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Abstract

In late 2019 and early 2020, an epidemic of measles ravaged Samoa, and nearly three people in every hundred (2.83%) in the small population were infected, with 1860 hospitalizations and 83 deaths, mainly children. In the circumstances of the 2020 Covid-19 pandemic, this case study shows that even when a proven vaccine exists for an infectious disease, circumstances may prevent its effective use. As academics and researchers who live and work in Samoa, this article seeks to shed some light into contributing factors to the measles outbreak. These include inadequate data collection, low vaccination coverage, weak institutional capacity, unpreparedness for an epidemic, lack of public information, vaccine hesitancy and anti-vaccine propaganda and public recourse to traditional and ‘alternative’ therapies. Through a combination of personal observation, analysis of media articles, government reports and historical documents, we present an overview of the circumstances of the measles epidemic. We trace the circumstances of low vaccination coverage, institutional weaknesses and an uninformed public resulting in a delayed an effective response. In conclusion we reflect on the lessons that history offers on public health services in Samoa.
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An Underlying Tragedy

In late 2019 an epidemic of measles ravaged Samoa. In the article we offer an overview of the colliding circumstances underlying the epidemic of measles in which inadequate data collection, low vaccination coverage, weak institutional capacity, unpreparedness for an epidemic, lack of public information and public recourse to traditional and ‘alternative’ therapies all combined to drive a high infection and mortality rate. As of January 6th 2020, there were 5697 reported cases, 1860 hospitalizations and 83 deaths (Lesa 2020). The infection rate was 2.83% of the estimated population of 200,000, amounting to nearly three people in every hundred (2.83%). We also describe how, in less than a year since the epidemic, Samoa has learned from its weaknesses and mistakes and has so far effectively prevented the incursion of Covid-19.

The precursor to the epidemic was a medical misadventure in 2018 when two infants died within minutes of being injected with a deadly mixture of an expired anesthetic, Atracurium, with the Measles, Mumps and Rubella (MMR) vaccine (Dreaver 2019). There was an immediate presumption that the vaccine itself was responsible for the deaths, and it was announced in the press that the vaccine was withdrawn. Two weeks passed before health authorities discovered that the infants had been poisoned; the two nurses involved, realizing their error, had taken the vials home and hidden them. However this was not made public. During the intervening period, there was intense speculation in the media in Samoa and abroad about whether the vaccine itself had caused the deaths. Headlines were attention grabbing, with examples such as:

“Samoa recalls vaccines, orders full investigation after two baby deaths” (Graue and Walsh, 2018)
“Samoa has issued an immediate recall of the vaccine for mumps, measles and rubella (MMR) following the deaths of two infants who reportedly passed away just hours after receiving their shots” (Graue and Walsh, 2018)

Another media release made reference to the New Zealand’s Ministry of Health’s statement on the tragedy in Samoa (New Zealand Ministry of Health 2018):

“Ministry of Health statement on the investigation into MMR vaccine safety in Samoa”

This was accompanied by the leading text:

“The New Zealand Ministry of Health expresses its condolences to the families of children who recently died in Samoa shortly after the administration of MMR vaccine. Samoan health authorities have launched an investigation into the deaths – until this is complete, it is too early to determine their underlying cause.”

The deaths were widely reported in New Zealand, with this example from TV1 News NZ (Dreaver 2018):

“Two babies die in Samoa Hospital minutes after receiving MMR vaccinations, investigations underway”

This was followed with the leading text:

“The Samoa Government has seized the MMR (Mumps, Measles and Rubella) vaccine from around the country and launched an investigation following the deaths of two babies last Friday.”

Similarly, concern by international agencies was also widely reported, for example: (World Health Organization and UNICEF 2018):

“World Health Organization and UNICEF Pacific statement on the deaths of two children in Samoa after MMR vaccine”

This was accompanied by the following leading text:

“UNICEF and the WHO are deeply concerned about the deaths of two children in Samoa last week after they received a routine Measles, Mumps and Rubella (MMR) vaccine. The death of these two children is a tragedy and our thoughts and prayers are with their families and the people of Samoa.”
These and other reports planted the suspicion firmly in the minds of the public that the MMR vaccine was the cause of the deaths. Although there was an immediate four-month suspension of the administration of the MMR vaccine and although ten months passed before routine vaccinations resumed, with the public still mostly unaware that there had been a medical misadventure, there was widespread public fear of the MMR vaccine. Several mothers were reported as saying they had lost faith in the public health system they preferred to treat illnesses via traditional means (Tautua-Fanene 2018). The suspicion that the vaccine was to blame enabled anti-vaccination activists in Samoa and overseas to seize public attention. Media reports in 2019 referred to the activities of anti-vaccination activists such as Samoan-Australian blogger Taylor Winterstein and Samoan Edwin Tamasese. A workshop was planned by a group of anti-vaccination advocates “Making Informed Decisions” to promote their theories in Samoa in June 2019. Although, the World Health Organization and other scientific experts cautioned against the potentially detrimental effect this would have on public opinion on vaccines, the Ministry of Health’s Director General Leausa Dr Take Naseri was reported to have said that they welcomed the opportunity to debate such theories (Mayron 2019a). This was despite evidence that anti-vaccination propaganda can produce vaccine hesitance, mediated by “the perceived dangers of vaccines, and feelings of powerlessness, disillusionment and mistrust in authorities” (Jolley and Douglas 2014). The workshop was eventually cancelled.

The majority of the public became aware of the real cause of the deaths when the case against the nurses went before the courts in August 2018 and was reported in the press (Morrah 2018). The nurses received sentences for manslaughter and for ‘obstructing and defeating the course of justice’ (Police v Tauvale 2019). In sentencing, the Judge, Vui Nelson referred to the need for local health authorities to refrain from defensiveness but to pay attention to the ethics of their profession and its protocols and standards (Police v Tauvale 2019).

Measles Vaccination Coverage in Samoa

The second factor was low measles vaccination coverage. Prior to the measles outbreak in 2019 the levels required for ‘herd immunity’ in Samoa had not been reached for many years. This requires vaccination levels between 93%–95% (Funk 2017). Records of the administrations of measles vaccines (MCV) in Samoa date back to 1982, and to 2004 for the vaccine including rubella (MR), (World Health Organisation 2020; McFarland et al 2003). In 2009 the triple vaccine for measles, mumps, and rubella was introduced (Ministry of Health (MOH) and Samoa Bureau of Statistics (SBS) 2015). Since its introduction in 2009, the vaccination coverage rate of the MCV2 has not exceeded 87% (reached in 2013). Figure 1 shows the coverage of MCV1 and MCV2 from 1982 to 2018.
The actual vaccination rate may have actually been lower than the reports indicate because vaccination coverage may have been overestimated. The rates cited by international agencies are derived from the Samoa Demographic Health Survey (SDHS), which is conducted every five years, utilizing a representative statistical sample of the population. Immunization coverage is gauged by the presentation of immunization cards or, in the absence of those, and the mothers’ recall of the child’s vaccination status (MOH and SBS 2015). Relying on recall introduces a potential error if mothers are reluctant to admit they did not have a child vaccinated. The 2014 SDHS captured information on children 18–29 months of age, the youngest age by which they should have received all of their vaccinations (World Health Organisation 2019a). This survey used a nationally representative sample of 4171 households, 16% in rural areas and 17% in urban areas (MOH and SBS 2015). According to the survey, 76.4% of the children had received the MMR1 (51.3% based on vaccination cards and 25% on mothers’ reports), and 52.1% of the children had received the MMR2 (39.0% based on presented vaccination cards and 13.2% based on mothers’ recall). Figures from Samoa’s four census regions (Figure 2) show that Savai’i, a mainly rural area, had the highest percentage of complete vaccinations (73%), followed by rural districts of Upolu, the Apia Urban Area, while the lowest rate was in North West Upolu which is the most populous area of Samoa and includes several non-village suburban areas. Sixty two percent of mothers in rural areas were able to produce vaccination cards compared to 56 percent of mothers in urban areas (MOH and SBS 2015). The difference may reflect the weaker system of local government in Samoa’s urban areas compared to rural villages, where health center staff are likely to have more knowledge of the local population. Children in the oldest cohort (42-59 months) were less likely to have received all their vaccinations (36 percent) than younger children aged 30-41 months (43 percent) and 18-29 months (50 percent) within the prescribed age. This declining trend was also observed in the ability to produce vaccination records, 61% of children aged 18-29 months, 56% of children aged 30-41 months and 47% of the oldest children 42-59 months. According to the data gathered for the SDHS 2014, 8% of children 18-29 months had not received any vaccinations, compared to 15% in the SDHS 2014.
2009. Despite this improvement, only 50% of children aged 18 months had received all basic vaccinations according to the data gathered by the 2014 SDHS (MOH and SBS 2015). In early 2020 during the epidemic, there was a massive push from the government, with external assistance, to raise the vaccination coverage levels to achieve herd immunity. This emergency response vaccination has occurred in other developing countries, for example, in an evaluation of an outbreak of measles in the Democratic Republic of Congo in 2013, Gignoux et al (2018), documented how a similar combination of low vaccination coverage and a reactive vaccination program contributed to eventual coverage rate.

The Measles Epidemic

The outbreak of measles in Samoa was declared in mid-October and on 15 November a State of Emergency was declared, however the National Emergency Operation Centre was not given the authority until 18 November to manage and organize the response (Mayron 2019 i). It was not until early December that effective action was taken; there was a national lock-down with roads closed to all but essential workers and vaccination teams. These teams included Samoan health workers and members of overseas medical assistance teams, including specialists from New Zealand, Australia, United States, Britain, Japan, Israel and Papua New Guinea.

The source of the outbreak appears to have been New Zealand where there had also been an outbreak, although with less devastating consequences. There are daily flights between Auckland and Samoa, and Samoa has a sizeable diaspora in New Zealand, with most living in the Auckland area. As of September 11th 2019 it was recorded that over 45% of the measles cases in Auckland were Pasifika (people of Pacific Island ancestry and that most of these cases were in Samoan and Tongan communities (Meyer 2019a). Subsequent statistics published in October 2019 showed that
Pasifika peoples were seven times more likely to become infected with measles than the general population (Meyer 2019b). Dr Helen Petousis-Harris, based at Auckland University New Zealand claimed that New Zealand was culpable for the “exportation” of measles to Samoa (Meyer 2019c); the immunologist and vaccine specialist at Auckland University said she was furious New Zealand had "exported" measles to Samoa. There were measles outbreaks in New Zealand in 2019 and Ministry of Health data showed that the three Auckland health administrative areas had less than optimal immunization rates in the 70s among Pasifika people.

According to the Samoa Ministry of Health’s public information release on October 30th 2019, 314 suspected measles cases with 15 confirmed cases were recorded in Samoa by October 27th. Three measles-related deaths were recorded; a 14-month-old; an 8-month-old and a 37-year-old, and were awaiting laboratory confirmation, from New Zealand, due to laboratory weaknesses in Samoa (MOH 2019). The Ministry of Health advised that measles is highly contagious, as follows:

“We wish to remind the public that the measles virus is very contagious. The measles virus can be spread by an infected person through the air through breathing, coughing or sneezing. It is important for the public to remain alert for any signs or symptoms of measles.” (MOH 2019)

In the following step up of vaccination, there were immunization clinics located at the Tupua Tamasese Meaole Hospital (TTMH) on Upolu and at the Malietoa Tanumafili Hospital on Savai’i (MOH, 2019) but there were reports in the media of the supply of the vaccines running out in Savai’i and of issues with the lack of cold storage (Sanerivi 2019). Despite these concerning reports, the Ministry of Health did not respond publicly. By the end of the first week of November 2019, the number of suspected cases had increased to 513 and still there were only three vaccination locations. Two locations were at the hospitals in Upolu and Savaii and the third was in the center of the Apia Township (Mayron, 2019b). Overcrowded waiting areas for vaccinations were observed at TTMH in the period leading up to the countrywide shut down for mass vaccinations in December. The fear of potential exposure in a crowded environment while waiting for a vaccine may have dissuaded some parents from bringing children for vaccination (Stein-Zamir et al. 2019).

**Institutional weakness and the rapid spread of infections**

The Ministry appears to have been slow to realize the potential magnitude of the outbreak and was slow to declare it and plan for its management. Accordingly the public was unaware of how serious the situation was, which undoubtedly contributed to the rapid spread. Samoa has very few remote or isolated villages; it has a closely interconnected population living on two adjacent islands linked by ferry services, in villages close to or alongside the main roads around the periphery of both Islands. In October 2019, when the outbreak of measles was first identified “White Sunday” was held; an occasion when most churches throughout Samoa gather children and their families together for a special day-long celebration. This would have created an ideal environment for virus transmission. Another factor is transportation. Although many Samoan families own cars or trucks, most people, especially young people, rely on bus services, which in Samoa are privately owned and operated (SBS 2013). As they often run less than three times a day with none on Sundays, buses are very crowded. Lack of reliable, weeklong access to transportation meant that many people were unable to quickly access vaccination services. Within three weeks of the epidemic being declared there were calls for the Ministry of Health to decentralize the vaccination response, so that vaccinators could go to the villages. One woman responding to the Samoa Observer article on public responses to the epidemic said:

“When I went to the hospital, I knew that the Ministry of Health response was late because they said all people should go to the hospital to get an injection for measles. But for me, the
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Ministry of Health should put together a team and send them to the village rollout the vaccination programme because the disease is spreading fast. Some people live far from the hospital and they don’t have access to vaccines. The Ministry should dispatch a group of nurses, like what they did when they ran a vaccination programme for women.” (Ulutoa, 2019)

There was a revealing incident reported on November 20th 2019, that five days into the state of emergency, about two hundred people were turned away after they had lined up at the Samoa Red Cross building expecting vaccinations to be administered by the Ministry of Health staff (Wilson 2019). In a Government Press release on 23 November 2019, the public was advised that private clinics providing the measles vaccinations for a fee had been closed as inquiries were proceeding, giving the reason that there was “no formal agreement between the clinics and Ministry of Health on operations and safety requirements needed”. It was not clear how the vaccines, which could only have been obtained by the government, were made available at the clinics (Government of Samoa 2019b). Only two days later in a Radio New Zealand report, the public was advised that another private clinic, which had provided measles vaccines, had received approval from the previous National Health Services and were awaiting permission to go ahead after a Ministry of Health and UNICEF evaluation (RNZ 2019). Ten facilities besides district health centres were listed as providing vaccinations and treatment for measles (Government of Samoa 2019a) but this information was only made public a few days before the mobile outreach campaign commenced. Until that was carried out most people were expected to travel to health centres on both major islands (Tupufia - Ah Tong 2019a).

Such delays are not unique to developing countries like Samoa; for example, in 2003 the Japanese government withheld World Health Organisation data that SARS symptoms had been recorded in Japan and also did not start a prevention plan in communities, affecting preparedness and facilitating the spread (Gesser-Edelsburg et al 2018). The rapid spread was clearly related to the delay in declaring an outbreak and building public awareness and the confusing response by the Ministry of Health. The response by the Director General of the Ministry of the Health was defensive in tone (Mayron 2019c). This may have been because the government of Samoa exerts tight political control over information from government agencies, which may have deterred the Director General of the Ministry of Health from speaking earlier and more frankly. The same criticisms have been widely made of the government of China concerning suppression of information about the early indications of the Covid-19 virus in Wuhan in January 2020. The lesson here is that public trust in the directives of the government during an epidemic is important and can exist in the presence of low knowledge about the illness, fostering receptiveness to government directives (Deurenberg – Yap et al. 2005). Despite advice from the World Health Organisation and UNICEF, Samoa was not prepared for the epidemic. These agencies sent warnings to all Pacific Ministers of health on prevention and outbreak response to the threat of measles, motivated by the re-emergence of measles in New Zealand. One measure that should have been taken immediately was surveillance at the Auckland airport and at the Faleolo international airport in Samoa. However no measures were taken to stop the spread of infection to the islands. In contrast, an appropriate measure was taken by the authorities in American Samoa, which prevented the spread of measles from Samoa by banning travelers unless they presented proof of vaccination against measles at least two weeks prior to travel.

Another factor underlying the problematic response by the government to the epidemic was the upheaval in the management of the health sector. In an organizational reform in 2006, responsibility had been divided between two agencies, the National Health Service and the Ministry of Health, each with its own director, apparently on the advice of international consultants. In 2019, under the NHS Amendment Bill (2018), the NHS and MOH were merged again. Issues of rising expenditure on personnel and decline in the provision of services were rumored as reasons, as was
neglect of community health programmes, which had tended to focus on cancer and STIs but less upon other common infectious diseases. This may reflect the focus of international agencies funding health programmes in Samoa.

Knowledge, Samoan Culture and Social Factors

Measles is often believed to be a harmless childhood infection, but in fact the disease carries the risk of severe complications, including “encephalitis, severe diarrhea potentially leading to dehydration, ear infections and severe respiratory infections such as pneumonia … which is the cause of the majority of measles related deaths …” (World Health Organisation 2019b). It was evident that most health workers and members of the public had never seen the condition before. Most people did not know what its symptoms were, or that the disease was very infectious. This is because measles is now rare in comparatively rich countries like New Zealand and Australia and has not been a public health concern for many years, due to effective mass vaccination in those countries.

Traditional medicine is still widely practiced in Samoa, incorporating massage, herbal infusions and other measures for the removal of harmful supernatural causes of illness. Many Samoans believe that there are two types of illnesses; Samoan illnesses (ma’i Samoa) and foreign illnesses (ma’i palagi). The former are amendable to Samoan treatments, the latter to medical treatment from the hospital or medical center (see MacPherson and MacPherson 1990). For example, a common ‘Samoan’ illness termed mūmū (of which there are many types), may manifest itself with fever or a rash. It is likely that many Samoan parents assumed that those with the symptoms of measles had mūmū and took them to a traditional healer (fōfō or taulāsea). An immediate public health measure should have been to alert traditional healers about measles and the need for vaccinations and medical treatments. When a person becomes ill families and individuals often oscillate anxiously between the hospital or clinic and the traditional practitioner, looking for speedy results. A child might be taken out of hospital if the parents are not satisfied with the treatment, or if recourse to a traditional healer has been unsatisfactory, a child may be taken to the hospital (Schoeffel 2016).

There appears to have been uncertainty among health workers about what to do when a person presented with symptoms of fever, sniffles and sore eyes. Several media reports tell of children being sent home with medication for fever. In one such case, a mother turned to traditional healers after attempting to seek assistance from the health facilities; the mother subsequently returned with the child to the health facility as his condition worsened and the child died (Tupufia-Ah Tong 2019a). In another, a seven-month-old with fever and refusal to feed was turned away five times until she was admitted to the hospital for treatment for measles; the mother reported that she was called a “paranoid mum” (Jackson and Lyons 2019). In another report a child who was twice incorrectly diagnosed with common cold by doctors, later died from complications of measles. The child had not yet received the first MMR vaccine, having missed the appointment after the suspension of the MMR vaccination program in 2018 (Mayron 2019d). Another child, known to one of the authors, was in remission from cancer and was called to the hospital for a checkup; being immune suppressed, he caught measles and died about a week later. Severe shortages of health workers, essential equipment and the absence of briefing of health workers on Samoa’s measles treatment protocol were revealed in a newspaper report detailing the TTM hospital’s weaknesses in the response to the measles outbreak in February (Mayron 2020).

In addition to traditional medicine, from time to time there are fashions for ‘alternative’ treatments. At the time of the measles epidemic in Samoa, one of these was ‘Kangen water’ (alkaline water, with acidity removed by a device) and a number of highly placed people in Samoa advocated its use to maintain good health. There is one report of a parent taking a child of four years of age with measles signs and symptoms to get the Kangen Water from an alternative healer. The mother
indicated fatalistic religious beliefs, saying that she believed her child’s “fate was preordained” (Fruean 2019a).

In November 2019, despite the Director General of the Ministry of Health indicating that the public should seek assistance from a medical provider when measles symptoms develop, Kangen Water continued to be made available to the public. One of the alternative healers, who claimed it could cure measles, was eventually ordered by the Ministry of Health to desist, with police intervention. A leading local anti-vaccination activist was recommending that children with measles could be treated at home with Vitamin A and C and liquid zinc, which was being sent to him by other anti-vaccination activists in the United States, and which he and his family were distributing (Mayron 2019e). On 22 November the police issued a public warning to anti-vaccination advocates and this was announced in the media more than one month after the outbreak had been declared (Mayron 2019f). Edwin Tamasese, a prominent local anti-vaccination advocate and self-proclaimed healer used vitamins and natural plants in his treatments, ignored warnings and was arrested on December 5th 2019 and charged with incitement against the Samoan Government’s vaccination order, after making the following statements on Facebook:

“I'll be here to mop up your mess. Enjoy your killing spree” (Kerr 2019)

The case was seen in the District Court on December 10th where he stated that he was not guilty, he was released on bail until a new hearing is scheduled (Vai 2019). Tamasese faces a sentence of up to two years if found guilty for this offence.

Communication Issues

Until the overseas medical support teams arrived the health services in Samoa were overwhelmed, with a lack of clear guidelines, procedures and communication strategy. School closures which commenced two weeks after the declaration of the outbreak on October 16, were poorly communicated to the public, with parents and preschool teachers in the Apia area saying they did not know about the instructions from the Ministry of Health to keep children under the age of five years of age at home (Mayron 2019g).

Around the world it has become common for people to search online for additional information about health issues, especially when this is not provided openly and accessibly by the health organizations. Clear information and instructions about what to do from official sources is essential to avoid confusion, panic and the spread of false information (Gesser-Edelsburg et al 2018, French 2011, Mayron 2019h). In Samoa’s measles epidemic the Director General of the Ministry of Health and the Prime Minister were in charge of the outbreak response under the National Emergency Operation Centre (N.E.O.C), with responsibility for actions that were taken and not taken (French 2011). Although the outbreak was declared in mid-October and the State of Emergency on 15 November, the National Emergency Operation Centre was not given the authority until 18 November to manage and organize the response (Mayron 2019i). However, these leaders have refused to accept calls for a formal enquiry into the epidemic, seeing such suggestions as political finger pointing. As commented in the local press:

“The prime minister has shut down criticism of his government’s handling of the crisis, saying that those who have suggested an inquiry into the outbreak show a lack of “common sense” and that such calls were a “political gimmick”. (Jackson and Lyons 2019)
Requests for an inquiry into the Government response to the measles outbreak were rejected by the Prime Minister, positioning the call as a political tool (Tupufia - Ah Tong 2019c). At times the Prime Minister placed the blame for infection and deaths among children on their parents, and in particular on mothers who had not vaccinated their children (Tupufia - Ah Tong 2019b). This was despite lack of government action on low vaccination rates for many years prior to the outbreak, a failure to respond to warnings by World Health Organisation and UNICEF, and the suspension of vaccination in 2018. The local media quoted a British journalist, who said that the Prime Minister was “evasive” about the epidemic. This journalist was one whose reporting had led to the retraction of the Lancet article linking vaccination with a risk of developing autism (Fruean 2019b). To date, Samoa’s government has avoided a public call for a national inquiry into the measles crisis. This has very serious implications for the country at multiple levels, including the role of the National Human Rights Institute. The effectiveness of the leadership during a public health crisis includes having an elected official ‘who is prepared to take responsibility for the crises response outcomes’ (French 2011 reviewing Khan, 2009) and in this regard, the Samoan government failed. A review of the crisis should be prioritized in order to evaluate key areas of the health system and provide a comprehensive understanding of health reforms for the long-term benefit of society. In doing so, taking lessons from past events will be crucial in how the State will manage health and illness, and rebuild public trust in the Ministry of Health and rebuilding the system of community engagement that once worked so well.

Over time Samoa has shifted its public health focus to the management of non-communicable diseases (NCDs) (See Lameko, this volume). While most mortality in Samoa is due to NCDs and makes sense in a stable environment, it can potentially limit the agility of the system to respond in times of public health crisis. As Razzaki and Kellerman (2002) contend:

> Historically, global health policy emphasized multiple, vertically oriented programmes that concentrated on maternal and child health and the control of communicable childhood diseases. This resulted in major public health agencies focusing their support on selective programmes that address priority diseases and activities. Unfortunately, vertical programmes do not encourage the development of strong and efficient health care delivery systems. The weakness of this approach is most apparent during crises, such as medical emergencies or incidents involving large numbers of casualties.

Less than 20% of the beds according to the Samoa National Health Service 2017/2018 annual report (12% TTM and 18% at Savai‘i’s major hospital) were dedicated to a combination of emergency, outpatient or communicable disease control. The bed capacity at all other district facilities is 15 or less for a total of 80 beds across all eight locations. Thus, 42% of the total number of referred cases seen at the Emergency Department at TTM were from district health facilities, an indicator that the district health facilities were already unable to respond at the time of the measles outbreak.

**Lessons from History**

Samoa is uniquely well situated, with its accessible and mainly well-organized communities, to disseminate public health information that encourages healthy practices. Unfortunately the system it had in the past for this purpose was almost completely discontinued by 2019. The re-emergence of measles in New Zealand and its spread to Samoa occurred when the authorities ignored history and the responses to and consequences of earlier measles epidemics.
Samoans had been exposed to measles a number of times in the preceding century. As early as 1884, New Zealand vessels such as the S. S. Wairarapa were refused permission to land in Samoa and Tonga due to measles onboard the ship (Evening Post, 1884). However, by the early 1890s, measles had struck rapidly in Samoa with about 200 deaths (New Zealand Herald, 1893) and reportedly 500 deaths in Tonga (Marlborough Express, 1893). A year later, missionary Samuel Hickman Davies (1841-1917) of the London Missionary Society, who had been based in Samoa since 1867 recorded the following observation:

Until a few months ago measles had not entered this group. It was conveyed to Tonga, 500 miles south of us, by the New Zealand steamer Upolu in June last, and from accounts we have received it nearly decimated that group. The same steamer brought the contagion to our group. Here, as in Tonga, the epidemic was at first mild. Comparatively few died in Samoa during the period of the fever and rash. The sequelae and complications have caused the mortality. I have not been able to obtain accurate statistics of the deaths from this recent epidemic throughout Samoa, as the ten inhabited islands of this tropical and volcanic group lie between five parallels of longitude, or, with the intervening straits, cover nearly 270 miles; but, judging from the accurate returns obtained here, including a fifth of Samoa, and also from reports obtained from missionaries and others, no fewer than 1,000 of the entire population of 34,500 died from measles up to the end of December, 1893, and nearly half of these adults. Since then there have probably been a few hundreds more. (British Medical Journal, 19 May 1894, vol. 1, p. 1077).

In 1903, doctors from Sydney had travelled to Fiji to provide support to the Board of Health due to a measles outbreak (Australia Press, 1903). Eight years later, another measles outbreak in 1911, affected populations in German and American Samoa with the mortality in the latter islands about 10% of the population (Medical Record 1911) and for German Samoa a ‘great loss of life’.

New Zealand’s very modestly funded administration (1914-1961) placed substantial emphasis on improving public health through a community-based public health system. Legislation (New Zealand Health Act 1920 and the Samoa Act 1921): contained provisions to build an accessible medical service and secondly, and to develop preventive and educational work. This was, no doubt, in response to the Administration’s culpability in failing to quarantine Samoa from the 1918-1919 pneumonic influenza pandemic, which killed one in five inhabitants, the greatest proportional mortality of any country or territory in the world (Tomkins 1992). Chastened, the Administration set out to eliminate common communicable diseases, including hookworm, filariasis, yaws, scabies and leprosy. Aiming to promote hygienic practices to prevent these diseases, village women’s committees were established. Hygiene committees (komiti tumama hereafter komiti) in the opinion of Lambert, a public health expert in 1929 were “a brilliant illustration of the possibilities of preventive medicine” (Thomas 2001 citing Lambert 1928:3).

New Zealand’s public health response was stalled in some districts of Samoa by the pro-independence Mau movement; in 1936 a whooping cough and measles outbreak resulted in the deaths of about 300 people, and three main villages had been placed under quarantine (Northern Advocate, 1936). In combatting the spread, the work of the Women’s Committees had been praised by government officials:

At the 31st March 1937, there were women’s committees in 122 villages, and they have all rendered excellent service, particularly during the outbreaks of whooping cough and measles. In this connection it was observed that the death rate was higher in these villages, which did not possess women’s committees (AJHR 1937: 23).
Only two years later, in 1938, the New Zealand Governor-General Viscount Galway’s September visit to the Pacific islands was interrupted due to a measles outbreak (Press 1938), since the Matua, a New Zealand vessel, had introduced measles into the Cook Islands. However, earlier in July, the HMS Achilles had on board three cases, and the Minister of Defence was keen to prevent spread to ‘islanders who have little resistance to infection’ (Auckland Star 1938).

