīfī i laumeamata; a uma ona tuu lea i ato fu'eumu ma amo i uta. O le auala faa alagaupu ma afīfī tagata (tulou); e le gata i lena ae o isi foi tamaitai o failele, ae ō atu foi ma le luuluuga tamaiti ma gaepu ma eleelaa ai le mata o le vai. O le nofoago o le Fe'e, e pito i uta i le nuu o Upolu/Salati’a/Ālaoā. O ā uma ni mea eleelaa e tutupu mai ai i uta, sa mafai ona selefutia ai le pito i tai. O ituaiaga Tapu faailoga tagata faapea, o isi ona igoa i le faasamoa, o le ‘avei poo le ‘avele.

O le igoa Ālaoā, e sau mai le upu lā'oa poo le upu lala’oa. E faauiga i faiva lala’oa o Ālaoā, e tiu ma afifi. E taatele i nuu āūta o Samoa, le aganuu lea, o le tiu ma afifi o ʻō latou faiva, e mafua ai le alagaupu e tiu faamata-lā’oa. A ā'e i matāfaga a latou tiuga malie poo soo se i’a, ona poipoi lea ma afifi i laumeamata; a uma ona tuu lea i ato fu’eumu ma amo i uta. O le auala faa Tautai lea a nuu āūta, e nanā ai faiva; auā e matagā i le faasamoa le faaliiali fano atu i le ala—a e tufā. E ala ona ē tufā, ona o nuu e mamao ese ma le sami, e seāseā ona ʻō e fagogota. A ʻō'o ina ʻō e fagogota, ona matuā la'u lava lea o ʻi'a e faafai'ai ma fagagata i le Faasamoa. O le uiga i ia upu, faga i pēpee—a faafana a latou fai’ai i’a, e sui laufa’ai laulelei o fa’ai ma toe sasaia iai isi pe’epe’e fou, ina ia uae ne’i mātūtū.

O le fanau teine e to’afā a Malietoa Leupoluasavea, na tauasi i Upolu/Salatia’Alaoha aua le puiuiga o lo latou saoga'alenu. O le igoa o le teine ulumatua, o Sina-Alaileule-Moeileule, ona e faapea, a ala ae loa i le taeao faa’ula loa i le ula ula, a o o foa ina moe i le po, ona toe sui foi lea o le isi ula fou e moe ai. O Alaileulamoeileule, na maliu taupou ma o le Tapuāfanua lea o Upolu/Salati’a/Alaoha e oo mai i onapo nei. O le teine lona lua, na igoa ia Sina-Malie ma o le Taulou o Malie ma Vaitoelau. O le lona tolu o Sina-Fogaa o le Fe'e lea na ia nofoia le Fale o le Fee i Upolu Salati’a ma o le isi lea Atua Fe'e tamaitai. O le lona fa o Sina-Toga, e pine ai le pito Toga o lo latou Tinā o Alainuanua, ma o ia lea na nonofo ma le Fa'e na tafi mai Afolau Mulifanua. O Sina-Malie ma Sina-Fogaa, na usuia e Tui o le Aiga Sa Too-ma-Latai ma le Aiga Sa-Limā na latou pulea le Matā-Utu o le Taulaga o Vaa i Apia, o loo mulivai ia le vaiteafe o Vaisigano.

O Matā-Utu e faamatalaina, o le mata o le āva, e ūtu iaia le sami i totonu ma maua ai le Taulaga o Vaa ma e lē tasi se Matā-ūtū i Samoa. O le Matā-ūtū foi lea, e faatūtū ai too ma lātai (lāfala ma lā’afa) o alia, ona o le matāfai‘i lea a le Aiga Sa-TooMALATAI; o le too mai o alia i totonu o le āva, ona tatā (talai) lea o lafalafa/aafa ma faatūtū faasavili. A o o foa i le a toe folau pe masi foi se autau o luga o le sami, o le Aiga Sa-TooMALATAI foi e toe faatutuua lá o alia folau ma alia tau ma faatonutonu le to’oga o alia i fafo o le āva. O le Fuāvaa tele lenei a Fuaiupolu, sa faaigoa o le Fua-Tā a le Matāfaga-Tele, ma o le Matāfaga-Tele, e afua atu i Apia e oo i Moataa. O le uiga o le Fua-Tā, o le fuāvaa e malosi lā Tā poo le faaagoina e aupega i luga o le sami.

O lātai o alia e fonu ma lātai pala e manaoimia le toe sui, sa gafa lea ma le Aiga Sa-Limā, sa faapito a latou tomai i le fonoga, lalagaga ma le ‘āulliga o lātai o alia. O loo iai pea le vaega o le Papa-Galagala e ta’ua o Ma’-lā’-āēli, e pine ai le vaega o le Papa-Galagala sa ‘āuli ma tatao faamafolafola ai lātai a le Aiga Sa-Limā. O le Aiga Sa-TooMALATAI ma le Aiga Sa-Limā, sa faamoemo e iai le Fua-tā a le Matāfagatele i o latou tomai āliva. O o latou tomai āliva e mafua ai le suafa Sei-ulii (o le sei) e aumai mai le upu masei), ona sa iloga Taulaga o Vaa na nofoia e sulī Tagaloalagi mai le vavau, poo Alātāua—sa ia ā latou āliva faapitoa mo vaiatu āfā o Samoa. O le vaiatu lea e lē toe ʻō ai ni vaa i luga o le sami, se‘i vaganā alia ma vaa e ūli e le Aiga Sa-Limā.

E lua mau e uiga i le igoa o le Taulaga o Vaa o Apia; muamua, o le sami lea e ūtu mai i totonu o le mata o le āva (Matā-Ūtu), e mafua ai ona piapiā totonu o le Taulaga o Vaa. A faapuupuupu le upu piapiā i le piā, toe faaopopoai iai le A-taulagi, ona maua lea o le igoa Ā-piā. O lea foi mau ua mafai
on a to toe saga faamatalaina, o le Taulaga o Vaa e āpi āi galu i lona āpitāgalu. O le mau lona lua, ua faamatala ai le upu Āpisā ma le upu Āpiā, i vaiga esese e lua. O le āpisā, o le nofoaga ua faasaina mo tufuga ese mai se isi nuu/itumalo, a uma la latou galuega, ona toe fo‘i lea; ao le Āpiā, ua faauiga i le nofoaga e āpi ai Tufuga e faasino tonu iai lea nofoaga, e lē toe foi, ona o Tufuga o le vavau a Tagaloalagi, na ifo so’a mai le lagi ma Āpi-ā i Āpiā.

O Tuiletufuga o Āpi na faūā le Fale o le Fe‘e ma e iai le talitonuga, o le Fale o le Fe‘e ua loa ona iai mai Fe‘e o le nofoaga ma uluai folauga. O Tuiletufuga, e lē gata o le Tui ao le Tufuga foi a le Tuamasaga ma Afolau, ma sa faūā maota o le Malietoa i Upolu/Salati‘a/Āloāo ma isi vaega o le Tuamasaga. O Tuiletufuga o le suli Tufuga ma Tagaloalagi pou le Atua Moa mai le nofoaga. E toe sooso pe a le mau e faapea, e fanau tama le Fe‘e ma na tālia e le auagia o le Fe‘e ma le nuu o Upolu/Salati‘a/Āloāo, le fanau mai o se teine. Na fanaua e le Fe‘e ma Sina-Toaga tama e toalima ma e iai i totonu o lea toalima lae le masaga o Ūlu ma To‘otua. O uiga o ioa o le masaga lenei, o loo nanā mai ai aga faa-Tui a Upolu/Salati‘a/Āloāo i le faatauunuuga o lo latou ioa—o Salati‘a.

Na fai le tautinoga a le Fe‘e i lona auagia e faapea, “a faapea e fanau so‘o afafine, ona taga lea o tamaitai ma fafine o lo’u auagia ma lo’u nuu ona taaele i le mata o le vai.” E le‘i talitonu le pito i tai o Upolu/Salati‘a/Āloāo i le tauloto faisoa lea a le Fe‘e, na maualuga i o latou manatu, e iai se fa‘i‘ai o le Fe‘e e manatu a ne ai i Tai i loo i le pito i tai. Ina ua fanau le afafine o le Fe‘e, na alu le tuli a tamaitai ma fafine ua tulioso i le mata o le vai ma o le vai muamua foi lea o Samoa, na tataia ai le ‘avele faalilaga tagata lea a Samoa ma mea tau taelaga i vai. O le afafine lea o le Fe‘e, na faaioa ia Sina-Le‘avele poo Sinave e pei ona faapuupuu au ai Upolu/Salati‘a/Āloāo anamua. O loo iai peai gā‘uta o le Fale o le Fe‘e le Āfu i i gā‘uta o Tapu, o le āfu lea o loo pine ai le alavai tonu na ‘avele. O puua o le togava o Upolu/Salati‘a/Āloāo, na maua ai ioa e faaioa ai ā latou autau, ma o loo olaola pea i nuu o Fuaiupolu suafa; Puua-uli, Puua-efu, Puua-ena, Puua-segisegi, Puua-sina (pa‘epe‘a) e Puua-latamai.

E pei ona tā‘ua i lugu, e tolo Ūlu o le Vaisigano, e tosi mai ai alavai e tolo. Peitai, o alavai ia e tolo, a oo ina pa pa, ona fetosiai solo lea i totonu o Upolu/Salati‘a/Āloāo. E olaolala tetele ma o loo malosi pea le alavai e tosi mai totonu o Tapu, uia faalava mai gā‘uta o le Fale-o le Fe‘e ma tofo i totonu o le alavai o Sō‘aga. O gatai mai o le Fale o le Fe‘e, e toe fetosiai ai foi alavai o Ūlu nei e tolo, ma o le malosoi o futauiga o nei alavai e tolo ua maua ai le isi alavai e faiga o Pago. O le alavai lea o Pago, o loo taoto faalava ane i gauta o le dam a Niu Sila ma ua eli atu ai le alavai o le dam ma fafaga mai ai e Pago le dam o loo i Upolu/Salati‘a/Āloāo. O le alavai o Tapu e alu iai i totonu le suavai lē faaogaina o le dam pe a ova ma tafe ifo ai i le āfu o loo i tafatafa o le vilimaa. O le alavai o le Sō‘aga, ua tafe mai pe pu‘e ai le suavai taumafa i faatanoa o loo i lalo i le vano o Upolu/Salati‘a/Āloāo. O lalo ifo o Malolē-lelei ma le Kolisi o Āvele, o loo ui mai ai le isi alavai ese mai Tiāvi, ona mimilo mai lea i lalo i Āvele, pipi mai lea iaia ma Tapu o loo tafe ifo i le vilimaa ma tofo loa i totonu o le alavai o Sō‘aga. O iina e tasi ai le alavai o loo ui mai i lalo o Tanugāmanono ma o le alavai tasi lina e le Ūlu e tolo o le Vaisigano o loo i uta. E tasi atu ai lava iina se‘ia oo i le Mulivai i Vaisigano.

O le iai o le Fe‘e i le Tuamasaga, e le‘i taofia ai lona soli nanā pea o Afolau ma le Aiga i le Tai. O lea aga na toatamai tele ai le Aiga i le Tai ma Afolau, ona masii mai ai lea o ā latou autau e fasioti le Fe‘e. Na fafasi sesē e Tui o Upolu/Salati‘a/Āloāo le fuā‘vaatau a Manono ma lo latou manatu, o latou na siitaua mai iai. O le autau lea, na fafasi ma tatanu i Tanugāmanono ma na toatamai tele ai Malietoa Galoā‘itofo ma le Tuamasaga, ona e toatele tausoga ma aiga faalotofale o le Malietoa na maliliu ai. O le toatamai tele o le Malietoa ma le Tuamasaga, na mafua ai ona malele le Malietoa ia
Fuaoletaoāgaga, ina ia fasioti le Fe’e ma faataape le nuu o Upolu/Salati’a/Ālaoa.

E soosoo pea le mau e faapea, o loo tanu le Fe’e i totonu o Upolu/Salati’a/Ālaoa i le vaega o loo iai Tiasā e oo mai i onapo nei. O loo ola pea i le Aiga Sa-So’oalo le suafa Fe’e-tau, peitai, ina ua fasiotia le Fe’e, ona ave lea o Sina-Toga ma lana fanau e ave ai le ifoga a Malietoa Galoā’itofo i Afolau ma le Aiga i le Tai. E uʻi ina oona le fasi a Salati’a, ae na talia faʻatamālīi ma le Aiga i le Tai ma Afolau le ifoga ma foi mai ai Sina-Toga ma lana fanau i Upolu/Salati’a/Ālaoa. Ina ua faataape le nuu o Upolu Salati’a, ona see mai le o le vaega toatele o Tui i le isi itu o le vanu o loo feagai ma Upolu/Salati’a/Ālaoa ma faaiga o lo latou nofoaga ia Majigaia poo Magiagi i onapo nei, e pei o upu a le Tuamasaga na fai i o latou nifo, pe le o magiagia ia le ‘aiga o sau o le Malietoa. O loo iai i Magiagi le suafa Fa’ai Malietoa ae tali’ai Ālaoa. O loo faaiga o foi e Magiagi le igoa Lupe-o-le-So’aga, e faaiga ai lana Aumaga, ana Autaalo ma le pasi. O loo iai foi i Magiagi le suafa Lupe-tali-‘ami.

Na taape isi Toa i Moataa ma o loo iai nei le suafa Toa ma lo latou faalupega, o le tagata o le vavau o Salati’a. Na fasinino foi Sina-Le-‘Avele i le isi itu o le vanu e feagai ma Upolu/Salati’a/Ālaoa, i le ogaelele o loo iai nei le Kolisi o Avele. Na tetotofo foi iai e Malietoa Galoā’itofo ona tuagane masaga o Ūlu ma To’otua e puipiuia lo la tuafafine. O loo ola pea i faalupega o Fuauipulu i onapo nei le Maota o Sinave ma le Malaefono o Ūlu-Ma-To’otua. O loo taeto foi i faalupega o Āpia, le suafa Vainalepa (Vainalelepa) ma le suafa Vaisigano, e pine ai le lelepaga a Tui i alavai o Vaisigano. O loo taeto foi i faalupega o Āpia, sulī o Sina-Fogaa ma Sina-Malie ua ta’ua o Álo o Sina ma ua faasino i le Aiga Sa-To’omalatai ma isi. O loo ola pea i Āpia ma le Papa-Galagala sulī o le Aiga Sa-Lima poo Sa-Limā. E o mai i onapo nei, o loo lagona pea i Āpia le siufogaga i le Tui na faʻau le Fale o le Fe’e—o Tui-Le-Tufuga.