In the 1930s a number of Samoan doctors (graduates from the Fiji School of Medicine) and local trained public health nurses set out to increase the numbers of komiti throughout Samoa. By the 1940s, the komiti became part of the village governance structure, with the wives of the highest-ranking matai (chiefs) taking the leadership roles. They were responsible for reducing risks of infectious disease by improving the safety of water supply, village and household sanitation and family hygiene. An important task of each komiti was to conduct regular inspections, often with the district nurse, to make sure that there were no breeding places for mosquitoes and other disease vectors in the village, and to ensure that every household had hygienic standards of living with mosquito nets, clean sleeping mats, and washing facilities and every village had communal toilets (in the early days built on jetties over the sea). They supervised the village bathing pool and drinking water sources (some villages still have komiti houses beside the village bathing pool). They organized monthly clinics for mothers of babies and young children, led by visiting public health nurses, who gave health talks every month on house to keep families health and to reinforce rules about village hygiene. In many villages, the komiti had first aid boxes and provided first aid services for minor illnesses and injuries. These organizations also had a certain amount of authority in local governance matters related to community health, for example, the komiti could fine women who failed to bring their children for monthly health checks. Many komiti also managed community water and sanitation projects related to public health improvement. In the 1960s they implemented Samoa’s first mass drug administration for filariasis.

By the 1970s some key public health practices such as village inspections had become somewhat ritualized into displays of new household property (Schoeffel 1984). Thomas (1986, 2001) was doubtful that Samoan custom could be blended into effective public health processes due to its hierarchical system; however her observations may reflect the declining priority given to the komiti as an instrument of public health in Samoa’s health system. In 1975, responsibility for komiti was transferred from the public health nursing division to a Women’s Advisory Committee. In the same year, following the UN International Year for Women, the focus shifted from village health to women and development. In 1982 the WAC became a minor adjunct of the national committee of village mayors (Komiti o Pulenu’u). Concerns and project proposal from komiti had to be channeled to government and donors through the village mayor.

The institutional arrangements linking the komiti to the central government have changed several times until the Women’s Division of the Ministry of Women Community and Social Development was established in 1991. The women’s committees were de-linked from the public health nursing services in the Ministry of Health because nurses no longer went out to villages routinely; instead people in villages sought advice and treatment from the nearest health center or district hospital, or if they had the means to do so, went to the outpatient clinics at the main hospitals on Upolu and Savai’i. Accordingly, the role of the komiti in community health promotion has almost disappeared. By the late 1980s the health inspectorate (mainly employing young men) took over responsibility for the condition of water supply and village sanitation, so in many villages the komiti no longer considered this work their responsibility for which they, unlike the health inspectors, were not paid. Most villages still have komiti tasked with ‘cleaning and beautifying the village’. It should be noted that ‘cleaning’ in this context means organizing grass cutting and sweeping up litter. Village councils still required all households to maintain the side of their property facing the road; to keep the grass cut and to plant decorative hedges and gardens. However less
attention is paid to the back of houses, out of sight, where refuse can collect water, providing breeding places for the Aedes mosquito that carries filariasis, dengue fever, chikungunya and zika virus, and discarded coconut shells and food scraps that can attract rats. Chickens and dogs wander largely unchecked in and out of cooking houses at the back of main dwelling houses -- also potential sources of disease. In a small survey of eight village komiti which was investigating knowledge, attitudes and practice on feeding babies and under-five year children (Magbity et. al. 2016) many women said they thought poor hygiene in households was the cause of malnutrition (presumably from diarrhea) among young children. Village women’s organizations are nowadays more church-focused than in the past with many weekly activities including cleaning and decorating and fund-raising for the church. There is no longer any direct community-based mechanism under the Ministry of Health for communicating health information.

Since the 1980s, broadly stated, there has been a gradual shift of emphasis from prevention to treatment of illness. Services which once aimed to provide health education and prevent infectious diseases are now geared towards treatment of illnesses, especially non-communicable diseases such as diabetes, cancers and cardiovascular disease which account for most morbidity and mortality in older age groups in Samoa today.

Taking those Lessons Forward*

Samoa remains one of the few countries in the world with no confirmed cases of Covid 19, a pandemic which has affected millions and killed thousands across the world. Developing countries have been identified as being extremely vulnerable to the impact of Covid 19 due to limited testing capabilities and weak health systems. The vulnerability of Samoa to an outbreak was most evident after the devastating impact of the measles outbreak in 2019 and the lessons learned from it have not been forgotten. Samoa implemented a sweeping series of restrictions in travel, improved health education about Covid 19 and a state of emergency swiftly. By these means, a country which still does not have testing capabilities and which has limited health resources has been able to prevent Covid 19 reaching its shores.

When media coverage of the cases of Covid 19 in Wuhan, China grew in January 2020, few countries put in place any restrictions on entry. On January 23, with immediate effect, the Government of Samoa put in place requirements for entry into the country including completion of a health declaration, a medical examination within 3 days of travel, 14 days quarantine at last port in a country with no cases of Covid 19 if travelling from a country with confirmed cases of Covid 19 and if the person arrived within the 14 days, quarantine would be applied and if necessary deportation (Government of Samoa 2020a). By January 29, nine travelers who had arrived in Samoa were returned on flights, some who had flu like symptoms and had come from USA and Chinese nationals who had come from China via Fiji (Government of Samoa 2020b). The requirement for a medical certificate was also expanded to include travelers who transition period was 24 hours or more in a country where there were confirmed cases. The Government press releases included the

* The review of the response to an outbreak can provide valuable lessons for health and governance leadership moving forward, to prevent and to be able to respond appropriately to outbreaks in future instances. After the outbreak of Measles in Auckland and its environs in 2019 that preceded the outbreak in Samoa, an inquiry into the response was commissioned. Many of the recommendations that emerged from that review align with the lessons learned from the measles outbreak in Samoa, according to the authors of this paper. These include the need to raise immunization rates to prevent outbreaks, improve documentation of the vaccines administered and bolstering coordination and leadership and the expected functions of those charged with leading the response. The overall conclusion from the Sonder and Ryan (2020) was that the response in New Zealand followed the outbreak, instead of getting ahead of the outbreak, similar to the findings of the authors of this paper. The full report is available at the link below.
list of countries and the list was updated frequently. There were some instances of public displeasure and human rights concerns with these decisions but the Government of Samoa remained firm, in its decision including Samoan Citizens and Permanent Residents in the requirement for medical clearance and quarantine (Jackson 2020). Requirements were further restricted by mid–March to require a negative test for Covid-19 (as a part of the medical clearance done five days before travel) to be allowed to board the aircraft.

In the reporting of statistics of cases of Covid-19 by country, the cruise ship Diamond Princess is reported as a standalone entity. After one person who disembarked in Hong Kong was diagnosed with Covid-19, the ship was quarantined off the coast of Japan from early February for a month. Over that time 700 more people were infected with the virus. Since that time, several other cruise ships have experienced similar predicaments, with cases of Covid-19 on board and difficulty in finding a port willing to accept them. Samoa’s Government banned arriving cruise ships with effect on February 24 (Government of Samoa 2020c), earlier than many other countries. To further reduce the number of people entering the country, the decision was made to reduce the number of flights entering and leaving the country, with effect on March 2nd (Loh 2020). For a country which relies heavily on tourism income and still reeling from the economic impact post the measles epidemic, this was evidence of placing the risk to human health above economic loss.

Samoa closed its borders on March 26 to international flights and the country was put into a two week state of emergency. This was subsequently extended by four weeks for a six week period. In the detailed State of Emergency guidelines, schools were closed, limits to five people for public gatherings, restaurants were only allowed takeaway services, ferry services between the two islands would be suspended for passengers, and people above 60 years were advised to remain at home. It also explicitly stated that church services were banned. Within one week of the State of Emergency, amendments were made in response to reports of churches holding services and social gatherings taking place. These included fines or jail sentences for contravening the requirements (Government of Samoa 2020d). Although personal stories are still shared of church members meeting in the pastors houses for smaller services, the large services which were a fixture are no longer taking place. Another aspect of the SOE regulations included the cessation of bus service, an identified potential contributor of the spread of the measles outbreak.

Most significantly, the weakness in public knowledge of how disease was spread and the availability of information to the public was addressed in the government’s response. Educational material is shared through television, radio and via the government’s Facebook and Ministry of Health’s Facebook pages on how the disease spread and preventative measures. All are in Samoan and English and on Facebook include the use of simple pictures and figures to relay the message. The Government met with all of the village representatives and komiti representatives to discuss and relay information on Covid-19. One the author’s students relayed that no children are being allowed to leave the village due to concerns about Covid-19. The Government also addressed quickly the potential issue of misinformation regarding Covid-19 via Facebook messaging, a critical lesson after anti vaccination activists were able to spread misinformation via these social media platforms during the measles outbreak. The Government of Samoa continues to post releases on its Facebook page and other media platforms (television and radio) about the number of tests which have been sent to New Zealand for analysis, awaiting transport and results. Currently Samoa is permitting repatriation of Samoans citizens and permanent residents, subject to strict supervised fourteen-day quarantine on arrival and testing before quarantine ends.
Conclusion

Samoa’s measles epidemic was the ‘perfect storm’; a medical misadventure reducing the already low vaccination rate and opened the country to measles, likely brought in by Samoans from New Zealand. It illustrates the globalized nature of Samoan society and the interlinked world they live in, through its transnational diaspora, population mobility, access to social media such as Facebook, foreign aid dependency, and international affiliation though United Nations agencies. Continuing dysfunction in the health system led to a belated and confused response to the early outbreak, so that as the infection spread and deaths mounted, many among the bewildered and fearful public had recourse to ineffective traditional and ‘alternative’ treatments. There is also a deeper message from these events; the modernization of health services has not served Samoa well as it moved from a largely preventative focus in services to a largely curative focus. Samoa has a double burden of communicable and non-communicable disease, and in recent years the health system has become dominated by concerns for the health consequences of the latter; diabetes, cardiovascular disease and cancers. The old health system was shaped by the colonial response to the 1918-1919 influenza epidemic with a major emphasis in community health, a system now largely abandoned as professionalization, medicalization, and new hospitals took center stage. As history shows, small populations in islands with limited resources are particularly vulnerable to outbreaks of infectious diseases. Samoa was ill served in an epidemic by its geography. Its population is concentrated in adjacent villages on two main and closely located islands, unlike most other Pacific island states where about half of the population is dispersed in outer islands and other remote areas where it is easier to contain the spread of infection. However, this geography was once a boom to a community based service, and one lesson of the epidemic is that it should now be re-invigorated.

The recent response of the Samoan government to Covid-19 illustrates that lessons have been learned and hopefully, that attention will now return to community health and strengthening prevention measures. Today about 60% of the population in Samoa no longer live under the authority of traditional village councils (Tauaa and Schoeffel 2019), suggesting the need for innovation and an expanded response to community health.
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Obesity in Samoa: Culture, History and Dietary Practices

Viali Lameko, Oceania University of Medicine

Abstract

This paper provides an overview, from an historical perspective, to identify the structural factors that have created an ‘obesogenic’ environment in contemporary Samoa. The prevalence of obesity among Samoan adults had dramatically increased over the past four decades and is now affecting about 59 % of men and 81 % of women in this small island country, respectively. More alarming is the association of obesity with prevalent non-communicable diseases, such as diabetes, stroke, cancer and heart attack. There are multiple factors at work which include, but not limited to, behaviour related to a nutrition transition, limited physical activities, sedentary lifestyle and cultural food practices. The question is why and how the people of Samoa changed their traditional diet, consisting mostly of taro, breadfruit, coconut, and fish, to meals consisting of mainly imported, processed food items laden with sugar, saturated fat and salt. This dietary change has not occurred because Samoan customs and culture of food has changed; it is the food that has changed.

Keywords: obesity, culture, dietary practices, nutrition transition.

Introduction

The high prevalence of obesity among Samoans has many determinants including the behaviour related to nutrition transition, and lack of physical activities, the influence of colonialism, modernization, globalization, food aid, rapid urbanization and international migration. The increased dietary intake of imported foods characterises Samoa’s nutrition transition and epidemiological transition among Samoans. Although the culture of food among Samoans is largely unchanged; the exchange of food gifts to establish and maintain social cohesion, diets have been transformed. The traditional daily meal of meaai aano (taro, yam, breadfruit) and meaai lelei (palusami, chicken and other birds, fish and other seafoods), as well as foods given ceremonially, have been almost completely replaced by bread, rice, and imported meats such as mutton flaps, turkey tails, fresh, salted and canned beef, and factory-farmed chicken. The drinking coconut has been replaced with sugar-laden beverages.

My general observation, as a clinician living in Samoa is that most of the politicians and government officials in Samoa are either overweight or obese. Unfortunately, most of the church ministers and their wives are also generally obese. Because church ministers and their wives are the modern ‘sacred chiefs’ of Samoa, they are well fed by their congregations to show love, so tend to be overweight or obese. In addition, most churches do not allow ministers and their wives to play village sport, this being seen as undignified. The fact that so many of these religious and political elites are obese, and in positions of power and influence, it may appear to many Samoans that power and influence are positively correlated with obesity. But, at the same time, Samoans are not immune from globalised cultural trends on what constitutes bodily beauty, propagated by social media.

This article aims to contextualise the grim statistics on obesity that dominate public health discourses, by reflecting Samoan food and customs in the past, and questioning the underlying premise about individual choices in much of the literature on obesity, for example that big bodies are a cultural preference, or that obesity is the result of ignorance or unwise choices which may be corrected by the means of health education. It will suggest that factors contributing to prevalence of
obesity today have accumulated over time and accelerated over the past 50 years as Samoans became increasingly globalised.

Public health statistics

To set the scene from a large literature on Samoa, around 53% of the adult population in Samoa is obese. The published data on the subject shows that in a small Pacific Island country with a population of approximately 200,000 Polynesian people, over the period 1978-2013, the prevalence of obesity increased from 27.7% to 53.1% in men (2.3 % per 5 years) and 44.4% to 76.7% in women (4.5% per 5 years) (Lin et al 2016; Hawley & McGarvey 2015). Obesity prevalence in 2020 is projected to reach 59.0 % of men and 81.0 % of women, making obesity the leading cause of disability in Samoa. The Samoans offer an extreme case, but they also exemplify a global trend. Samoa provides a good case study of the trend to endemic obesity in a population and this article will examine the contextual correlates of cultural practices and values and socioeconomic change leading to the present prevalence of obesity.

Samoan is not alone: In 2000 it was estimated that, for the first time in human history, there were more overweight than underweight people, globally (Mendez, Monteiro, & Popkin 2005). The current obesity epidemic has been called “the greatest public health failure of the past century” (Brewis 2011). According to Kelly et al. (2008), if the current trends continue for the next two decades, the ratio will grow to more than two thirds. This trend has been labelled a “globesity” by the World Health Organization, and an “obesity pandemic” (Swinburn et al. 1999). It has also been identified as the leading nutritional problem by the U.S Department of Agriculture. Today, after years of trying to mitigate and halt the rising prevalence of obesity, the figures are not showing significant reductions in either affluent or developing countries. The World Health Organization defines obesity as “abnormal or excessive fat accumulation that may impair health” (World Health Organization, 2014: 1) because of its association with other diseases (Centre for Diseases Control 2012; NCD Risk Factor Collaboration 2016; World Health Organization 2000). As simply put by Powers and Howley (2004) “obesity is a result of a consistent prolonged imbalance between energy intake and expenditure”. Obesity is a serious public health concern because obesity is a risk factor for numerous health conditions such as, but not limited to, diabetes, stroke, cancer, and heart attack (Zhang, Rexrode, van Dam, Li & Hu 2008). The prevalence of adult obesity in Samoa and some other small Pacific Island developing countries places a heavy burden on health resources (World Health Organization 2014; McLennan & Jayaweera, 2014). Pacific Island migrant communities in other countries such as New Zealand have similar high prevalence of obesity.

Measuring obesity

In order to compare and interpret variations of obesity across various populations over time, agreed upon standards and measurements for gender and age-structure have been developed. These are the basis of epidemiological comparisons and proposed relationships between obesity and health outcomes. A widely used anthropometric measurement is body mass index (BMI), which is defined as a person’s weight in kilograms divided by the person’s height in metres (kg/m2) (World Health Organization 2015). Generally, a person who has a BMI greater than or equal to 30 kg/m2 is considered obese. However, these standard measures do now allow for ethnic differences in body types, so when reporting about BMI in Polynesian populations, researchers have recently suggested that there is a need to correct measurements to allow for a greater amount of lean muscle mass per kilogram in Polynesians, compared to the general global population (Swinburn 1999). Accordingly, there are now new cut off points for measuring BMI among the Polynesians at 26 kg/m2 and 32 kg/m2 for overweight and obesity, respectively. One of the limitations of the BMI method is that it does not measure body fat. Since half of body fat is stored underneath the skin, it is possible to capture the percentage of fat in the body. This involves grasping and measuring, the skin folds at body locations.
such as triceps and biceps on the upper arm. Nonetheless, this method requires equipment and training to stratify those being measured according to gender, age and ethnicity (Malina 1996).

**Factors identified as driving the prevalence of obesity among Pacific Islanders**

There are a number of factors correlated with obesity among Pacific Islanders. Brouwers (2016) suggested that of six factors driving the obesity epidemic among the Pacific Island populations (globalization, increased international trade, urbanization, physical inactivity, changing eating patterns, and culture), changing eating patterns, physical inactivity, and urbanization are the most potent drivers of obesity. Galanis et al. (1995) and Keighley et al. (2007) argued that the observed nutrition transition in Samoa today is closely related to (i) economic modernization, (ii) rapid urbanization, and (iii) shifts in lifestyle toward increased total energy intake and sedentary behaviour. Consequently, Samoans are experiencing an epidemiological transition, characterized by the increasing prevalence of obesity, Type 2 diabetes mellitus, and metabolic syndrome (Keighley et al, 2007; Keighley et al. 2006; McGarvey 2001; and Galanis et.al. 1995). The World Health Organization (2015) points to four factors. The first is behaviour related to a nutrition transition, limited physical activity, sedentary life style and cultural practices. The second is early life nutrition and growth. The third includes structural factors, such as globalization and modernization, free trade, rapid economic growth, unplanned urbanization, environmental degradation, and growing inequities within countries. The fourth factor is genetic variation in association with obesity in different populations (World Health Organization 2014:1) Obesity trends have also been strongly linked to societal norms and environmental elements, which promote overeating and lack of physical activity (Sturm 2005; Swinburn, Egger, & Raza 1999). Swinburn et al. (1999) referred to these environmental elements as “obesogenic environmental elements”. Robinson, Thomas, Aveyard, and Higgs (2013) also found consistent evidence that social norms and cultural eating practices are obesogenic environmental elements that influence food intake. Along the same lines, Robinson et al. (2013) pointed to a strong association between eating practices and social identity. Dietary change is a global phenomenon, referred to as the nutrition transition (Baylin et al 2013) and is exemplified by the Samoans. They no longer eat their traditional diets of mainly plantain, root crops, coconut and seafood. These have mainly been replaced by cheap, easily available processed food, consisting of foods such as canned fish and meat, imported mutton flaps, chicken, turkey tails, bread and rice, as well as sugary drinks. However, although the food has changed, the Samoan culture of food related to social status, hospitality, and more recently, to cultural identity, continues to strongly shape Samoan food consumption practices with a strong historical continuity.

**Traditional Samoan foods**

Until the 1960s in Samoa, when mass emigration and cash remittances began, Samoan people mainly ate food they procured or produced themselves from land, sea and reef food sources, such as coconuts, taro, yams, breadfruits, bananas, fish and other sea food, and occasional chicken and pork. The traditional daily Samoan diet consisted of *mea’ai a’ano* (taro, yam, bananas, & breadfruit) with *mea’ai lelei* (small amount of meat or fish or shell fish) and *palusami* (coconut cream wrapped in green taro shoots and baked in the traditional ground oven). There were two main meals, the first in late morning; usually the leftover food from the previous evening meal, and the second one in the evening with the whole family. The food was always served first to the chief and head of the family. The other members of the family, including the children, did not eat until the head had finished eating (Kramer 1903; Turner 1884; Grattan 1948; Brewis 2012; Tuvale 2016). In Christian Samoa these courtesies were
extended to priests and ministers of religion (patele, faifeau) and are still practiced in most Samoan households.

Among the responsibilities of the village council was ensuring food supply for the community. The council coordinated the work of the untitled men (aumaga) in fishing, planting and raising pigs and chickens. Many varieties of taro were grown, and planting followed an annual production cycle with bananas, yams and breadfruit, so there was always a supply of staple food. In its present form and varieties, breadfruit was probably first domesticated by Polynesians. Fruiting twice a year, it was not only an important staple food but was also processed and stored for times of famine resulting from cyclones. It was laid down in pits where it fermented and could be retrieved when needed, shaped into biscuit-like portions (masi) and baked for consumption. Another plant once widely cultivated was arrowroot (masoa), a source of edible starch for preparing a variety of traditional dishes. The coconut palm provided not only food and drink but resources for constructing houses, tools, mats, weapons, fishing gear, fuel, toys, and equipment, (Grattan 1948; Tuvale 2016). Samoa had few native fruits aside from the Polynesian apple (vi, Spondias dulcis) but foreign tropical fruits such as mango, pineapple and some varieties of banana such as Cavendish and others, were among the early European introductions. There was almost no sugar in the traditional diet; in a very labour-intensive process a sweet substance was obtained for drinks by baking the roots of the ti plant (Cordyline fruticosa; see Hinkle 2004). The Samoan traditional diet obtained its variety from seafood; a variety of fish, crabs, lobsters, crayfish, seaweed, and a large array of other marine organisms were fished or gathered from reefs. In addition, chicken and pigeons were also part of the traditional diet. Pigeons in particular were more popular for meals than chickens, especially in the months of September and October of every year, when the pigeons were believed to have just put on fat in their bodies (Kramer 1903). Turtles were referred to as ‘sacred fish’ because they must be presented to the highest chiefs before being distributed for consumption (Turner 1884; Kramer 1903; Grattan 1948; Tuvale 2016). Coastal erosion and overfishing have diminished the supply of these foods in recent times. Life in Samoa before the contact with Europe has been described as having a “subsistence abundance” of food (Thaman 1982).

Traditional Samoan bodies

Large bodies and a life of leisure were prestigious in ancient Polynesian societies (Brewis, McGarvey, Jones, & Swinburn 1998). That is, there is an absence of significant negative view about obesity among Polynesian societies. The “fattening rituals” among Pacific island countries in the past is also another witness to this claim (Pollock, 1995). This is an important observation and differences in values compared to Western industrialized societies which regard the ideal body sizes are slim. However the notion that big bodies are a cultural preference, is refuted by Hardin, MacLennan and Brewis (2018:291) based on their research in Samoa and Nauru. Dr Augustine Kramer, a German naval surgeon, made a detailed ethnographic study of Samoa and Samoans in the 1890s, a time at which Samoa had about sixty years of contact with Europeans. He makes no mention of obesity; describing men as about 190 -200 cm (1.9 – 2.0 meters) and women as slightly shorter at 150 – 170 cm (1.5 – 1.7 meters). Women, he observed, had short and heavy legs; whereas the men’s upper body and limbs were more proportionate and slim. Women were more likely to sit inside houses and were not often seen taking part in physical exertion. Their occupations were mainly making tapa cloth, mats and other textile goods. He noted that Samoa had a stratified social system and that men of higher ranks in village and district setting often were of a larger and “nobler” build than the common people, which he attributed to the better care and nutrition they received, with privileged access to the most highly prized foods (Kramer, 1903). Historical sources cited by Keesing (1937) Schoeffel (1979) and Tcherkezoff (2008) describe the practice of secluding chosen sacrosanct virgins (taupou), daughters of the highest-ranking chiefs, inside their houses so the sun did not darken their skin. They were kept plump and well fed by their attendants, comprising the unmarried women of the village (aualuma). Since these adolescent girls were intended for dynastic marriages, extra body weight was supposed
to provide a biological advantage in becoming pregnant; a fattening practice found in many other traditional societies (Frisch 1988; Pollock 1995). As in many Asian cultures, fair skin in Samoa denoted persons of chiefly rank, indicating that they did not labour in the sun (Schultz 1911; Blair & Hawley 2018). Although a large body was clearly admired by Samoans; the photographs of Samoan chiefly men and women taken in the late 19th century (Museum of Samoa) do not show bodies of exceptional fatness. In traditional Polynesian societies, slimness was the norm and plumpness indicated the high status of a person with access to an abundance of food, the opposite of the contemporary Western idealisation of slim bodies and their association with high social status.

No evidence of obesity among Samoa’s chiefs in a photograph from Rev. Dr. George Brown photographic collection c. 1876-1880. Australian Museum.

Food and Samoan cultural practices

A young man could earn the respect of his chief and eventually his place as a future chief of the family and in the village by his skills as a food provider. He would go out fishing, or working in the farm, including hunting for wild boars until this day. The traditional method of cooking used a ground oven (*umu*) in which rocks were heated in a fire until they glowed red, after which food items were placed on them and covered with banana and breadfruit leaves. Food was integral to the exchange of gifts in ceremonial activities for births, marriages, funerals, bestowal of chiefly titles, and the reception of visitors (Turner 1884; Kramer 1903). As McLennan (2014:4) put it “food is not simply a source of energy, but also a means of building and maintaining social relationships, and reinforcing community cohesion”.
There were special food rites and practices. For example Turner (1884) described how new-born babies were fed in their first three days of life, with the strained juice of the chewed kernel of the coconut and the mother’s breast milk was tested before the child was put to the breast. A famous historical story in Samoa depicts this diet for the new-borns. This is the story of a new-born baby who was stolen by two men, named Tutuila and Ape, and this baby was later named Tamaalelagi (child from the heavens) and became one of the early kings of Samoa (Samuelu, F. M 2009). He was fed with coconut juice and chewed kernel for the first few days of his life. However, according to Turner (1884) a new-born of chiefly ancestry was put straight to the breast, and each of its developmental stages, sitting, crawling and walking were celebrated with gifts from maternal and paternal sides, the paternal side providing food.

Turner also recorded that gifts of food, as well as canoes, weapons and tools and “foreign goods” (oloa) were ‘masculine’ in old Samoa, while gifts of textiles such as mats and tapa cloth (toga) were ‘feminine’. The centrality of food gifts was most clearly demonstrated at weddings where the groom’s side exchanged ‘masculine’ gifts with the ‘feminine’ gifts of the bride’s family. The weddings of high-ranking people were arranged politically. Courting parties (aumoega) arranged chiefly marriages after they identified a young woman of suitable pedigree and had gathered together food to present to her family and village. If the chief of the young woman’s family accepted the food, the betrothal was formalised, but if rejected, it signified that the prospective bridegroom was also rejected. The presentation of food and other gifts involved a special gift giving ceremony (ta’alolo) and weddings lasted for several days.

Kinship networks extended into villages throughout the Samoan archipelago and inter-village visiting parties were part of the old way of life. The visitors never brought food and the feeding of guests was a cornerstone of Samoan culture. For instance, in the old days, once the guests arrived, a special presentation of food was made in the form of a sua or ta’alolo. Traditionally it comes in two parts; first is called the sua talisua (first meal) consisting of a green drinking coconut (vailolo), a cooked chicken (ta’ailepaepae), and a wrap of cooked taro or breadfruit (fa’avevela). The second step is called a suata’i which is a gift of food for the guests to take with them when they leave, consisting of a whole cooked pig and a fine mat (ietoga). A ta’alolo is a larger form of the sua and is presented if the guests are from a chiefly family and accompanied by their whole village. The sua is still presented to honour important guests in Samoa today, but the content of the gift has been transformed completely. The coconut has been replaced by a can of soda; a 3lb tin of corned beef replaces the chicken; a box of biscuits for the wrap of taro; and a whole box of corned beef or herrings has replaced the pig.

Food was also the main currency of punishment; village councils punished the families of wrongdoers with fines. Kramer (1903) described an example of a fine consisting of two large pigs and one hundred taro. This custom is still practiced today but the fine is more likely to include cash and now likely to be paid in boxes of canned-food, and take-away food items from restaurants.

Funerals were also a time of hosting guests with food and gifts of food. Burials were usually the day of death, but at times high chiefs were unburied for several days to allow the assembly of the clan (Turner, 1884). Food was taboo in proximity to a corpse and the house in which it was held. The attendants of the deceased were fed by others so that their hands would not touch food and underwent a purification rite before they could eat normally again (Turner 1884). Kramer (1903) witnessed the funeral ceremonies for a paramount chief, Malietoa Laupepa in 1898. For ten to fifteen days, the warriors and families related to Malietoa participated in war games, boxing, wrestling, club duels, spear throwing, and nights of wild dancing and lots of food and feasting.

Variations of these traditions live on today among Samoans in Samoa, as well as in the diaspora, and reinforce the social centrality and value of food. Food and feasting are still cultural expressions of love and respect, and the exchange of food is still the focus of social gatherings, which is thought to bring harmony in the society and to maintain the social fabric.
Nutrition transition

Foreign food was introduced to the Samoans in the mid-19th century in the trade with foreign ships (Tcherkezoff 2008). For example pigs, coconuts and fresh water were exchanged for barrels of brined beef and canned pea soup. These foods became highly prestigious, as it is likely that they were given to the chiefs. Today, these food items are still prized foods among most Samoans in their modern form of povi masima (salted beef) and pisupo (canned corned beef). While it is unlikely that these foods were consumed in great amounts in the past, as the economy of Samoa became monetised they became accessible to all and affordable to most, leading a trend towards a diet characterized by a heavy intake of imported foods (Hawley et al, 2015; DiBello et al, 2009; Baylin, et al 2013; Seiden, et al 2012). Once isolated, the Samoan islands are now the centre of a global network of families. Its geographical and political boundaries have been permeated by global ideas of development and economic growth, rising incomes, and freedom to choose how to spend these incomes in order to survive in a “globalised world” (McLennan 2014). For instance, the transformation of the labour market produces an increasing number of high status, well paid sedentary jobs, and office based. The increasing reliance on imported food items and more sedentary jobs as developing countries entered the global economy and people have moved away from subsistence farming and fishing to live and work in urban areas (Ulijaszek, 2006).

One of the consequences is a ‘nutrition transition’ and a trend to obesity in the population. The ‘nutrition transition’ refers to the shift from diets rich in vegetables, and relatively lean proteins, to diets based on processed foods laden with sugar, saturated fat, and sodium, and has occurred worldwide at individual, national, and global levels (Brewis & McGarvey 2000). After 150 years of exposure to the industrialised West, the Samoan diet has been substantially changed, but not its cultural practices; new food items such as salted-beef and bread were incorporated into exchange over a century ago, beginning with visiting ships, missionaries and traders. The question is whether dietary preferences have changed.

However, it is also important to appreciate the influence of the concurrent increase in technologies on the reduction in the amount of physical effort spent on food production. For instance, increasing availability of convenience foods which require no direct energy expenditure on the part of the consumer. Another is the increasing use of new agricultural technologies, such as chainsaws and chemical sprays and sprayers which have reduced the amount of physical effort required to produce a given amount of food. Furthermore, the recent explosion in private vehicle ownership, like for instance in Samoa, means that many activities which formerly involved expenditure of physical effort no longer require this effort. Farmers who once walked to plantations can now drive and food which was formerly carried from point of production to point of consumption can now be transported from plantations in vehicles.

Colonial interventions and Nutrition Transition in Samoa

Besides many benefits, European contact brought changing patterns of food production, distribution and consumption. Missionaries changed gender roles in food preparation (Schoeffel 1979). Young people; mainly males, were once the sole providers and food handlers in the family and the village. However, in the 19th century missionaries encouraged new roles for young women, taught in the mission girls’ schools, which they considered more feminine and appropriate for Christian families. This included sewing and cooking using stoves and pots instead of the Samoan umu. The new method of cooking contributed towards changing Samoan diet and food preference, introducing dishes now considered to be ‘Samoan’ foods such as dumplings (kopai) and steamed pudding (puligi), as well as fried foods. Chinese plantation workers also brought new dishes to Samoa, which are now also considered essentially Samoan dishes such as noodles (sapasui). Those who worked on plantations in the colonial era were fed with rations which included beef, flour and rice. Meleisea’s (1980) interviews
with Melanesian labour recruits on government plantations revealed that one of the attractions of plantation life in Samoa was the food, particularly the meat they were given. New dishes assimilated into Samoan diets relied on imported ingredients such as flour, sugar, salt, cooking oil, noodles, rice, soy sauce, and beef. The Second World War had a big impact on Samoan tastes and diet (Blair 2018; Schoeffel 1987). Samoa was occupied by thousands of American marines in 1943-4 who brought with them an abundance of food and drinks that were previously unknown or very scarce, such as Spam, canned spaghetti, liquor and carbonated drinks. These food items were used by the soldiers to trade with the Samoans for local artefacts or labour. Imported food quickly became associated with high status. As Hawley and Blair (2018) put it: “If you show up [at a social gathering] with a can of tinned corned beef, you’re much well-received than if you show up with papayas from your garden.” Over time, as imported foods became cheaper and more available, and as increasing numbers of Samoans gained access to a cash income, imported foods became normal parts as the daily diet for families. A study of Samoan traditional healers report that they have long affirmed a view that imported food items are the cause of ill health in modern Samoans (MacPherson 1990).

Another influence of the Samoa diet was the health system. In the 1960s, nurses from New Zealand sought to change Samoan practices in the feeding of the new born and weaning of the child, with intentions of improving child health. Mothers were discouraged from the use of traditional feeding methods and practices and encouraged to feed babies with cow’s milk or milk products and eggs (Parkinson 1982). In 1980s, the policy changed and as the harmful effects of bottle-feeding were realised, mothers were urged to breastfeed and give their children local foods. In this early period when Samoa had become an independent state, but still relied on New Zealand guidance, the concept of a ‘balanced diet’ was introduced; another example of how foreign messages about a healthy diet may not be the best approach. Parkinson (1982), Thomas and Schoeffel (1977) pointed out that the message was widely misinterpreted to mean ‘foreign food’, possibly because illustrations of the ‘three food groups’ included items unfamiliar to Samoans, whose traditional diet was already a balanced combination of a starchy staple with protein and vegetable accompaniments. The problem was the historical assumption by foreign health officials that the Samoan people are ‘ignorant’ about healthy eating and needed ‘healthy food’ messages. There was evidence to the contrary. Samoan healers interviewed by C and L Macpherson and reported in Samoan Medical belief and Practice (1990) identified imported food as a key cause of ill health in modern Samoans. The idea was, and still is, that obesity is the result of unwise personal choices which may be corrected by the means of health education (Hardin and Kwauk, 2015). Many messages on nutrition were embedded in Western culture and dietary preferences. For instance, the idea of the dessert following a main meal was never part of the traditional diet, but now Western influence is evident when a Samoan main meal is supplemented with a sweetened coconut cream and rice dish, bread and jam, and mugs of sugar-sweetened tea or cocoa. Development programmes for Pacific island women have long been a target for overseas funding, and in the 1960-1970s, women’s training involved teaching home economics, which included new cooking methods and baking. The cooking ingredients, mainly flour, butter, dripping and sugar, were imported and were often not readily available in rural areas. Drum ovens (kerosene drums with lids, fuelled by a fire) for baking cakes, pies and bread were promoted as ‘appropriate technology’ (Schoeffel 1987; Schoeffel and Kikau 1980).

At the same time, certain foods have been pointed to as the cause of Pacific Islander obesity, for example mutton flaps from Australia and New Zealand (see Gewertz 2010) which were once cheap and still considered delicious if less affordable by Samoans, were seen by many public health advocates as foods rejected by Western consumers, dumped by exporters on to island markets. This led to a ban on imported flaps in Fiji, and in Samoa turkey tails, which attracted similar criticism, were also banned from importation. Similarly other foods such as vegetables, most of which were never part of the Samoan diet, have been promoted as solutions to obesity (see Hardin and Kwauk, 2015).
Samoa is vulnerable to tropical cyclones, which routinely ruin staple crops and cause food shortages. As noted previously, the Samoans once had a strategy for such events, by fermenting breadfruit (masi ulu) as a reserve food and taro cultivars which were harvested and used only in such circumstances. However, since the 1960s the United Nations agencies and two of Samoa’s main aid donors, the New Zealand and Australian governments, have provided food aid. For instance, in 1965, a cyclone damaged crops around the country, and as part of the aid response food, such as flour, rice, sugar, oil and milk powder was donated (Schoeffel 1979). Another popular food item, which was also donated in this period by the New Zealand government, was milk biscuits (masi susu). Milk biscuits are small blocks made of sugar sweetened and fruit-flavoured milk powder. Food like this was originally offered as an incentive for the people to return to planting more cash crops. Many Samoans think this was a time when people acquired the taste for European (palagi) food. In this period with flour and sugar available, it is likely that pancakes (panikeke) fried in oil became a popular ‘Samoan’ food. In the seven cyclones in the following years, Samoa continued to receive imported food as part of aid. Food aid is obviously helpful, as Samoa today is no longer self-sufficient in food; only about half of the population live in farming households. After the 1965 cyclone, when Samoa was less externally dependant for food, the government encouraged extensive replanting of food and cash crops (Lockwood 1971 cited in Tiffany 2019). However sustained food aid can have the unwanted effect of delaying replanting and giving people an acquired taste for foods with high trans-fat, salt and sugar content. In some cases, although not documented for Samoa, food aid has included food items that are not allowed to be consumed within the donor countries because they are of poor quality or because their consumption dates have expired (WHO 2015).

Findings on the current diets of Samoans

Three different dietary patterns have been identified in contemporary Samoa (Wang et al 2017). First, a modern diet consists of a high intake of imported and processed foods, including pizza, cheeseburgers, margarine, sugary drinks, desserts, snacks, egg products, noodles, nuts, breads and cakes. In addition, there is also a low intake of traditional agricultural products and fish. Second, the mixed-traditional dietary pattern which consisted of a high intake of traditional foods, such as fruits, vegetables, soup, poultry and fish, and imported and processed foods, including dairy products, breads and cakes. The third pattern is called the mixed-modern diet consisting of high intake of imported and processed foods, such as pizza, cheeseburgers, red meat, egg products, noodles, and grains, but also with traditional foods, such as seafood and coconut. The third kind of diet also included a low intake of fish, tea, coffee, soup, and traditional agricultural staples. They concluded that the Samoan people have abandoned their traditional diet and adopted a modern diet mixed with varying amounts of traditional food items (Wang, et al 2017).

Food is a part of daily social exchange among Samoans as in the past, not only in ceremonies but also in daily life. When one Samoan visits another, they take a gift of food, and in the workplace, food accompanies meetings, workshops, and training sessions. Practices have not changed much but the food has, and most of the new foods are conducive to the development of obesity. For example polystyrene caterer’s boxes or plastic trays of food are handed out at ceremonies and workplace occasions usually consist of many foods and are judged more on the variety and quantity of food than the quality. A typical food box will contain portions of mainly imported foods; fried chicken, salted beef, fried fish, macaroni salad, vermicelli, potato salad, rice and taro. In recent years there has been an effort to make food boxes ‘healthy’ by adding an imported orange or apple.

Samoans living overseas seem to be following the same eating habits and food culture as the people living in the islands. For instance, a study by Tanjasiri and his colleagues looking at the physical activity, nutrition, and obesity among Pacific Islander youth and adults in Southern California, found that Samoans were consuming...
a larger daily percent of energy from saturated fat compared to Marshallese (Tanjasiri et. al. 2018). Interestingly, an information paper provided by the Queensland Government in Australia (2015) revealed that Samoan people living in Queensland share the same food and cultural practices as the people living in Samoa. Their meals consisted of a mixture of traditional foods (some imported from Samoa) and processed food and fruits. Farmers in Samoa have benefited from the enduring taste among the Samoan diaspora for taro, which is now a major export crop.

Public health interventions against obesity

There have been multiple interventions aiming to control not only the prevalence of overweight and obesity, but also the risk of obesity to health, but those efforts have produced disappointing results (CDC 2012; Thomas et al. 2010; World Health Organization 2015). No country to date has reversed its obesity epidemic (Christina et al, 2015). Even more importantly, countries are led to believe that the interventions that promoted the adoption of healthy lifestyles alone, such as eating five servings of fruit, vegetables, and low-fat products every day have been shown to be ineffective in reducing rates of obesity (Christina et al 2015). The promotion of regular physical exercises alone has also been shown to be ineffective in reducing weight (World Health Organization, 2014). The lack of progress in curbing obesity has been partly attributed to the fact that prevention programs frame obesity as a problem of individual choice and behaviour rather than as a structural problem arising from mass production and commercial promotion and pricing of foods likely to appeal to human tastes for salt, fat and sugar. Therefore most public health efforts have placed emphasis on primary and secondary prevention interventions (World Health Organization 2013) and there is little research addressing the long-term impact and benefits of such programs (Centres for Diseases Control 2012; World Health Organization 2000). Nestle and Jacobson (2000) point out that these past interventions have failed to consider the social context of individuals and the impact of the social context on dietary behaviour. Building on the work of Nestle & Jacobson (2000), Robinson et al. (2013) concluded that eating practices are usually transmitted socially and therefore efforts which are aimed at curbing the problem of obesity must consider the social norms which drive eating practices in various social contexts.

The World Health Organization (2014) posited that the social and cultural fabric of Samoa and other Pacific island countries would be the appropriate platform for promoting health. This refers to the closely knit community settings within various Pacific Island cultures. Understanding the social context of food choice practices and eating habits, along with how they act as determinants of health, is necessary for developing more socially and culturally focused interventions for reducing the prevalence of obesity among Samoan people (Cockerham 2005; Robinson et al. 2013; Williams 2003). One of the on-going challenges faced by the health promotion unit of the Samoa Ministry of Health is the lack of original research which informs and evaluates the health promotion activities aimed at addressing obesity at the national and community level (Government of Samoa 2019).

Conclusion

Any health promotion measure aiming to curb or reverse the obesity problem in Samoan must consider addressing the structural factors, such as the impacts of globalization and modernization; trade practices; rapid economic growth and development; unplanned urbanization; environmental degradation, and growing economic inequities.

One measure has been tried in Samoa since the 1970s; projects to encourage vegetable gardening at the family, village and school level. Most recently a Chinese aid-sponsored vegetable-growing project has improved local skills. But this needs to be accompanied with cooking demonstrations at secondary schools, produce markets and on television, showing how to prepare vegetable dishes.

Arguments that Samoans should return to traditional agriculture for the sake of their health ignores the reality that according to Samoa’s agricultural censuses of 1989, 1999 and 2009, declining
proportion, less than half the households in Samoa, rely on agriculture for some of their food (see also Hardin and Kwauk 2019: 381)

Another more controversial measure is to increase the taxes on fatty, salty, and sugar-sweetened food to deter consumers from buying these items. The model used to reduce tobacco smoking by increasing taxes and by banning media advertising offers a good example. In Samoa soft drinks and sugar sweetened beverages are being advertised on billboards facing the main streets and there is a barrage on TV of retailers advertising imported snack foods and other processed foods. Perhaps using the same ideas to ban the food industries from conducting widespread advertisement of sugar sweetened beverages and from sponsoring sports activities of all ages.

A much-needed measure is to promote sports and exercise within the communities and at the village level in Samoa. A recent survey by Schuster and Schoeffel (2018) found that Samoa’s urban middle class are the major users of local sports facilities and predominate in various sporting associations. They found that the health and sports subjects in the curriculum are not offered in many rural secondary schools. Also, in rural areas there are few sporting activities for adults; sports activities are mainly rugby for young men and volleyball for youth of both sexes. A few villages offer Zumba-dance-based-exercises for adult women, and one of the national television stations has an hour on air of gym exercises at five o’clock in the evening to encourage people to exercise at home. However this is a time when few rural people would be watching TV, as they would be busy with cooking and cleaning the house. The imbalance between urban and rural access to sports activities and exercise need to be corrected, which is enhanced by the lack of sports facilities such as gyms and playgrounds at the rural setting. The Samoa Ministry of Health had utilised some of the sports celebrities and popular athletes, as “health promotion champions” to appear on billboards and television exercise shows to promote physical activities and healthy diets.

To confront the structural effects of obesity, policy and practice needs to move from being an exclusive concern of the Ministry of Health to become a national goal promoted by communities, churches, government department, business and their leaders. Other areas of potential influence are at the politicians and government officials and church ministers in Samoa. As I noted at the beginning of this article many Samoans in positions of power and influence are obese, so it may appear to many Samoans that power and influence are positively correlated with obesity. Work needs to be done in parliament, the public service to discourage these notions. In theological colleges and Bible schools and to health promotion should be taught as Christian calling. A hopeful sign is that recently, the Government of Samoa and the Ministry of Health have renewed commitment to community development by re-engaging the women’s committees into health promotion and protection activities at the village level, which brought about significant changes in public health in the past.
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Samoan Villages and the MIRAB Model: Four case studies

Tiffany N. Arthur, National University of Samoa

Abstract

In 1965-67 Brian Lockwood documented the socioeconomic circumstances of four Samoan villages (Poutasi, Uafato, Utuali‘i and Taga). In this paper I present the results of studies of those four villages in 2018-2019 that show the trajectory of mainly subsistence to mainly commercial agriculture expected by Lockwood and others in the period following Samoa’s Independence in 1962 has not occurred, and suggest that the processes of change and the similarities between the case study villages may be explained with reference to the MIRAB model first articulated in 1984 by Bertram and Watters. The MIRAB model of development proposes that, the interacting characteristics of small Pacific Island of migration (MI), remittances (R), aid (A) and state generated employment (bureaucracies ‘B’) created a “perfectly sustainable strategy” for most Pacific island countries. My research findings suggest MIRAB model can be applied to an understanding of the trajectory of village development in Samoa since the 1960s. The economies of the four villages studied rely heavily on remittances (R) from their relatives overseas (MI) and the new component of aid (A) in the form of village projects funded directly by donors for development purposes in a particular village in the form of village projects. The village councils, women’s committees, or youth groups usually implement these projects. The bureaucracy (B) component of the MIRAB (which in the literature refers to government employment) can also be understood as the provision of services to villages and rural districts by government agencies (B), such as health and educational facilities, police outposts, access roads, water and electricity supply and other infrastructure.

Introduction

In 1965-1967 Brian Lockwood documented the socioeconomic circumstances of four Samoan villages (Poutasi, Uafato, Utuali‘i and Taga), aiming to test empirically Fisk’s model of transition from subsistence to the production of a market surplus in an economy of ‘primitive affluence’ (1964). The term ‘primitive affluence’ refers to the economic practices of agrarian societies like Samoa in the pre-European contact period. Fisk’s model saw the production of traditional surplus crops for the market as the first step towards commercial agriculture, driven by new demand for goods and services that required cash to buy them. Lockwood’s study confirmed that the first step had been taken in Samoa in the 1960s, with market participation extended beyond food crops to export crops such as coconut, cocoa and bananas. In this paper I present the results of studies of those four villages in 2018-2019 that show the expected trajectory of mainly subsistence to mainly commercial agriculture has not occurred, and suggest that the processes of change and the similarities between the case study villages may be explained with reference to the MIRAB model first articulated in 1984 by Bertram and Watters.

In the 1980s it was assumed that rural development would and should follow the colonial economic model based on export agriculture, as well as the concept of nation-based development. To the contrary, the MIRAB model of development proposes that, the interacting characteristics of small Pacific Islands of migration (MI), remittances (R), aid (A) and state generated employment (bureaucracies ‘B’) created a sustainable strategy for small Pacific island countries (Stahl and Appleyard 2007; Bertram and Poirine 2007; Bertram 2006; Bertram and Watters 1985). The MIRAB model can be considered as having two distinct components: that of aid and that of migration and remittances. The first component depends on the availability of foreign aid, which, in MIRAB economies, supports government operations in various sectors such as health, education, agriculture, law and justice, and basic services. In the MIRAB economic model, government is the largest employer and public sector wages benefit households and the overall economy (Tisdell 2014:3). The second component of the model is migration and the sending of remittances by emigrants from MIRAB economies to their families. However, the benefit of foreign exchange inflows to the economies of small island states is offset by the high dependence on imported goods made possible by increased spending power in the population (Tisdell 2014:3).
My research findings suggest MIRAB model can be applied to an understanding of the trajectory of village development in Samoa since the 1960s. The economies of the four villages studied rely heavily on remittances (R) from their relatives overseas (MI) and the new component of aid (A) in the form of village projects funded directly by donors for development purposes in a particular village in the form of village projects. The village councils, women’s committees, or youth groups usually implement these projects. The bureaucracy (B) component of the MIRAB (which in the literature refers to government employment) can also be understood as the provision of services to villages and rural districts by government agencies (B), such as health and educational facilities, police outposts, access roads, water and electricity supply and other infrastructure.

Methodology

I locate myself here to explain the context of my learning and research. I am an Afro-Caribbean woman from Guyana and a CARPIMS (Caribbean-Pacific Islands Mobility Scheme) scholarship recipient who arrived in Samoa in February 2017 to undertake study at the National University of Samoa (NUS). I was interested to learn how aid has influenced village development in Samoa, and so I used Brian Lockwood’s four case study villages, described in ‘Samoan Village Economy,’ a book based on his observations over 50 years ago, in the first decade of Samoa’s independence, when migration still had a relatively insignificant impact on village life. These villages were Poutasi, Uafato, Utuali’i and Taga (figure 1). I was unable, due to lack of time and resources to duplicate Lockwood’s detailed study but was able to use his data to compare changes in population and economic practices.

Figure 1: The four case study villages

Source: Centre for Samoan Studies GIS database

My research was funded by the NUS research fund (UREC), and used a mixed-method approach with literature review and field-based data collection using questionnaires and interviews. Samoan research assistants helped me with context and language in each village.
Profile of Samoa

Samoa is a Pacific island nation made up of eight islands but the two bigger islands of Upolu and Savai’i hold over 90% of the population. Samoa, (formerly called Western Samoa) has a population of approximately 196,440 people (ADB 2017) on a land area of 2,830 sq. km (1,093 sq. miles). The population are mainly indigenous Polynesians. Samoa has the reputation of being one of the most traditional and conservative cultures in Polynesia (Connell 1987).

The country has a nominal GDP of $844 million. Samoa’s GDP is expected to grow by 2.0% in 2019 and 3.0% in 2020 (ADB 2015). Traditionally Samoa's economy has been dependent on fishing and agriculture and, since the 1970s, on development aid from donor countries, bilateral donors and international development organisations and tourism. Agriculture, including fisheries, furnishes 90% of exports such as, fish, coconut oil, nonu products, and taro. The manufacturing sector chiefly processes agricultural products. The manufacturing industry accounts for nearly about 22% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) but employs fewer than 6% of the labour force. The service sector accounts for just about around two thirds of the GDP and employs approximately 50% of the workforce. Tourism was an expanding sector accounting for 25% of GDP in 2019. Samoa shares with its Pacific island neighbours a vulnerability to natural disasters and other economic shocks, as well as challenges of social transformation (USAID 2016). In the latest Human Development Index Samoa is ranked at the low end of ‘high human development’ with an overall ranking of 111 out of 164 countries (UNDP 2019 (a)).

After Samoa gained independence in 1962, Samoa’s constitution formalised three main categories of land. These are customary land, freehold land, and public land. Customary land in Samoa cannot be sold or mortgaged in accordance to article 101 (2) of Samoa’s constitution (Schmidt 1994: 172). About 80% of the total land area of Samoa is under customary tenure, and most village land is under customary tenure.

Samoa has 11 traditional districts (Itumalo) which date back at least to the 18th century and longer, according to Samoan traditions. These are now divided into 19 main districts, 89 sub-districts, Villages (nu’u) are not just settlements but comprise territories, typically from the interior mountain ridge to the outer reef in the sea. There are 286 villages governed under Samoan customs and traditions by a village council of chiefs (Schoeffel and Taua’a 2019). Society is based on the ‘āiga’ which is a large extended family group with a matai (chief) at its head. Villages comprise several families each with their matai who represents them in the Fono. The fono has judicial and executive authority under the Village Fono Act 1990 as long as these do not contravene national laws of the Constitution of Samoa (Meleisea 1987). Each fono elects one of its members (sui o le nu’u) to liaise between the fono and the government. The fono has a significant impact on village life, regulating operations, mediating disputes and enforcing resource utilisation.

The traditional Samoan village is made up of two conceptual entities ‘the village of men’ and the ‘village of women.’ This division reflects the gender division of labour on which almost all traditional institutions are based. The criteria for membership in village groups are age, marital status, political status and whether one is born in the village or married into it. The system accounts for everyone and imposes a number of different expectations on all members of the village (UNICEF 2006: 9). Other village groups are the Women’s Committee, the Untitled Men’s Group and Christian Youth Group.
Changes and Continuities since Lockwood’s findings in the 1960s

When I commenced this research I expected to find significant changes in the population and economies of the four case study villages as described over 50 years ago. To my surprise, I found little change in many aspects, although there were major increases and improvements in the provision of government services, schools, sealed roads, water supply, electricity and telecommunications. All these have contributed to the well-being of village families but less significantly to the village economies. Lockwood appeared to assume that the direction of economic change would be towards market participation that would extend beyond subsistence farming to export crops such as coconut, cocoa and bananas, in the end, increasing cash income and fostering social and economic development. Therefore villages that were most advantageously located in relation to markets such as Utuali’i would have greater engagement than remote villages such as Uafato. However, he found little evidence to support this assumption. Lockwood concluded his study by saying:

Samoans are generally content with the life they lead. They have little interest in the outside world which intrudes on them in the form of the market sector. They likewise have little evident concern for the future, little interest in productive investment, little willingness to develop.

However, he appears to have contradicted himself when he discussed villagers’ responses to opportunities:

... they are willing to take on new cash crop as these become available and to earn money from other sources such as wage employment when opportunities were presented. All ‘āiga had invested labour in establishing sources of cash income in their villages, such as their coconut, cacao and banana small holdings. Some had attempted to increase their cash income further by investing labour and money in such capital items ... for the same reason, most had invested money in their children’s schooling, and some also in sending individuals to New Zealand (Lockwood 1971:1897).

In each village surveyed for this research it was evident that families do have concerns for their lives and futures. They depend on multiple livelihood strategies by investing in their children’s education, and in some cases operating a small shop or other businesses. Some work overseas to provide for their families, and most manage their plantations and cattle farms, sell agricultural produce, carve and weave mats for sale in the market or have paid work. Lockwood found that education was seen as the way out of village life and to help the family in the village. This is still true. However, the access of these villages to the local market or export markets has little to do with their level of cash income. In the 1960s there was little difference between the crops grown in villages that were produced for subsistence and sale. This finding is still valid: there is very little to distinguish the villages from each other in respect to production for subsistence and sale.

Land

Lockwood found that Poutasi and Taga villages were the best well-endowed with land and in these villages, land is still not yet a limiting factor on village agricultural output. However, Uafato is being pressured to conserve its land as a conservation area, and Utuali’i lost much of its land in the 19th century. Lockwood thought that both subsistence food and cash crops could be expanded or intensified either by clearing forest or by using land already cleared more intensively (Lockwood 1971:188). There was a taro boom in Samoa about 20 years ago, when the number of overseas Samoans and other Pacific Islanders created an export market for taro (O’Meara 1995, Macpherson and Macpherson, 2009). Village families and urban businessmen with matai titles invested in chainsaws to carve out big taro plantations from the forest, but this ended due to taro blight, and although new disease resistant varieties are now planted and exported, the market for the preferred variety was captured by Fiji and did not recover its former strength. In Poutasi and Taga there is a
trend for matai to fence off former plantation land for cattle. Meleisea (personal communication, 7 September 2019) thinks this has more to do with matai claiming sections of customary land as family property than a big increase in cattle farming.

**Markets**

In 1965 the four villages varied considerably in the strength of linkage with the market sector (Lockwood 1971:201). In the 1960s, Utuāli‘i village ranked first in access to the market followed by Poutasi, Taga and Uafato respectively. His ranking could still be applied, although in all of the villages, transportation has increased in numbers and types as families have invested in cars, van and utility trucks. Due to the terrain of the Uafato village route, no public buses are available to traverse to and from the village, however Uafato now has a newly built sealed road and the people no longer travel by sea.

In the 1960s Poutasi village had the best retail marketing facilities of the four villages Lockwood studied. In 1953 a Poutasi taule’ale’a (untitled man) returned from working in New Zealand and opened a small but well-stocked store and in 1959 a large trade store was built by a Chinese trader, Lee Hang. His store attracted a large share of the copra output of Poutasi and considerable quantities from the neighboring villages by offering a variety of goods for sale at prices similar to those in Apia. In 1964-1965 another taule’ale’a and a matai each built a small shop (Lockwood 1971:139). In 2019 these two stores were gone but another locally owned store opened about 18 years ago and is now leased to a Chinese businessman. The store has expanded its range of goods and attracts customers from the whole district of Falealili.