O le vaitau o Siāmani, na faaunuua ai Malietoa Laupepa ma e foi mai ua faatau nanā isi vaega o Upolu/Salati’a/Ālaoa e tagata. Na toea fai fai mai e Malietoa Laupepa ia vaega ma o le vaitau o lona atalii o Malietoa Tanumafili I ma lana Masiofo o Momoemamanū, na avea ai Upolu Salati’a/Ālaoa ma Esetete a Malietoa Tanumafili I. O le vaitau o Pulega a Niu Sīla, na talosagaina ai e te Malo o Niu Sīla, le 250 eka poo le sili atu foi e peʻuʻe ai le suava mo le eletise le vaʻi taimafo mo le soifua ilelei o tagata. O lea ogaelele e tumu i vanu ma mauga ma ua le mafai ai ona maua ona funa tagata saʻo. O lea vaega ua afua mai Ūlu e tolu o Vaisigano o loo i Tuasivi, aoe ai le Afu o Soaga (Ite i Sasae), Afu o Tapu (Ite i Sisifo) ma le ogatotonu o loo iai tōeaga o le Fale o le Fe’e.

Aotelega

O le aotelega o lenei tusiga, ua mafai ai ona toea tepa ia ona ‘auga e pei ona folasia i ona ootootoga o loo i luga. (i) Ina ia salli pe iai ni sootaga o suesuega a le Ausesue o Talaʻeli ma le Talatuué e pei ona faomatatalaina. O suesuega a le Ausesue o Stair ma Brown (1907) i totonu o le Tusi a Martinson Wallin (2016), o loo masalomaia ai Tufuga Mekalifi (megalith builders), peitai o le mau a (Smith 1911) i totonu o le Tusi lava lenei a Martinson Wallin 2016, ua faapea mai ai, “o fausaga faamekalifi, ua no a ni masalosaloga sa taatele i le Ausesue i no vaitau.” O masalosaloga taatele ia i Ausesue o na vaitau, ua vaiva ai Tufuga Mekalisi i le Aotelega lenei.

O le talitonuga o lenei tusiga, o tōeaga o poumaa ma poupapa o le Fale o le Fe’e—o le Foga’ā. O Tuiletufuga foi na tuufaasolo mai ona tomai faautufuga mai Tufuga o le Aiga Sa–Tagaloalagi o uluai folauga poo le faofagoa. O loo atagia i toea o pou ma folamaa, tomai tipi maa ma tipi papa o le Aiga Tufuga na faa Fale o le Fe’e. Peitai, o le igoa Fogaa o loo i Faleula, e le o iai se Fogaa poo se Fale
poumāa pe pou papa, ae o le papa atoa o loo sosolo mai uta e oo i luga o le sami. Talu ai ona e mamoa ese Upolu/Salatī’a/Ālāoā ma le sami, e mafai ai ona fau se Fogaa i uta e faailo ai le ogaelelele tonu na nofoia e Atuaga Fe’e.

E tusa ai ma mau a tagata Samoa sa faatalanoa e Freeman, i totonu lava o le Tusi lenei a Martinson-Wallin (2016), o le faalilhauga a Freeman, e mafai ona Fale a tapuai ai i le Atua o Taua o Fe’e ma o le Fe’e e iai ona sootaga i Fiti ma Tagaloa o Manu’a. Fetaui lelei ia vaitau i vaitau o uluai folauga pōo le feeqoaga, e pei ona sa iai sootaga o le Fe’e i Salesfe’e ma le Ve’a i Pulutou i Fiti, lea na ui ma i ai uluai folauga (Bellwood 1978a, 1978b). Ae fetaui foi i pulega a Tagaloalagi poo Tui-Manu’a o Manu’a i le Vasa Tele. Peitai, o le Fe’e o loo masalomaia i le Fale o le Fe’e o loo i Upolu/ Salatī’a/Ālāoā, o le Fe’e lea o loo tagatasi ai Talatuu ua faamatalaina ma faamauina i ona faapuiga e faaapea; o le Fee na tafi mai Aana … ma e mafai ona moni ae mafai foi ona le moni lea manatu, ona e le o mafai e poumāa, ma folamaa ona aumai e le Noa ia Ti‘eti‘e le Atua Fe’e i Upolu/Salati’a ma Malietoa ua mavae, i le Tufuga na ia faua le Fogaa poo le Fale o le Fe’e. O le mau, loo atagia lelei ai, le pepē o Atua Fe’e sa i Afolau Mulifanua, Fogaa i Faleula ma Upolu/Salati’a/Ālāoā. O le mau, e oti le tagata ae lē oti le suafa, o loo pine i lea manatu le vaiga faaapea—sa tofo lava augatupulaga ma o latou Atua Fe’e sa so‘oālo i nofoaga na patino i Atuaga Fe’e. O lea foi vaiga, sa mafai ona tagatasi uma ai Atua. O le mamate o Atua Fe’e, e le faaititiia ai le talitonuaga a Auga Malietoa ua mavae, i le Tufuga na ia faua le Fogaa poo le falepapa o le Fe’e o loo i Upolu/Salati’a/Ālāoā.

O le ‘auga lona (ii), ina ia faamatalaina sootaga o le Atua Fe’e i Upolu/Salatī’a/Ālāoā. O sootaga o le Atua Fe’e o Upolu/Salatī’a/Ālāoā, e afua mai i le vaitau o uluai folauga ma le feeqoaga, e pei ona aumai e le Solo ia Ti‘etti‘eatalaga, le ala i Salesfe’e sa i le Papa-Galagala lona faioto’a. (iii) Ina ia faamatalaina sootaga o le Fe’e mai Afolau/Mulifanua, o loo ola pea i faalupega o onapu nei. O ia lea na faataape ai le nuu o Upolu/Salati’a/Ālāoā ma mafua ai igoa o nuu o Tanugāmanono ma Magiagi. O ia foi na mafua ai le igoa o le Åfu o Tapu ma na ia fanaua Sinia-Le‘Avele ma Ūlu ma To’otua, e mafua ai igoa o le Moata ma le Malaefono o Fuaiupolu, o Sinave ma UlumaTootua. O lona uiga, ua loa ona iai Fuaipolu i le vaitau o Tui-Upolu Pili, ae faaatao fai lona Moata ma lona Malaefono i le vaitau o Malietoa Galoā‘itofo.

O suafa o loo i Magiagi, o le Fa‘ai Malietoa ae tali‘ai Ālāoā, o le suafa o le vaitau ua suia le suafa Tui-Tuamasaga i le suafa Malietoa. E mafua lea manatu, ona o loo ta’u ai le igoa Malietoa i lea alagaupu poo lea suafa. Peitai, o suafa Lupe-tali-ama ma le igoa Lupe o le So’aga o igoa o le vauvau mai Upolu/Salatī’a/Ālāoā ma na sosoo e Magiagi o latou faaaogaina. O le suafa Toa o loo i Moata ma lo latou faalupega, o le tagata o le vauvau o Salatī’a, o le suafa o le vauvau ae na faaaauu i Moataa. O le vauvau lava o le Fe’e lea mai Afolau/Mulifanua ma Malietoa Galoā‘itofo, na maua ai le faalupega o le Aiga Sa-Toomalatai ma isī–o Alo o Sinia, ina ua usuia e Tui o le Aiga Sa-Toomalatai sulia tamaitai o Malietoa Leupoluūsāvea–o Sina Fogaa ma Sina Malie. O lona uiga, o le suafa Toomalatai o le suafa o le vauvau, ao le faalupega Alo o Sinia, faaatao maua i vaitau o Malietoa Galoā‘itofo.

O le suafa Tilialo a Sale‘īmoa na maua i le vaitau o Malietoa Gagaasāvea ma Malietoa Leupoluūsāvea. O le suafa Fe’e-tau a le Aiga Sa-So‘oalo, o le suafa o le vauvau, o loo pine ai tomai faa-Tui ma faa-tagata-o-taua o le Atua Fe’e. O le suafa So‘oalo foi, o le suafa o le vauvau ona na afua mai i vaitau o uluai folauga ma le foafoaga Atua eseese e pei o le; Fe’e, Ve’a, Pili, ma isi na soaolo iai augaaso a Samoa. O suafa Tukutufuga, Lima, Vainalelepa, Vaisigano, Puaauli, Puaa‘ena, Pu’a‘efu,
Tonga records are not internally consistent beyond the reign of the Tu‘i Tonga ’Uluakimata I sometime in the 16th century. Earlier than that, the various independent records conflict with each other. Samoan records have doubtful historicity earlier than Malietoa La‘auli, and both Tongan and Samoan records are suspect in relation to the Tongan overlordship. Indeed it would have been in the interest of both cultures to rearrange history and push the long period of subjection and conflict further back into the past. Traces of the occupation which remain in later traditions are probably the most accurate pointers to the real date of that occupation. (Gunson 1987:150)
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Potential for Community Managed Sustainable Tourism Development on Apolima Island
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Abstract

Apolima Island is the least populated island of Sāmoa, with a natural environmental and cultural setting that could potentially add value to Sāmoa’s sustainable tourism future. However, to date, Apolima Island has remained dis-engaged from tourism activities. This study focused on understanding why tourism has not manifested on the island, using talanoa as a method of social inquiry to obtain community perceptions as well as those of the tourism sector, of the potential for community based sustainable tourism development. Themes narrate these findings indicating an overall acceptance of small-scale tourism developments amongst the community members. However, the community felt that it was more important for other developments (mainly infrastructural) to occur before tourism activities begin. This study contributes to our knowledge of island tourism, specifically South Pacific tourism highlighting the sustainable tourism spectrum in Sāmoa and the challenges associated with peripherality. Furthermore it contributes to the use of talanoa as an appropriate method for indigenous researchers to retrieve data from an indigenous population.

Keywords: community based tourism, sustainable tourism development, island tourism, peripherality, talanoa

Introduction

Islands are peripheral tourism destinations that have drawn a great deal of interest because of their physical conditions and socio-cultural structures. Popularised through Western literature and imagery, the global tourism interest in islands is strong. With such interest, however, come challenges of developing an industry in such fragile physical and socio-cultural environments. Tourism is often perceived by island peripheries as an economic diversification tool. However, tourism can be a double-edged sword, promising modernisation and development while placing pressure on natural and cultural resources (Apostolopoulos and Gayle 2002; Gossling and Wall 2007) and posing resource management and governance challenges (Graci and Dodds 2010). Many island destinations recognise that rapid tourism growth has brought negative economic, social and ecological impacts (Graci and Dodds 2010), has created a cycle of dependency (Gossling and Wall 2007) and potentially jeopardises islands’ sustainability (Twining-Ward and Butler 2004).

Thus, more sustainable forms of tourism development are desired and indeed this is the current goal of a number of South Pacific Island destinations. But it is clear that within such challenging social, cultural and political environments that tourism is a contested form of development, and can be expected to face both infrastructural and attitudinal, community-related challenges. A community may be defined as a group or inhabitants who share “… common beliefs, attitudes, interests, identities or other types of connections” (Dredge and Hales 2012: 528), and who may collectively participate in tourism initiatives or developments. Community involvement and prioritising tourism integration through a bottom-up approach may help to address concerns about the potential impacts of tourism development. Specifically, community based tourism (CBT) is a form of tourism which “seeks to increase people’s involvement and ownership of tourism at the destination end” (Mowforth and Munt 2008: 368).

This paper presents the findings of research undertaken in October, 2015 that focused on the potential for tourism on Apolima Island, Sāmoa. The paper considers the depth of Apolima Island’s

Note: 1 Meaning talk, converse or chat.
integration into the overall Sāmoa sustainable tourism development strategy, exploring infrastructural as well as attitudinal barriers to tourism development on the island. In particular the paper considers the challenges faced in the ‘pre-exploration’ phases of development of a potential tourism destination, further exacerbated by the island’s characterisation as a periphery of an already peripheral destination—Sāmoa.

Theoretical Background

Islands are commonly small and isolated peripheries, not only in terms of physical isolation (Conlin and Baum, 1995; Depraetere and Dahl, 2007) but also in terms of political-economic isolation (Baldacchino 2015; Carlsen and Butler 2010). A mass of leisure tourists visit the warmer islands spread out in the Mediterranean, Caribbean and the South Pacific basin (Carlsen and Butler 2010), mainly for relaxation and rejuvenation (Conlin and Baum 1995) usually compelled by early colonial exploration imagery (Harrison 2002) of warm clear waters, and an abundance of food and hospitality, resembling a ‘good life’ (Gossling and Wall 2007; King 1997). In addition to the islands’ sun, sea and sand component, there is a growing interest in cultural and heritage tourism valuing the islands’ historical significance (Graci and Dodds 2010). However, developments including tourism developments in peripheral destinations are restricted by poor infrastructure, limited human resources, lack of local capital and high dependence on export markets (Gossling and Wall 2007). Furthermore, operational limitations such as centralisation of operations, elite influence and domination, and cultural limitations in the form of traditional power or limited local capacity (Hamilton and Alexander 2013; Tosun and Timothy 2003) may impede growth. Peripheral destinations are also prone to natural disasters and vulnerable to global changes (Sharpley 2012).

South Pacific Island tourism utilizes a year round warm climate, white sandy beaches, endemic marine and land eco-systems, lush terrains of the larger islands, distinctive cultures and social structures, as well as history linked to Western penetration, including wars and colonialism (Panakera et al. 2011). However, these islands can expect to face challenges to tourism growth as peripheral destinations and as their MIRAB (Migration, Remittances, Aid and Bureaucracy) economies (Bertram 2006) restrict development opportunities, including tourism specific infrastructure.

Secondly, tourism development is commonly viewed to be associated with socio-cultural disruption, including the commodification of local culture (Ryan 2001; Weaver 2002). While tourism’s threat in terms of acculturation is acknowledged, conversely, some argue that it can play a role in preserving local culture (Besculides et al 2002). It is acknowledged, though, that even a small number of tourists can influence the local culture (Mowforth and Munt 2008) leading to hesitation or division within local communities on whether or not to engage in tourism. Ultimately, some local communities (or individuals) may not respond positively to tourism development as Doxey’s Irritation Index illustrates, the host-guests relationship over time can lead to irritation and finally antagonism (Hunt and Stronza 2014). Ecological challenges are also a reality for island destinations given their limitations in terms of land and natural resources, local use needs and the pressure of tourism resource-intensive activities (Graci and Dodds 2010). These challenges pose both infrastructural and attitudinal barriers to island tourism development.

Adopted from the globally inspired approach towards development in the 1980s (Miller and Twining-Ward 2005), sustainable development has emerged as a means to integrate the economic,
socio-cultural and environmental aspects of development. The notion of sustainability raises debate concerning tourism’s long-term viability, its inter-connected nature (Liburd and Edwards 2010), and that it should not just be business (Butler 1991). Furthermore, in the name of sustainability, the possibility of a less tourism-centric approach must be considered (Miller and Twining-Ward 2005). Graci and Dodds (2010) assert that long-term viability of tourism depends on the constant availability of both natural and cultural resources, highlighting the need for planning and managing these resources and to broaden understanding of the economic, social and environmental factors that affect them. To assist with broadening our understanding of such factors, it is beneficial for island communities to identify where they are in terms of potential tourism development pathways. Butler’s (1980) tourism area life cycle (TALC), depicts the development of tourist areas as occurring in six distinct phases with specific planning and management needs at each. The initial discovery stage of a tourism potential area is called the ‘exploration phase’, which is followed by the ‘growth and development stages’ demonstrated by increased local community involvement, marketing activities and then eventually less local involvement and control (Butler 1980). This may further lead to the ‘consolidation’ phase where decisions are prompted by capacity issues as the destination has reached ‘popularity’ and local resentment of tourism is evident (Butler 1980), despite tourism being the major contributor to the local economy. Associated with a decline in environmental quality along with social impacts, the destination may then stagnate, reaching a final stage where efforts may be needed to initiate a rejuvenation. Most significant for this study is the ‘exploration phase’ where the area could ‘possibly’ be a tourist area (Graci and Dodds 2010), however little research has contributed to our understanding of critical issues at this stage, and how community attitudes may influence progression from this to the next stage of ‘Involvement’.

It is common for Pacific communities to accept tourism development (Movono, Pratt, and Harrison 2015), especially community based tourism (CBT) because of the perceived benefits to local communities (Tolkach and King 2015). The functional view of tourism highlights collaboration through joint decision-making between stakeholders (Jamal and Getz 1995; Sautter and Leisen 1999) valuing the over-arching nature of sustainable tourism (Hunter 1997). Collaboration counters top-down management typical of tourism development (King et al. 2000), while nurturing a sense of ownership among stakeholder, decentralizing power (Hamilton and Alexander 2013; King et al. 2000) and ensuring a more equal distribution of benefits. Collaboration ensures an affective bond between stakeholders, and ideally the community as the main stakeholder.

General support from the community for tourism ventures is desirable, because as a key stakeholder, their participation is seen to make an essential contribution to sustainable tourism development (Sebele 2010; Wahab and Pigram 1997). A community approach to tourism or CBT can provide benefits such as: tourism development acceptable to local residents; control over what is or not accepted; empowerment to integrate tourism and other activities; opening up of opportunities for sharing ideas; reinforcing positive operations in the area; and facilitating the establishment of codes of conduct (Liburd and Edwards 2010). The primary intention of CBT is no longer about the development of the community but development in the community (Hall 2008). This intention places priority on the community’s natural and cultural heritage. However, CBT has been challenged on the basis that it works from a “stereotypical idealization of community” which “assumes shared interests and a consensus on the preferred tourism outcomes” (Blackstock 2005: 42). Critics argue that most communities are heterogeneous, and that the above conceptualization
of community ignores how individuals or groups can act out of self-interest rather than for the collective good (Blackstock 2005; Silk 1999).

This research aims to explore the opportunities and obstacles—attitudinal and infrastructural—for the development of CBT on Apolima Island, while also contributing to our understanding of peripheral destinations that are in the exploration phase of tourism development.

Sustainable Tourism Development in Sāmoa

In the early 1990s, Sāmoa recognised that tourism development must be both environmentally responsible and culturally sensitive (Scheyvens 2008) to benefit both the visitor and the host, aligned with Sāmoa’s Strategy for development vision of an ‘Improved Quality Life for All’. Sāmoa has shown a determination to protect the fa’a Sāmoa and land ownership, thus has taken a cautious approach to tourism, adopting a low-volume high-yield policy focused on small-scale tourism operations (Sāmoa Tourism Authority [STA] 2014a; Scheyvens 2008).

As a peripheral destination, the cornerstones of Sāmoan tourism are a pristine natural environment and a unique culture. These orchestrate the image making of Sāmoa as an emerging tourist destination, under the brand of “The Treasured Islands of the South Pacific”, largely featuring beaches, rainforests, volcanic activities and a vibrant Polynesian culture (Scheyvens 2005). Traditional authority secures local ownership and encourages community management of attraction sites, accommodations and overall Sāmoa tourism activities. Thus local participation in tourism conditions the vision, tourism indicators, priorities and activities of tourism in Sāmoa. Local participation is organised in line with fa’a Sāmoa and because of this, many villages engage in community-based tourism activities. For example, in order to enhance experiential travel, Sāmoan tourism recognises the need to increase community-based tourism income and the support services available to local providers to better enable them for effective operations management (STA 2014b). Sāmoan tourism also recognises that in order to build local tourism capacity, there needs to be “toe dipping” opportunities for the people in the villages to test and experience tourism activities, for instance, engaging as tour guides to take tourists around their village (STA 2014a), the goal being the collective benefit of the village.

Sāmoa interprets sustainable development as the pathway to an Improved Quality of Life for All, and its tourism sector holds the overall aim to be recognised as the leading Pacific destination for sustainable tourism, which engages both visitors and the local community (STA 2014a). Sāmoa is an emerging tourism destination that appreciates sustainable development and values tourism in its economy (STA 2014b). The growth of the beach fale accommodations in Sāmoa is a unique example of successful small-scale operations (Scheyvens 2008) which are community-based, locally owned budget accommodations along the coastal area. According to Scheyvens (2008), beach fale operations complement the existing livelihood of Sāmoans, for example, the hospitality, food and activities available for visitors is not far from the reality of everyday Sāmoan life which does not necessarily strain the host-visitor relationship. The owners are people from the village, and the village renders support. The idea is to generate a healthy multiplier effect for the community, and beach fale owners for example, buy fish from the village fishermen, make donations to the church and village projects and provide village people with employment. In general, many of the tourism activities are operated by local people and communities. Thus the tourism system is well integrated.
into the Sāmoan community; however Apolima Island’s degree of involvement in this system is unclear.

**Methodology**

This study employed a qualitative approach to retrieve data to gauge community perspectives and attitudes towards tourism on Apolima Island, and to investigate the potential for community based sustainable tourism development on the island. The research population included the community of Apolima Island (Group 1) and the Sāmoa tourism sector (Group 2) which includes representatives from the Sāmoa Tourism Authority and Government ministries within the sector. This exploratory study employed purposive sampling to recruit participants with a degree of diversity (Ritchie and Lewis 2003). Five participants were confirmed from Group 1 and four from Group 2, which, in this study was considered adequate to achieve data saturation. These participants are the stakeholders referred to throughout this article. It has been noted that data saturation may be attained by as little as six interviews (Guest et al. 2006). Furthermore, there is general agreement that data saturation is not about the numbers *per se*, but about the depth of the data, and that it is better to focus upon the richness of the data rather than the size of the sample (Burmeister and Aitken 2012). Group 1 participants were purposively selected to fully represent the common perspectives of potential and existing community development through their roles as matai², *taule’ale’a*³ and *tama’ita’i*⁴. Likewise Group 2 participants were selected as working experts in the tourism sector, clearly informed of community engagement through various projects and platforms. The selection included both gender, and considered participants’ role, or traditional status (with or without authority) in the community and all were more than 18 years old.

This study also utilizes the researcher’s status firstly as a Pacific person, a Sāmoan, a female academic, and a *nofotāne⁵* of Apolima Island. These ‘credentials’ steered the accessibility to information and the contextualized analysis of this study. Ethical considerations for the research processes were aligned to the Otago University Research Ethics and Pacific Research Protocol.

While qualitative interviews have been used effectively in the field of CBT elsewhere (Lepp 2007; Okazaki 2008) in the Pacific context, *Talanoa* is an appropriate method of social inquiry. *Talanoa* is, similar to in-depth interviews, guided by topics to lead informal conversations and/or standardized open-ended interviews (Marshall 2011). *Talanoa* in Sāmoan “...refers to loose, casual conversation” (Suaiilii-Sauni and Fulu-Aiolupotea 2014) extended by *soilāupule⁶* “...to include the idea of engaging people in serious conversations about matters of importance...redefining its usage...” (p. 341). Thus as a research method, *talanoa* acknowledges a Sāmoan world view and cultural specificity which qualitative research can be devoid of. *Talanoa* sessions were flexible face-to-face engagements that were not always continuous and not more than one hour, which were planned around the availability of participants. There were various topics intended to initiate the *talanoa* sessions, conducted in both English and Sāmoan, and carried out on Apolima Island and in sector participants’ workplaces. The analysis of these data involved coding themes that evolved

---

² Chief  
³ Young untitled man  
⁴ Young woman  
⁵ Woman married into the family/community  
⁶ Traditional decision making where all parties are entitled to an opinion; this talanoa is usually for serious matters like conflict resolution.
(Fossey et al. 2002) through reflexive writing, transcribing/translating and document analysis. This thematic analysis produced themes that form the main headings within the findings section below.

**Apolima Island—A Periphery of a Periphery**

Apolima Island is West of the main island Upolu, closest to the big island of Savaii. It is the least inhabited of the four inhabited islands with 94 residents in 14 households (Sāmoa Bureau of Statistics [SBS] 2011) and quite difficult to access but with the skill of the *alia* boat navigators, the trip is 30–40 minutes. Figure 1 captures the passage between Apolima-uta/Apolima Fou (on Upolu Island) and Apolima Island, where most residents of Apolima Island have migrated and settled. In the previous census, 432 people were residents of this village (SBS 2011) and it is the common understanding that urban drift in the search for job opportunities has contributed to this migration from Apolima Island. However, it is also believed that as the village grew in size, the island became too small to live on. Also, cyclones in the early 1990s destroyed the island’s infrastructure including its primary school and health clinic facility, which also contributed to the move for many to Upolu.

There is a limited literature on Apolima Island mainly because the island has been difficult to access by researchers. There is limited geographical, flora and fauna research (Freifeld et al. 2001; Richmond and Roy 1989) but some local environmental and sustainable development research provides some information about the island. For example, Apolima Island became the first successful site for solar power installation and use in Sāmoa, as a result of ongoing Government collaboration and research with international bodies including the UNDP (Government of Sāmoa, UNDP, Electric Power Corporation and Organisation for Sustainable Energy (Denmark) 2007). Figure 2 provides an imagery account of entering the island from its only point of entrance, which is an extraordinary experience because it is such a narrow reef opening. Before the efficiency of *alia* boats, navigators used to count seven waves before attempting to enter.

**Figure 1: Locating Apolima Island**

(Source: Google Maps 2015; (Inset map) https://cdn.vectorstock.com)

A traditional Sāmoan community setting and daily life is evident on the island (refer to Figure 3). For example, when guests arrive and stay at a resident’s house, the whole village helps to host the
guests by providing food, *talanoa* and to show them around. The two main sources of income are employment of men on small fishing boats by business people on the main island, and the fine mats woven by the women. Children attend school on the main island, returning only for the weekend. While the men leave for employment, the women, young infants, older folk and the youth left responsible for the plantation and everyday sustenance of the family, remain on the island.

Community activities occupy the residents, and this includes church choir, village clean-up days, house improvement inspections, organised village games at the end of the week, and fishing expeditions for the village and so forth. The traditional authority is the village mayor/representative, who ensures harmony within the community and lobbies for opportunities to improve the community’s welfare. A recent success has been the donation of water tanks for all households on Apolima Island.

*Figure 2: Entering Apolima Island*

(Source: Author; Google maps)
Sāmoa’s Internal Affairs Division (IAD) in the Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development (MWCSD) is the official gateway to villages. IAD manage the various committees of village representatives and organises projects with the help of these representatives, and communicate Government policies and/or events to the villages. The IAD village profile of Apolima
Island in 2013 did not identify the establishment of any tourism facilities or activities. However, it indicates that there are eleven vegetable gardens, three cattle farms, ten piggery farms and eleven poultry farms occupying customary land, and that families owned fishing tools and share five alia boats. This data confirms the predominance of subsistence living on the island. Residents purchase other household goods from the main island. In terms of development projects, the IAD Apolima Island profile notes a few of these projects, including community economic development projects in sewing and fishing since 2012, led by the Small Business Enterprise Centre (SBEC) and funded by the Development Bank of Sāmoa (DBS). Another project proposed the inclusion of Apolima Island as a natural heritage site, a project in progress, led by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, and funded by UNESCO. Apolima Island has been identified as a key marine biodiversity area by the MNRE. Protection is an ongoing environment and social development project that is funded by the Government and steered by the MNRE. With assistance from UNDP, South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission, Government of Sāmoa, Government of Denmark and Asian Development Bank, the Electric Power Corporation (EPC) leads the wind energy project where Apolima Island is the pilot site. On the village level, the Apolima village council (includes matai from Apolima Island and Apolima Fou) administer and fund a community based watershed management project. These projects, both planned and established, speak to the application of a sustainable development approach on Apolima Island, highlighting the island’s capacity for sustainable community managed projects and collectively contributing to an environment in which sustainable forms of tourism may be apposite.

Apolima Island: Potential for Community Based Sustainable Tourism Development?

Analysis of the interviews with key community and industry stakeholders provide an insight into the potential for community based sustainable tourism development on Apolima Island. The findings are presented under five themes, drawn from the thematic analysis of talanoa and also discussed with reference to relative tourism sector documents. The themes present a narrative that begins with a broad statement of the local view on sustainability in relation to development. This provides a basis for discussing the importance of sector-community collaboration in sustainable development. The focus then shifts to the community and their perspectives on development in general, and later their response to tourism developments on Apolima Island. Finally this narrative addresses the potential barriers to development on Apolima.

Understanding of Sustainability

The community’s understanding of sustainability is in relation to ‘developments’ that can be managed by the community and are within their means on the island. A community interviewee says “...we cannot afford to put effort into developments that crash in two months”. There is an insistence that whatever developments occur at this level, they have to be viable and durable so to not waste resources. It was also observed that this understanding is a result of community engagement programmes administered by government organisations, and guided by documents such as the Village Sustainable Development Plans (VSDPs) and the Community Profiles amongst others. As a tourism sector interviewee articulates;

*The whole idea is for the community to identify their assets and their understanding of these assets, and how they would like these assets to develop further, so that it is sustainable for them. In that way, they
own the project, they own the plan, and they lead the implementation. We hope to have VSDPs for all communities, to add to the Community Profiles that we have of each village.

The tourism sector participants seemed well informed of the sustainability concept, obviously enabled by their line of work and their delivery requirements according to the Strategy for the Development of Sāmoa 2012–2019 (SDS), which emphasizes developing opportunities that provide a ‘Quality Life for All’ by boosting productivity through sustainable developments. Their informed understanding and the direction of their work, relates to the proposal by Graci and Dodds (2010) that sustainable tourism development should provide a quality of life for all through forward thinking, community involvement and relative policies and strategic implementation. This requires the use of indicators such as sustainable tourism development indicators (Miller and Twining-Ward 2005) which pull together the three pillars of sustainability (Liburd and Edwards 2010). It is important to note that these indicators should reflect the context of the locality (Twining-Ward and Butler 2004), which the community sector strives to achieve with the developments that it initiates. These indicators must be applied should developments occur on Apolima Island, to monitor progress in alignment with other tourism sector developments occurring throughout the other islands of Sāmoa. It is indicated in these findings that sustainable tourism development is desired as expressed through talanoa as developments that the community can manage and are within the means known to them. Furthermore, this desire is also reflected in the direction of ongoing community engagement programmes. This interest is particularly important for island periphery destinations as Graci and Dodds (2010) point out, because rapid unmonitored tourism growth has brought negative economic, social and ecological impacts.