Utuāli‘i village had the best market access because of the ease and cheapness to travel to Apia. The village is close to the London Missionary Society’s headquarters at Malua, and commercial plantations and lay on the only major road in Samoa at that time. That road now connects to the international airport and the inter-island ferry port. Utuāli‘i village now has the best retail marketing facilities with a branch of one of the major local supermarkets (Frankie supermarket), a total of nine shops and a Vailima beer outlet. Utuāli‘i also has the cheapest and most convenient access to a market supply of subsistence foods. Taga village has a total of six small shops and Uafato village has the least marketing facilities with only two small shops offering a limited variety of food items.

**Production**

Lockwood commented that ‘to raise the subsistence output levels in all four of the villages it requires not only additional land in production but, also additional labour’ (1971:191) which suggests that even in the 1960s there were not enough young men interested in commercial farming. He found that the village access to the market has nothing to do with the level of cash income in the villages. This is still true; the agricultural output levels from these villages remain low. Because agricultural work is tedious and the financial returns are low, the youth from the villages try to escape the hardship of agricultural work and search for jobs that pay wages. Copra was the only cash commodity produced in the villages during the time of Lockwood’s study and is no longer economical to produce. Coconuts have declined in importance since 1965 but there is now a rising demand for coconuts in Samoa after many years of decline, due to markets for green drinking nuts and ripe coconuts for manufacturing coconut cream, oil and other products. The government of Samoa is encouraging replanting. Yet so far there have been no significant efforts in the villages to replant their aged coconut palms (Schoeffel & Meleisea-Ainuu, 2016: 15).
Lockwood tried to assess the opportunity cost by recording the labour time-cost of harvesting which varied in the villages. It took 1.9 hours in Poutasi to gather 100 coconuts, 2.3 hours in Utuali’i and 2.3 hours in Taga and Uafato. However, Lockwood did not describe the number of people required to collect 100 coconuts in that time, or the time to carry them to the point of processing or sale. Lockwood’s conclusion was that ‘there is a decided lack of interest in earning money through village agriculture, and yet there were very few other opportunities’ (1971:206), this is still valid. Generally, the villagers found that they could maintain the level of living they wanted with multiple strategies, casual labour, wage employment, some market sales, and growing subsistence staples.

In 1965-1967 Uafato and Taga villages had the same level of subsistence food production with limited substitution in favour of market goods (e.g. rice for taro), and in Poutasi where there was more substitution, subsistence output has declined only slightly. Utuali’i village purchased most of its staple food, and there was minor dependence on subsistence production (Lockwood 1971:193). The finding is still valid with the exception of Poutasi village where there was less substitution of traditional staple food for rice. At the time of my survey that village was facing a particularly steep decline in the production of taro, likely because many young men were working overseas as seasonal workers. Lockwood (1971:189) found that substitution (for example taro for rice) in the villages was directly related to the strength of the linkage to the market sector. Uafato had the weakest linkage to the market and the least substitution. Poutasi had the strongest linkage and the most substitution. Uafato and Taga had the same level of staple food production and rarely consumed flour, rice and bread as substitutes. All four villages approximately conformed to national data on agricultural production which shows significantly increased subsistence production, which is not what Lockwood’s modernisation model predicted:

Table 1: National data on agricultural activity in households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Agriculture</th>
<th>1989 (%)</th>
<th>1999 (%)</th>
<th>2009 (%)</th>
<th>2015 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly for home consumption</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly for sale</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Population and housing

There was little change in population 1960-2019 (Figure 1) except in Taga village on Savaii, followed by Utualii which has increasingly urban characteristics in terms of wage employment. Poutasi has had a slight increase and Uafato a slight decrease. The increased population in Taga may reflect the considerable effort made by government to provide modern services to Savaii, and remove disparity with Upolu. It seems likely that people who remain living in a village may do so partly by preference or by lack of alternatives, but also by obligation to safeguard the assets of the extended family, care for their elders, support their church and keep their relatives overseas connected to their home village.
The main coastal road, the busiest in Samoa ran through the Utuali'i malae. This village was different from Poutasi, Uafato and Taga because of the houses and larger fales faced the road from the other side, and there were more non-traditional (fale palagi) than traditional dwellings (fale Samoa) (Lockwood 1971:157). The difference now is that Utuali’i, Poutasi and Taga village have adopted the same housing patterns, with houses built in rows facing the main road on each side. In Uafato however, the dwellings are found on the right side of the road, almost immediately in front of the sea. Additionally, in all of the case study villages, there has been further substitution of fale palagi for fale Samoa than during Lockwood’s time of study in the 1960s. This clearly shows a trend towards privacy and modernity. Utuali’i villages has more non-traditional houses than the other three case study villages because of the village has long had relatively easier access to supplies of non-traditional building materials than the other villages.

**Investment**

The minor changes in investment is related to the population sizes of the villages, of which none have increased significantly since the time of Lockwood’s study in the 1960s. Lockwood concluded, comparing the four villages he studied, that Poutasi was the best endowed of the four villages in terms of its natural resources, and that ‘there was more investment of productive capital ... such as tools and equipment, fishing gear, canoes, fencing and a road into the plantation’ (1971:132). He described other investments of labour in fencing and rock walls, access roads and cleared land (1971:135). Also that Poutasi had strong traditional leadership which encouraged the level of subsistence and the market output, as well as investment in the Congregational and Roman Catholic church building and houses for their clergy. This finding is still valid, and the availability of government services in the village has been improved such as the new district hospital, police station, district college, and the district office of the Department of Agriculture. The village is also well known because of the Poutasi Development Trust, a non-government organisation under the leadership of a single chief/businessman of the village, but some of my sources said the village council leadership was weak.
Where investment has been really significant is in the building of houses and churches. In the 1960s migration was just beginning to gain momentum and already people were remitting money home regularly and returning to invest savings in a ‘āiga store, bus or European-style home (Lockwood 1971:209). In the 1960s Uafato and Taga there was only one dwelling built with imported or modern material. The opening of the road in Taga in the 1960s led to the purchasing of building materials, so that saw the building of many homes with purchased materials. In Poutasi the opening of its new road brought the construction of houses with more purchased materials but, this practice was restrained as in the past the fono attempted to preserve the traditional housing style by forbidding the construction of fale palagi. Two high chief’s dwellings, the pastor’s house and the school buildings were exempted from this rule. As for Utuali’i village, non-traditional dwellings were more common (Lockwood 1971:186).

*Fa’aSamoan*

Lockwood concluded that the overriding ambitions of Samoan youth were based on the available models in village life; to enjoy the prestige and status of the elite in Samoan society, to become matai or Pastors. This is still the case, although to be a pastor is more prestigious than to be a matai of any rank. Another major ambition was to move to New Zealand or to be a seasonal worker there.

Economic change has increased *fa‘asamoan* practices rather than decreasing them, as implicit in notions of modernisation. According to Meleisea (personal communication, 5 September 2019) the greater access to cash from remittances has increased the expenditure on *fa‘alavelave* ceremonies since the 1960s, especially funerals. In the past funerals were held on the day or the day after a person passed away, so the money and gifts needed depended on what could be amassed in a short time. Now, with overseas families, funerals last two weeks or more because there are funeral parlours to hold the deceased person until the overseas family comes to Samoa. In the intervals, money can be amassed from many sources. Funerals often cost between SAT$ 50,000 to 100,000 or more in the case of pastors and high chiefs.

*The churches*

Lockwood’s study found the villages invested a lot in their church buildings, and for the support of their pastors and the national churches, especially Poutasi village, even when they had less access to cash than people have today. The Christian Congregational Church of Samoa (formerly the London Missionary Society) was the biggest church in each village in the 1960s and still is, but since then other denominations have been able to find their way in the villages as well. Then as now the villages provide the pastor and his family with food, money, farming land and services including housing, furniture, other handicrafts and domestic help. In my own observations, Utuali’i had invested more in the church buildings, having just built a new pastor’s house, followed by Poutasi village then by Taga and Uafato. Decline in membership of the CCCS since the 1960s occurred in all four villages following national trends, with defections to the Latter Day Saints (Mormon), Assemblies of God, and in one case, to the Seventh Day Adventists. In each village the church is the centre of the community, not only for worship but for meetings, choir practice, fund raising and youth activities. The established churches have been critiqued by those suggesting that the major financial and other material demands of the churches are contributing to poverty in Samoa (Macpherson 2011:137; Maiava 2016; MNRE 2017:11). The general view of most Samoans, however, is that devotion to the church leads to blessings of success and prosperity.

Democracy, culture and Christian values have integrated well in a manner that is acceptable to the local community. Government leaders are often church leaders as well, which therefore reinforces the mutually beneficial relationship. Church buildings and pastor’s houses are among the costliest ones in the village communities. Church financial and other material demands on church
members who are already experiencing economic difficulties may explain the reasons for the decline in the membership of mainstream churches. Monetary offerings collected by the biggest denominations range from SAT$ 5-8 million per annum. These offerings are drawn even from many families who live just above the poverty line.

**Remittances**

There is evidence that remittances feed back into social and church obligations. Brown and Ahlburg (1999) found that 63% of Samoan households used remittance income for ‘social uses,’ with 41% typically directed to support churches (Ahlburg and Brown 1999:334). Macpherson and Macpherson (2011:307) pointed out that ‘cash contributed to churches effectively limits the capacity of individuals, families, and village groups to save or to acquire assets that could be used as collateral for commercial loans to establish and operate commercial ventures.’ The social expectation to donate to church can impose a heavy burden on families. Financial contributions are often more than 30% of family income, leaving families with not enough money to pay for basic needs. Failing to contribute can result in public shame and embarrassment. The 2006 UN Development Report (United Nations 2006) noted that households failing to meet material expectations could be punished by village councils in ways that were harsh and financially expensive.

**Climate change and natural disasters**

Lockwood’s study was conducted around the time when Samoa was hit by a major cyclone in 1965. Approximately 70% of Samoa’s population and infrastructure are located in low-lying coastal areas. Projected sea level rise could exacerbate coastal erosion, loss of land and property and dislocation of the island inhabitants. Since then tropical cyclones Ofa (1990) and Val (1991) have caused damage to homes and crops with costs estimates of approximately four times the gross domestic product (GDP) of Samoa (UNDP 2019 (b)). The country is not only vulnerable to devastating storms but to other extreme climate events, for example, prolonged drought periods and coral bleaching stimulated by extremely low tides (SPREP 2013: 11). The impacts and devastation caused by the 1990 and 1991 tropical cyclones wiped out the cocoa industry in many communities/villages, with damage to the economy of Samoa at an estimated value of USD35 million (12% of GDP).

On 29 September 2009, a tsunami swept over the nation’s southern coastal region of Upolu, killing 143 people, destroying infrastructure and devastating the nation’s vital tourism industry. Losses were estimated at US$106 million, equal to 17% of annual gross domestic product (GDP). It was the worst natural disaster to hit Samoa since Independence (ADB 2011:4).

Another disaster in the early 1990s was the taro blight outbreak, a fungal disease that severely damaged the production of the country’s main staple food, also a key export product. While Samoa coped by substituting less vulnerable varieties, resulting production reduced household incomes and failed to achieve the same level of international competitiveness. The taro blight also resulted in a shift to consumption of more imported foodstuffs (primarily to rice as a staple) as it discouraged some farmers from commercial production, making poorer families more susceptible to rapid increases in imported food and fuel prices (Samoa School Fee Relief Scheme Background Analysis 2009:11).

**The MIRAB model in village economies**

The MIRAB model proposed by Bertram and Watters (1985), with some adaption concerning the role of government and aid, explains the socioeconomics of the four case study villages of this research. These village economies have maintained relative prosperity and improvements in living standards, without significant increases in agricultural productivity. This is because of their dependency on
migration (MI) and remittances (R), direct village level aid to fund projects (A), and bureaucracy (B) (redefined as government services) for their livelihoods.

**Migration (MI)**

A 50-year pattern of exodus from village to urban or overseas labour markets is demonstrated in each case study village where the population has not grown significantly (Table 1) in relation to their unchanged youthful population structures reflecting overall fertility rates, in the period from the 1960 to 2016. The average value for Samoa during that period was 5.61 births per woman with a minimum of 3.93 births per woman in 2017 and a maximum of 7.65 births per woman in 1960. In the 33 households surveyed in each village, all had close family members living abroad (Poutasi 117, Uafato 117; Taga 134 and Utuali’i 134). In Utuali’i the increase in population can be attributed to the village’s proximity to the employment opportunities in the urban and peri-urban areas.

The pattern confirms O’Meara’s (1990) conclusion that village-based Samoans find wage labour and other sources of cash income more rewarding than investing their time in commercial smallholder agriculture and that many aspire to migrate to find paid work. According to the International Labour Organisation (ILO) the Government of Samoa has recognised the reality and opportunity presented by increasingly global markets for labour, and is developing labour migration policies to ensure that labour migration is managed in the best interests of Samoa’s people and economy (ILO 2015). After more than a century of Western influence, most Samoans today, whether rural or urban, subsistent or commercial, see their horizons for living as including the wider environments of New Zealand, Australia and the United States. Migration has its roots in Samoans’ perception of the good life and is motivated by the desire for money and the potential increase in social status conferred by having money. This is a rational goal when there are other opportunities more rewarding that the uncertainties of village agriculture in Apia and overseas (MNRE 2017:54).

Given the white-collar orientation of the school system, young people go into subsistence production mostly as a last resort’ (Muagututi’a 2006:48).

The situation of the four villages demonstrate the far reaching impacts on Samoa’s village economies of outward migration since the late 1960s. Circular short term migration which involves the migration of young single men for work as well as permanent migration when whole families take up residence in a different country have all proven to economically benefit the home country and can continue to do so as long as migrants transmit a sufficiently large flow of remittances. The massive migration of Samoans since the 1970s has been accompanied by a correspondingly large flow of remittances which over the years, has accelerated, making labour the most important export (Ahlburg 1991:2).

These villages illustrate how labour movement from Samoa to advanced economies such as that of New Zealand and Australia has become part of the country’s economic norm (Moustafa and Dwyer 2012:161). As I have observed during my time in Samoa, extended family events such as funerals, titles conferring ceremonies and weddings involve not only those living in Samoa, but depend on a Samoan diaspora which exceeds the population of around 200,000 living in Samoa.

The introduction of the seasonal labour scheme in Samoa has created a new avenue for the generation of income in the village communities. In each of the case study village the men of the village have benefitted. Of the four villages, Poutasi village had the largest number (200) of seasonal workers mainly because it is located at the centre of a district recruitment program under the Poutasi Development Trust. In the other villages only a handful of villagers have had the opportunity because there is no recruiter in the village districts. Overall, Samoa is currently ranked second in the region, in terms of overall numbers, after Vanuatu. The total number of Samoans finding seasonal employment
in New Zealand, (mainly agricultural harvesting work) in the fiscal year 2018/2019 was 2,473 (NZI 2020).

Remittances (R)

In the four case study villages all of the households received remittances some monthly and others occasionally from abroad. However, the most frequent interval was on a monthly basis. The case studies illustrate how remittances form an important part of village families' incomes and are also an important part of Samoa’s GDP (20%) and a vital source of foreign exchange (Choong et al. 2011; Gibson and Mackenzie 2007).

The big question is, what is it that ensures the sustainability of high levels of remittances in Samoa village economies? The MIRAB model lacks a significant cultural explanation of the factors that influence the migration, remittance and the maintenance of social network among Samoans (Niko, 1993:8). In my observation, remittance behaviour in village economies can be understood in relation to the importance Samoan families living abroad attaches to their identity as Samoans. Referred to as fa’asinomaga it attaches their identity to place or places, their ancestral villages, and the rights they have there if they were to return, which is maintained and validated by remittances. As a cultural principle Samoans view interpersonal relationships as o le va fealoa’i – meaning a communication relation or space between two or more people as a protocol of respect when engaging in a conversation with one another as between parents and children, matal and non-matal, a pastor and his congregation, a brother and a sister, a person and his or her in-laws (Niko 1993:8). Samoan culture values unity and a holistic view of life in terms of service. From birth Samoans are taught that their obligations are to the family, the village and God. Samoans living overseas maintain very strong ties with their families, villages and churches, even among second generation migrants. This strong attachment of overseas Samoans to their extended families and continuing flow of new migrants have ensured the reliable continuity of remittances during past crises.

As the four village case studies illustrate, the sending of remittances is not only through the overt formal money orders, and tele transfers but, also in kind such as the shipment of food, clothing, and home appliances, as well as cash gifts carried by family visiting from overseas, which often go unreported. Remittances are more stable than exports of goods and services. The counter-cyclical nature of remittances was seen vis-a-vis the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) of 2008, and the 2009 Tsunami.

‘During the GFC there was a sustained nominal level of remittances – US 135 million and US 132 million in 2008 and 2009 respectively. Furthermore, after the 2009 Tsunami, data suggests a spike in remittance levels both in nominal terms as well as in % of GDP. The counter-cyclical nature of remittance flows is particularly helpful to Samoa given its vulnerability to large external shocks (including natural disasters)’ (GOS 2016:4).

What the government of Samoa has done to ensure the continuity of remittances is to lessen unemployment in the country by encouraging the seasonal workers schemes to New Zealand and Australia (Connell 2015:122; Moustafa et al, 2012:35 & Gibson et. al. 2011:114-116). The schemes have enabled many low-skilled Samoan workers to earn money overseas and to bring their savings home to their village families. In Poutasi village for example, these savings were usually used for housebuilding, businesses (brickmaking, cattle farm) and other expenses for families. Despite these evident benefits of remittances in the economy, there have been critical comments on the effects of remittances on Samoa’s economy. One is that reliance on remittances creates dependence that hinders the expansion of the local economy (Lee, 2009:20). It has also been argued that the labour force at home is reduced both in terms of skilled and unskilled workers and can stand in the way of progress for key sectors such as tourism and agriculture (Moustafa et al, 2012:34-35). In the village economies it has led to a labour shortages for commercial agriculture.
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Aid - for village projects

While, as I have noted previously with reference to Bertram and Watters original configuration of the MIRAB model, the ‘A’ stood for aid given by bilateral and multi-lateral donors to prop up the government as the major employer and service provider. In the village context aid is also valued and hoped for to fund village projects. All the four villages had externally funded projects that were distinct from government services, and included bee-keeping, vegetable production, and environmental conservation activities. Some of them did not appear to be very successful, and some were said to have failed. Although having an aid project in the village is prestigious, the design of these kinds of projects is usually to provide village-wide benefits, and they do not always meet local expectations that a project should provide money directly for village families. Villages retain many of their cooperative characteristics as described by Lockwood and others in the 1960s and 70s, but Schoeffel (personal communication, October 14, 2019) notes that voluntary contributions of time and effort, other than for the churches, are more likely expected to be remunerated nowadays, compared to the village service ethics she observed in the 1970s.

Village projects also tend to reflect the donor priorities of the day rather than desires of villager for cash income. A major focus of aid at present is for climate change resilience. The villages of Poutasi, Uafato, Utuali’i and Taga have all received funds for various environmental goals, because they have all faced damages such as coastal erosion and damage to homes, plantations and to roads, as a result of cyclones which hit Samoa over the years. Given the urgency for adaptation in small island states, there has been an increase in ad-hoc stand-alone environmental projects. The South Pacific Environment Programme (SPREP) points out that these measures have been used rather than a programmed or strategic approach to the funding of adaptation options and measures. SPREP argues that successful adaptation in small islands will depend on supportive institutions, finance, information and technological support. A donor consensus is needed for an climate adaptation strategy for the Pacific islands and should include a strategy for precautionary adaptation since it is difficult to predict far in advance how climate change will affect a particular site, sector or community. This would more than likely lead to better management of natural resources and sustainable development (SPREP 2006:4).

Uafato village has a number of environmentally focused projects such as the forest conservation project, honey bee project, community agro forestry and ecological restoration nursery, sea wall construction and flood prevention project. The honey bee project ended because of the lack of cooperation between the village members and suspicions of its management. Two of the projects (community agro forestry and ecological restoration nursery; flood prevention project) were still ongoing during my time of data collection. If the resources allocated for these projects are utilised as stipulated by the donors the projects, they are likely to be successful. The community agro forestry and ecological restoration nursery project sustainability will rely on good management and transparency in the use of funds towards the village development.

The same environmental focus can be found in Taga village benefits from the forest conservation project and to ensure this project is being sustained collaboration with the village authorities, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment and the Forests have been developed. Past project includes a water conservation project and a water tank project. Utuali’i village has benefited from an emergency shelter to be used in the event of severe cyclones.

In Poutasi village the women’s committee is completing a project to protect its river, after damage by the tsunami. But most projects, including its environmental tree-planting activities, have...
been mainly initiated by a businessman who holds a high chiefly title in the village and lives there. He operates the Poutasi Development Trust and its projects include a vegetable garden project, arts and craft center, ukulele workshop and the community center hall. All of these projects aim to generate income and employ people residing in the village. The sustainability on these projects is a question, however as they are dependent on one leader, and other leaders of the village say they are not aware of the actual costs, income and expenditure of these projects.

**Bureaucracy (B)**

As I have noted previously, the B for bureaucracy originally, in Bertram and Watter’s formulation, referred to employment creation by government. Around 70% of Samoa’s domestic economic activity occurs directly or indirectly in the Apia urban area which has only 40% of the nation’s population. In my reformulation of the ‘B’ I point to the fact that the Government of Samoa delivers services to the entire population. Samoa provides decentralised district level access to 13 years of education as well as district level health, agriculture, and police services, although progress is needed in addressing the differences in the quality of, and access to, healthcare between urban and rural areas (DFAT 2020:23). As far as I have been able to find out, in no other Pacific Island state does every village have sealed roads, electricity, piped water, telecommunications and access to a full range of government services for health, education, law and justice, as is the case in Samoa.

Poutasi village is the best served of the four villages being the headquarters of its district, with government services in the form of an agriculture extension station, the district hospital, a police outpost, electricity, sealed roads, and the district secondary education college, as well as water supply and electricity. Taga village benefits from electricity supply, water supply, and sealed roads within its boundaries. Health care is accessed from either the district Faleolo hospital, or the Sataua hospital. Uafato is the least developed in terms of services because it is in a historically disadvantaged location, but it has an independent water supply system, electricity, and recently benefitted from a sealed road. Utuali’i has water supply, electricity, a new inland access road and other services easily accessible in the district or in town.

Samoa is often praised for its progress and good development indicators, but this is at least partly because of its advantageous geography, with virtually the whole population on two main islands linked by ferry services. There is an absence of remote outer islands, and a concentration of population on two of the adjacent islands, its village services are also encouraged by an electoral system that favours village voters (Fiti-Sinclair et.al. 2017). If rural Samoa is looked at from a modernisation perspective it presents a picture of state subsidisation and a consumer economy as indicated by modern houses and cars, yet at village level its economy remains predominantly ‘traditional’.

**Sustainable livelihoods and the MIRAB model**

A comparative analysis of the social-economies to the four-case study village (Poutasi, Taga, Uafato and Utuali’i presents a picture whereby in each village migration (MI), remittances (R), direct village project aid (A) and bureaucracy redefined as government services, are the backbone of socioeconomic development in the villages. Underlying these characteristics is the villagers’ minimal reliance on commercial agriculture and in three cases, their focus on production that gives daily or weekly cash in hand by small market trading as well as supplying their staple foods.

My comparison of village socioeconomics confirms the heuristic value of MIRAB model. It initially stemmed from discussions of the problems of agricultural production and development in small Pacific Island economies (Hardaker, Fleming, and Harris 1984; Watters 1985). The MIRAB model rests on the notion that very small island states do not conform to standard modernisation theories about development, such as moving from an agricultural to an industrial economy. Tisdell (2014)
endorsed the model as the most relevant to island states such as Cook Island, Samoa and Tonga. According to Bertram 1999:107;

Conventional emphasis on the gross domestic product as the key economic growth indicator is based on the modernisation view that expenditure can only be sustained based on local (geographically bounded) output. The MIRAB model suggests that on the contrary, external sources of financing that do not leave a residue of debt-current account transfer are the key to the economic performance of small islands.

The most sustainable form of livelihood in the villages has been the traditional village subsistence agriculture and fisheries. It does not produce the foreign exchange necessary to support villagers in Samoa’s modern cash-based economy but in three of the four villages, Poutasi, Taga and Uafato and to a more limited extent in Utuali’i, it provides a degree of basic food security.

Samoa relies on foreign aid to partially fund the service provisions and development operations of the government thereby creating employment for public servants, who also benefit indirectly from the aid by supporting their family and relatives, building houses and buying goods. Emigrants from MIRAB economies send remittances to families which, as Tisdell (2014:3) explained: ‘Spending those remittances has a local multiplier effect on incomes and employment but this is damped by a high import leakage’ because in MIRAB economies there is a small – or no – manufacturing sector, most goods, including food, are imported.

The Food and Agriculture organisation (2020) defined sustainable livelihood as;

A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base.

Samoa has a complex relationship with the world economy. In some ways, global links strengthen Samoa’s economy. Greater integration into high-income countries’ labour markets through permanent settlement and seasonal migration provides some access to higher-paid work opportunities. Migration can be seen as a risk-management strategy, with some households diversifying the locations of family members overseas. However, links to the world economy can also bring economic vulnerability. The 2008–09 global economic downturn compounded domestic economic volatility, contributing to a contraction of 5% in the fiscal year 2008–09, the worst economic decline in two decades (World Bank 2010). The resulting projected budget deficit—equivalent to approximately 10% in the fiscal year 2009–10—could threaten the provision of essential social services. The combination of large government expenditures and a depreciating currency has contributed to high inflationary pressures, 6.1% in 2009 (Akhtar et.al. 2010: 69).

Conclusion
A substantial literature now exists discussing the pros and cons of the MIRAB model (Connell 2003; Bertram and Watters 1986 (a); Hau’ofa 1993; Bertram 2006; McElroy and Oberst 2007; Poirine 1998; Finau 1994; Mines 1981; Fraenkel 2006; Mac-Master 1993; Duncan 1994; Browne 1995) and the question of whether MIRAB economies are sustainable over time. Despite various critiques of the model it continues to be applied and developed to take into account changes within Pacific economies and the importance of social relationships and personal agency (e.g. Bertram 2006; Evans 1999, 2001; Fraenkel 2006; Stahl and Appleyard 2007).

Samoa’s increased external dependency on remittances, imported food, fuel and other goods does not present a picture of a sustainable economy. Sustainability in the context of Samoa is mainly discussed in terms of consideration of the natural environment: external economic dependence is seen as strength more than a weakness (ADB 2015). Lockwood concluded that village-based Samoans
have no interest in economic development, but his analysis was flawed. Bertram and Watters model of the Pacific Island Mirabar economy (1999) offers the best insights on why socio-economic changes has occurred in the four Samoan villages over 40 years since Lockwood’s study.

Samoan has a small, open economy driven by agriculture, fisheries, tourism, remittances and, increasingly, the service sector. Subsistence agriculture and fishing are integral to Samoan livelihoods. Overall economic activity is concentrated in urban areas. In 2001 the Asian Development Bank (ADB) estimated that 70% of Samoa’s domestic economic activity took place in the Apia urban area (ADB 2011). Samoa also faces substantial structural economic challenges, unemployment, limited markets for agricultural production, limited land cultivation due to lack of young men to work the land and continued land disputes (DFAT 2012:13).

Overall constraints to a less dependent economic development mode include a narrow natural resource base, limited infrastructure in rural areas, small domestic markets, isolation from international markets and a heavy dependence on fuel imports. Its geographical remoteness from its main markets contributes to high transportation costs and few producers achieve the economies of scale necessary to compete in foreign markets. Distance from foreign markets also increases the cost of imported goods, contributing to a weak industrial base. Additionally, the overexploitation of natural resources, including forestry and fisheries, is threatening sustainable management and growth of these key sectors.