Stakeholder Consultation, Collaboration and Communication

The fa’asāmoa has always been an important part of a Sāmoan’s life, especially in the village. Consultation, collaboration and communication of decisions lead to the improvement of villages, and it is a pathway that is employed and recognised by the tourism sector to be effective and recognised in the overall development strategies of Sāmoa. This implies forward thinking and vision on the sector’s part, and identifies the need to effectively communicate with the community affected. It also affirms that communities are like ecosystems (Jamal and Getz 1995) where their components depend and respond to one another, and decision making shifts from the top-down scale to a more decentralised bottom-up manner (King et al. 2000). A talanoa participant explains that: “Each ministry specialises and understands its own area and so when we work together, we are drawing the best from each other to achieve our targets and push the development of Sāmoa.”

In this perspective, community involvement in sustainable development is not a new concept in Sāmoa, but a ‘label’ for a usual practice. A practice that is readily achieved between ‘neighbours’ such as Manono Island and Apolima Island, who share the wandering tourist, as explained by an Apolima Island interviewee, “My friend and owner of the Manono Island resort contacts me when he has visitors who want to come to Apolima. They transport the visitors over, and the visitors either stay for a few hours, or for a night or two, and then we take them back to Manono or Savaii”. It is a practice that is strengthened by ideas or projects that the ministries and organisations import from the main island and overseas, along with capacity building opportunities and funding to implement projects. This emphasizes that communities should have a voice in the developments that affect them, especially in tourism development (Tosun and Timothy 2003). Even though some community representatives do not participate in interactions such as workshops and training, these are still
established channels of interaction, available for those who can attend and most used these channels of interaction and depended upon them for community-government-sector interaction. However, the element of non-participation presents a potential weakness in the authorities’ community engagement strategy. On this note, the fa’asāmoa can play an important role when utilized thoroughly, as one interviewee states “We make the decision as matai, and then we encourage our families and work together to make it happen, it’s the system of our forefathers and it is a system that works for us today.”

**Potential Developments on Apolima Island**

Through *talanoa*, participants presented a wide variety of potential developments on Apolima Island, reflecting on the outlined development pathway in documents such as the SDS and the STSP. In these sessions, tourism sector participants displayed a wide understanding of the development pathway of Sāmoa, and their perceptions on possible developments for Apolima Island reflected this understanding. The reoccurring perception from this group was, that should Apolima Island community engage in tourism development, they must align with the national strategy for development (SDS). This is the expectation for all village community developments in Sāmoa, drawn out of the Community Engagement Framework (Internal Affairs Division, 2014). In relation to this, a facilitator of community projects explains that the aim is, “...to teach people how to sustain themselves and their community, without introducing extreme lifestyle changes. So far communities accept these projects because they provide other means that ensure a good life, taking away the thinking that only a job in Apia can provide a good life.”

The community participants demonstrated a positive perspective on development, tempered with a desire that any developments must be useful and practical. It is evident that the residents view tourism as one potential development, but there were more “urgent” developments according to a community interviewee;

*Yes that (tourism development) would be great! But I think before we get there, there are a lot of other developments that we need assistance with. Like a seawall, a more stable wharf so that people can jump off the boat on to dry land, and a boat to operate just for the tourists.*

Other developments identified included a medical clinic and a school. Participants’ priorities seemed to be more on infrastructural development, as they felt that this can enable subsequent developments such as tourism to flourish. Reflecting on the resident participants’ responses and behaviour during *talanoa*, they portrayed a confidence in their remoteness and security in their community life, with or without tourism. In this sense, tourism is not a development that residents feel they needed to engage in at this stage because their livelihood does not depend on it. Therefore their main concern seemed to be more about developments that protect their community, for example, the construction of a seawall to prevent coastal erosion and a medical clinic to help maintain a healthy population on the island.

**Tourism on Apolima Island**

The general impression from participants is that there is support for sustainable tourism development. The major concern of participants however, was about having ‘proper’ tourism facilities and accommodation.

*Palagi do come to our island, usually from Manono Island. They pop in around to our house, talk with us and we have the chance to practice speaking English. They usually walk up to the lighthouse, see the*
spring and just mingle with us. There have been talks to establish beach fales to accommodate them, but I don’t know what happened to those talks.

While the resident participants also recognize that tourism can be economically beneficial as another source of income, tourism development is not seen as a development priority, but a potential development that if serendipitously happens, it must benefit the community. Participants were more excited about the social benefit of tourism such as the opportunity to display their pride in their island and to ‘practice’ their English speaking skills, which are features of success in sustainable tourism development according to Graci and Dodds (2010). The Sāmoan-ness that was observed on Apolima Island during the data collection fieldwork is definitely significant. The hospitality shown was also non-obligatory but a normal response, which one of the islanders explained “It is our way to show that little Apolima has a big heart, and when visitors return to their homes, they will only have great things to say about Apolima.” The residents were in control of the interactions that took place on the island because they were in their own space and in their normal routine of social life. Hosting visitors was not an extreme activity that would obligate them to change their lifestyle.

These findings on residents’ attitudes towards tourism confirm that Apolima Island is situated in the exploration stage of Butler’s (1980) TALC model. Visitors make their own travel arrangements to get there, they explore the new place and the locals host them in their homes. The hosts are friendly and positive to having visitors regardless of their purpose or type because it gives them the opportunity to share their culture and everyday existence of which they are proud. It is necessary to stress that participants feel that visitors at this stage do not have a major cultural and economic impact on the community.

From the perspective of tourism sector participants, while excited about the possibilities of tourism on Apolima Island, they share the perception with residents that tourism is not a priority development, but if it happens, it must happen as a sustainable form of development. This is expressed by one representative, “We duly support Apolima Island as a tourism operation area especially because it is not located on the (main) island, and ideal for the adventure seekers and backpackers because of the experience of getting there and just with what is available there.” The overall response from the sector indicate concerns surrounding the sustainability of natural and cultural resources for tourism, which alludes to the environmental and cultural impact of tourism discussed by in terms of carrying capacity by a number of researchers (Graci and Dodds 2010; Mowforth and Munt 2008). The sector is cautious of tourism development but it is also optimistic given neighbouring Manono Island’s success with tourism activities. While there are important differences between the islands, the overall attitude is that tourism development must capture and sustain what Apolima Island has to offer.

**Barriers to Development**

The barriers to tourism were mostly identified by participants from the tourism sector, demonstrating their awareness of the repercussions of poor development planning, especially on an island such as Apolima. The majority of the barriers identified were infrastructural barriers that can potentially impede development—including tourism development. As one of the *talanoa* participants from the tourism sector highlighted, Apolima Island is difficult to access, which poses as a risk factor that may deter some visitors but at the same time, appeal to others such as adventure seeking tourists. This concern is related to a lack of transport providers (boats) with whom the sector
could collaborate to construct a timetable of transfers. This gave rise to the concern of the security of tourists travelling over through the Apolima Strait which is regarded as one of Sāmoa’s roughest channels. Safety, however, is an important component of tourist satisfaction in Sāmoa (STA 2014a) and thus it is a prevailing concern of the sector to maintain a positive view of Sāmoa. Inquiring further on this, the sector representatives were cautious and referred to the need for risk management even though they acknowledged that there haven’t been any recorded mishaps in this channel. In contrast, the residents, however, did not raise the issue of safety. In fact, they were quite casual in their talanoa about travelling to and from Apolima Island, noting that it has always been safe for them because of their skilled boat navigators who were born and raised on the island, and therefore, knew the conditions well.

Another key challenge identified by participants that could impede development is the poor current water supply and waste management infrastructure available on the island. Participants believed that this issue is crucial to consider, along with the need to anticipate the pressure that development and increased number of visitors may bring. At this stage, the residents have received water tanks for each household, but the concern raised by one of the tourism sector participants is the impact of droughts such as that arising from the recent El Nino event which has strained the water supply, especially on remote islands. That participant suggests the possibility of enhanced rain water harvesting to counter water scarcity issues. From an environmental perspective, some participants also raised the need to consider waste management parallel to development growth. One tourism sector participant feared that “Increased number of visitors and [growth of] the community will eventually exhaust the existing septic tanks; what will happen then is a major marine environment issue.”

In contrast to the raft of issues identified by tourism sector participants, through talanoa the residents’ generally expressed a confidence and pride in the “little Apolima with the big heart”. In the residents’ positive attitude towards tourism there was no indication of any cultural taboos on developments. They did emphasize, however, that developments required the consensus of the community or soālāupule. Such a process takes time which again a key participant from the tourism sector identified as a challenge that can impede or even stop a development; “After identifying a site we proceed to establish it, but then we encounter customary land ownership issues and find ourselves as mediators in a tangle of ownership.” Elaborating on this issue, this talanoa participant believed that it is important at this early ‘pre-development’ stage to determine who will be responsible for the site so that it can be maintained and developed according to Sāmoa’s tourism objectives and principles. Participants also identified the challenges around the ongoing management of any tourism developments on the island. In particular, they were referring to the skills and capabilities necessary to operate developments on the island, such as beach fale accommodations, and the challenges of finding suitable skills and capabilities within a community of less-than-one hundred Apolima Islanders. Thus if tourism development does occur on Apolima Island, it is seen as important that the tourism sector matches such development with the capability and skills set of the residents by offering ongoing training and workshops. Apolima participants reiterated that there is also the need to continuously collaborate with the community to ensure that customary access is maintained, and in order so that any tourism development can proceed and be sustainably managed by the community.
Conclusion

The community participants on Apolima Island held a positive attitude towards tourism development. While their perceptions may be limited to the visitor-host experiences they may have had to date, tourism is recognised not simply as another source of income but more for the social benefits that allow them to display pride in the Sāmoan way of life that they practice, which Graci and Dodds (2010) highlight as a feature of successful sustainable development. For the currently very limited number of visitors, there is a high level of interaction between with the community because there are currently no tourism specific facilities, fitting the description of tourism development in the Exploration-early-Involvement stage (Butler 1980) of minimum visitors, non-regularity of visits and hosted by the residents. Visitors are usually Sāmoan working people, and the palagi visitor is only expected when they request to visit through Sāmoa Tourism Authority or Manono Island friend. At this stage of the TALC model, the economic and ecological impacts of tourism are low because visitor numbers and length of stay are usually short overnight stays, and interaction with the locals is the main activity. While the Apolima Island residents perceive social impacts to not be an issue with Sāmoan visitors, they may be naïve in terms of the potential impacts from domestic (cf. international) tourism. Studies elsewhere point to the substantial tourism impacts from large scale domestic tourism (Ghimire 2013).

It is noted that the Apolima Island community participants prefer developments that they themselves can manage because they value their existing lifestyle. Residents have a can-do attitude towards tourism if tourism developments are initiated, otherwise their priority lies with the development of physical and health related infrastructure. The common perspective is that these infrastructural developments lay the path for other developments for the community. For example, a seawall is an identified development priority which the community feels will not only preserve the island but minimise posed risks of climate change on islands. It is also evident that the community relies on the Government to initiate developments. This includes assisting them with finding sponsors and donors for community projects. Such dependence reflects the MIRAB economies of peripheral destinations (Gossling and Wall 2007) such as Sāmoa, and moreover Apolima Island as a ‘periphery of a periphery’.

Sustainable tourism researchers emphasise the relationship between collaboration and sustainability (Liburd and Edwards 2010). The tourism sector participants in this study recognise the importance of collaboration, which can lead to joint decision making (Jamal and Getz, 1995; Sautter and Leisen, 1999) that benefits communities. On Apolima there is an overall confidence in the established forms of collaboration, that when effectively used, can lead to community managed tourism projects. Collaborations between the formal tourism sector led by the Sāmoa Tourism Authority with Apolima Island could, for example, help to establish safe and regular transport to the island, secure historical narratives, protect significant sites, create safe visitor activities, initiate the correct accommodation arrangements for the community to operate, and most importantly ensure a continued healthy visitor-host relationship.

However, the sector highlighted infrastructural barriers to sustainable tourism development, specifically accessibility, water supply and waste management and also questioned who will be responsible on the island to ensure that developments such as tourism are sustained. These barriers reflect conditions common to peripheral islands (Tosun and Timothy 2003) and highlight the
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importance of STD indicators (Miller and Twining-Ward 2005) that are context specific to the community (Twining-Ward and Butler 2004).

Furthermore, the sector also pointed to other potential sustainable developments that may be more viable for Apolima Island, such as a pilot site for renewable energy projects. Tosun and Timothy (2003) emphasise limitations that need to be considered in community projects, which Mowforth and Munt (2008) believe strengthen the bond and ownership of projects because of continuous collaborations. This reflects what the tourism sector aims for in community projects, encouraging communities to not only engage in project planning but to also lead in the implementation and management of projects. In this light, the tourism sector relies on the community to initiate the developments or at least indicate an interest that they can support and work with the community on such projects. However, it is apparent that both the sector and community wait on each other to initiate developments.

Overall, Apolima Island has practicable potential to participate in tourism activities, fitting with Sāmoa’s national cultural and environmental tourism approach. The fa’asāmoa land ownership also ensures that ownership is local and the community benefits from developments. However, there appears to be a misunderstanding on who should initiate developments—the community, the government or the private tourism sector. Apolima Island has yet to be integrated into the Sāmoa tourism matrix but indications from this exploratory study are that the residents’ positive attitude together with the government and tourism sector’s support, can enhance the quality of life for the residents, while providing a quality visitor experience through its inclusion as a community based tourism experience within Sāmoa’s tourism offering.

Research Implications and Ways Forward

This explorative study contributes to our overall understanding of sustainable development, and particularly sustainable tourism development, and emphasises the value of community perceptions and community involvement in development planning, especially pre-development or ‘exploration’ phases (Butler 1980; Graci and Dodds 2010). The study articulates the need for collaboration between the tourism sector and the community, in order to achieve a truly community based form of tourism (Mowforth and Munt 2008). It provides a useful window into local perceptions of sustainable tourism and points to the intricate link between general development needs and specific tourism development needs in a ‘chicken and egg’ like manner.

A further contribution of this study comes from its focus on island tourism, specifically warm water islands in the South Pacific tourism. While Conlin and Baum (1995) and later Sharpley (2012) argue that island tourism is not a new phenomenon in academic research, this study acknowledges Carlsen and Butler’s (2010) argument that there are various complexities in island tourism, and that these are worthy of research. Such complexities include peripherality which in the local context, Apolima Island aptly demonstrates, being a “periphery within a periphery” which poses further challenges not only in terms of development but also in terms of maintaining general community engagement. There are areas highlighted in this research that could be expanded into larger research projects.

This research did not investigate the relationship between renewable energy and tourism in Sāmoa. However, renewable energy is a growing interest in Sāmoa, along with increasing concern over limited resources in island countries. Also this topic was frequently mentioned during talanoa
sessions. In line with sustainable principles in tourism, it may be useful to investigate the context of renewable energy in Sāmoa, and how it can contribute to the tourism sector, affect the quality of visitor experience and the quality of life for the local community.

This study can be viewed as a case study of Sāmoa, featuring Apolima Island, and special interest in community involvement and sustainable tourism development. These parameters can be repeated with various other village communities around Sāmoa, profiling the villages, generating and expanding knowledge on tourism in Sāmoa. Furthermore these case studies can contribute to documents such as the Village Sustainable Development Plan (Internal Affairs Division [IAD] 2014).

Finally, this research has highlighted that *talanoa* is an effective research method especially in the local level. *Talanoa* encourages the use of the first language which articulates Sāmoan values and insights, providing a useful pool of contextualised information that can be adapted in various forms of development. Comparative studies between villages would be possible through *talanoa*, identifying potential community developments.
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Transnational Sāmoan Chiefs: Views of the Fa’amatai (Chiefly System)
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Abstract

Sāmoans make up the largest Pacific population in New Zealand, the United States and Australia. Family networks remain strong between diasporic Sāmoans and their homeland, and through these networks social, political and economic links are maintained. While there is increasing global concern about the ‘erosion’ of the fa’amatai, there is a need for more evidence of how transnational matai experience and practise fa’amatai and their roles and obligations to aiga (families) and villages in their host nations and Samoa, to better understand both the potential and risks associated with the future of the fa’amatai.
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Introduction

This paper presents some initial findings from a three-year study still underway into matai living, born or raised outside the islands of Samoa. The study “Sāmoan transnational matai (titled chiefs): Ancestor god ‘avatars’ or merely title-holders?” is funded by the Royal Society of New Zealand’s Marsden Fund. The transnational matai in our research are Sāmoan migrants and their descendants who have become matai while living outside Samoa. Given the Sāmoan diaspora has already outstripped the population in Samoa, in future matai titles are increasingly likely to be bestowed on those born and raised primarily outside Samoa. So there is a need for more information about how transnational matai experience and practise fa’amatai—their chiefly roles and obligations to ‘āiga (family) and villages in their host nations and in Samoa.

Our research looks particularly at the ‘affective ties’ of transnational Samoa, the complex emotional and social ties between Sāmoan migrants and their communities of origin (Macpherson 1994: 83). These affective ties underpin the fa’amatai as a system and framework for action which defines the relationships between people economically, politically and socially (Iati 2000: 71–72). Anae’s work among New Zealand-born matai (1998) describes matai affective ties as ‘to be tino malosi ma loto alofa’—to have a strong body and a loving heart. So what are the affective ties which encourage transnational Sāmoans to take up the duties of a matai? Do transnational matai, especially those born in western metropoles, maintain meaningful and sustainable ties to families and villages in Samoa? How is transnational life transforming the way they ‘do’ fa’amatai? And what are the challenges and possibilities for the persistence of the fa’amatai outside Samoa?

Literature

Fa’amatai is the chiefly system of Samoa, and is central to the organisation of Sāmoan society. It is the traditional indigenous form of governance in both American Samoa and the independent State of Samoa. Of central importance in the system are the matai, the holders of family chief titles. Fa’amatai is the key socio-political system of governance and way of life in Sāmoan culture. Inherent in the fa’amatai is the welfare and well-being of the extended family and the protection of family property, consisting most importantly of customary land. In the 49-seat parliament of independent Samoa, all 47 Members of Parliament must be matai, performing dual roles as chiefs and modern politicians, with the exception of the two seats reserved for non-Sāmoans. The fa’amatai is significant in modern Samoa where most of the land, about 81 percent (567,000 acres), is under
customary ownership with the rest under the national government as public lands. Over the last 200 years, the fa’amatai has been greatly impacted upon by colonialism, Christianity and capitalism (Macpherson and Macpherson 2009) and more recently by the burgeoning transnational communities of Sāmoans abroad. Transnational matai are those chiefs who have been conferred with titles while they have been domiciled abroad. They consist of men, women, and those born in Samoa and overseas. They may speak Sāmoan or not, they do not attend village fono regularly, but all are part of large Sāmoan families who may span several continents and who all serve their families to varying degrees.

Much of the literature on transnational matai is polarised. Critics point to the perception that transnational matai demand authority and respect yet they have not acquired the ‘tools of the trade’ to earn them the right to exercise that authority or deserve the respect of their peers in Samoa (So’o 2008). They are seen as lacking the “cultural grooming to become ‘proper’ matai who know their stuff—oratory language, genealogy and esoteric matters, and many subtle nuances associated with fa’amatai” (So’o 2007: 254). Opening the ranks to transnational matai is also seen as eroding the homogeneity of traditional family and village matai by introducing better educated youth and new social agendas on gender, sexual orientation and political philosophy (Macpherson and Macpherson 2009: 191). Advocates of traditional fa’amatai argue that for Sāmoans to confront and manage globalising forces without a sense of historical disjunction, cultural foundations must remain intact (ibid: 57).

However, advocates of transnational fa’amatai see it as leadership intent on attaining and maintaining peace and harmony for aiga (families) and for Samoa in changing times. At the same time as they are becoming socio-economically and politically successful outside Samoa, they reinforce their commitments to extended family and village, thus reproducing the social relations that ensure the reproduction of fa’amatai (Gough 2006: 39; 2009).

There is a clear need to move beyond these oppositions and to conceptualise fa’amatai from a transnational stance, which recognises the experiences and narratives of transnational matai and their children born on foreign soil. Lee states: “Any issues facing Pacific peoples must be discussed in the context of both the islands and their diasporas, taking the processes of ‘world enlargement’ and transnationalism into account” (2007: 1). This is especially important given the implication that transnational matai, especially those born outside Samoa, are not considered real and viable networks of exchange or connection (Gershon 2012, 2007; Gough 2006, 2009). Anae’s previous research on Sāmoan transnational matai and fa’amatai in New Zealand (1998, 2002, 2006), has shown overseas-born matai to be ‘real’ Sāmoans, to be thinkers and makers of cultural discourse and thus critical for the persistence of the fa’amatai.

Approach

For this research we are drawing on interviews with 24 transnational matai, including women, living in three centres of the Sāmoan diaspora—Sydney, Australia, and in the United States in Hawaii and Oceanside, San Diego. Many of the first generation of Sāmoan migrants to New Zealand in the 1950s then moved to Australia in the 1970s in search of better work opportunities, taking advantage of the Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangement. Steady Sāmoan movement to North America via American Samoa and Hawaii since 1951 was enabled by granting American Sāmoans the status of US Nationals
and free entry to the USA, but fewer rights than American citizens. Access has also occurred through membership in the Mormon Church (Lee 2007: 1).

This paper focuses on the eight matai in Hawaii, including two women, and sketches themes from a first round of interviews in mid-2015. The matai included retirees, professionals, blue-collar workers, housewives, and one in the military. Four were pioneer generation aged 64 to 94, and the others born or raised primarily in Hawaii were aged between 38 and 54. The interviews took place in Honolulu in English and Sāmoan.

All became matai while living overseas. Their titles were bestowed by villages in Samoa or American Samoa. In the pioneer generation, two matai held ali‘i (sacred chiefly) titles, one held a tulāfale (chiefly orator) title, and one held two ali‘i titles from different villages. Among the younger cohort raised or born in Hawaii, one matai held an ali‘i title, two held tulāfale titles, and one held an ali‘i title and a tulāfale title from the same village. This last matai did not attend saofa‘i (title bestowal ceremonies) in Samoa but had them conferred through ‘Tapā le ipu’—where a title is bestowed in absentia with a family member in Samoa acting as matai proxy.

Key Themes

Several themes have emerged from the preliminary analysis of the Hawaii interviews.

Knowledge of Fa’amatai

Reasons for accepting their titles were varied but all had a strong sense of the many years of service they had given to village, family and Sāmoan communities in Hawaii and Samoa. For some accepting was straightforward. One felt his titles recognised his tautua (service) to his village and government. Another spoke of not wanting a title but accepted it recognised her “strong life of service”. Another had been told “one day it would happen” by his father, and accepted the title on his death despite believing Sāmoans overseas should not become matai;

My mum, my family and my wife wanted me to ... because I am that person who fights for the fa‘asāmoa and family stuff ... and church fa‘alavelave...Secondly, I know my family wanted me desperately because of my job... to help doing family fa‘alavelave.

He liked the “excitement” of fa‘asāmoa and saw it as a blessing from God. His military service gave him confidence to be a “respected leader and matai”. Several participants had resisted a title but acquiesced in the end. One had not wanted the financial demands of being a matai. Another “didn’t much care for it”, but eventually accepted after the 2009 tsunami devastated Samoa and his aiga desperately needed help. One turned down offers twice from his wife’s family because he never saw himself as a matai, preferring “to work at the ūmu’ at the back”. But he accepted the third time despite feeling “not worthy for it”;

To this very day I still don’t understand much about it, I try! ... I’m thankful for it, it has its perks but if I had a chance to give it back I would ... now I tell my wife, basically, I’ll hold my turf until one of my boys is ready and then I’ll give it to him.

Another was told by his father that education was more important in their new country and fa’amatai was a “waste of time’. But his love for his mother meant fa’amatai had become important to him because “it was so important” to her:
I didn’t think about the gravity, wisdom, significance, importance of faʻasāmoa because I had no context at all [as a young man]...but I knew I was there, to honour my mother ... now I feel the weight of responsibility, I’m ready for it.

It was his mother who taught him about his gafa (genealogy) and faʻasāmoa shortly after leaving college. He accepted his title two years after her death.

The men gave the following explanations of learning about faʻamatai:

- As youth, they didn’t know anything about faʻasāmoa and faʻamatai. All they knew about was the work—the ūmu (cooking), killing the pig, and other feʻau (chores).

- First real education was serving a matai—their father:
  
  ... it’s when you serve that you learn, [you] can’t learn by just talking.

- Service was defined as ‘being a good son’; watching and learning:
  
  ... Then I realise that being a good matai’s taking care of your family so they’re happy! My dad never kept anything! He always gave it ... Whenever he need something they always came! ‘Cause they know, e alofa ... My dad...he only had a sixth grade education but he was a tagata alofa...and that made all the difference.

- Matai overseas must tautua mamao (provide service from afar)—to give and lead however you can so that when you return to Samoa you are loved.

- Need to understand about the two systems of faʻasāmoa and democracy:
  
  If we combine those two...the faʻasāmoa will continue to grow.... we have to be smart and when we get the matai title...then people will respect us...both go together.

The female matai gave the following explanations:

- The key is understanding the “path of the matai”, including the language and respect.
  
  ... what’s most important is the attitude of the matai, and his speech, no matter how high they are. But if they come and they are disrespectful? No ...

- Ethics are important.

- Being responsible but open to advice.

Overall, there are strong themes of tautua (service) and faʻalavelave between pioneer matai and younger ones raised in Hawaii. Tautua was seen as the most important requirement of a transnational matai.

For the pioneer generation, tautua in Hawaii embraced a range of community and church activities, including:

- Organising Flag Days and other anniversary celebrations;
Setting up cultural/language programmes and radio and TV programmes;

- Raising donations and help for villages in Samoa; and

- Hosting Sāmoan official delegations.

After running through her extensive list, one pioneer matai added, “Whatever I have to give out, even to this day I’m still doing it.” Other experiences of tautua in Hawaii and Samoa were shared by pioneer and younger generations:

- Monotaga—traditional contributions to the village or to family social obligations.

- Financial and cultural responsibilities during weddings, funerals, ‘Church things’.

- Support for ‘āiga—mainly financial in Hawaii, Samoa and elsewhere.

Showing respect for elders was also cited as important by the younger matai. Apart from one who taught Sāmoan at university and ran a small aoga (preschool), the Hawaii-born or raised matai tended to focus their tautua around the church. Lack of confidence with the language was an important factor. Lack of extended family in Hawaii was also cited a reason for “less and less involvement from my part as being a matai in my family”. The main time that matai’s title was “active” in Hawaii, he said, was when attending his wife’s fa’alavelave. However, another young matai felt the responsibilities of tautua had made him “stronger physically and mentally”, in particular imbuing a “good, strong feeling that enabled me to stand in front of people”.

Support for family and villages in Samoa and elsewhere was an important part of tautua for all the matai. One younger matai said he always contributed to a mogotaga or other village donations “because of my chief title…I can’t avoid it” and recognised he always had to be “prepared and equipped” for that.

A pioneer matai said he and his wife still “serve our families” in Samoa:

Such as yesterday, her sister called for a money … we sent her 300 to help her and church fa’alavelaves. Even though the air fares are expensive we still want to travel to Samoa for fa’alavelave.

Another pioneer had always helped his village and family in Samoa. He had brothers and sisters there to “take care of things” and one brother “represents” him:

When he’s there I’m there. He communicates exactly, so he knows what’s happening on the ground and what is needed, and he’s much more, much more knowledgeable, than I am.

Trust was one of the challenges of tautua at a distance from the village. Distrust and language difficulties underpinned misgivings among many Hawaii-born and raised matai about taking part in fa’alavelave. One said relatives in the islands were always asking for money and were not honest about what it was spent on:

It got to the point where you’re avoiding the phone calls … I told my daughters whenever you see the 684 don’t answer it. They just have to draw the line.

Excessive demands for fa’alavelave were being fuelled by excessive spending in the islands, he said, citing funerals costing tens of thousands of dollars with hundreds of fine mats.

It really makes you think….is this the fa’asāmoa? What has changed? A lot. So having a matai comes with a lot of responsibility.
But another younger matai felt “chiefs that were brought up here” tended to complain about fa’alavelave as a “burden” because they did not understand what it was about:

I tell them, no... by giving and helping others when needed, then in return they’ll give and help when a fa’alavelave happens with them... I don’t think of fa’alavelave as an obligation but a way or opportunity of fellowship with family and friends—like the fa’asāmoa, we all work together so then the work load is easier and lighter.

Despite the misgivings, tautua was valued by all the matai. One younger matai described being able to serve as the “best part” of Sāmoan culture. One of the pioneer matai agreed but lamented that “money carries more weight” than actual physical service.

Personally I’d rather have the service because it’s more deeper. You can build your ‘āiga with that, you can’t build it with money.

Inter-generational Challenges

The loss of knowledge of fa’asāmoa and fa’amatai was identified as the most important challenge by both pioneer and younger matai. In particular, incompetency in tautala fa’asāmoa, Sāmoan language, was seen as the biggest problem for matai raised or born in Hawaii. One pioneer matai felt “kids are hesitant” because they did not know the correct “respectful language” required by matai when speaking and by others when talking to them. A younger matai admitted he hesitated over becoming a matai because of the injunction to “educate your mouth first before becoming a chief, not get a chief title and not understand anything or know how to talk like a chief and then that would bring disgrace to any family”.