In conclusion, the modernisation perspective on development that informed Lockwood’s work has proved insufficient to explain the trajectory of Samoa’s village development. It was a perspective that envisaged village becoming economically viable and largely self-sufficient entities linked to export markets for tropical products. A deterrent to commercial agriculture, in addition to crop disease, climate events, and low prices has been fluctuations in the prices of traditional produce which can reduce cash flow dramatically. Aside from migration overseas the population is increasingly concentrated in North West Upolu close to areas of economic growth, commerce, communication, construction and transport — that are concentrated in there. My case studies show that households in rural Samoa face barriers to developing sustainable livelihoods using their own resources of land and labour. Although formal employment opportunities are very limited, households get by on a mixture of activities to provide food and cash. However, a final consideration is that the fish and crops that sustained Samoans historically before contact with the capitalist world are still produced in Samoa’s villages and, in the event of some global event which dislocated its present globalised character, would allow rural villages to sustain themselves.
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Tautuaileva:
A Samoan Hermeneutic to explore Egalitarianism in the Bible

Vaitusi Nofoaiga, Malua Theological College

Abstract

The continuous changing of cultures and of the ways people think about the world brought about a new change in the world of hermeneutics (ways of interpreting a text). Martin Heidegger and Hans-Georg Gadamer brought into hermeneutics the significance of recognising the contemporary issues, social status and location of readers (Jasper 2004: 104-106; Thiselton 1980: 24-47). This brought about a shift from the classical hermeneutical approach to the structuralist, humanistic and critical approaches. In other words, in contrast to the traditional approach of interpretation that focuses on the author, biblical interpretation now considers the world of the reader, which brings a new dimension. It recognizes that each person brings his/her own questions to the text, and thus shapes his/her interpretation of the text. This is not to give the reader the opportunity to impose his/her meaning on the text, but to recognize what the reader brings from his/her contemporary situation and takes back to that situation. Our people (Samoans) as Christians believe that we find in the Bible answers to any question about living life in this world. This article is an attempt by a Samoan reader of the Bible to develop a Samoan hermeneutical critical approach that recognizes questions on some local issues in our Samoan world, to be used as a reading approach to seek in the Bible answers to those questions. The issue that raises questions for the hermeneutic explained herein is the issue of egalitarianism in relation to gendering and elitism in our contemporary Samoan society. The hermeneutical critical approach is called Tautuaileva and how it is used in reading a Bible text will be shown in an interpretation of John 4:16-30. Elaboration on how this reading approach is used in interpreting the Bible, see Nofoaiga 2017. Another example of reading the Bible from the Samoan perspectives, see Nofoaiga 2018.

Keywords: Tautuaileva, hermeneutic, egalitarianism, hybridity

Introduction

The Samoan hermeneutic, Tautuaileva, emerged from my experience and understanding of the issues of gendering and elitism in contemporary Samoan society. It is recognition of egalitarian issues in my Samoan world to be used as a guide in the search for more understanding of egalitarianism in the Bible. Thus, Tautuaileva identifies and recognizes the voice of the ‘other’ that is suppressed by gendering and elitism in a text. Gendering is a tradition or a belief functioning in a society (a society dominated by men), which defines and shapes how women and men should act and behave (Wainwright 1991: 28). It functions hierarchically within the patriarchal tradition. Elitism is, “advocacy of or reliance on the leadership or dominance of a select group,“ (Brown 1993: 800) and is recognized and respected phenomenon of power and knowledge that controls a society or community. Most societies took on a particular flavour of gendering and elitism as social, political and religious processes that represent colonialism. Thus, the gendering and elitism should be understood as colonial values. There were many ways used to introduce such colonial influential values in Samoa such as the Scriptures that were used as instruments and how this was possible has been demonstrated by Elaine Mary Wainwright and Malama Meleisea. Wainwright (1991: 2) writes in relation to the function of the scripture:

It became clear that while scriptures provided legitimation for the liberation of all who suffered under oppression, they were also used by many within the Christian churches as a weapon against the poor and marginalized, as a means of “keeping them in their place.”
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Meleisea (1987: 52-59; 67-69), a Samoan historian, said that the new foreign ways such as the London Missionary Society’s (LMS) teachings of the Bible brought a change that would benefit and improve the lifestyle of the Samoan people but beside many good results of the missionaries’ work there were some failures, especially in transforming the traditional and cultural values of the Samoans. For example, traditionally, the women shared with men chiefly and priestly roles. The gendering the missionaries introduced which emphasized the woman’s wifely role, nullified the traditional roles of a Samoan woman. From a Samoan biblical interpreter’s point of view, I agree with Meleisea. The gendering understanding brought in by the first teachings of the missionaries was based on the one-truth ideology of men as the only chosen disciples of Jesus in Jesus’ ministry. This type of gendering contradicts the shared-egalitarian responsibilities emphasized in the undertaking of the reciprocal and relational role of tautua in the male-female relationship in the Fa’aSamoa (Samoan culture), as practiced in the sister-brother relationship in the Samoan social and cultural world. Thus, the Samoan hermeneutic of Tautuaileva explained herein is shaped by the practice of the social and cultural egalitarianism in the culture of tautua in my Samoa world.

The Samoan hermeneutic, Tautuaileva (serve/service/servant in between spaces)

Tautuaileva as a hermeneutic considers my own location as a reader of the Bible in the Samoan world. I regard this location, a location in hybridity (a postcolonial approach), in which I place myself as a Samoan reader of the Bible. Mosese Mailo, a Samoan biblical scholar in his study of Bible translation in Samoan in the nineteenth century, emphasizes the use of postcolonial approaches (focusing on decolonization and emancipation) to investigate ideologies behind Bible translation (Mailo 2016: 263-265). Mailo’s study investigates how the colonial thinking of the missionaries influenced Bible translation in Samoan in the nineteenth century. My use of postcolonial approaches as shown herein is different. They are used as hermeneutical approaches to situate my location as a reader of the Bible in today’s world.

Hybridity according to Homi Bhabha is an intervening space (Bhabha 1994: 163), which is not a new horizon but a location he calls “beyond” (Bhabha 1994: 1-2, 121-131, 145-174; Ashcroft, et al. 139). In this sense, hybridity is a new space or the third space, which gives any person an opportunity to explore the Bible and any space or place beyond the norms of the past and the present. I claim egalitarianism as the critical element of my being in that third space to identify and expose the ‘local people in need’ in the Bible and in local Samoan communities. This is important because as Ricouer suggests, we cannot fuse two horizons neatly, such as the horizon of the text and the horizon of the reader of the text. A critical element is needed to make more sense and more interesting an exploration of an issue in between horizons (Lundin 1985: 26-27; Habermas 1985: 293-219; Warnke 1987: 129-132).

The consideration of egalitarianism as the critical element for my hermeneutic comes from my experience with the struggle faced by some of our local people’s (poor and marginalized) vying for equal opportunities and egalitarian access to local resources. For example is the current issue of the Government’s proposed amendment Bills, the Land and Title Court Bill and the Judicature Bill. The proposed changes would see the Land and Titles Court have its own High Court and Court of Final Appeal and Review. This is a significant change to the current system where the Supreme Court is the court of appeals. Could this be a change that would affect mostly the poor and the marginalized in families and villages in Samoan society? Thus, what equality or egalitarianism means to us as local people in our local Samoan values and cultures should be the basis for any hermeneutical approach we attempt to construct to guide any exploration or examination of any issue in our Samoan society. We should not rely solely on what equality or egalitarianism means as proposed by the world chart of human rights for it does not do justice for the local Samoan society with customs, values, and traditions that are not so rigidly defined. Rather, the hermeneutic presented here presents my own understanding of egalitarianism from my perspective of a tautua (servant) in a local family and church within a Samoan society. The Tautuaileva hermeneutic will be explained in these sections. First, how my being a tautua expresses and depicts my sense of place as a member of a local Samoan family and
church. The significance of place determines how and why I enter the third space, Tautuaileva. Second, entrance into this third space conveys my understanding of egalitarianism followed by the consideration of egalitarianism as the critical element of this hermeneutic in the third section. Fourth, from this understanding evokes the categories of Tautuaileva to be used as lenses to explore egalitarianism in any biblical text such as the text interpreted herein – John 4:16-30.

**Tautua my sense of place**

According to Charles Taylor (1985: 129) “we cannot understand another society until we have understood ourselves better as well.” For me, in order to understand undertaking service as an egalitarian shared role that aims to help those in need, I have to understand the culture of service (tautua) in my world as a Samoan. Tautua as a concept has two significant meanings (Tofaeno 2000: 300). First it identifies the servant status and role of untitled men in the Samoan chiefly system. Second, it expresses the moral value of serving the family. Thus, tautua as the culture of service in Samoa is a family-based social and cultural status, role, value, and practice, which views the needs, rights, and roles of people in the family and community as primary. Being immersed within and through that culture, I consider myself a tautua. It is the fatuaiga tautsi (role of a member of the family) of any member of a Samoan family regardless of status and gender. Thus, the fundamental existence of tautua begins within the family. Tautua in terms of belonging to a family, village, and church, including chiefly title appointments, is expressed in Samoan as fa’asinomaga. There is a saying in Samoan, ‘O le tagata ma lona fa’asinomaga’ (The person and her/his sense of identity). It expresses the connection a person has to a particular family or who the person is in terms of the family he/she comes from. The word fa’asinomaga is made up of two parts, fa’asino and maga. Fa’asino, is a verb meaning ‘point,’ or ‘direct’, which points a Samoan to a particular family and village that he or she belongs or is linked to (Milner 1966: 50). The particular families and villages that a tautua belongs to, have title names, customary lands, and residential places particular to themselves. The second part, maga, is a suffix (Milner 1966: 120) that makes fa’asino a noun, fa’asinomaga. Thus, fa’asinomaga is a way of identifying a tautua in and through his or her social and cultural links to a Samoan family and village in Samoan society. Part of a tautua’s fa’asinomaga is that it points a tautua to his social and cultural status and role.

Fa’asinomaga (sense of belonging to a place) of a tautua also points a tautua to particular relationships he belongs to within his family and certain roles he is to carry out to fulfil being part of those relationships. Examples of those relationships are the tautua’s relationship to the matai (Samoan chief) and to his sisters (Schoeffel 1995: 85-105; Le Tagaloa 1997: 16-20). Carrying out his role in those relationships is demonstrated by the Samoan word va fealoa’i. Va is a noun meaning space, any space. Not just spaces between people but metaphorical spaces between people and social, cultural, and religious systems in a particular place. This space is relational. The word fealoa’i means to interact respectfully. Thus, va fealoa’i designates any type of relationship such as relationships in-between people, and between people and the social and cultural systems that function in that society. So, a tautua is expected to relate to other people and spaces with respect.

These spaces are relational and have boundaries and are described in Samoan as tuaoi. Tuaoi is the short form of the Samoan phrase ‘tua atu o i’ which means ‘beyond this point’ (Ta’isi Efi 2008). It expresses the expectation that respect for other people, owned lands such as customary lands, statuses such as social and cultural status in the chiefly system and relationships such as the chief-tautua relationship is expected. The important function of these tuaoi is not to mark a dualism between the person in high status as the colonizer and the person in the low status as the colonized. Rather, the boundaries reveal the importance of the social and cultural order in a local Samoan family and community where the young people respect the elders or the untitled men and women respect any person chosen by the family as family leader. What this means is that sometimes families select to be a leader someone young whom they see to have the wisdom or has already proven in and through his serving the family that he or she is the good person to lead the family. It is not that other people who are older than him are not good enough but it is a decision everyone in the family agrees is good for the family. A tautua’s sense of place as fa’asinomaga concerns how he is linked to his family.
and the space which his family inhabits within a village. Part of that fa’asinomaga is the relationships to which he belongs and his role in those relationships.

**Tautuaileva (service in-between spaces): My location in third space**

*Tautuaileva* is the word I have coined as short form of the Samoan phrase ‘tautua i le va.’ This phrase means a service that is carried out in-between spaces or a servant standing in-between spaces. It expresses the expectation that the role of undertaking a service within a family or community is a reciprocal responsibility where the needs and rights of everyone are important. My utilization of *Tautuaileva* as one word has significance. It shows that my hybrid location as that of a third space – in between my understanding of service in Samoan and Christian cultures – has no gaps in between. As such, it reveals that in times of undertaking my service role to both my family and church units, I negotiate and renegotiate the fulfillment of my needs and roles in relation to both units, depending on which unit’s needs are given priority. It is the location where I stand as a servant allowing myself to accept changes and challenges in life and choosing what change and challenge is relevant or mixing them in a way that would help fulfill my role and responsibility to both my family and church. As such, *tautua* is no longer restricted to a particular level, space, culture, and people. It shows that a *tautua* needs courage to face challenges and changes in today’s world such as the courage to break away from the expectations considered as traditions in his or her place of belonging and to seek in other spaces other ways that will improve his or her *tautua*. Thus, my location in the third space, *Tautuaileva*, is a dynamic location where I move to and from space to space as a *tautua*, and act in accordance with the reality of life I encounter in my everyday life as a Samoan. This is where I stand as a Samoan and from which I see life in today’s world. I claim egalitarianism as the critical element of my being in that third space in order to identify and expose the local people in need in the texts, and local places in Samoa. That egalitarianism will be defined in the next section.

**Egalitarianism: the critical element of my location in third space**

There are many types of egalitarianism. In this section, I explain the type emphasized in my location in the third space. I begin by defining the complex idea of egalitarianism. Because there is not only one type of equality, the following section includes examples of some types of egalitarianism leading to the version emphasized here. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines egalitarianism as a belief in the natural “equality of mankind.” It explains egalitarianism simply as equality. It has been the main thinking behind some major movements in history which have fought for equal treatment and rights. For example Roth (1995: 249-50) writes,

> [i]n the twentieth century, egalitarianism has influenced movements for civil rights, women’s rights, and equal opportunities for the disabled, and has promoted the idea that equality is an important moral principle.

While egalitarianism as equality seems like a straightforward matter, in reality, it is in fact far more complex. From a political point of view, Choi says that one reason why that complexity occurs is because egalitarianism as “equality is an intrinsically comparative idea” (Choi 2010: 411-414). She adds that comparing two things as equal is not an easy task unless particular aspects of each object thought to be equal are well specified. So egalitarianism as an idea to define and explain how people in different situations in a context relate to each other is a complicated and provocative exercise. For example, if I talk about egalitarianism from a poor person’s point of view in a lower socio-economic situation, a rich person in a higher socio-economic bracket may see it differently. Thus, egalitarianism as a comparative idea shows that there is not one type.

As an example, Susan Kent has established a cross-cultural allocation of types of egalitarianism by comparing gender relations in society. She classifies egalitarianism into six types. I will mention only three to give an example of that comparison. These are: “[h]ighly egalitarian, [s]trongly egalitarian, [m]oderately egalitarian” societies and cultures (Kent 1999: 37). According to Kent, highly egalitarian...
societies are where gender relations are correlated. In such cultures, there are few societal differences between males and females. Both males and females equally make decisions for the group. The egalitarian societies Kent calls the strongly egalitarian are those where gender differentiation occurs but not in a hierarchical way. In such societies, males and females complement each other’s existence. Kent’s third type, the moderately egalitarian, defines societies where males and females complement each other in accordance with the hierarchical structure of that society. For Kent, there are clearly different types of egalitarianism once the issue of gender equality is raised. In her classification, there is no such thing as a purely egalitarian society.

Egalitarianism is also an important and contentious topic in Christian ethics and biblical studies. As a Christian ethic, egalitarianism is proposed by the following Christian teachings:

[egalitarianism is shown in] the creation of all men and women in God’s image (Gen. 1:27), in the fall of all humans into sin (Rom. 3:23), and in God’s love for all the world that resulted in Christ’s death on the cross (John 3:16) (Essenburg 1992).

These teachings present egalitarianism as a general biblical and theological understanding. However, in studying Jesus’ movements in Matthew’s gospel, Dennis Duling warns about the use of egalitarianism because it has a limited quality (Duling 2011: 151-152). He refers to peasant egalitarianism in the first century Mediterranean world. He observes that that egalitarianism does not mention women explicitly because women do not challenge it. Duling’s warning reflects the complexity of egalitarianism mentioned above by Choi which occurs when considering one meaning of equality to define egalitarianism for all people involved. From a feminist perspective, Wainwright sees equality and hence egalitarianism as a contentious term because it depends on who defines it; it is generally taken to mean ‘equal’ to the dominant power. She utilizes the concept of ‘inclusion’ instead of ‘equality’ by making a clear distinction between “inclusion” and “equality.” She chooses to employ:

the principle of “inclusion” rather than “equality” as a necessary correlative to “liberation” since “equality” can function to hide the distinctive experiences of women and men or the distinctive qualities of those experiences in an attempt to show both that the same experiences have been or should be available to both (Wainwright 1991: 32).

Of course, there is no explanation of egalitarianism that can define or explain equality for all, for many contextual considerations must be taken into account. As a result, in this study, egalitarianism is defined and used relative to a particular area or context of life.

The type of egalitarianism emphasized in Tautuaileva hermeneutic is seen in Kent’s description of moderately egalitarian societies in which males and females complement each other but in accordance with the hierarchical structure of society. It is non-gendered and non-elitist and is embedded in the reciprocal respect for each other in tautua – it is men and women filling different but complementary roles. This type of egalitarianism consciously has in its meaning the Christian values of servanthood as proclaimed and practiced by Jesus in his proclamation of God’s kingdom, and Samoan social and cultural values of tautua. It is morally, ethically, and practically based signifying chosenness not as a comparative factor of inequality but equality as revealed in the sister-brother relationship and matai-tautua relationship in Samoan culture. It is about respecting those of high status such as elders and in return those in high status should earn that respect by being good leaders. Such leadership is considered their tautua. Also important in that type of egalitarianism is the ability of those in any hierarchy to have wisdom to decide which need in that hierarchy is to be given priority. In this way, enacting tautua is responding to help the person in need in accordance with the situation he or she is involved in. Thus, the egalitarianism emphasized in my third space location supposes that being chosen for a higher status is not an excuse to oppress those of lower status. Instead, it should
make every person involved in a hierarchy undertake his or her role as tautua in relation to the needs and rights of all people involved.

**Categories of Tautuaileva as the hermeneutical lenses**

As mentioned above, my location in this third space of ‘service in-between spaces’ as determined by my sense of identity in relation to place in Samoa is not static. It is dynamic and liable to changes and challenges. It is open to changes from time to time and space to space according to changes and situations occurring in particular places. As such, it exposes the marginalized in my world and in the text. It shows that anyone is a tautua regardless of gender, status, color, and race. Accordingly, the following categories of my location in third space, Tautuaileva (service in-between spaces), are the lenses through which I seek to explore egalitarianism in the Bible: fa’asinomaga (sense of belonging to a place) and tautuatoa (courageous servant).

**Fa’asinomaga: Sense of belonging to a place**

As explained above, fa’asinomaga (sense of belonging to a place) is a way of identifying a tautua in and through his or her social, cultural, religious, political and economic links to a family and village in Samoan society. Fa’asinomaga in my third space location is open to new changes and challenges. Therefore who I am as a Samoan is sometimes identified and defined beyond the social and cultural restrictions of the norms of traditions my family and church have been practicing. In this way, fa’asinomaga of a tautua can be extended to other spaces and places forming and shaping new fa’asinomaga for the sake of making sense of belonging to another place. It is where a tautua is able to adapt his or her being Samoan to a new land, home, people, culture, language, and relationships, in order to make that place his or her own home. It is where a Samoan sees and views the world in light of the variety and diversity of cultures that run and control the locality of the world he or she inhabits. This allows the undertaking of tautua roles to go beyond the boundaries of the community and family-based original fa’asinomaga by seeking new fa’asinomaga that would help improve one’s service roles to his or her family.

I have also explained that another part of fa’asinomaga faatautua (tautua’s sense of belonging) is the relationships (va fealoa’i) he or she belongs to which are not just relationships to people but to the social, cultural and religious systems in the place he or she inhabits. Thus, there are three functions of va fealoa’i from my third space location. First, va fealoa’i designates various relationships between people. Second, va fealoa’i expresses people’s relationships to systems that run and control the local spaces they inhabit. Third, va fealoa’i is not just a response in silence to another person or other people but making one’s voice heard either in or through words or actions. Thus, identifying and defining va fealoa’i is in accordance with the locality of the fa’asinomaga of those in need, and those who help fulfill those needs. More importantly, the tautua’s sense of belonging to place enables him or her to identify the problem/s that marginalized him or her as tautua.

**Tautuatoa: Courageous servant**

Toa as a word added to tautua means bravery or courage. It makes tautuatoa a category that depicts a tautua who is able to go beyond the spaces he or she is familiar with to seek in other spaces ways to improve his or her role as tautua. As mentioned previously, the pathway to see, feel, and listen to how other’s inhabit of the places they belong to is ‘egalitarianism.’ And this pathway is an action-in-progress. What this means is that this pathway is where a tautua is prepared to face challenges and changes choosing what is relevant to his or her tautua role and considers all needs important, regardless of gender, status, race, and color. It makes a tautua a good tautai and tufuga. As a tautai, he is like a fisherman who will go beyond the rough weather in search of fish for the family. As a tufuga, despite how high the mountains are, he will search for the best wood to build a strong house for his family. Thus, a tautua is someone who has the courage to face any challenge, such as breaking away from the spaces of norms and traditions he or she is familiar with, and entering new spaces where he or she is able to find ways to help fulfill his or her role as a person that belongs to a particular place. And this approach is revealed in the reciprocal value and practice of tautua.
Tautuatoa as a category speaks of the action of undertaking service in-between people and spaces by the tautua whose places/spaces of belonging to a local context, and the various and different relationships he or she is linked to in that place are explored through the hermeneutical lenses of fa’asinomaga. Tautuatoa as the second category expresses the actions undertaken by a tautua in between those spaces and relationships. It is a relational treatment of each other with fa’aaloalo (respect), and loto fuatiaifo (subjectivity). Tautuatoa as action/s undertaken by a tautua in-between spaces and relationships reflect a tautua’s subjectivity to act in a way that will enable consideration of the needs of those whose needs should be given priority. Thus, Tautuaileva as action shows that the subjectivity of a tautua to respond to a situation that fulfills a need is important. It shows the creation of new ways to consider various and different needs of local people in accordance with the situations they are engaged in. Furthermore, it undertakes ways to break down social and cultural barriers that have been stumbling blocks to local people’s fulfilling of their needs like the marginalized men and women.

Interpretation of a Bible text (John 4:16-30) using the Samoan hermeneutic of Tautuaileva

These questions from the Tautuaileva hermeneutic will guide the interpretation of John 4:16-30. First, does the language of the world encoded in the text tell and show Jesus and the Samaritan woman characters as servants in-between spaces – servants who have shown that they belong (fa’asinomaga) to the local space in the text in terms of their relationship to other people in that space? Does the language of the text tell and show Jesus and the Samaritan woman as courageous servants (tautuatoa)?

From Tautuaileva hermeneutic, I see in John 4:16-30 as a narrative unit, the roles and responsibilities of Jesus and the Samaritan woman characters as local tautua or servants carrying out their roles as such in between spaces. They have shown that they consider important the well-being of the local people of Samaria in this part of the story – the well-being of being included in Jesus’ saving actions (Koester 1990: 665-680). For example, the conversation between Jesus and the woman in John 4:1-15 shows that Jesus understands that he as a Jew relates to the Samaritan people. His meeting the Samaritan woman at the well of Jacob depicts that relationship – the well that both the Jews and the Samaritans got water from when they were one nation. But, the long standing hatred between the Jews and Samaritans of each other did not stop Jesus from bringing the Samaritans into Salvation. Jesus is practicing serving his people (the people of Israel) by standing as a tautuaileva, a servant in between spaces – the space of the Jews and the space of the Samaritans.

Jesus has proven himself a tautuatoa (courageous servant) who has taken the risks by crossing the line of the conflict between Jews and Samaritans to make sure that all the people of his Israel’s family, God’s chosen nation, are given the chance of salvation. It is the main reason why he goes through Samaria on his return from Jerusalem in this part of John’s story of Jesus’ ministry.

The Samaritan woman likewise from her status as a woman also stands in-between spaces of Jesus and her people, people of Samaria, in order to bring her people into drinking the water that Jesus offered her. The woman does this by leaving her water jar and went back to the city to bring her people to Jesus (vv. 28-30). The water jar she left behind is symbolically interpreted as the woman’s old way of life – the life of having five husbands and another man not her husband. She comes out of that old life and enters the space of life worth living for as Jesus suggested – the living water. And the living water is repentance and returning to God wholeheartedly. The woman’s response to Jesus’ request makes her a courageous servant of Samaria. This is proven in the word used by Jesus in her commanding her to “Go” translated into Greek ὑπάγει in verse 16. The word ὑπάγει meaning depart is an intransitive verb that “always expresses the past tense by the Imperfect” (Wenham 1965: 52-54, 103, 203). As such, it expresses the ‘go’ that Jesus commands – that is for the woman to make her being the person that draws water from Jacob’s well, as the person that is used here by God to bring her own people into God’s salvation in and through Jesus Christ’s ministry. Thus, her drawing water from the well where she met Jesus is the departure point for returning to her Samaritan households. In this way, it implies Jesus’ expectation of this woman’s
drawing of water which is to return to serve her Samaritan household/s in light of what she has experienced and understood in her encounter with Jesus. Thus, the sending of this woman is a sending of a messenger or a disciple (a tautuatoa – courageous servant) to bring her people, the local people of Samaria to Jesus. This woman’s obedience, to do Jesus’ sending of her, makes her a local disciple, whose role is to look after the needs and rights of her people in this part of the story. Hence, this woman can be looked at as a disciple in this part of Jesus’ ministry – which is in the local space and place of Samaria.

The interpretation using the Tautuaileva hermeneutic has shown Jesus as saviour entering spaces that expose danger to his life to save the long lost people of his family – the Samaritans. The interpretation also in the use of Tautuaileva hermeneutic has shown two aspects of the Samaritan woman as a tautuatoa (courageous servant) who has a very close sense of belonging to the local place of Samaria, and who stands in-between spaces as shown in the story, crossing local social and cultural boundaries as a woman, not only to help her but more importantly her people. First, she belongs to Samaria as a woman whose role is to get water from the well of Jacob. Second, regardless of her reputation as a woman and her role as woman in accordance with the life she encounters in local Samaria, this woman also belongs to Samaria as a person chosen by God to spread the word of salvation. Thus, her other sense of belonging to Samaria is as a good person who helps make her people become members of God’s kingdom. Her work makes her a person with honour and her people as honoured people as well in God’s kingdom.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Tautuaileva as a hermeneutic recognizes egalitarian issues such as gendering and elitism in contemporary Samoan world to be used as a reading approach to seek in the Bible text more understanding about egalitarianism. It depicts the consideration of the needs and rights of local people in a Samoan local family or community regardless of who they are – in terms of gender and status. And that consideration is the type of egalitarianism that I have described as not seeking equality among local people but recognition of each other with respect in accordance with each person’s status in a local family or community. This is an approach that the Samoan government could have used in their attempt to change the Judiciary system of Samoa where the Land and Titles Court have its own High Court and Court of Final Appeal and Review. The use of the tautuaileva approach as an example was shown in the interpretation of the characters of Jesus and the Samaritan woman shown above. It is a social and cultural operation where, on the one hand, becoming a leader (as shown in Jesus’ character) is not to oppress the people he or she leads but to serve them by caring for their needs. On the other hand, for the people in lower status (as shown in the character of the Samaritan woman), their being in such position is not to disrespect the leaders in their families and communities, but to serve their leaders by helping them find better ways to take care of their needs. According to my location of Tautuaileva, the leaders’ failure to recognize those in need is approached not in an aggressive and violent way but in the Samoan way of amio fa’aaloalo (respectable behaviour) and loto maulalo (humility). In other words, Tautuaileva is not to create a revolutionary or subversive type of resistance against those in power. Rather, it is the beginning for those in need (poor, marginalized, women) to realize ways that would help them move away from the margin such as the Samaritan woman. One such way is found in taking advantage of the available understandings, resources, and opportunities he or she is able to have access to in his or her local world/s. The Samaritan woman takes advantage of the water resource offered by Jesus for her and for her people. It is about seeking survival in accordance with the reality of life a person in need is encountering. In other words, entering the third space of Tautuaileva involves weighing the opportunities available to them and then making a decision on the opportunity that would best fulfil a servant’s, his or her family’s and/or his or her household’s needs. As mentioned above, the motivation of a family member as a tautua (either a male or female) to enter the third space of Tautuaileva is his or her realization of the need to seek in other spaces ways to help fulfil his or her family’s needs. This type of tautua is a place-based mission to be carried out in relation to the many changes occurring in a particular local
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community. The use of a hermeneutical critical approach that considers the world of a reader now in reading the Bible as shown in this article, is a new approach to reading the Bible. Its use as emphasized in this study is to raise questions as critical elements to guide a reading of a text. Thus, the basis of the interpretation is the text not the reader.
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Lafoga a Faifēau ma le Tete’e a le EFKS: O le Feagaiga ua Ōia

Latu Latai, Malua Theological College

Fa’atomuaga

O le aso 17 Juni 2017, sa pasia ai e le Palemene a Samoa le Tulafono o Suiga o Lafoga o Tupe Maua (Legislative Assembly of Samoa , 2017). O lea suiga i le tulafono ua faaopoopo po i ai le totogina o lafoga a faifēau tausinu. O lea lafoga e fuai luga o alofa a faifēau, faafasai ai ma so so se alagatupu e maua i le faatinoina o lana galuega. Mulimuli ane sa toe faase’e ese le vaega lona lua lea, ae ua agai sa’o le tulafono i alofa a faifēau (Palemene Lona XVI, Tauaofiaga Lona Tolu, 2018: 358-374).