Some younger matai enrolled in Sāmoan language classes. Others gained confidence from speaking at church, learning from elders and at family fa’alavelave, especially at si’i:10

I try to read and read so then I can understand the proverbs and how to use them or when to use them... so if I understand them really well then I’ll be able to use them confidently with clarity.

Another younger matai confessed that “not knowing the meaning of what needs to be said and why” held him back on occasions when he should be speaking as a matai. He memorised from books but knew he lacked understanding of the context:

My uncle tries to help me a lot. He’d make me do the faafetais11...like the closings, but as far as laugas12... there can be up to seven parts, I’m like...no way.... If I did this more I would be much better matai and be recognized out there in the community...

Some pioneer matai taught Sāmoan language classes, including at university and in prisons. One younger matai had set up a small preschool. The need to teach Sāmoan language from preschool age to university level was stressed by several matai, as was the need for parents to “force” their children to speak Sāmoan. One pioneer matai said she always spoke Sāmoan at meetings regardless of whether anyone understood, just to give the children the opportunity of “hearing the Sāmoan language”.

Allied to the language shortcomings was the lack of knowledge about the fa’amatai because of the absence of village meetings in Hawaii. One pioneer matai said children learned about the fa’amatai “from observing, on top of service” and classes were a poor substitute.

Another repercussion of the loss of understanding about Sāmoan culture was the perception that fa’asāmoa and fa’amatai were just about fa’alavelave and giving money. A pioneer matai noted “the kids now say being a matai brings hardship”.
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One younger matai agreed:

*It stops and makes them turn their back to our fa’asāmoa. This is caused by our own families....if they do not explain properly to them where they are giving it....how much they’re giving.*

As a result, he said, younger generations were choosing faapalagi—or European style—weddings because “they do not want their families to be suffered by cultural stuff”.

One trend identified by some participants is for transnational matai and women matai to be increasingly given ali’i (sacred) titles rather than tulāfale (speaking) titles. One younger tulāfale explained how it worked out for two contemporaries after they all received their titles together:

*The other two, even though they know the fa’asāmoa, they’re not that strong with the āganu’u which is why they were given the high chief titles.*

As a result, of the three he is the one asked to speak for the family and is also the representative for his pastor and church.

*When it comes to sharing opinions and ideas the two young chiefs would hardly say something because their fa’asāmoa is weak. So a lot of times it’s always myself and the other high chiefs that would make the decisions.*

For their part, the female matai suggested perhaps there is a perception that women needed to be protected from potential political conflicts as tulāfale; or, that it was just another expression of the fa’amatai being perceived as the domain of men.

**Transformations**

Some different forms of fa’amatai in Hawaii have emerged from the interviews.

**Atoa Ali’i**

A unique development of the fa’amatai in Hawaii is the Atoa Ali’i, formed in the early years of Sāmoan settlement there and whose members act in similar ways to village matai in Samoa. Initially the council was instrumental in organising annual flag days, hosting visiting Sāmoan groups, and working with social agencies to help with Sāmoan youth. Some of those ceremonial functions have continued:

*If there are any special guests such as the government or the governor of American Sāmoa then a kava ceremony would be held specially for and to greet them. The high chiefs and the orators of our country are still trying to uphold and carry on the culture and traditions in our own country.*

The Atoa Ali’i has monthly meetings, a structure, and rules for serving its matai, as one senior member put it, “in heaps and heaps of ways”:

*Such as celebrating independence.....we all have to put in money... to run the flag celebration.... if someone of our members passed away...we all have to put in 500 or even up to 1000 if we all agree to it.*

But the Atoa Ali’i’s prominence has faded in later years amid disagreements among members and with other matai. One source of contention has been the acceptance of government money to run flag days. One pioneer matai refuses to attend because “they all about the money”. A younger matai felt the arguments “make Sāmoans look bad in Hawaii”:

*... It went from flag day being the biggest Sāmoan thing in Hawaii ... to where, you’d be lucky you see a hundred people...*
Questions also surround the Atoa Ali’i bestowing some matai titles on members. The relevant village in Samoa is informed, according to a senior member, but the title “cannot be register[ed] there … it is registered under the Atoa Ali’i here in Hawaii”. Matai in Samoa do not recognise these titles, so some matai with Atoa Ali’i titles cannot stand to faatau (give an accounting of their contribution) among matai in Samoa or elsewhere. However, one Atoa Ali’i member stated that had not been his experience for events like funerals:

...the Atoa Ali’i has to put in and agree to all go to Samoa to take the sii...it doesn’t matter if they question whether the Atoa Ali’i are registered matais…automatically they will accept us and give us ietogas.

The Church

The significance of the Church to fa’asāmoa and fa’amatai in Hawaii was very clear, as summed up by one pioneer matai:

For countries overseas there are no villages, so the church is the village.

All participants had “grown up in the Church” and expressed great respect for it. Four attended the EFKS and the rest were members of either the Latter-day Saints, Catholic or United churches. As substitute villages, the churches were seen by the pioneer generation as the “the backbone” for maintaining the fa’asāmoa and fa’amatai and passing them on to younger generations. There was a symbiotic relationship between matai and ministers (faifeau) of the various denominations, as described by one pioneer matai:

I always use them for major events ...to do the church service for the [visiting Sāmoan] prime minister ... flag day ... but other things, they need my help ... in the community...

However, the younger matai had concerns about the churches’ role. They acknowledged that in the absence of village councils or family strong in fa’amatai, the churches were “the primary school where you’ll be educated and advised … how to speak formally”. But one of the big problems if they did speak at church was being criticised publicly for their lack of Sāmoan language and knowledge of the fa’asāmoa. Misgivings were also expressed about the influence churches wielded over fa’asāmoa and fa’amatai in Hawaii and the lack of coherence with practices in Samoa. In Samoa, one younger matai noted, when someone died, all the matai of that village would get together to support the family:

That’s the real fa’asāmoa ...but here it’s a different story....the matais give their help under the church...they only chip in if it’s a church member who passed away...because only the church runs the fa’asāmoa...

Another young matai was frustrated at the erosion of fa’amatai in the Church:

The villages as well as the chiefs don’t really have a say anymore because priorities are firstly given to the leaders of denominations ...they act as if they’re chiefs in the village.

However, one matai found a way to balance the competing demands, taking advantage of twice-yearly church visits to Samoa to also “help out in any way when there are family obligations.”

Women Matai

The two female matai, both of the pioneer generation and strong in their fa’amatai, expressed strong views about difficulties being recognised as ‘real’ matai.
I got it in terms of ability. I know there are other men who look at me and think why am I the one chosen when I am a woman? But to me it’s because the elders have faith in me.

The main obstacles were from male matai who were “ignorant” about why female matai existed, and from those who did not believe female matai should exist at all. Living in Hawaii has provided ways to challenge such attitudes that would perhaps be unavailable in Samoa. The younger of the two women spoke about a female tulāfale who wanted to speak at a wedding but was told to sit down by the Master of Ceremonies:

He said that there is no such thing as women matai … when I found out about that, I was not very happy … I did the Sāmoan programme on the radio … I said to him for your information, don’t you ever, you and the other men who are all listening, think lowly of mothers and women. The women were the first tafaifai17 … The man was shocked. So I told him if I ever hear again that you or any male says another thing to the women matais then you watch what is going to happen … then the telephone was buzzing … then he got fined at his village.

Participants considered both women had been chosen to be matai because they were leaders with strong and sustained records of service to ‘āiga and communities in Hawaii and Samoa. The elder woman was acknowledged for her promotion of Sāmoan language and customs, summed up by one younger matai as “the greatest Sāmoan teacher here, I love her”.

A pioneer matai said opponents of female matai would do well to remember Salamasina,18 “one of the greatest traditional leaders in Pacific history” whose era marked “a moment of peace [and] the flowering of our race in voyaging and building fales and all of the art forms and the medicine”.

The Future of Fa’amatat

Most participants believed the fa’asāmoa and fa’amatai would survive in Hawaii, despite the challenges and obstacles, because “we are the fa’asāmoa… that’s part of who we are”. One younger matai felt it would survive but “require much more to maintain it … financially”:

... It’s getting more and more expensive... and it’s gonna get worse... [but] I don’t think it will go away.... we are the fa’asāmoa... while the process changes, the pillars of identity don’t change.

But a few were more pessimistic. One younger matai described the fa’asāmoa in Hawaii as “tottering on the edge” because people want to be “more fia tagata”19:

It’s all about bring this, bring that ‘cause I’m the matai...the respect has gone.

One pioneer matai suggested fa’asāmoa would not last in Hawaii because “it’s the American life” there and “after the old generation is gone, the children will not have anyone to listen to”.

To help the fa’amatai in Hawaii to “endure for a long time in a very good way”, one pioneer matai suggested changing the way matai were chosen. ‘āiga should define the qualities needed to be a good ali‘i or tufale, then identify a young person and “shape and mould” them for the role. It was pointless, he said “conferring to somebody in his eighties and then you know five years later…it’s all over”:

And also I really feel it should be the best Sāmoan not the best male Sāmoan ... the need is for wisdom .... Gender is irrelevant.

Another theme for pioneer matai was that the fa’amatai could not be separated from duties to Samoa. It was essential to maintain Samoa as the “sacred place”, the spiritual source that would sustain fa’asāmoa “wherever we go and no matter how many generations we move”.
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Among the younger matai, there was more emphasis on the need to respect elders in the ‘āiga and church—“the relationship or the gap between you and people who are older than you is important”. Also to know that despite hardships—the constant demands on money, time and services, this was the path of a chief. Most participants felt giving was central to maintaining fa’amatasi overseas and “if you don’t give, then you won’t get blessings… matai i fafo need to realise this.”

Criticism of matai outside Samoa for eroding fa’asāmoa and not practising ‘real’ fa’amatasi drew differing responses. One pioneer matai observed wryly he had seen “more erosion in Sāmoa than I saw outside of Sāmoa … so I see more integrity trying to preserve our fa’asāmoa away.” One younger matai recounted how overhearing criticism from matai in Sāmoa made him “shake and my uncle just tells me to cool down”. He put it down to them being “jealous because we were able to sustain the culture outside of Sāmoa”:

They don’t think our village can sustain, I guess, the way they do things there … I can for sure a hundred percent say it’s a lie! Because of our church … been doing fa’asāmoa for how long [and] we got a lot of little kids… so I know in our church, our village, the Sāmoan language … the Sāmoan culture will always be strong.

And moreover, he added, his younger children had “the fa’asāmoa app—so I just tell ‘em hey, keep it up, it’ll come to you don’t worry.”

The best way forward agreed by all participants was to teach younger generations born in Hawaii about Sāmoan āganu’u (customs) and language, and that would be good for the future of the fa’amatai. One pioneer matai suggested young overseas matai or matai-in-waiting could be sent back to Sāmoa “to do the village life, to learn”. In Hawaii, it was important to teach Sāmoan language, culture and “traditional way of life” in the churches and from preschool through to university. If all those institutions were “stronger …then there’s a big possibility our culture and the fa’amatai will survive”. But ultimately, the future of the fa’amatai in Hawaii was up to all Sāmoans:

We are the ones who have to continue wherever you may go … the father and mother, elderly, faifeau, community leaders … teaching the language and to make important the culture, especially the matai system …to implement the power of the matai, that’s the power of the matai [to] develop your family.

As one pioneer matai summed up, “The title only has meaning if the family is together…otherwise it’s an empty symbol”.

Conclusions

“There’s no way of getting rid of it, it’s who we are. We have to die in order to get rid of it.” (pioneer matai)

Despite changes over the last hundred years, fa’amatai is still being reproduced out of Sāmoa. As pointed out by So’o (2007: 253) the versions of fa’amatai that are practised overseas are variants of the fa’amatai that is practised in Sāmoa. And so they should be; culture changes. There is debate about where to find the ‘true’ fa’amatai. But does a ‘true’ version exist? Some say the fa’asāmoa and fa’amatai in Sāmoa are more corrupt than in Australia or the US. They see the ‘real’ Sāmoa happening out of Sāmoa—mainly because transnational matai hold on to the fa’asāmoa and fa’amatai that their parents taught them as pioneers (See Anae 1998). Practices often referred to as transnational Sāmoan cultural and fiscal “excessiveness” (ibid. 255) have now infiltrated the homeland and been accepted as the norm.
This research suggests that affective ties are becoming stronger for younger generations born and raised outside Sāmoa; stronger because of rather than despite the loss of language and knowledge of customs and gafa (genealogy). These emotional, spiritual and social ties wrap around the changing elements of the fa’amatai to hold them together. They have been expressed in this research as:

- respect for elders and the sacrifices they have made to be Sāmoan in a foreign land;
- a desire to take on matai titles out of respect for parents, ‘āiga and villages and to work for their wellbeing;
- acknowledgement of inequalities associated with rank, status and system of authority in the fa’asāmoa and fa’amatai;
- and, a strong emotional attachment to the fa’asāmoa and fa’amatai as a way of life, despite the challenges and misgivings identified in this paper.

Understanding the perspectives and experiences of transnational matai gives a temporal perspective on how the fa’amatai is changing. In independent Sāmoa, Tcherkézoff (2005) finds possible challenges to fa’amatai in the debates about suffrage and in new religious movements that emphasize individualism. Research on Sāmoan migrant communities in New Zealand (Anae 1998, 2002, 2006), Australia (Va’a 2001) and California (Gershon 2012) indicates that fa’amatai takes new forms to stay relevant for life in Sāmoa i fafo. For the pioneer generation, traditional fa’asāmoa and fa’amatai had to take a back seat to the demands of settling in a new home, establishing their churches and raising local-born children. Now those new generations are grappling with issues of social justice, culture, language and identity by rebuilding what they know of fa’asāmoa and fa’amatai, limited as it might be, because they are affected by the values such as service and respect learned from their pioneer parents (Anae 1998; 2002; 2006).

In New Zealand, the affective ties are what inspires younger generations born out of Sāmoa to demand from their elders and from the government the setting up of re-education/new education programmes where they can be taught Sāmoan culture, history, language and identities in the aoga amata (language nests), schools, Universities and other tertiary institutions (see Anae 1998, 2002, 2006). It is also affective ties which inspire New Zealand born Sāmoans to take on matai titles. These trajectories may well occur in the other nodes of Australia, Hawaii and mainland USA. Time will tell.