Talu ona tutoatasi o Samoa i le 1962, e le’i aofia faifēau tausinu i le totogina o lafoga. E pei o le saunoaga a le Alii Palemia i se faatalanoaga i le 2018, “Ua 56 tausaga talu ona Tutoatasi, ua 56 foi o tausaga o malolo pea tatou Faafeagaiga mai le totogina o lafoga.” (Legislative Assembly of Samoa , 2018) I le ma lea “o le lafoga o le sao lea a faifēau” i le atina’eina o le atunuu (Peagaimaalii-Luamanu, 2017).

E lē o toe po malaē i le tete’e a le Ekaesia Faapotopotoga Kerisiano Samoa (EFKS) i lea tulafono. O lea tete’e sa pasia i le Fonotele i Malua ia Me 2017. E ui i se tu’ualalo a tamā o le Ekaesia i le Malo ina ia toe laulii lona lemeni mataupu, ae na faatinoina lava ma faamalosia i le masina o Ianuari 2018. O le faamamaluina o le tulafono na amata aia loa ona mola o faifēau tausinu a le EFKS, ma amata valaua ai loa e tului i luma o le faamasinoga.

Ua tele finagalo ua faaalia i lenei mataupu talu ona amata ona faailoa a le Malo. O se mataupu foi ua vaeluaina ai le tele o tagata Samoa ia i latou e talia ma le’i tete’e. O nisi ua o latou fai’inoa le Malo i le manatu, o le faatinoina o leeni lafoga ona o le tau totogina lea e ana aitafalu ua taulata i le piliona, i Faletupe tetele a le lalolagi ma atunuu e pei o Saina (Maliko, 2018). O nisi ua faaupiga lemeni lafoga o se auala e aapa mai ai le Malo i le pule tutoatasi a le Lotu (Tu’u, 2018). O nisi ua faapea o leeni tulafono - e le’i uia faiga faavae e faaopi ai se mataupu i le Palemene. E aofia ai le lē lava lea o le taimi sa faatalanoaina ai ao le’i faitauina leeni tulafono ma pasia (Tamati, 2018; Tumutalitelu, 2018).

Sa iai foi le tali a le EFKS e tusa ai o lana tetee i le tulafono, e ala i le Komiti o le Au Toeaina. I se tusa sa tusia i le Malo, sa finaunia ai le tetee agai i le faaupiga e le Palemia malo le Malo o le Tusi Paia e faavae a lenei lafoga (Tusi lugafonotele, 2017; Ofisa o le Failautusi Aoao, 2017). O le talitonuga o le Au Toeaina, o le lafoga, e le o se totogi, o le faifēau foi e lē o se tagata faaupiga. O le finagalo o le Au Toeina, e lē tatau ona alofa ia se lafoga i luga o le alofa. E le gata o ia tupe o le faai paia a tagata i le Atua, ae o le le aafia ai foi ma alagatupu a le EFKS mo ana atina. O le manatu o le Au Toeaina, o leeni tulafono ua ta’uititia ai le telē o le sao a le EFKS i le Malo ma le atina’eina o Samoa mai lava i le faatoa taunuu o le Talalelei i le 1830 seia o mai i nei onapo. I le ma lea, o leeni tulafono o le a avesea ai le va lelei o le Lotu ma le Malo talu ona faavae mai le Malo Tutoatasi Samoa i le 1962 (Tusi lugafonotele , 2017; Ofisa o le Failautusi Aoao, 2017).

E pei ona matau mai, ua tele finagalo faaalia ma tusitisuga agai i le mau a le EFKS. E talitonu foi le manatu ua telē se sao o nei finagalo taua i lea mau. E leai ia se manatu e toe foi i tua e aualu lenei tulafono. O lea foi ua taatia manino le faaupiga o le Tusi Paia ma le Mataupu Silisili agai i leeni tulafono, e pei ona faaiole o tamā le Ekaesia. A’o le faamoemoe o leeni pepa, o se taumafaiaga lea e vaai i leeni lava mataupu, mai le taalafasolopito o le Ekaesia. O se aotelega o manatu o leeni taumafaiaga, o le paiaina o le tulafono i lafoga a faifēau tausinu, o le òia lava lea o le feagaiga sa osia i le va o le Lotu ma Samoa talu ona taunuu o le Talalelei i o tatou laufanua i le 1830.
O le Feagaiga

E tusa ai ma le faauigaga a le aili misionare Lonetona Misionare Sosaiete (LMS) o George Pratt, sa ia tuufaatasia le uluai Tusi o Uiga o Upu i le 1862, o le uiga o le upu ‘feagaiga’, o se faiga faavae e tausi ai le va fesoottai; e pei o le va o le tuagane ma lona tuafafine ma a latou fanau, faapea le va o le Alii ma le Tulafale. Sa ia tautia foi o lea upu e mafai ona faauiga lautete o se maliega.1

O le talitonuga o Samoa, o le tuafafine faapea foi le Alii la te tauaveina le mana, le paia ma le mamalu. E ese mai lea i Tulafale ma tuagane, la te tauaveina le faaeteino. O le upu feagaiga la mai le vaai faaSamoa o se fesoootaiga o le faaeteino ma le faaleagaga. O lona uiga o le feagaiga - o le va paia, poo se va tapua.

I le tele o tusitusiga a misionare i le Sulu Samoa mai le 1839, o loo amata ai ona latou faaogaina le upu ‘feagaiga’ i le faamatalaina o tala o le Tusi Paia. E pei o le feagaiga i le va o le Atua ma le nuu o Israaelu, o le Atua ma Aperaamo faapea isi augatama o le Feagaiga Tuai. Sa matauina e misionare le uiga lea o feagaiga i le va o tuagane ma tuafafine faapea Alii ma Tulafale, ma o lea sa o latou faaogaina ai i le faaliliuina o le Tusi Paia (Latai, 2015). E pei ona paia o feagaiga i le va o le Atua ma le tagata, e faapania foi le uiga o le feagaiga i le faaSamoa.

O le feagaiga i le va o le tuagane ma le tuafafine

O le talitonuga a Samoa, o le tama teine e fanau mai o le tama. I le mataupu silisili a Samoa, o ia e paia. O le talitonuga lea e faavae ai lona tulaga ma ona nafa i totonu o le Tusi Paia. A pei o le feagaiga e ave ai le faamatai a le faaSamoa o se fesootaiga o le faaeteino ma le faaleagaga. O lona ui a le feagaiga - o le va paia, poo se va tapua.2

E pogai mai lea i le feagaiga i le va o ia ma lona tuagane. O lea feagaiga e ave ai le faaSamoa a le faaeteino ma le faamalaia a le tamaisi. Mai lava i taimi lai, iai sā o le feagaiga lea. Lē tatau ona latalata le tuagane i le tuafafine. E lē tala'feaga ili ona ia faaleo lea o le Tusi Paia i le faaliliuina o le Tusi Paia (Latai, 2015). E pei ona paia o feagaiga i le va o le Atua ma le tagata, e faapania foi le uiga o le feagaiga i le faaSamoa.

O le tuagane e tausi ma faapelepele i lona tuafafine seia oo i le oti. E iai alagaupu e faailoa ai lea tautua.3 O le o’imata i le mata o le tuagane lona tuafafine. Afai o le i’omata e malama ai le vaai a le tuagane. E mu mata o le tama i lona tuafafine. O ia alagaupu e faailoa ai le tautua ma le faaaloalo e ave e le tuagane i le tuafafine. O le tautua e tatau ona lelei, aua e iai le talitonuga e malaia le tuagane pe a lē lelei ana faatinoga.4 O le faamalaia a le tamaisi e oo ai lava ina pā pē le feagaiga, aua e iai le talitonuga e malaia le tuagane pe a lē lelei ana faatinoga. O le faamalaia a le tamaisi e oo ai lava ina pā pē le feagaiga. E iai le talitonuga e malaia le tuagane pe a lē lelei ana faatinoga.5 O le faamalaia a le tamaisi e oo ai lava ina pā pē le feagaiga, aua e iai le talitonuga e malaia le tuagane pe a lē lelei ana faatinoga.6 E iai alagaupu e faailoa ai le tautua ma le faaaloalo e ave e le tuagane i le tuafafine. O le tautua e tatau ona lelei, aua e iai le talitonuga e malaia le tuagane pe a lē lelei ana faatinoga.

O le faamapeina o le feagaiga e taua ai ona nafa. I aso ao lei taunuu o le Talalelei, o feagaiga sa avea foi ma oisiautauga i tapuaiga a aiga, o se naa la te faaia ma le matai o le aiga (Meleisea, 1987; Le Tagaloa, 2003). O ia o le pae ma le auli, e faasino i lana naa o le faaleleia ma ni vevesi ma ni faaistauila i totonu o lona aiga. O ia o le faasino i lana taulaga ma magalo ai se sala a le aiga. O le faaiga, e feagaia ma le gaosina o meaiana i pei o siapo ma ietoga e taua i tu ma aganuu a Samoa. A’o lana naa pito sili ona taua, o le taisiga lea o le mamalu o le aiga, a lea lea i le taisiga i lona teine muli. O le aveesea o lona mamalu, o le avea lava lea o ia ma luma e le gata i ona tuagane ae faapea ai le aiga atoa.

O le feagaiga e se’e’ese’e talāluma. A oo ina faatasi le aiga, e nofo i le tala i lumu. A laulau o se taumafataga ma muamua i luma ma le sa’o le aiga. A talanoa se matauupu e tapa lava sona finagalo. E mafai foi ona ia toe lauliliuina se faaiga. A oo ina filifili sē e avea ma matai o le aiga e iai foi lona avanoa e avea ai ma matai.7 Peitai e ave lava lana faaaloalo i lona tuagane, o lana lea tali e taua ai lana tautua. O le ala lea o le tele ina lēai oni matai tamaitai i taimi o Samoa anamua.8 Auā o le avea ai o se tamaitai ma matai e lē gata e aveesea a i lona tulaga mamalu o ia o le feagaiga, ae o se lē faaaloalo tele lea ma le lē amanaiaina o le tautua a lona tuagane.

E pei ona matau mai, e maualuga ma faaaloalogia le tulaga o le feagaiga i totonu o aiga. Ma e faapea foi i totonu o nuu. O feagaiga o le auluma lea. O i latou foi e tausi le mamalu le le nuu. E faaaloalogia e matai ma le auluma foi e tausii le va lelei o tamaitai ma le saoafiaga a matai.
Peitai a o o ina faaipoipo le feagaiga ma agai i le aiga ma le nuu o lona toalua, ona suia lea o lona tulaga.6 Ua ta’ua o ia o le nofotane. La te tautuaina le feagaiga a lana tane. A o o foi ina faaeaina lona alii i se suafa ona avea lea ma faletua o se Alii po o se tausia o se Tulafale.7 E uli lava le le suia o lona tuliga i le aiga o lona toalua, ae le aveesea ai lona tulaga o ia o le feagaiga i lona lava aiga.

E pei ona matau mai, o le feagaiga paia i le va o le tuagane ma le tuafafine, sa tausia ai le va feavatia i totonu o aiga. E le gata i lea a’o le va lelei ma le filemu i totonu o nuu. O le feagaiga i le va o le tuagane ma le tuafafine ua faailoa manino ai se lalolagi e limataitaina i le va fealaloaio. O lea va o loo lotolotoi ai ma le fetausiaiga o le faaetino ma le faaleagaga. I le molimau a le alii suesue o George Milner, o le ausia lava lea o le paleni poo le “social balance” i totonu o le sosaietie (Milner, 1968).

O le taunuu mai o le Talalelei

O le feiloaiga muamua a Ioane Viliamu ma Malietoa Vainuupo i le 1830 na osi ai le uluai feagaiga i le va o Samoa ma le Lotu Kerisiano. Sa faaepu upu ai Malietoa ia Viliamu, “o le asô ua avea ai i tatou ma aiga e tasi.” (Williams, 1840). O le fiafia tele o Vainuupo sa ia tautino ai o le a na ia lagolago i faifeau ma puipui i lo latou saagelmu, ao laotou tiute o le aaoaina lea o tagata i le Atua fou ma le Lotu fou. O le feagaiga lea sa osia i le ului feiloaiga i Mataniu Feagai ma le Ata. O le feagaiga sa toe faamautiuina i le 1832 ina ua toe foi mai Viliamu, i le 1836 ina ua taunuu uluai Misionare nofo mau ma o latou faletua, ma le 1841 i le mavaega a Vainuupo ao lea tuaumalo. O le mavaega sa faataape ai papâ, ae faaee le Susuga ma le Ao o Faalupega i misionare (Le Tagaloa, 1986). O le feagaiga lea o loo manino ai le faaaeaea a le Tupu o Samoa ma Samoa i le Lotu Kerisiano. O le feagaiga na mafua ai ma le faalagiga o faifeau - o ‘faafeagaiga’ (Le Tagaloa,1986; Meleisea, 1987; Robson, 2009).

O Alii taua o Samoa e pei o Malietoa sa iai foi a latou feagaiga, o a latou tuafafine sa o latou faaaloalo iai. O le oo mai o le Lotu fou, aemaise o auaua a le Atua, o lea sa faaee iai le faaaeaea lea. O le uiga o le upe ‘faafeagaiga,’ e pei o se feagaiga. O lona uiga ia ave iai le faaaloalo ma tausi e pei o se feagaiga. O le feagaiga lea i le va o Malietoa ma misionare na malu ai le lotu mai lona amata.

O se tasi o mea sa fiu ai Misionare, o le faatuina lea o aulotu e tuufaatasi ai nuu o itumalo (Latai L., 2014). E lei taliaiena lea faiga e Samoa. O nuu o Samoa o nuu mavae, ma e manino lava pulega a matai. O le mafuaaga lea o le mananao o nuu e fai lava a latou aulotu ma ia tofu le nuu ma lana faafeagaiga. O le faatuina o Malua i le 1844, o le aotauina lea o le auagaiauega ina ia faamalie ai le manao lea o le tele o nuu o Samoa.

O le ofi atu o faifeau Samoa i totonu o nuu sa faaauau ai le feagaiga lea sa amata i misionare. Ua faatino e le nuu se na te solia le fale ma le fanua o se faifeau. Ua ave iai le faaaeaea. Ua taisi ma ua fagafa. O mea lelei uma ua ave iai ai. Ua tapu foi o latou fale ma fanua. I se tasi o faamaumauga a le Alii misionare o Brown sa ia faaamaiua ai le Atuia upu a se tasi o tama e igoi ia Penisimani;

E leaga lava pea faale popoi ma faale ava i...le faifeau, ia poi ma ava i ai i le mea o nofo ai, ‘aua le tagofia ana mea e le gaoi, ma tagata ulavavale, pe soli lona fanua ma lona lotoa poo se tasi lava ana mea, a ia poi lava ma ava i ai (Brown , 1865-1870).

O le molimau a le misionare o Henry Nisbet i le 1843, e faasala e le nuu se na te solia le fale ma le fanua o se faifeau. E pei o le tuafafine i le va ai ma lona tuagane, o mamalu ma sa ia ua ave i le faifeau. O le talitonuga o tagata Samoa o ia o le Sui vaapia o le Atua. O lana upu e mamalu. E manuia toea maalaia ai le tagata.

O lea mamalu ua ave i le faifeau sa faataua ai lona tulaga ma ona nafa i totonu o le nuu. O le faifeau ua avea ma ositaulaga. E le gata i ia e feagai ma le olafaeleagaga o tagata ae o lana tatalo ma ana aoaoga sa talitonu ma maua ai manoia o le nuu. Ua avea foi o ia ma pae ma auli - na te tausia le filemu ma le va lelei o tagata. O ni misa ma ni feeseeseaiga e vave lava ona filemu pe a susu atu le faifeau. O fale o faafeagaiga sa avea foi ma sulufaiga i sē su aafia i se sala matuaia. I taimi e malotia ai
nuu i malaga ona o taaloga, fiafia, maliu, fa’aipoipoga poo ni saofai tetele, o faie o faifeau sa malau ai se tagata ese ua solia se tapu o le nuu (Crawford, 1977).

A’o se tasi lava o nafa taua o le faifeau, o le tausia lea o lona mamalu. O ni amio matuia e pei o le muliulua e matua le talaiaina. Afae ae soli o ia tapu, ona tatala lea o le feagaiga. E aofia ai i le feagaiga le toalua ma le fanau a le faifeau. E pei lava o le feagaiga i le va o le tuagane ma le tuafafine, ua faapena foi le feagaiga i le va o le nuu ma le faifeau ma lona aiga. O le toe fenofoa o fanau a faifeau ma fanau o le nuu, o se mea sa tatala ai feagaiga a nuu ma faifeau (Tuimalealiifano, 2000).

E pei ona matau mai o le avea ai o le faifeau ma faafeagaiga, sa vavae ese mai ai foi o ia mai mea faaletino e pei o pulega faalenuu ma mea faamatai. O le mafuaaga lea o le tulafono e le tatau ona iai ni suafa matai o faifeau poo ni piitaga foi i le nuu e galue ai. E ui lava sa uluai faaaogaina e misionare matai latou te faatuina ekalesia i totonu o nuu, ae na vave lava ona faamalosia e misionare, aemaise lava ina ua faatu Malua, le le auai o faifeau Samoa i faiganuu ma le faamatai. O lea sa faasaina ai ona toe faaaoga a o latou igoa matai faatasi ai ma le le mafai ona toe galue faafafeau i lona lona nuu (Turner, 1861). Sa molimuainia e le misionore o Nisbet i le 1857 le tulaga lea, ina ua fiu e tauanau Salelavalu latou te talaiaina Su’a e se lona o latou faifeau. Na iloa mulimuli ane e le misionore, o Su’a e lona piitaga i le nuu (Nisbet, 1875).

O le faaeeina o mamalu ma paia o le feagaiga i le faifeau ma lona aiga na siltia ai lo latou tulaga ma taoto lelei ai lo latou faasino moma e totonu o nuu. O mamalu ma sa sa tausi ai le feagaiga i va o le tuagane ma lona tuafafine ua faaave ai nei le feagaiga i le va o le faifeau ma lona aiga ma le nuu. O lea faiga sa faatumauniia ai le va lelei ma le nonofo lelei i totonu o nuu ma le sosaiete o Samoa, ma vave ai foi ona tupu ma ola le Lotu.

O le Alofa

I se tusitusiga a le faletua o le misionore o William Day a’o galulue ai i Sagaga i le 1844, sa ia faapea ai;

O le aso lenei na o mai ai Tamaitai o Sagaga ma la latou alofa mo Faifeau [Misionare] o talo ma i’a, sa la’ei tasi i siapo matagofie e faatautau i o latou tauau, ma ietoga i o latou sulugatiti, e totosoe e pei oni veli umu ma pale fugalau i o latou ao; na sau la latou solo i lumafale ma usu a latou pese malie. Ina ua taunu o le solo umi, ona tula’i lea o lo latou taitai ma lauga mai. Sa lē mafai ona toafi le maligi o o’u loimata (Day, 1963).

O le alofa, o le ogatotonugalemu lea o le feagaiga i le va o Samoa ma le Lotu Kerisiano. O le alofa o le fatu foi lea o le feagaiga. Aua o le tatua lea a le tuagane i le tuafafine, i le talitonuga a faamalieina, e āu i le pule. I le va o le faifeau ma le nuu, o le alofa foi lea e maua ai e le nuu faamaniuaga a le Atua. O le alofa lea sa faatinoina e Samoa ma sa maofa ai misionore ma o latou faalei. Lea foi na maligi ai loimata o le faletua o le faaopea. E lē gata o le tausiga ia mea taulaga e se faapea foi ma measina a le atunu.

Ina ua tulai mai faifeau Samoa e tasia galuega i totonu o nuu, sa faapea ona molimuainia le siitia peo le faatinoina o alofa. Sa taumafai o misionore e faia ni totoji o uluai faifeau Samoa (Stallworthy, 1856-1857), peita i na vave ona o latou molimuainia le maao’e o le taisia a nuu.

O le fono a misionore sa faia i le 1852 sa maau ai le l’uga, o faifeau Samoa uma o le a tasia lea e nuu o loo galulue ai. Faatasi ai la ma se faiga taulaga faapitoa mo faifeau e ese mai le Faiga Me. O lea taulaga sa amatalia ia ianuari 1853. Sa talia lelei lea taulaga e tagata Samoa. Sa lipotia e misionore i le 1854,

O lo matou faamoemoi e tausaga o lunanai, o mea uma e manaomia mo faifeau o le a faatinoina lea e i latou o le a faamanuiaina i la latou galuega, ma o le a faamuta ai ma le faalagolago i le Sosaiete [LMS] mo sa latou fesoasoani (Samoan Reporter, 1846).
Ia manatua o le vaaitaimi lea ua sefulu tausaga talu ona faatuinua Malua, o lona uiga ua toetiti tofu nuu ma faifeau Samoa. E oo mai i le 1853, ua 190 faifeau Samoa ua tausinuu (Samoan Reporter, 1854). O le ala lea o le fiafia o le LMS i le faiga lea aua ua faaitiitia ai ana tupe alu. I le molimau a misionare, pau lava le mea o le a latou foai o tusi, api ma isi mea a faaaoga a ioga a faifeau ma o latou faletua (Lange, 2006).

O alofa ma taulaga a tagata Samoa sa faatinoina lava i mea taumafa ma measina a Samoa. I le uluai Faiga Me i le 1840 sa foai ai taaga afa, siapo ma ula lopa lanu moana. I le 1842 ua amata ona foai o oloa a papalagi. O se tasi o itumalo sa o latou foai siapo e 200, o fala, faatsasi ai ma naifi e 150, o selaulu ma to'i, ma le 200 o ula lopa lanu moana. O se tasi itumalo sa o foai ma matorua a’e a 97 (Hempenstall, 2004).

Mulimulii ane ua iloa e misionare o le tele o lenei alofa e tele ina lē a o aoga, o lea sa o latou a’oa’oina ai tagata Samoa e gaosi le faaauina lava. O le 1847 sa foai ai le 1847 sa foai ai e teitu o Leulumoega kalone e 648 o suauu popo, 1000 pauna o arrowroot ma ituaiga tupe eseese o lona aofai e £13 – 4s (Hempenstall, 2004). O le 1849 sa maua ai e le LMS le 3,862 o suauu popo (Samoan Reporter, 1849). Ina ua faasolo ina maua a tagata Samoa tupe, ona avea foi lea o tupe ma vaega i le la latou alofa. E pei ona molimau o le misionare o James P. Sunderland,

O se vaiga faafiafia loto i lo latou foai ma le lotofuatiaifo... Ua amata ona masani tagata i tupe ao nisi faatoa tagofia o tupe ua foai lava mo le galuega a le Atua. O se tasi...ua sau ma le 10 tala, o leisi e 6 ma leisi e 5 (Samoan Reporter, 1847).

E oo mai i le 1856, ua oo le aofai o le alofa mo faifeau i le £245, 1857 ua sii i le £503, 1862 ua oo i le £1,058 (Samoan Reporter, 1849; 1854; 1856; 1957; 1962). E oo mai le 1876 ua faamauina alofa a faifeau i le va o le £21.00 ma le £70 i le tausaga (Davies, 1876). O le vaaitaimi foi lea ua lē toe aoina faatasi le alofa a faifeau, a ua tuu lava i le faiatia o nuu. O nisi ua fai tai vaiaso, o nisi ua tai lua vaiaso. E le gata i lea, ae sa faaaauina lava le faatuiga ma taumafa. Sa tusia e sa leina a fiaa o alofa i le 1890 ma faapea lea alofa e oo ile “20 i le 30 ato meaai e tuu i le fainotoa o le faifeau...e lava ai o ia a lona aiga faiatasi ai ma le au nofotumau i lana aoga seia oo i le Aso Gafua.” (Phillips, 1890).

O le vave o le alu i luga o le alofa tupe o faifeau, ona o le folafolaina lea o alofa a matai ma aiga lotu. O lea sa faita faai sa fai ma auala sa lelei ai le faatuiga a faifeau ae sa vave ai foi ona te Kaulua molimau mo le LMS. Sa maunatua e misionare na faapea lea alofa e faapea lea alofa, peitai o le la lea sa maau ai tupe mo le galuega a le LMS i Samoa faapea le Pasefika.

E oo mai i le matagat o le 20 seneturi ina ua i lalo Samoa i pulega faakolone a Siamani i le 1900 ma Niu Sila i le 1914, ua maualuga lava le faaaoaaina o le tupe. Ua malosi foi lea le tamaiaga o Samoa ona o faatoa a o popo ma le koko mai le taimo a Siamani (Meleisea, 1987). E oo mai i le ogatottonu o le 20 seneturi, ua maau fai galuega a tagata ma ua tele ai lava ina o latou foai tupe mo a latou alofa.

Peitai e uila ina sui le faatinoga o le alofa, ae lei faapea na suia ai lona uiga. I se lauga a le faifeau o Tanielu F. i le Fono Tele i le 1915 sa ia faamatalaina ai le galuega a le faifeau ma le tiute a le nuu e faavae i luga o le tusi o Kalatia 6:6.

O ia [le faifeau] e galu mo i tatou i mea faaleaga, ao i tatou e galu mo ia i mea faaletinou, e lea ua tatou fagaga ia ia te ia, ma tausi ia te ia i mea e lavalava ai ma ofu ai (Sulu Samoa, 1915).

O le Tutoatasi o Samoa ma lona Faavae

O le tutoatasi o Samoa i le 1916, o le taununu lea o le naunautaiga a Samoa ia saoloto mai pulega faakolone; ina ia pulea lava e tagata Samoa lo latou atunuu ma ia faatumauna ana pulega
faaleaganuu, lona saolotoga ma lona mamalu. O le lē amanaiaina e Siamani o tu ma aganuu a Samoa ma le fa’atamala o Niu Sila i le Faama’i Oti o le 1918, o mafaaga tetele ia o le Mau a Pule ma Tumua ina ia tutoatasi Samoa (Wendt, 1965; Liuaana, 2001; Goodall, 1954: 361; Wood, 1975: 320).

O le tutoatasi ia o Samoa i le 1962, o se laasaga tāua lea i le talafaasolopito o Samoa. O le mea muamua lava sa faatāua i lea laasaga o le Faavae. Ma sa galulue ai taitai o le atunuu. Ina ua maea ona tusia o le Faavae e lua lava mea sa matilatila ai, o le Lotu ma le Aganuu. I le Faatomuaga o le Faavae o loo tomua ai lava upu nei; “I le Suafa Paia o le Atua, Lē Silisili Ese, Lē Alofa pea lava pe’a.” O Ialo ifo o loo iai ma le faaupuga faapeea; “o le Malo Tutoatasi o Samoa fa faavae i lugu o faiga Faakerisiano ma tu ma aganuu faaSamoa.” (Government of Samoa, 1960)

E tusa ai ma le molimau a Lauofo Meti,

A’o faia o le faatalanaoaga sa lagona e le komiti le tāua o le faailoa o le mamalu o le Atua. O lea sa toe faaopopo ai le upu ‘Paia’ i lumua o le upu ‘Atua.’ E le gata i lea, sa malilie foi e faaopopo le upu ‘tulafono’ i lumua o le Atua ina ia manino ai o le pule e pulea ai Samoa e tatau ona faatinoina i lugu o tulafono a le Atua (Meti, 2002: 64).

Sa tauli foa e Meti le manatu o nisi o le komiti le faaogaina o le upu ‘tu ma aganuu’. I le manatu o nisi o le upu ‘tu ma aganuu’ ua atagia tele ai le taimi a’o le’o ci mai le talalelei aemaise lava e iai tu ma aga e lē lelei. Peitai sa manatu le komiti, ua talafeagai lava lea ona o upu ua masani ai le atunuu. E le gata i lea o loo manino lava o tu ma aganuu faaSamoa ua faaKerisianoina (Meti, 2002: 64).

O le Faatomuaga o le vaega mulimuli lea o le Faavae sa tusia ma talanoainia. O lona uiga e faailoa ai le tauli o lea vaega. O le faaupuina o le Faatomuaga o loo manino ai mea e pito sili ona tāua i le fatu o soo se Samoa; o le Atua, ma ana Tu ma Aganuu (Meti, 2002: 64).