Despite changes over the last hundred years, fa’amatai is still being reproduced out of Sāmoa. Understanding the perspectives and experiences of transnational matai gives a temporal perspective on how the fa’amatai is changing. In migrant communities as expressed by matai in Hawaii, the Sāmoan church pastors assume prominent leadership roles. Other serious challenges to the reproduction of fa’amatai are expressed above—especially the increased use of English. Many young people do not know the honorific language, the pan-Sāmoan ranking of titles, and the appropriate speeches that are necessary to conduct a ceremony or a sophisticated debate in a fono o matai. They do not have the oratory skills that are necessary for performing fa’amatai. Then there are the pressures for giving—money, time, service. However, with the leadership of the pioneer generations, first and second-born generation NZ/Aus/US-born generations are finding ways to meet these challenges. Strategies developed amongst pioneer cohorts and NZ-born Sāmoans in New Zealand are leading the vanguard in the persistence of fa’asāmoa and fa’amatai in Sāmoa i fafo.
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Notes


4. In this paper, Sāmoa encompasses both the independent (former Western) Sāmoa and American Sāmoa.

5. Sāmoans living in Sāmoa in 2006 were estimated at 188,000. The majority of ethnic Sāmoans now reside in other countries, primarily in the United States (180,000 in 2012), New Zealand (115,000 in 2001) and Australia (55,843 in 2011). https://www.google.co.nz/?gws_rd=ssl#q=Samoan+population+in+Sāmoa+

6. A hindrance, an impediment; term applied to events like a funeral, wedding, graduation where the extended family gather together to help financially.

7. Earth oven

8. Person with a loving heart

9. Family obligations like a funeral, wedding, graduation or any occasion when the extended family gather to help in terms of service, time and financially.

10. ritual giving of gifts such as fine mats

11. Thank yous or acknowledgements

12. Oratory

13. Ritual giving of fine mats, gifts, money

14. Fine mats – exchanged during ritual ceremonies

15. Ekalesia Fa’aapotopotoga Kerisiano Sāmoa (also CCCS – Congregational Christian Church of Sāmoa)

16. Negative experiences of female matai are reiterated in the literature (So’o 2007) where women matai have become the ‘target for discontent’ (ibid.:83) of their male counterparts.

17. Holder of the four paramount titles of Sāmoa

18. Salamasina, Queen of Sāmoa was the first to hold the four (royal) titles. Holder of these four paramount titles together give full royal status

19. Arrogant

20. outside Sāmoa
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Is There a Link?: The Effect of Attitude toward Television Advertisement, Brand and Purchase Intention.

Bernadette Samau, Tapu Iemaima Gabriel and Hobart Sasa, National University of Sāmoa

Abstract

Television Advertising as a medium of Communication is largely used by companies in Sāmoa to inform, persuade and remind consumers of their products and services. The study investigated the relationship between Attitude toward Television Advertisement (Aad), Attitude toward Brand (Ab) and Purchase Intention (PI) with a particular focus on consumers in Sāmoa. A real product advertisement by Sāmoa Beverage Company (SBC) was chosen for the study. Through convenience sampling, the primary data was collected from 60 students of the National University of Sāmoa. The conceptual Framework was adopted from Wahid & Ahmed 2011 studies. The nine-item scale used to measure Consumer’s attitude toward advertising (Aad) over intention to purchase the advertised product (PI) and Consumer’s attitude toward brand (Ad) over intention to purchase the advertised product (PI) was largely adapted from Putrevu and Lord (1994), Taylor and Hunter (2002) and Wu and Chen (2008) studies. It was found that (1) consumers’ attitude towards advertising has significant and positive influence towards brand and intention to purchase the advertised products; and (2) consumers’ attitude towards brand has significant and positive influence over intention to purchase the products that are advertised. Findings from the study support the importance of television advertising as a marketing tool to help build positive consumer behaviour towards advertised products and services. This study provides a first insight on Sāmoan consumer’s behaviour toward a locally designed TV advertisement.

Keywords: Advertising, Consumer Attitude, Attitude towards Advertisement, Attitude towards Brands, Purchase Intention, Consumers, Sāmoa.

Introduction

Consumer attitudes towards the advertisement of products and services have been widely researched by scholars in marketing, consumer behavior and advertising (for example, Biehal, Stephens and Curio 1992; Homer and Yoon 1992; Brosius, Donsbach and Birk 1996; Wahid and Ahmed 2011; Jalilvand and Samie 2012; Saxena and Khanna 2013; Hudson and Hudson 2013; Duffet 2015; Jae-Sin and Dae Yul 2015). These studies examine consumer attitude and perception towards different forms of advertising mediums and its influence on brand preference, intention to purchase and actual purchase. Television is a form of advertising medium that is most influential because it can reach masses of geographically dispersed buyers and enables the seller to repeat a message many times. Belch and Belch (2012) note that television advertisement has numerous advantages over other media to include impact, coverage, creativity, cost effectiveness, captivity, attention, selectivity and flexibility. Studies specific to television advertising are common in FMCG (fast moving consumer goods) and look closely at television advertising techniques that trigger positive customer attitudes to stimulate purchase intention and encourage actual purchase. For example, (Mathew and Aswathy 2014 and Armstrong et al 2012) concluded in their studies that television advertising is very effective because advertisers are able to inform, persuade and remind consumers more precisely through the careful combination of sounds, words, motion, colour, personality and stage setting to execute an advertising message.

In this paper, we extend these insights to the situation in Sāmoa with a focus on the use of a real local television advertisement to test the relationships between Advertising, Brand, and Purchase intention.
Advertising and Television: A Global Perspective

Advertising is defined as ‘any paid form of non-personal presentation and promotion of ideas, goods or services by an identified sponsor’ (Armstrong et al 2012). The paid aspect of this definition reflects the fact that the space or time for an advertising message generally must be purchased. The non personal aspect means that advertising involves mass media such as TV, radio, magazines, newspapers that can send a message to large groups of individuals, often at the same time (Belch and Belch 2012). Advertising communicates vital information about the firm, its products, product features, place of product availability and also helps consumers to make proper purchase decisions (Mathew and Aswathy 2014). Different advertising mediums include newspaper, radio, social media, billboards and television. Understanding consumer attitudes towards the advertisement of products and services help to provide feedback on the effectiveness and efficiency of advertising as a marketing tool.

Hoyer and MacInnis (2001) define attitude as ‘relatively global and enduring evaluation of an object, issue, person, or action’. Recent studies on consumer attitudes towards advertisements suggest that consumers hold attitudes toward a variety of objects that influence purchase behavior (Mathew & Aswathy 2014, Armstrong et al 2012; Belch and Belch 2012). Belch and Belch (2012) propose that there are three parts which constitute attitude and also shape what is known as the Multiattribute Attitude Model. These three elements are: (1) cognitive (an individual's beliefs regarding an object), (2) affective (an individual's feelings towards the object that may be positive or negative) and (3) behavioural (the individual's readiness to respond to the object in the form of behaviour). According to this model, when consumers have positive cognitive responses towards the product being advertised, they have positive source related thoughts and ad execution thoughts. These positive feelings also generate positive affective attitudes which consequently positively stimulate purchase intentions.

In marketing, television advertising is one form of advertising that falls under the promotional element. Despite the wide variety of advertising mediums, Laroche, Kim and Zhou 1996; Phelps and Hoy 1996; Prakash and Pathak 2014 observe that television advertising remains the most dominant form to which typical consumers are exposed. Understanding how consumers react and respond to television advertisements is vital noting as Wahid and Ahmed (2011) have done that understanding consumer attitudes towards television advertisements will help determine consumer purchase intentions and purchase behavior. This mirrors similar suggestions presented by Hoyer and MacInnins (1997), that a consumers positive attitude towards one object for example is said to affect his/her attitudes towards another object associated with it. As such, consumers’ liking and affection of an advertisement will eventually be transferred to the products brand and the liking of the products brand will influence the intention to purchase.

Advertising literature is non-existent in Sāmoa and this paper intends to contribute to existing Advertising literature by examining the degree of influence by a local television advertisement on consumer attitudes towards a local brand and intention to purchase.
Television Advertisements and Consumer Attitudes in Sāmoan Contexts.

In this paper, we attempt to investigate if consumers' attitude towards television advertisements (Aad) has an influence over their attitude toward brand (Ab) and purchase intention (PI). Our question was whether there are similarities in the reaction, responses and overall attitude of consumers in Sāmoan and non-Sāmoan contexts and the extent to which there are particular issues for consumers in the Sāmoan context. The conceptual framework for the study are adapted from Wahid and Ahmed studies (2011).

Our analysis of the Sāmoan context draws on 60 structured questionnaires administered through convenience sampling. The participants consist of first, second and third year students studying at the National University of Sāmoa in the Bachelor of Commerce Program. A real product advertisement was selected from a range of local product advertisements that appeared on Television 1 (TV1). The selected product advertisement is by Sāmoa Beverage Company (SBC), Sāmoa's only locally owned and operated Brewery/Beverage Company. The chosen TV advertisement is Taxi Lime. Taxi Lime is one of seven soft drinks under the brand name TAXI released by SBC back in 2013. Since its introduction, selling at $1.50 for TAXI Small (330ml) and $3.20 for TAXI Large (660ml), The Taxi brand has been popular due to its product range, and also because it is cheaper than Coca-Cola an allied soft-drink brand bottled under licence by Sāmoa Breweries Limited also known as Vailima.

The Taxi Lime TV advertisement was recorded and shown to the respondents in the classroom after which they were asked to respond to a set of structured questions in the questionnaire. A five-point Likert scale ranging from $1 = strongly disagree to $5 = strongly agree were used to measure responses for all (Aad), (Ab) and (PI) variables in the study. Items to measure (Aad) were adapted from Goldsmith et al.'s (2000) studies. The nine-item scale that was used to measure Consumer’s attitude toward advertising (Aad) over intention to purchase the advertised product (PI) and Consumer’s attitude toward brand (Ab) over intention to purchase the advertised product (PI) was largely adapted from Putrevu and Lord (1994), Taylor and Hunter (2002) and Wu and Chen (2008).

Three questionnaires were designed to collect primary data for the study. The first one was used to assess the influence of advertising on the brand; to test the relationship between Consumers’ attitude towards advertising (Aad) and attitude towards brand (Ab). This first questionnaire contained ten (10) questions on a Likert-Scale from 1 (Strongly Agree) to 5 (Strongly Disagree). The second questionnaire was used to test the relationship between Consumers’ attitude towards advertising (Aad) and intention to buy the advertised product (PI). This questionnaire
contained nine (9) questions on a Likert-Scale from 1 (Strongly Agree) to 5 (Strongly Disagree). The third questionnaire was used to test the influence of Consumers’ attitude towards brand (Ab) and intention to buy the advertised product (PI)”. This third questionnaire contained nine (9) questions on a Likert-Scale from 1 (Strongly Agree) to 5 (Strongly Disagree).

The questionnaires were developed to gather data measuring the dependent variables of consumers’ perceived level of attitude towards advertising and brand in relation to the independent variable of intention to purchase. In our study, we used within-subjects design. This is because we wanted each participant to participate in all three questionnaires. The experiment raw data were stored in an Excel Spreadsheet (Microsoft Excel 2010 ©Microsoft Corporation), while all of the statistical analysis and testing was done using Predictive Analytics SoftWare (PASW) Statistics Release 18 (PASW Statistics, 2009) and R version 3.3.0 (2016-05-03).

Findings

Reliability Analysis (Cronbach’s Alpha - α)

Reliability analysis refers to the consistency of a measure. It is a test to confirm the fact that a scale should consistently reflect the construct it is measuring. In statistical terms, it is based on the idea that individual items (or set of items) should produce results consistent with the overall questionnaire. The Cronbach’s alpha is the most common measure of scale reliability. It is a useful method for examining reliability, with the calculation being based on the number of items and the average inter-item correlations (Hinton et al. 2004).

The alpha value ranges from 0 (indicating a completely unreliable test) to 1, (for a completely reliable one). There is debate on an acceptable alpha value to conclude a questionnaire is reliable, but values over 0.70 would be considered acceptable in this study (Hinton et al., 2004). Cronbach’s alpha was calculated for every social factor using the questionnaires from all 60 participants.

From the reliability analysis test done in SPSS, both consumers’ attitude toward advertising and brand, and consumers’ intention to purchase questionnaires produced high alpha scores, indicating that the items (from the questionnaires) within each factor in each of the three conditions were measuring a consistent underlying construct (internal consistency) (See Table x.1, x.2, x.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Processing Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

\[ n = \text{number of items} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table x.1 Reliability Test - Cronbach’s Alpha values for Questionnaire 1
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Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded(^a)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.840</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table x.2 Reliability Test - Cronbach’s Alpha values for Questionnaire 2

Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded(^a)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.872</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table x.3 Reliability Test – Cronbach’s Alpha values for Questionnaire 3 (H3)

Significance Testing

Repeated Measure Analysis

The significance testing is a statistical measure to test if the data from an experiment support a given hypothesis. That is, in the case of our study, it is a test to show if (i) there is a significant and positive influence of consumers’ attitude towards advertising over his/her attitude towards brand; (ii) there is a significant and positive influence of consumers’ attitude towards advertising over his/her intention to purchase; (iii) there is a significant and positive influence of consumers’ attitude towards brand over his/her intention to purchase.

We used Repeated-Measures Analysis of Variance with conditions as a repeated measure (within-subjects factor) since all participants was tested in all three hypotheses. This tests for any difference among the three conditions. To determine which means among the three hypotheses were different, a Sidak test was conducted.
Results for Questionnaire 1 (Q1): Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>var</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9.600</td>
<td>5.015</td>
<td>25.156</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23.700</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>21.789</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16.400</td>
<td>4.718</td>
<td>22.267</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6.400</td>
<td>2.675</td>
<td>7.156</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>1.581</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table x.4 Descriptive statistics for Q1

Results for Questionnaire 2 (Q2): Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>var</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8.556</td>
<td>3.432</td>
<td>11.778</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21.000</td>
<td>4.153</td>
<td>17.250</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18.778</td>
<td>4.737</td>
<td>22.444</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7.111</td>
<td>3.219</td>
<td>10.361</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table x.5 Descriptive statistics for Q2

Results for Questionnaire 3 (Q3): Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>var</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8.556</td>
<td>3.432</td>
<td>11.778</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21.000</td>
<td>4.153</td>
<td>17.250</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18.778</td>
<td>4.737</td>
<td>22.444</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7.111</td>
<td>3.219</td>
<td>10.361</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table x.6 Descriptive statistics Q3

Test of With-In Subjects Effects

The Mauchly Test was not significant (p=0.485), so the assumption of the correlations are equal among pairs of conditions (eg 1 vs 2, 2 vs 3, 1 vs 3) is not violated. Therefore we can use “sphericity assumed” tests.

Comparison of means of three Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Hypothesis 1 (H1)</th>
<th>Hypothesis 2 (H2)</th>
<th>Hypothesis 3 (H3)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9.600</td>
<td>8.556</td>
<td>4.777</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23.700</td>
<td>21.000</td>
<td>22.111</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16.400</td>
<td>18.778</td>
<td>17.556</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6.400</td>
<td>7.111</td>
<td>17.556</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>2.777</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Respond</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table x.7 Comparison of means of three hypotheses
**Discussion and Implications**

The findings indicate that Attitude towards Advertisement (Aad) had significant and positive influence on both attitude towards Brand (Ab) and Purchase Intention (PI) which supported study results carried out by Wahid and Ahmed (2011) and Goldsmith et al, (2000). The results found in this study on the positive effect of Brand (Ab) on Purchase Intention (PI) are also supported in studies like Laroche, Kim and Zhou (1996) Phelps and Hoy (1996) and Prakash and Pathhak (2014).

In Questionnaire 1 (Q1), elements that were put in inquiry related to the interaction of sight and sound, the overall appeal, captivity and attention and the use of humour in the Ad execution. The findings indicate that positive cognitive responses were generated from the presence of these elements in the advertisement of Taxi Lime and these positive responses had significant positive influence over consumer attitude towards the Taxi brand. In Questionnaire 2 (Q2), positive attitudes towards the overall appeal of the ad, the use of humour, source attractiveness and overall execution had a significant and positive influence over the intention to purchase the advertised product. However purchase intention was determined by (1) the participant had money; (2) the advertised product was on promotion and (3) intention to buy the advertised product in the near future. In Question 3 (H3), positive attitudes towards the Taxi brand were also influenced by the fact that the product was a local beverage. This had a significant and positive influence over the consumer’s purchase intention on the basis that (1) they would buy Taxi soft drink if they had the money, (2) they would buy a Taxi product in the near future and (3) they are likely to buy a Taxi product that is being promoted.

**Conclusions**

The findings from this study provide an understanding of consumer behaviour from a Sāmoan perspective with a particular focus on university students’ attitudes towards television advertisements. Although Sāmoa is a developing country, from an Advertising perspective, consumer dependency on television advertisement impacts the way purchase decisions are made. The results from this study imply that television advertising is a dominant communication tool for
companies and marketing practitioners to inform, persuade and remind consumers about available products and services. An important finding from this study is that Sāmoan consumers are definitely influenced by the television advertisement that they are exposed to.

It is important to note that while the results from this study seem promising, there are still some issues that we need to address carefully when doing future work. Factors that we identified as having the potential to impact our findings and results include: participants’ affiliation, previous experience, gender, and age grouping. For example, participants’ experience or familiarisation of the participant with the product refers to how well a participant knows about the product or the brand being advertised. The participant may have never tried the product before or may have never heard of it before. This has an effect on our result. We assumed that all participants have somewhat affiliated with the brand being advertised. Gender is also another important factor in the study of personal perceptions and attitude. We did not have a control on this issue as participants were selected convenient to the researcher’s time and availability. This is one area that could be further investigated in future research. Another limitation to be noted is on the small study sample and sampling method used. The use of sample size of 60 University students means that the results cannot be generalized for all consumers in Sāmoa. The study focused only a single TV advertisement whereas future studies could examine more TV advertisements. Cognitive and affective attitudes warrant further research, since consumers’ first need to become aware and be informed of an organisation’s products and develop favourable emotional bonds before they can progress to behavioural activities. This study utilised quantitative data, as have past inquiries on cognitive and affective attitudinal components, whereas qualitative research would provide greater insight into consumer attitudes towards TV advertising.

The findings from this study echoes similarities in studies carried out by Laroche, Kim and Zhou (1996) Phelps and Hoy (1996) Goldsmith et al, (2000), Wahid and Ahmed (2011) and Prakash and Pathhak (2014). This study supports previous studies that Attitude toward Advertising (Aad) has an impact on Brand (Ab) and Purchase Intention (PI). It suggests that companies and marketing practitioners can influence Purchase Intention (PI) if their advertisements are carefully designed to stimulate positive cognitive responses. We can draw conclusions that (1) consumers’ attitude towards advertising has significant and positive influence towards brand and intention to purchase the advertised products; and (2) consumers’ attitude towards brand has significant and positive influence over intention to purchase the products that are advertised.

This study provides marketing practitioners a general view on elements that consumers’ consider important, eye catching and attention grabbing when evaluating the effectiveness and attractiveness of a television advertisement. The results indicate that the cognitive responses generated when viewing the both the television advertisement and the advertised product were positive. This influences positive attitudes towards the Taxi brand and purchase intention. Television advertising is considered to be more effective over other media because of its creativity and impact, coverage and cost effectiveness, captivity and attention, selectivity and flexibility. This suggests, the advertising of convenience products such as Taxi Lime is still important. A television advertisement that provides creative message appeals, free from clutter and stimulates source attractiveness is most likely going to produce positive consumer attitudes. These positive attitudes are indeed important to marketing practitioners’ based on the assumption that consumer attitude can influence consumer behaviour.
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This remarkable book documents, in words and illustrations, Sāmoan participation in the traveling ethnic shows that were popular in Germany in the two decades prior to the First World War. These shows featured indigenous people performing dances and other exotic “customary” performances from North America, Africa, Asia and the Pacific Islands, in Zoos around Germany. Among these, the Sāmoan shows were particularly popular due to the seductive charms of Polynesian women and the lure of the South Seas in the imaginations of many Germans. The pioneering entrepreneurs who masterminded many of these travelling shows were the brothers Fritz and Carl Marquardt. Fritz established his connections in Sāmoa when he was a minor official in the Apia Municipality, a political entity established by the governments of Britain, German and the United States in the late 19th Century to protect the interests of their expatriate citizens in Sāmoa. This preceded the colonial partition of Sāmoa in 1899 and the establishment of a German administration in the western islands of Sāmoa, and an American naval administration in eastern Sāmoa.

The book is prefaced by ‘words of welcome by Sāmoa’s Head of State, His Highness Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Efi, and by His Royal Highness Franz Duke of Bavaria (the book was produced by the Museum Funf Kontinente [Museum of Five Continents] in Munich, Bavaria). It comprises an introduction and eleven illustrated essays. To contextualise the book Galumalemana A. Hunkin provides an overview of Sāmoan culture, and Peter Hempenstall an overview of “Germany’s Pacific Pearl”. The latter provides an excellent historical summary of Germany’s presence in Sāmoa and it’s economic and colonial ambitions. Hilke Thode-Arora, who also edited the collection, contributes seven of these essays, explaining the phenomenon of ethnic shows in Europe, and the history of the German “traders in ethnographica”.

More analytically, Thode-Arora explores German fantasies about Sāmoa, including arresting cartoons images of conquest, depicting a large white business man (Germany) rapturously clasping (or being clasped by) a dusky island maiden representing Sāmoa. The photographs and posters advertising the shows portray handsome warriors, but more frequently beautiful young women, and a languorous Sina with her eel, affirming the sexualisation of Sāmoa in the German mind. The programmes for the shows promised, “forty lovely girls ... scantily dressed in short costumes” (p.103).

Sāmoa became officially German in 1900 and the German Colonial Society applied pressure to ban the recruiting of people from German colonies for ethnic shows. The Sāmoa show that travelled Germany in the years 1900-1900 managed to avoid the ban with the justification that it served diplomatic and economic ends, rather than mere entertainment. It was partly organised and led by high-ranking Sāmoans including Te’o Tuval Te’o and Tamasese Lealofi I. On this tour it was unclear as to whether Tamasese was there to be exhibited (he was advertised as an attraction in posters for the show), or whether he was there for diplomatic purposes to meet the Kaiser and other high-ranking Germans (which he did).

Although with historical hindsight and from a contemporary perspective these shows may seem vulgar and exploitative, it also seems unlikely that the Sāmoan participants saw them this way.
Although there were many hardships involved in the tours, it is more likely that Sāmoans saw them as great adventures, as gestures of friendship, and following 1900, as affirmations of their new status as Pacific Island Germans. Hilke Thode-Arora made considerable efforts to locate the relatives to learn more about the lives those who toured. The book concludes with an interview with the New Zealand-Sāmoan artist Michael Tuffery discussing his Siamani-Sāmoa art exhibition, which was shown in Munich in 2014 in conjunction with the From Sāmoa with Love? Sāmoan Ethnic Shows in the German Empire exhibition at the Museum of Five Continents.

Safua Akeli, Centre for Sāmoan Studies, National University of Sāmoa

Mothers’ Darlings of the South Pacific: the children of indigenous women and US Servicemen, World War II (2015) is written 74 years after the arrival of United States servicemen to the Pacific Islands during the Second World War. The cover image of two servicemen flanking an unnamed indigenous woman holding a baby was taken months after the arrival of US forces in Tonga in 1942. The work of the editors and co-authors Judith Bennett and Angela Wanhalla alongside the contribution of seven authors has culminated in an important text. This book acknowledges a gap in the military history of World War II which it proposes to fill, that of women, Pacific Islanders and the intimacy of encounter.

The war stories of relationships formed between indigenous women and US servicemen stationed in the Pacific are lived experiences retold by their children, many of whom for various reasons were left behind. As the epilogue states “[t]hese children, however, are the embodiment of the human cost of war. Like their mothers, their lives are marked by war, and they live with its legacies. For them, the war never ended, it is still unfolding as they search for their American father. The ‘always after’ of their stories continue” (p.308). The geographic coverage is extensive with case studies in Bora Bora, Sāmoa, New Caledonia, Vanuatu, Uvea Island, Tonga, Fiji, New Zealand, Solomon Islands, Cook Islands and Kiribati. Some common themes throughout the region relate to the state and US immigration policies which restricted marriage based on race. However as some of the stories recall, a few were able to break through these barriers in order to return to the Pacific Islands or to join their GI abroad.

The Introduction asserts that ‘[f]ull identity longs for the history of blood and the geography of bones’ (p.30). Thus these first-hand accounts reveal some of the lasting legacies of war which brought about tremendous change in a short space of time. In many ways this book offers a reconciliation of sorts, mainly as a bridge for the ‘GI babies’ seeking to find information on their fathers, and to understand their place in society and the world.

In Chapter One, Bennett (pp.31–41) describes Bora Bora, and the local admiration for the Americans who were seen as ‘attractive’ and ‘irresistible’ (p.35). Alongside the building of new infrastructure for the community, the servicemen also forged new relationships; as a result about 130 children were fathered by Americans. One amazing story centers on Fred Giles and Tetua’s marriage against the odds, and their subsequent migration to America where they raised their children.

Saui’a Louise Mataia-Milo’s chapter titled ‘There are no commoners in Sāmoa’ (pp.42–82), depicts a different picture of local responses to the ‘maligi’ invasion. While Mataia-Milo draws out the cultural structures that inform Sāmoan identity, often times the child of the maligi experienced hardship, discrimination and shame. Many were harshly treated as children outside of these spaces of identity. Perhaps the most vocal demonstration of this experience is through the well-known song ‘Outou Teine o le Atunu’u’ which criticized local women who associated with the Americans (p.71).
The author argues that the change in values as a result of the encounter revealed how society attempted to cope with the tide of new goods, products, services and ideas.

Kathryn Creely’s chapter on ‘New Caledonia: The Experiences of a War Bride and Her Children’ (pp.83–117) was a compelling account about the life of New Caledonian woman Isabelle Pezron in America with her husband Robert Melina and their children. Her journey and the struggle of coming to terms with a new place and people contrasted their initial optimism. Consequently their children endured a traumatic experience of loss and struggle. This heart-wrenching story ends with a meeting between Pezron’s two children left behind in New Caledonia and their Melina siblings in America.

Bennett’s chapter on New Hebrides (Vanuatu) (pp.118–145) centers on Tom Harris, a European who was considered an ambiguous figure. His dubious multiple identities included his role as a father figure to Rosalina Marie Boetovo (p.133). In the next chapter, Bennett describes Uvea (Wallis) Island (pp.146–164). Similarly in place of his parents who had passed, Father Bertrand Soucy became a father figure for Petelo Tufale. Not so much in his search for his father’s family but as a guiding hand. However as Tufale was to later explain ‘he already had two fathers, his Wallis one and Father Soucy. So why would he need another?’ (p.164).

In chapter six ‘Tonga in the Time of the Americans’ (pp.165–182) Bennett writes that, ‘silences, although they can liberate, also often imprison’ (p.182). However for local woman Louisa Raass of mixed ancestry, she was able to marry and migrate with serviceman Warren Scott since her father was a US citizen. About 400 children were born as a result of the war in various circumstances. For many this period of encounter was ‘best forgotten’ since like Sāmoa it saw the departure of Tongan society from its usual Christian norms.

Jacqueline Leckie and Alumita Durutalo’s chapter ‘Kai Merika! Fijian Children of American Servicemen’ (pp.183–201) follows the story of two women Adi Romera Drodrovakawai and Martha Naua. For Adi and Martha, the construction of their identity as ‘Kai Merika’ impacted their lives and sense of belonging. The authors attest that for Adi and Martha, ‘[i]dentity goes beyond securing a belonging within the fractious ethnoscape of contemporary Fiji’ it was about a journey to find ‘unknown kin’ (p.200).

For New Zealand, Angela Wanhalla and Kate Stevens’ chapter ‘I Don’t like Maori Girls Going Out with Yanks’ (pp.202–227) outlines some of the encounters brought about by the presence of 100,000 servicemen stationed in mainly the North Island. The mobility of Maori women from rural to urban areas increased public health and church interventions to curb sexual behavior. However cultural groups also became enclaves providing social support. As experienced elsewhere, US immigration laws enabled the breakup of families, and left many questions unanswered, for some until now. It also demonstrated local resentment towards the Americans by young Maori men.

In the Solomon Islands as Bennett explains through the story of Letisia and her relationship with serviceman Paulo Cruz, a daughter Basilisa was born. Their stories are a reminder of the ‘global war’ even in some remote places within Guadalcanal (p.242). Just as the command areas were active in the war, smaller outposts endured cross-cultural encounters that have had lasting legacies.

The Cook Islanders as Rosemary Anderson writes saw the American presence as a ‘friendly invasion’. Relationships formed were largely approved since the population was already of mixed ancestry on Aitutaki and Penrhyn atolls. The locals were grateful for American protection. Thus the small number of servicemen who returned were greatly admired. Although the GI babies were
accepted into the family network, many continue to seek answers about their American fathers and kin.

The final chapter on Kiribati (pp.270–299) follows several women such as Ellewies Foon and Norah Talanga both children of servicemen. Many of the US troops had been stationed in Tarawa, Butaritari and Abemama. However very little information is known about the men who have left permanent memories of their time in Kiribati. Due to federal restrictions, religious differences and family anxiety some of the documents or mementos were destroyed or discarded out of fear or resentment. However genuine attempts were made by some of the American fathers to support their children by sending parcels and providing money for their education. Yet as Bennett writes ‘secrecy and social practices, all created barriers for these wartime children seeking their American families’ (p.299).

This important text with its insightful images and maps contextualizes with empathy some of the lived experiences that have not been documented in this way. With its attached resource guide to assist people searching for families, Bennett and Wanhallä’s book goes beyond the limits of academia and reaches the hearts of those asking similar questions.
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