O le Faatomuaga la o le Faavae i so’u manatu, o le toe faamausaliiina lava lea o le faegaiga lea va o Samoa ma le Lotu Kerisiano lea sa amata ia Viliamu ma Vainupu. O le faegaiga lea sa ave ai le faaeae a le Atua ma auauna a le Atua. O le lē aofia ai o faifeau tausinuu i tulafono o Lafoga i le faavae lea, o le faafila manino lea ena o le va’ai maualuga a taitai o Samoa ma Samoa atoa i le uiga ma le loloto o le feagaiga lea.

**Upu Faaiu**

O le tulafono e totogi ai lafoga a faifeau tausi nuu, oute manatu ua ōia ai le feagaiga sa osia e 6 tautou tuaa ma misionare sa aumua le lotu. O le feagaiga sa ave ai mamalu ma sa o le ‘feagaiga’ i misionare ma faifeau. Sa malu ai le Lotu ma taotoga lelei ai le tulaga o faifeau i totonu o nuu. O le feagaiga sa tausia ai faifeau e ala i le ‘aloafa’ i faifeau. O le tautia e le u o se ‘totaio’ ao le tautia ona o le talitongu o faifeau, o Sui Vaaia ia o le Atua. A’o le feagaiga foi lea sa faae’e ai foi nafa tauli i faifeau. Lea sa avea ai latou ma ositaulaga aua se manuia mo aiga, nuu ma le atunuu. Sa avea ai foi i latou e tautia le va lelei, le filemu ma le mamalu o nuu. O nafa ia o faafagaiga sa tautia ai le va fetausiai ma le va fea vatai i totonu o nuu ma Samoa atoa. O le tulafono e totogi ai lafoga a faifeau, e lē gata ua ōia ai le feagaiga paia lea, ae o le a aveasea ai foi le mamalu lea.

E le gata i lea, o le nei tulafono oute talitonu, o le amataga foi lea o le solaia o mea e pito sili ona tuaa i loto o tagata Samoa, o le Lotu ma lana aganuu. O le ofi mai o le Lotu i totonu o Samoa ma pei ona tautou molimauina i le talafaasolopito, sa limataitaina lava i tu ma aganuu a Samoa. O lea faiga sa faamalosia ai le tulaga o le Lotu, ae sa faaaauu ai foi ma faatauaina ai pea a tatou tu ma aganuu. Peitai o le totogiai o Lafoga a faifeau, o le a aveasea ai le tauli o le Lotu ma le aganuu. O le a pei a lava Samoa e pei o atunuu e pei e Niu Sila ma Ausetalia.

E faaigu le nei taua faaigaiga e George Milner o le upu feagaiga i lana Tusi o Uiga o Upu sa tuufaatasia i le 1966, pe tusa lea ma le 100 tausia talu mai le faauiga a George Pratt i le...
1862. Fai mai Milner, o leisi foi uiga o le feagaiga “o ni aiaiga lea o se maliega, poo se tulafono sainia, poo se konekarate i le va o ni vaega se lua pe sili atu.” (Milner, 1966).

Soifua ma ia Manuia.

**Manuata fa’aopopo**


2. O le tautua o se vaega ogatotonu o le olaga Fa’aSamoa, e pei ona iloa i le alagaupu “O le aia o le pula o le tautua.” O le tautua e lautele ma e mafai ona faasino i soo se fesootaiga i totonu o le aiga ma nuu, e pei o le tuagane, matua ma fanau, matai ma aiga, ma isi. O le tautua a le tuagane o o e aofia ai le gasesega o tuamafa ma le puipuina o lona aiga. O le tuafafine o le gasia lea o le aiga. O le tautua o se vaega taua o le filifilia o se na te tauavea se suafa o le aiga. Peitai o nei aso ua aofia ai i le tautua le teupe o le tuaga tulaga maualuga i le malo ma le sasaiete. O le tautua o se vaega taua o le filifilia o se na te tauavea se suafa o le aiga. Peitai o nei aso ua aofia ai i le tautua le tupe ma tulaga maualuga i le malo ma le sasaiete. O le tautua le tupe ma tulaga maualuga i le malo ma le sasaiete. O le tautua o se vaega taua o le filifilia o se na te tauavea se suafa o le aiga. Peitai o nei aso ua aofia ai i le tautua le tupe ma tulaga maualuga i le malo ma le sasaiete. O le tautua o se vaega taua o le filifilia o se na te tauavea se suafa o le aiga. Peitai o nei aso ua aofia ai i le tautua le tupe ma tulaga maualuga i le malo ma le sasaiete. O le tautua o se vaega taua o le filifilia o se na te tauavea se suafa o le aiga. Peitai o nei aso ua aofia ai i le tautua le tupe ma tulaga maualuga i le malo ma le sasaiete.


4. O le talitonuga a Samoa e suli uma tagata i le suafa matai tusa lava poo le tane poo le tamaitai. Soo se aiga Samoa lava e faaauaua lea faiga i fanau a tamafafine ma fanau a tamatane.


6. O le upu nofotane e tele ina manatu nisi o se upu e ta’umaualoloa iina taitoalua o tuagane.


8. Nisbet, Journal, 1843, Oct. 28, Nov. 1. O taimi o taua sa saogalemu lava faile ma meatotina a misionare ma faifau mai autau ona o lo latou tulaga o faifau. SSL, Turner, 16 April, 1869. Afai ae afaina fale ma meatotina a misionare ma faifau sa faasalaina i latou i le fono a matai a nuu. SSL, Murray, 24 Aug., 1869. MS.

9. O le manatu o Margaret Mead o le faifau o ia foi lea e suitulaga i taulaitu a Samoa ma o le aia lea e maua ai foi i latou le mana. Margaret Mead, Social Organisation of Manu’ap, p. 147.
10. E ui lava sauluai faaogaina e misionare matai latou te faatuita ekasesia totonu o nuu, ae na vave lava ona faamalosia e misionare, aemaise lava ina ua faatu Malua, le le auai o faifeu Samoa i faiganu ma le fa'amatai. O lea sa faasaina ai ona toe faaaoga o a latou igoa matai faatasi ai ma le mafai ona toe zalue faafaifai e lona lava nuu. Turner, Nineteen Years, p. 163.


12. O le 1840 na amata ai Faiga Me aua le galuega faamisionare a faifeu Samoa i Vanuatu ma Niu Kaletonia. O le faatauaina o le masina o Me ona o le masina lea sa faavaeina ai le LMS 1795.

13. O le molimau a Derek Freeman, sa oo lava ina nono e nisi o nuu tupe ina ia faamaualuga ai a latou taulaga nai lo isi nuu. Derek Freeman, Margaret Mead and Samoa the Making and Unmaking of an Anthropological Myth, 154. O le molimau foi a Richard Gilson o le mafuaaga e tele ai foai a Samoa ona “e le ona o le lagolagoina o le galuega a le LMS ao le fia maua lea o manuaia mai le Atua faatasi ai ma viiga a tagata i le tele o latou taulaga - ‘not so much to support the mission as to seek the favour of God and the respect of men in the volume of their sacrifices.’” Richard Gilson, Samoa 1830 to 1900 the Politics of a Multi–Cultural Community, 133. O le molimau foi lea a Holmes – “Generosity in gift exchange had always been an admired quality among Samoans, and Christianity provided the opportunity of acquiring additional respect from one’s fellows by lavish giving to the church.” Lowell Holmes. Quest for the Real Samoa the Mead/Freeman Controversy & Beyond, 60.

14. Aiono Le Tagaloa 1992, 125. In 1960, a Constitutional Convention (Fono FaaFaavae) formed to draw a national Constitution for independence, (Aiono – Le Tagaloa 1992, 125). In the formation of the Fono FaaFaavae, Aiono claimed that the nuu (villages) and itumalo (districts) chose one hundred and seventeen matais (chiefs) as members of the Fono FaaFaavae; forty two members of the Legislative Assembly, five Europeans members and three European assistances, one tama-a-aiga, and Tupua Tamasese Meaole and Malietoa Tanumafili II to chair the Convention, (1992, 125-6).
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O To’atūgā ua Fa’ava’atu’ia ai le Avea o Tama’ita’i ma Taitai o ‘Āiga, Nuu ma Ekalesia i Sāmoa

Silia Pa’usisi Finau, National University of Samoa

‘Oto’otoga

E ‘ānoa ma tāua tiute o se taitai i pulega ma le mataituina o faatinoga ma atinae i totonu o alalafaga (lato, 2000). Na amata ona faaululu pulega ma faamasinoga faalenuu i alii ma faipule (matai) i le 19 seneturi ona o latou sa nafa ma le tausisia o le saogalemu lautele ma le nofo filemu o nuu, ao lei iai se faigamalo tuotonu aloaia (Davidson, 1970). O pulega nuu e aofia ai alii ma tulafale ua faasuaufaina i aiga potopoto ma ua resitala lele faamasinoga o Fanua ma Suafa (Keessing & Keessing, 1956). O le faalapotopotoga lenei e faia tulafono, faapiu i alalafaga ma ua faatino o le faativai ma faasalaga i nuu, ma e mafuli i le itupa o alii.

Olo’o faamauina i le talaaga o Samoa le avea o tamaitai ma taitai i seneturi ua mavae, ao lei o misionare, ma pulega mai faafoeina le atunu (Gunson, 1987). O nisi ma lagisoifua o nei taulagiga, aofia ai le taitaiga a le atu a o taua o Nafanua, faapea foi ma Salamasina, o le uluai Tafaifa na pulea Samoa i le silia ma le 40 tuasaga (Meleisea, 1987). O tina ma tamaitai is tagata na galulue malosi ina ia maupino ma maupu le tutoatasi o le malo o Samoa. Sa faatu le latou mau i le 1930 e tetee atu i le pulega le malo o Niu Sila, e un ia o le vaitau tonu lea o le vevela o fevesiaiga (MacQuoid, 1995). Na auina atu e le Mau ma Tana ma Tamaitai se taitai i Malo Aufatasi e lagolago ai le mateapu a le Mau e Alii ma Faipule, ina ia faamatuu mai le Malo Tutoatasi ma Samoa. Na faamanuiaina le talosaga lenei ina le taitaiga le faamuia tosinu Samoa ia launari aso 1, 1962.

O galuega faatino a tina ma tamaitai e faamaonia ai lo latou lototetele, finafinau ma le sogasoga. E ogatasi ata lafoia nei ma lo latou faalupega o le feagaiga, e pei o alafua faataatitia o le va nofo o le tuagana ma le tuafasefine (MacQuoid, 1995). O aiaiga o le feagaiga lenei i manaoalai ai le tufa i e tautua ma puipui lona tuafasefine ma lana fananua i le olaga ato (Holme & Holme, 1992). Na matua faata a tamaitai le mana o le feagaiga, ma sufi gofie ai o latou lagona e tahuave ma faatino matafai o le faataa. Peitai, o le nafoi mai o misionare ma pulega faalofone, na vaemanu’a ai le tāua o le tulaga faatala o tamaitai (Schoeffel, 1979). O le vaitaimi foi leina na atagia ai le amata ona le maopooopu o tamaitai, ma aiavea ai le mamalu o le tulaga uma tamaitai, e pei ona uluui tumui tumble i tulaga faataatia ma alii ma faafule. Ua vaaia ai le faataa faalagagonu iia uai suituvalu tapuagai o le faalagagonu ma talonuuga faakerisiana i tapuagai faaleagaganu (Kamu, 1996).

E le o toe faamalaluiina taitaiga faatamaitai ma le o toe amanaia foi se leo o le komiti a tina ma tamaitai i faaiauga e ai le fono a le nuu i le tele o alalafaga (Quay, 2006). Peitai, e un ia mafuli le pulega ma nuu ma alii ma faaagaga i aiga ma tamaitai i avanoa ma atia ai o latou tomai ma agavaa faatiai (Samoa Women Empowerment Project Report, 2015).

O le auga o leina pepa, o le salliiiliga o to’atūgā ua fa’ava’atu’ia ai le avea o tamaitai ma altarai o ‘āiga, nuu ma ekalesia i Sāmoa nei.

‘Ano Matā’upu

E tele afioaga ua vaeseugā tapu i papupuni ai tamaitai mai le umia o suafa matai. O le ogaoga o le tapu leina, ua faaulululumamau ai le tele o aiga potopoto, mai le tofia i ni o latou matai tamaitai. Ua faagasolo pea i tuasaga leina tapu, ma ua talia i le toatele lona talafeaga ma aulape o le aganu ma le faaSamoa. Uma talitonu foi nisi, o soli tamatane i faasolo i le suafa matai, ao soli tamafafine i faasolo i le suafa augafaapa. O nisi foi o tamaitai, e lilifia lo latou
taofi e onomea i le alii ona tauave mamalu o le suafa matai, ae ititi lona taua, pe afai o le tamaitai.

E 41 faiganuu i Sāmoa latou te le faatagaina tamaitai e umia suafa matai, atoa ai ma le isi 34 e le fa’amamaluina le auai o matai tamaitai i fonotaga a le nuu (CSS, 2015). O le tufafo na pulega a nuu i le 1990, na amanaia ai faaletufafo o tufafo ma faasalaga e fausia e le fono a alii ma faipule o alalagafa. E foliga mai la, ua talitonu le toatele, ua agavaa faaletufafo foi ma le tapu mo tamaitai mai le umia o suafa matai.

Na faamauina i le tusigaigoa o le 2011 le itiiti ifo i le 10% o le faitau aofai o Samoa, le aofaiga o matai tamaitai. O le ata lafoia, e ogaoga to’atūgā olo’o taumafai atu e avea ma matai o le tulafono atu aotau aiga. Na o le toalima faipule tamaitai i le palemene o Samoa, i le taimi na tusia ai le lipoti lenei, faatusatua i le aofai o faipule e le maota fono e 49. E to’a’a na manumalo mai nofoa o le tulafono atu i le 1990, na amanaia ai faalelone a tulafono ma faasalaga e fausia e le fono a alii ma faipule o alalagafa. E foliga mai la, ua talitonu le toatele, ua agavaa faaletufafo foi ma le tapu mo tamaitai mai le umia o suafa matai.

O faatuatuaga tetele e tolu i Samoa e pei o le Ekalesia Faapotopotoga Kerisiano i Samoa (LMS), Lotu Metotisi ma le Ekalesia Katoliko (Lotu Pope), latou te le faatagaina tamaitai e ulufale i Kolisi Faafafea, pe faauu foi e avea ma faalelone a le Talalelei. E faapena foi i le tofiga Aoao Fesoasano i le LMS po o Failauga i le Lotu Metotisi. Pau tofiga e agavaa ai o Tiakono, o le vaega lona tolu lea e pulega e ekalesia. O lona uiga, tasi lea o le faalinu o matai tamaitai mai tuai o le fono o le tulafono o le 1990, na amanaia ai faaotai o le fono a alii ma faipule o alalagafa. E foliga mai la, ua talitonu le toatele, ua agavaa faaotai o le fono a alii ma faipule o alalagafa. E foliga mai la, ua talitonu le toatele, ua agavaa faaotai o le fono a alii ma faipule o alalagafa.
Na vaivai le malosi o pulega a tamaitai ina ua taunu mai pulega faakolone ma faamaite ituaiaga taitaiga fou ma pulega tutotonu mo atunuou o le pasefika. O lea faiga sa feteenai ma faavea i faalapotopotoga faaleaganu mo le seteneti e 19 (Feinberg & Watson-Gegeo, 1996). O feteenaiiga nei sa avea ma faafitauali i pulega faaleaganu a le tele o atunuou o le Pasefika. O le isis faafitauali, o le taumafai o misionare ma faaeleaga le malosi faaleaganu sa faatuaaia a pulega o atunuou o le Pasefika i aso anamua (Gustafsson, 1992). O le talitonuga o misionare, o aga faafitauli, au aga faalapotopotoga faaleaganu i aso anamua (Maiava, 2001). O le taumafai o misionare, o aga faafitauli, au aga faalapotopotoga faaleaganu i aso anamua (Maiava, 2001). Na vaivai le malosi pulega faataitaiga i lou le Pasefika. O lea faiga sa feteenai ma fa'avea i le tofiga o se matai (Saolotoga, 1995). E foliga mai, o nafa patino nei e tatāau ona fa'ama'amulu le vaega tele o tamaitai ina ua malosi pulega faataitaiga a alii.

E līlīfa le talitonuga faaSamoa i le faafesootai o tina ma tamaitai ma feau masani o le aiga e pei o le taisua o tagata matutua ma fanau, gasease taumafa, ma fai le tuano'a. O le tasi lea manūa'aga ua manatu a aiga, ua le agavaa tina ma tamaitai i le tofiga o se matai (Sāoletoga, 1995). E foliga mai, o nafa patino nei e tatau ona fa'amamafa le taua e tina ma tamaitai, ae le le le o le avea ma taua. Ua o se aga masani e vaai sa lelei taga, ma e le fua tasi, ae toetoe laugatasia ai le vaega tele o tina ma tamaitai. Ua manatu le toatele, e le tatau ona faalavesonu le toe aap a o se tina po o se tamaitai i se isi matata ma e se atu ai ma ana lava matafai'ai faapitoa. O le mafuaaga tonu lea, ua alagatau ai ona patino le taitai o se tofi tumau mo alii, aua e malualii ma onomea le le tofiga lea.

E le to'atūgā foi lea olo' o fa'ava'atū'ia ai le taumafai o isis tamaitai i tulaga faataitai, i le tele o atunuou o le lalologa. Fai ma faataitaiga, o le tele o kamupani i le lunaite Setete o Amerika, le faafatagaina se tamaitai e taitai, ona ona le manatu faapea, e le le tofiga se matai, le fai ma faataitaiga, ona ona le manatu faapea, e le tele o faalapotopotoga (Schwanke, 2013). E le gata ina ua agavaa na o ali i tulaga faataitai, o se faaafiga foi o nisi i tu ma agana na nisi o atunuou, le le le aiga na o tomai faataitai o tamaitai. O nisi ia o mafuaaga ua sufia gata ai lagona o nisi o tamaitai e faafetai luitau o le avaea ma se taitai (Akao, 2008).

E afua mai le pulega o aiga sia o o upufai o malo, e matamata tetele le ogaoga o aafiaga o tulafono faaleaganu, tiute faatina ma talitonuga faakerisiano, i le taumafai a tina ma tamaitai e ausia tulaga faataitai (Finau, 2017). O le tele o faalapotopotoga faaleaganu ua iloga lelei le eseeseja o ali i tamaitai, ma ua faaitiitia le taua o tamaitai i tulagatofi o faalapotopotoga nei (Harris, 1991). Ua fa'amāmāsagia ma maalolo le tulaga o le tamaitai, ua ta'u fa'atauva'a'aina ma le agavaa i tofiga faataitai (Eagly & Mladinic, 1994). E manatu nisi o ali i tamaitai, ua tamafai nisi o tamaitai i tofiga le fa, ma sosopo atu i tofi na o ali i talafeagai iai. O le isi fo i tu, a tulai se tamaitai i le tulaga o se taitai, o se tulaga e taufa'amatu'a ma ta'u fa'atauva'a'aina ai ali latou te galulue (Broughton & Miller, 2009). Peiti, e le o le manatu lea o le tele o tamaitai ua avea ma taitai. E manatu latou, o se matatia lea, ma o se faamoemoega foi sa tulimatai ia mafai ona oo iai.

E taga tutusa le tulaga olo'o iai tina ma tamaitai Samoa, ma isi foi tamaitai i isi atunuou o le Pasefika. O le atunuou o Toga, e faatauaina ma faaolaola pea le faaauauiina o le pule e fai
E iai le talitonuga, o le taitai na te tauaveina le mana o ona tua, ma o se suivaia o mauui o le aiga i le tulaga faataitai (Sanga & Chu, 2009). O le mauui na te faamasolisia le mana, e faatamaoaigaina ai le taitai o le aiga ma le nuu i le atamai e faatina ai matafai o le nei tofiga maualuga, aloaia ma taua (Aiono, 1986). Olo'o tā'ua i le lipoti o le Samoa Millennium Development Goals Progress Report 2010, le itiiti o avanoa e faaaoga ai e tamaitai fanua faaleaganu, ma e le agavaa foi e faalanga ni lisi mo fanua nei, e iia tutusa lelei le latautai aia ma le itupa o alii. Olo'o faamatalaina i le lipoti le e, o le pulea o fanua le isi toatuga e faaalo'i ai le atamai o le taitai ona ausia tulaga faataitai, ona e le auai i le tele o taimi i talanoaga e aafia ai fanua faaleaganu, aua latou te le umia ni suafa matai. E telē le eseesega e tulaga faataitai o alii ma tamaitai i saoafaiga a nuu (Schoeffel, 2015). O le mafuaaga tonu lea ua tauamai ai le suesuega lenei e faapupula i le paia ma le mamalu oloo ala ma papaao i afioaga eseese, e aia tutusa alii ma tamaitai i tofiga taitai, aemaise i le avea ma matai o se aiga potopoto, e pei ona faamatala mai e le faavea o le Malo Tutoatasi o Samoa.

Fa’aiuga
E tatau ona agavaa tagata uma e auai ma lotolotoi o faiauga fai, aemaise i vaega taotaomia e pei o le itupa o tina ma tamaitai (Haider, 2009). E lagolagoina malosi le mau leenei Freire, (1983) i lona talitonuga, o le aia tatau a tagata uma le auai i faiga o faaaga, ma talanoa faatasai i matau ma faaaga uma ai tagata. Talu ai o tulaga faataitai e le o se faamaniuaga faapitoa mo se ituaga tagata po o se tagata foi se toatasi, o le mafuaaga lea e faatuiaina ai le fausia o se tulafono e agavaa uma ai tagata e faaaga saolo o latau lagona i faiauga fai o aiga, nuu ma ekalesia. E tumua pea le papupuni o tamaitai e umia suafa matai o aiga, pe afai e leai se tulafono e soloa ai tapu a le 41 o nuu mavae i Samoa, e le o faaaga ni tamaitai e suafa matai. O le malosiaga foi lea e faamatu ai le le amanaia o le auai o tamaitai ma suafa matai e le i ai 34 nuu mavae i Samoa. E iai le naunautaiga o leenei sueguega, o se avanoa foi lea e mafai ai e ekalesia ona faamatu nasi o tofiga taitai i tamaitai, e pei o le avea ma failauga e folafolaina le Talalelei. O le faiga lea ua lla iai ekalesia faapotopotoga kerisiano i Amerika, Europa ma Peretania, ao leenei lava e taofiofimamau faauluuluuga o le lotu i Samoa e tapu tamaitai mai le avea ma faifeau. E talitonu nasi, o le pulega e faauluulu u aii ni faaulufale mai
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The Journal of Sāmoan Studies, Volume 10 © e Misionare i le 1830, ma ua faaauau pea e tagata Samoa ona faatua e amata mai le lotoifale o le aiga, seia oo atu i le lio o le nuu, atunuu ma ekalesia. Olo'o faamauina e Schoeffel (1979), na matuia tulaga ese le ituaila pulega lea ina ua faaofi mai i Samoa, aua ao lei taunuu mai misionare, sa tumuai tutusa lava le ali'i taua ma ona tuafafine i tulaga mamalu ma aloaia.

E le tau faamatalaina sao taua o tina ma tamaitai i le atinae o nuu, alafafaga ma ekalesia. E maumaututu le talitonuga o le vaega tele o tina, ua mafai ona ausia tapulaa nei ona o le faaogaina o o latou tomai ma agavaa faaaitai.

O fa'amatalaga na tuu faaatasia mai fa'atalanoaga, mitaituina o galuega i nisi o komiti a tina ma tamaitai ma le iloiloaga o lipoti ma iuga o nisi o suesuega, na aliai mai ai le mafuli o finagalo faalalagai i faaiga nei. O to'atūgā ua fa'ava'atu'ia ai le avea o tamaitai ma taitai o aiga, nuu ma ekalesia, ona o tulafono a nisi o nuu ua tapu ai tamaitai ona umia suafa matai ma lē amanaia lo latou auai i fonotaga a nuu, o talitonuga faaafalelotu o le tama o le ulu o le aiga, ma talitonuga o le toatele o tagata e onomea ali'i i tulaga faaaitai, ae le o tamaitai. O le tapu o tamaitai ona avea ma matai o o latou aiga, ua le mafai ai ona agavaa o taua i faigapalota lautele mo sui o le palemene. Ua le avanoa tamaitai i tofiga faaafaeau, ma faamaluina pe'a le lagolago a le toatele o le atunu i le avea o ali'i ma taitai. E iai le faamoemoega, o le tali o faafitaui olo'o fa'ava'atu'ia ai le taumafai o nisi o tamaitai ma avea ma taitai, o se tulafono mo 'āiga, nuu ma ekalesia, e mafai ai ona matala ia Sega le tele o to'atūgā ua saisaitia ai tamaitai i agavaa i tofiga fa’ata’ita’i.

Puna’oa


Do the Pacific Islands Still Need a Regional University

Eric Clem Groves, National University of Samoa

Background of Higher Education in the South Pacific Region

This article offers some background on a current issue in Pacific regionalism with reference to the problems of the University of the South Pacific (USP). The USP was established in 1968 for the twelve English speaking Pacific Island states located south of the equator (Samoa, Fiji, Tonga, Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, and Cook Islands), and later included the northern Pacific Marshall Islands, (Crocombe M, 1988: 29). Its establishment was coordinated and funded by the joint efforts of the United Nations, Australian, British and New Zealand governments (Aikman, 1988 p. 35-38). Fiji was chosen as its location when New Zealand offered suitable premises at the former New Zealand air base at Laucala Bay in Suva. The rationale for its establishment was to reduce the dependence of the new states on expatriate teachers and administrators and to build a spirit of Pacific Island regional identity.

When USP was established, decolonisation was underway in the Pacific. The decolonisation of the Pacific Island states began in 1962 with Samoa the first to achieve independence. This was followed by Nauru (1968), Fiji (1970), Tonga (1970), Papua New Guinea (1975) and, Solomon Islands (1978), Tuvalu (1978), Kiribati (1979), the Federated States of Micronesia (1986), Marshall Islands (1986) and Palau (1994). The other Pacific Island states were granted self-governance but still remained in ‘free association’ relations with the former administrative powers such as that of the Cook Islands and Niue with New Zealand. New Caledonia, Tahiti, Wallis and Futuna and French Polynesia are overseas territories of France, while American Samoa, Northern Mariana Islands and Guam remain territories of the United States of America. Tokelau is a dependent territory of New Zealand.

During this period most Pacific Island governments had only recently established schools offering more than elementary levels. In the 1960s a few people who had achieved well in school were sent overseas for senior secondary schooling and higher education. Only the more populous countries, Fiji and Papua New Guinea had specialised education in fields such as medicine. Large South Pacific Island states such as Papua New Guinea, Fiji and Samoa were also able to establish national teacher’s colleges alongside the existing theological colleges. Small South Pacific Island states such as Tokelau, Niue and the Cook Islands either struggled or were not able to establish post-secondary education institutions due to their small size and limited resources (Crocombe R, 1994:26 – 27).

Early Initiatives in Higher Education

Papua New Guinea led the way when the Administrative College (now the PNG Institute of Public Administration) was established in 1963 (Pacific Precinct, n.d). Two years later, the University of Papua New Guinea (UPNG) was founded in 1965 by the Australian colonial administration making it the first official university in the South Pacific region (Weeks, 1991:3). Since then, Papua New Guinea’s large population and resources have allowed the island state to establish at least three national institutions of higher education since 1965, as well as two operated by churches. With the establishment of UPNG, the former colonial powers acknowledged the need for post-secondary education in the region, and decided in 1966 to explore the idea of an institution of higher education for the South Pacific region. This is what led to the establishment of USP in 1968 (Luteru 1991:78).

As most small Pacific Island states could not afford to offer senior secondary levels for university entrance, and because few of their people qualified for training overseas, the leaders of Pacific Island states supported the concept of a regional university (Baba, 1991). For this reason USP immediately established pre-degree bridging programmes to provide university entrance certificates leading to diploma and degree level programmes.
Meeting early ends for higher education

Until the 1980s the USP satisfied most of the higher educational needs of its member countries, but in some of the larger island states there was a growing need for local higher education, to train secondary school teachers, nurses, technicians, and administrators. The cost of exporting all this training was expensive and also posed a risk of brain drain with graduates in some fields such as medicine, often opting not to return home for work when overseas opportunities at higher salaries existed (Docquier, 2014). There was also a need for more emphasis on national culture in teacher training, as exemplified in 1975 by the establishment of the Atenisi Institute in Tonga, a brave effort to establish a post-secondary college without support from the state or aid donors.

The desire of individual Pacific Island states to establish their own national institutions of higher education were constrained by the on-going commitment of the former colonial powers and USP donors to channel resources to one institution for the whole region or to fund scholarship in the countries of the donors. This limited the government’s economic capacity to redirect the majority of aid-funded scholarship toward building and sustaining their own national higher education and post-secondary training institutions (Crocombe & Meleisea, 1988 p. 34). It was more cost-effective and convenient for donors to fund one institution for the region compared to funding separate national institutions. The all-the-eggs-in-one-basket approach by aid donors made sense at the time of USP establishment when larger island states such as Samoa, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands had only small numbers of students graduating from secondary schools with university entrance qualifications.

USP’s in-country presence

Concern began to be voiced about the disproportionate benefits USP offered to Fiji in the 1980s. These benefits included numbers of enrolments and consumers, taxation, and employment opportunities. Early critics were Ron Crocombe who was Professor of Pacific Studies at USP, and Professor Albert Wendt, who also taught at USP for many years, commented on Fiji’s disproportional benefits from USP:

‘Our governments and donor governments should ask themselves if they are still willing to finance an institution which, I believe, is Fiji’s national university’ (Crocombe R, 1994 p. 127.)

To spread the benefits in the early 1980s, USP and its aid donors established university extension centres in each of the member countries and later decentralised its Faculty of Law to Vanuatu, its Faculty of Agriculture to Samoa, and had established an Atoll Research Unit in Kiribati. The extension centres (now described as ‘campuses’ of USP) were originally set up to deliver continuing education and programmes of study by correspondence, once using a satellite to broadcast tutorials, later developed to online learning modes as most member countries obtained internet connectivity computers and other communication technology. The extension centres did not equally satisfy all the member countries higher educational needs as they did not offer the full facilities to study for a degree in-country. This came at a cost for students or their governments outside Fiji because students enrolled by distance education are usually required to spend part of their learning time at the main Laucala Campus in Fiji for varying periods of time during their degree studies (Tuiringariki & Short, 1991 p. 113). In the case of Samoa, Fiji and Solomon Islands, USP’s in-country facilities have an aid-subsidised competitive edge over national universities.

National needs and aspirations for higher education

By the 1980s and the 1990s there was a rising demand to train professional’s in-country, especially in fields such as education, medicine, business, administration and technology. Today the majority of small Pacific Island states are still dependent on aid-funded scholarships to USP, or to universities in Papua New Guinea, New Zealand and Australia for higher education. Over the past thirty years or so scholarships to many other English-speaking countries and to China have become available.
As shown in Table 1, only the first six countries ranked by population size might reasonably be able to support a small national university tailored to their national human resource needs. However with the exception of Tuvalu and Nauru, four of the remaining six countries are in free association with the country that formerly administered them and have access to education in those countries. Fiji, Samoa and Solomon Islands have already established national universities and would welcome students from other Pacific Island countries such as Tonga Nauru, Tuvalu and Kiribati, if aid-funded scholarships were provided.

Table 1: Population of USP Member States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>896,445</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>667,044</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>304,500</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>199,052</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>120,100</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>100,651</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Marshall Islands (USA)</td>
<td>55,500</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cook Islands (NZ)</td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>10,640</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>10,084</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Niue (NZ)</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tokelau (NZ)</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Oceanian_countries_by_population

Funding of USP

The World Bank (2000 p. 50) taskforce argues that ‘higher education institutions can thrive only if their funding levels are adequate, stable and secure in the long term’. The USP is securely funded with Australia and New Zealand contributing directly to its operational budget. In addition, Australia and New Zealand award scholarships and special grants channelled at USP. Each of the twelve member countries as collective owners of USP also provide direct funding to the regional university.

Overall USP has an annual budget of approximately $257 million tala (source: https://www.usp.ac.fj/index.php?id=109). The USP also receives revenue from tuitions from self-funded students (predominantly Fijian nationals), leasing out its venues and sales of its publications. In comparison the National University of Samoa (NUS) annual budget is approximately $20 million tala and is heavily reliant on tuition fees to keep the institution afloat (Groves, 2019). The UPNG annual budget is approximately $56 million tala and is also heavily reliant on tuitions for additional funding (PNG Education News, 2019). This means that USP is the highest funded university in the Pacific region aside from the US funded University of Guam and those funded by France in New Caledonia and French Polynesia.

Although USP is securely funded, there have not been equitable benefits for all member countries, as pointed out many years ago by Crocombe and Meleisea, (1988 p. 346 – 63). This is because Pacific Island countries have different funding needs according to their size, resources, and education and training systems. For instance, in the early 1990s, island states such as Tuvalu had to run short courses for adults on several of its isolated islands as it was cheaper to send training staff out than to bring students in (Crocombe R, 1994 p. 25). However, for a larger Pacific Island like Samoa, it is cheaper to have students attend a national institution than it is to send the students out to USP or New Zealand.
Emergence of National Institutions

In 1983, the Government of Samoa announced its intention to establish a national institution of higher education and on February 14th 1984, the NUS was established with the University Preparatory Year programme mirroring that of USP (Groves, 2019). The founding of national institutions in the Solomon Islands, as well as outside the USP region in French Polynesia, New Caledonia and Guam soon followed. These new institutions began to offer secondary teacher training, general, technical, and advanced study in various fields such as humanities, science, business, health and trades.

The hopes of the other Pacific Island states to follow suit remain constrained by the lack of support from the development partners. At the national level major donors such as Australia and New Zealand, place the greatest emphasis on health and basic education, overlooking the need to assist higher education services towards better quality training of teachers, health workers and sector administrators.

By the 2000s towards the present day, the economies and populations of Fiji, Samoa and Solomon Islands have grown considerably allowing them fund and sustain national institutions of higher education via government subsidies and aid apportioned to the education sector as a whole in addition to tuition fees and other revenues. USP remains the best option for Tuvalu, Nauru, Tokelau and Kiribati, but these countries could also send students to national Pacific Island universities if scholarships were made available. Table 2 below shows a list of Pacific Island universities and higher education institutions in a chronological order:

Table 2: Pacific Islands Universities Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Year Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Public Administration</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea University of Natural Resources and Environment</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea University of Technology</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the South Pacific</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atenisi Institute (Tonga)</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National University of Samoa</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Adventist University (PNG)</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands National University (formerly the Solomon Islands College of Higher Education)</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of French Polynesia</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Goroka (PNG)</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Caledonia</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problems of donor support for regionalism in higher education

Regionalism was once a high ideal but one that has gradually withered with the demise of a regional airline and shipping service and (so far unsuccessful) resistance by Fiji to Australia and New Zealand having a presence in the Pacific Forum. The headquarters of the Forum and USP sit, often uncomfortably, in Fiji, which has had a series of military coups since 1987 and considerable political instability between coups. For many years now most of USPs staff at all levels have been Fijian nationals. In 2020 it is in turmoil over allegations of mismanagement, Fiji government interference, and, so far, the member states appear powerless to resolve the situation.

It may be a time to rethink the role of USP as a more specialised regional institution. Perhaps it might become a regional institution for post-graduate studies and research, allowing more aid-sponsored and government investment in the under-graduate programmes of national universities and Pacific inter-country student exchanges. There could be stronger partnerships, supported with development assistance funding, with New Zealand and Australian universities to develop accredited professional programmes and build capacity in technical and vocational education. There are countless opportunities that can be achieved at a larger scale if donor assistance can be disbursed throughout the regions national institutions. Maybe it is time for a change. Let us ask ourselves, do we still believe that the Pacific Islands need a regional university?

Acknowledgement
This article draws on the second chapter of my 2019 NUS Master’s thesis in Development Studies titled ‘The Five Tala University: Higher Education in Developing Countries - A Case Study of the National University of Samoa’. I thank Associate Professor Penelope Schoeffel for her editorial assistance.

References


Tāua o le Gagana Fa’a-Failauga i le Gagana male Aganu’u Samoa.

Emo Tauave, National University of Samoa

Folasaga

O le gagana, “O le fale o oloa tāua” (Le Tagaloa, 1996) o loo taaofa’i ai le sosia male tamaoaiga o le lalolagi o tagatanuu o Samoa. E pei ona taua i le Tofamanino a Samoa, O tama a manu, e fafaga i fuga o laau, o tama a tagata e fafaga i upu ma tala. O le gagana o le taiala lea e a’oa’o ma fofoa ai o tatou mafaufau ia poto ma ia iloa le soifuaga o le lalolagi fa’a-Samoa (Le Tagaloa, 1996).

Ou te talitonu, e tu mati’e lava Samoa i lana gagana, aua e tasi le gagana ae eseese ona tafa poo malosiaiga, fai ole gagana fa’afailauga, gagana faaaloaloalo, gagana fa’akerisiano, gagana fa’avaoli’a poo le fa’aiualu ma le gagana valiata, o ituaiga malosiaiga ia o loo tiu ai le Samoa i aso uma. O tafa ia o le gagana Samoa e ese mai ai mai i isi gagana O lenei tusa puupuu o le a agai tonu lea i le taua o le Gagana Faa-failauga.

Gagana Fa’a-Failauga

O le gagana fa’afailauga, o le gagana sa fa’afailele mai e saofaiga a matai o totonu o nuu ma itumalo ta’itasi. O loo faamauina e Aiono i lana tusi “O la ta gagana” le taofi a Tomasi Paueli (faifeau misionare na galue i Samoa 1837) e fa’atatau i le Faleula o Fatuaiupu. O le saofaiga a Fatuaiipu o matai o nuu, sa latou tausia ma tauloto upu ma uiga o la latou aganuu (Le Tagaloa, 1996). O le taofi a Paueli, o le saofaiga a matai e saunoa/fetalai ai le fatuaiipu ma fa’amalamalama lona finagalo i lana upu o loo tau fa’aofi lea o le saofaiga. A maea le saunoaga/fetalaiga a le fatuaiipu, ona faapea lea o le Faleula, “Se ua malo saunoa/fetalai. E mālie i le fa’alogologolo atu lau folasaga, ae tofā malie, tā mai lagisoifua o lou taofi lea” (Le Tagaloa, 1996). E no’omia le fa’amaoniga o le mau a le fatuaiipu. E ioe lo’u taofi, o le tasi lea o auala na mafua ai ona iai lagisoifua i le tausiusiuga o le tele o alagaupu o loo fa’aagogaina e matai.

Fa’ataitaiga –

- Ua muāmuā le Asō e pei o le upu ia Tualemoso.
- Ua ta’ialalo le i’a a Sā Sa’umani.
- Ua ola i fale le laau a Nafanua. (ma isi alagaupu ua felanulanuai ai la ta gagana fa’afailauga).

O le gagana fa’a-failauga o le gagana taualoa a matai i felafolaoa’iga pe’a fono nu’u i a latou Aso Gafua masani ma isi tulaga e pei o fa’alavelave i malu, fa’aiopoipoiga, saofa’i, to’ona’i a aulotu ma Ekalesia pe’a fai felauga’iga. Ma o loo mulimuli lava i ta’iala e masani ai lauga fa’aSamoa atoa ai ma alagaupu ma muāgagana e talafeagai ma vaega taitasi o le lauga. E iai lava gagana faafailauga e talafeagai ma vaega eseese o le lauga. E pei la o se fa’ata’ita’iga o loo tu’uina atu i lalo:

Auivi o Lauga

- Tuvaoga poo le folasaga (aofia ai ma paia o le Aso)
  Fa’ataitaiga- Ua matalupe le seuga aua o lupe na vao eseese a ua fuifui faatasi.
- Ava
  Fa’ataitaiga- E faamalulu atu, ua laulau toafa tuamaota o le nuu nei.
- Faafetai
  Fa’ataitaiga- O le viiga i le Tagaloa matua aua o lea ua taulau le faamoemoe i le Asō.
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• **Taeao**
  Fa’ataitaiga- O taeao o le atunuu o taeao o le totomasa’a, ae o le taeao sili o le taeao o le talalelei.

• **Faiā poo le mataupu e autu iai le lauga**
  Fa’ataitaiga- Wa tini pa’o le uto pei o le upu i le tapalega aua o lea ua tino le tatalo na fauao faupo.

• **Fa’amatafi**
  Fa’amatafi- A ta’ape le fuāmanusina, lele le gogo ma si ana i’a.

E fuafua lava le lauga i le a’ano o le Aso ma le faamoemoe.

  E le tāgā tasi le gagana fa’afailauga, ua iai lava upu e talafeagai ma sauniga ese’ese fa’aleaganu’u. Fa’ataitaiga, Malu. E le mafai ona fa’aaogaina fa’aupuga o le maliu i se isì lava aganu’u a Samoa. Ua iai lava gagana e patino i maliu. E pei o faaupuga ua tusia i lalo.

• Tulouna le lagi.
• Ua lagia Tupua ma Maota.
• Ua lē sivā le malili a le tausala. (ma isi faaupuga e fa’atatau i le maliu)

  E fa’apena foi i le Nunu avaga po ole fa’aipoipoga. Ua iai foi ona fa’aupuga e patino tonu iai. E pei o fa’aupuga nei.

• Tini i le tausala.
• Ua o se ie e folasia i malae (ma isi fa’aupuga e fa’atatau i fa’aipoipoga)

A fa’atino foi se Saofai poo se nofo, e iai foi ona gagana e fa’atatau iai.

• O le fa’afotutupu.
• O le fa’afotou o le vaaulu. (ma isi)

  A talimalo foi le atun’uu, e iai foi fa’aupuga o le Gagana fa’afailauga e fa’amatala ai lagona o le fiafia. E pei o alagāupu ma muāgagna nei.

• O lupe na vaose’e’ese a ua fuifui fa’atasi.
• Ua atoa tino o Va’atausili. (ma isi)

  Ua maioio lelei le vaevaeina o le Gagana fa’afailauga e fuafua i siosiomaga eseese e fa’aaoagaina ai le gagana.

O le Gagana fa’afailauga e fasia mai i vaogagana, alagaupu ma muagagana. O le ala lea e oa ai ma tamaoaiga le Gagana Faafailauga.

O vaogagana, o upu ta’itasi e maua mai i le natura o le soifuaga fa’asamoa atoa ai ma talatu a le atunu’u. Fa’ataitaiga o le seugalupe, o lona vaogagana le muniao, faleseu, falevaai, puto ma isi upu taitasi na maua mai le faiva o le seugalupe. O la’au tau a Nafanua, le faauililito, tafesilafai, ulimasao, o se fa’ataitaiga lena o Vaogagana i talatu. O upu taitasi ia, e tāua tele i le faufauina o la la’agoaga.

O lagāupu, o fa’aupuga ia na maua mai i Talatuu a le atunu’u. E pei o le tala iia Leatiogia, na maua ai le alagaupu, “Ua pati taoto le Feepa. Momoli laau i Fogaa. O le toe Aso na Moamoa, ma isi alagaupu. Tala iia Taufau na maua ai le alagaupu “Ua tafea le utu a Taufau.” O talatu’ugutu ma tu’utaliga a vai o tatou tua’dia na maua mai ai le tele o tamaoaiga o la la’agoaga.
O *muāgagana*, o fa’apuiga ia e maua mai i le natura o le siosiomaga fa’asamoa atoa ai ma faiva o le vao male sami, ta’aloga fa’asamoa, fa’atufugaga, fa’afiaiiga ma isi natura o le tagata Samoa. Fa’ataitaiga o Muagagana, “Fa’atili foe mo le a’e” (faiva o le sami) O le natura lea o le tautai, e fa’atoetoete se malosi aua le a’e ai i fanua. “Seu oe i falemua ae ou sei i falevaai” (seugalupe) O loo fa’amatala e le upu tagata e toalua i le taimi o seugalupe “la mau le toovae” (ta’aloga fa’asamoa) A le to’a le tagata taalo i le taulafoga, ona le mau lea o lana nofo, ona faapea mai lea o tagata ta’alo, mau le toovae, aua le popole vale. “Mu le lima tapa i le i’ofisi. (natura o le tagata) “Ua aluatu le afi” (fa’afiaiiga fa’asamoa) E ta’aitumalae fa’afiaiiga fa’asamoa, a maea le isi itu, ona faapea lea –ua aluatu le afi, o lona uiga o outou lea o le a fa’afiafa

**Tāua o le Gagana Fa’afailauga**

E tulagaese le Gagana Fa’a-failauga i le gagana a Samoa ona o le vaega tonu lea o loo taofia ai le tomai (skills) o ò tatou tua’a i aso ua mavae i le matauina o le soifuaga ma fa’amauina e avea ma lagisoifua, o le so’otaga o le tagata ma lona tupuaga, o le tino i oau Aganuu ma avea fo i ma au measina tu’ufaaosolo.

**Tomai ma Lagisoifua**

O le tāua lenei o le gagana fa’afailauga o lo’o pine ai le tomai tu’ufa’asolo mai i ò tatou tua’a i aso ua mavae. O le pinafa’amaou foi lea o le atamamai ma le sogasogā sa i o tatou tagata i ia aso i le matauina o le soifuaga ma suiga i le natura o le siosiomaga. Ou te talitonu, o le tomai lea a ò tatou tua’a sa fesoasoani tele i a latou tapenana fa’usauiga i aso taitasi. O nei foi tomai na avea ma tiala o le soifuaga o le tagata Samoa i ia ona po. E pei ona fausia ai muāgagana e fa i lagisoifua o tomai tu’ufaaosolo mai i tua’a ua mavae. *Fa’ataitaiga,*

1. **Aua le tulimataia le lauamanu ae taga’i le faamuli o atu.**

O le tomai lea sa i o tatou tua’a i le faigaigaFa’ai o le tuligaatu, o le matauina lea o le natura ole lauamanu i le gataifale. A va’aia loa se lauamanu i le moana ona tuu loa lea o le vaa agai tonu i le lauamanu. E iai taimi e sese ai le aua faifaiva i ia aso aua e lē o le lauamanu lava ma le atu. Ona faapine loa lea e matai i le muagagana “Aua le tulimataia le lauamanu ae vaai le faamuli o atu”. Ia mataalia le faaa o le lauamanu ae ia vaai foi ile atata o le ila ane o sī’u atu. O le tomai lea ooo taiala ai le tuligaatu.

2. **O le fuata ma lona lou.**

O se tasi lenei o tomai a nai o tatou tua e ala i le faiva o tautua. E le aumaia le lou o le isi fuata ulu e fa’aagoa i le fuata fou ua fotu mai. O le tautua lelei, e atagia i le augofie, e vaе mama e tapena se lou mo le fuata fou o lo’o fotu mai. O le fa’atatumumulima ona fai le tautua e mafua ai ona le tapenina le lou fou mo le fuata fotu. A fa’aagoa le lou o le isi fuata i le isi fuata, o le mea e tupu, a le gau le lou e gau le maga o le lou, e mafua ai le isi muagagana “Ua fetaa’i fa’alou le magā” O uiga ia o le tagata tautua na mafua ai ona fatu’ai e tua’a le upu e fa i fa’amana i o le au-tautua. “O le fuata ma lona lou.

3. **E taufeai le atualoa, ae palai’i i le moa.**

Tasi lea natura o le meaola sa matauina e tua’a ma faatu iai le upu talafeagai lelei male soifuaga o le tagata soifu. O le tasi lea fili o le tagata soifu, o le atualoa, ona e ogaoga le maini o lana ū. Peitaia, na matauina e tua’a, e u ia mai ana faiga i le tagata, ae to’ilalo lava i le moa. Ou te talitonu, natura ia o le meaola na fatu iai e tua’a le upu ua felanulanuia ai la la gagana i nei ona po “E taufeai le atualoa ae palaia i le moa.

O ata faata’ita’i na o tomai a nai o tatou matua ua tao’o mai tia, sa ò latou fa’afaileleina le gagana fa’afailauga ua ta tiu ai nei.
So’otaga o le tagata male siosiomaga

O le isu taua o le gagana fa’afailauga, O le fesootaiga lea o le tagata Samoa ma lona siosiomaga, e fesoooti i le natura o mea o lo’o siosiomia ai le tagata. Fa’ataitaiga- A si se faiva i le tai ae asa, ona faapea lea o le tautai, ua tapatautali le taliuta, pe tupu le masalo po ua iai se fa’alavelave ua tupu, o le natura lea o le tagata e maua ai le muāgagana, “E asa le faiva ae le asa le masalo.” O le auala lea o feso’otai sa fa’aaoa e o tatou tua’a e feso’otai ai ma tagata o lona aiga o lo’o nonofo valavala. O le isi fa’ataitaiga faigofie, o le natura o le siosiomaga na faigofie ai ona matauina fesuiaiga o le tau. A fuga laga’ali ma moso’oi, fainai toea’ina, ua vovoga fitogia o le sami, o lona uiga, ua tatau ona tapena se faiva. A talitaliaga le taifau i lumafale, o luo faaiola mai o le a taunu’u ni malo. O lona uiga ua tatau ona tapena le fale. O so’otaga ia o le tagata male siosiomaga e mafuaai ona tamaoaiga le gagana faafulauga.

So’otaga o le tagata ma Tuua

O le fa’aaogaina pea o alagaupu i folasaga a matai, o le ata manino lena o le feso’oataiga o le tagata Samoa ma ona tua’a. A talanoa i tofiga, e tā’ua suafa o tua’a na faia tofiga. Fa’ataitaiga- O tofiga a Pili i lana fanau, na tofia ai le Aiga i le Tai le tama o Tolufale i oia o le feagaia a Tumua. Tofiga a Fonoti, na mafua ai le alagaupu “Toleafoa, sau i le fale sei totofo a ta mea”. O Tofiga na maua ai mamalu o matai Samoa o loo tiu ai nei. A fa’amatafai foi se lauga, e tā’ua foi le tagata e ana le mavaega. Faataitaiga- mavaega na le Falepuna’a, o le mavaega lea a Manusamoa ma Tautiapagofie, fainai upu o le mavaega “O manu na ta feiloai ai, o manu foi tate tetea ai” Mavaega nao Pulotu, o le mavaega na mavae ai Saveasualeo ma lona afafine o Nafanua, fainai upu o le mavaega, “A pō’ia le pa i fualaga, sua le tuli aua le alii’oaiaga.” O mavaega, ua tu’umatamaga ai le nofo lelei o le soifuaga fa’asamoa, ua le sopoupo ai le isis matai na tamaia aua umu ona tu’umave mai tua’a mo le nofolelei o le atunu’u. Ua folasia i luga ni luna o Alagaupu e fa’amanatu mai ai pea mea na tutupu i Aso ua mavae. A tosi le faia o tagata Samoa, ona talanoa lea i gafa ma tagata na tupuga mai ai, e mea ane se talagāgafa, e tino e tasi tagata uma. E moni ai se tasi o muagagana, “E tele a’a o le tagata nai lo aa o la’au” O ni luna na o tāua o lo’o natia totonu o le gagana fa’afailauga.

Laei o le aganuu

E taua le gagana fa’afailauga ona o leai lea o le aganu’u, e le mafai ona tino le aganu’u pe a auona male gagana fa’afailauga. So’o se fa’alavelave fa’asamoa, e momoli vaega uma i le gagana fa’afailauga. E ofigofie i le loto o le tagata fa’alologologo pe a mālie upu a le molitofā. A lelei ona su’i fa’afoaaii manogi upu a le failauga e le taumate le liu suavai o le loto ua tumu i le fia tauamasui. E pine se lagona i le aganuu lenei o le ifoga. E le so’ona masi’i se ifoga, e faatino pe afai o se sala uluā u a o ai le malu i se tagata. O taimi tiga iai male fia taui le mata i le mata. Peitai, a lelei ona fa’aooioi le gagana fa’afailauga e momolea le tofā, e malie ai lava le loto ua a’asa ma magalo ai le sala a le pagota. E moni ai le folasaga a Fonoti lupati Fuatai i lana folasaga sa faia i Aukilani i le fono a le FAGASA e faapea. “O le gagana o le auala i le loto o le tagata.” Le gagana ua mea tapei i soo se tafa o le soifuaga o le tagata Samoa.

O le fa’apolopolo mo tupulaga ilavoa

E mafai ona ou faaapea atu, o le gagana fa’afailauga, o lau mea’alofa taua lea e te tu’uina atu i le isi augatupulaga o lou aiga, nu’u male atunu’u. A matau lelei i le soifuaga i ona po nei, tasi lea vaega ua fa’atua e ni isi o tagata. A fai’ilagi le folauaga a o latou tua’a, ona o lea uai saili pe na iai se api ni fa’amaumau ai ni ana lauga, gafa o le aiga, measina ma isi vaega taua o le aiga. Aisea? Faimai le taofii a Monalisa Saveaalii, “E oti le tagata ae le oti suafa” E tu’ufaaia le suafa o aiga, le suafa lea na te
pulea ona elele faaleaganu’u. Peitai a valetu’ulima le gagana fa’afailauga e tu’uina i le matai, e faapefea ona fa’aleo lana pule fa’amatai? O nei e tapena ai taeao. Sauni se oso aua Samoa mo a taeao.

Aotelega

A aunoa ma le Gagana Fa’a-failauga, ua gaogao le gagana Samoa. O le oa male tamaoaiga o le gagana Samoa, o loo putiputi lea e le gagana fa’afailauga. O le poutu malosi lea o loo tu ai lo ta faile o oloa taua. O le laei o la ta aganu’u. E iloagofie le tama male teine Samoa ua maona i upu ma tala, e poto le gutu e tautala. O le fa’aagoina o muagagana ma alagaupu i tautalaga e fa’amasino ai le tagata Samoa, e iloa ai le tamali’i male tufanua. E tele tagata e mafai ona tautatala i le gagana Samoa, ae le o tagata uma e malamalama i le Gagana Faa-failauga, ona o le gagana lea, o le tomai e maua i le ola tautua. O le gagana e su’i fa’a-fa’asolo, o fa’aupuga na maua i talatu na maua na maua na le natura o le siosiomaga, lea na fanauina le Gagana Fa’a-failauga e logomalie i le faalogo ma ofigofie i le loto. O le gagana a matai e malu ai le aganuu Samoa. E le fa’apena gagana a isi atunuu. Lo ta tofi nei valetu’ulima, ona tafea lea o la ta aganuu ma lilo ai si o ta atunuu.

PUNAOA O MANATU
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The cover artwork of this book created by Rotuman artist John Mausio, and titled ‘I am Here’ depicts an arresting image of a person painted as a combination of shadow and solid form, seated on a layer of rocks against a backdrop of a woven and solid brick wall. Mausio is himself an active artist in the mental health area working with the St Giles Hospital, a key centre of the book’s narrative.

Comprising of seven chapters and populated with images of people and buildings, Leckie states ‘this book explores the way the practices and discourse of modern bio-medicine and mental health were articulated in local communities as well as in the asylum’ (p.3). Furthermore, her interest is in ‘reading the lunacy archive to address how madness was constructed and managed and how it affected individuals and communities in colonial Fiji’ (p.4). Leckie draws on archival research from ‘the remaining records of former patients at St Giles to explore the nebulous condition and label of madness and states of mental difference’ (p.4). These records are described as ‘fragmentary’ and ‘scribbled in shorthand by colonial officials and doctors’ (p.5). Nonetheless, they provide an account of a complex and deeply affective narratives.

In chapter one, Leckie outlines the rationale for asylums in far-flung places away from the metropole such as Hawai‘i and Fiji in the nineteenth-century and the blurry lines of asylum and prison.

Chapter two titled ‘Displaced Minds: Indo-Fijians and Mental Distress’ outlines the tragic stories of displacement due to migration, illness, and cultural structures. The causes of asylum deaths were mainly due to heart failure and exhaustion. The limited support available to patients within their own communities brings to the fore the underdeveloped structures that hindered care in and outside the walls of the asylum.

In chapter three, the high rates of deaths in the year of admission was alarming (p. 62). Leckie writes, ‘The relationship between indigenous Fijians and Western medicine was complicated and ambivalent, especially when the destination was the mental asylum’ (p.63). For example, people were likely to ask for State intervention to remove ‘mentally ill or troublesome people’ (p.63). In addition, the role of Native Medical Practitioners was ‘ambivalent’ in relation to ‘indigenous beliefs about illness and healing practices’ (p.70). The impact of the changing environment was evident in the physical landscape and increasing pressure points after the Second World War.

Chapter four focuses on gender and mental illness, where Leckie states ‘the asylum are both constructed by and form gendered and colonial identities’ (p.88). Narratives of women, their diagnosis, gendered expectations, and surgical intervention surfaces disturbing features of the care environment. The distressing story of Lani, a 14 year old, Fijian woman who was admitted in 1958, and her subsequent readmission about 10 years later, following a turbulent life depicts a deeply moving experience.

Leckie draws on her database of 3,866 admissions between 1884 and 1964 in chapter five. The data focuses on classification of biomedical discourse, and how symptoms were qualified. This...
presented an interesting and disturbing intersection of stereotyping and treatment which were often grey areas of qualification.

The private letters interpreted in chapter six contrast the clinical records which have been much of the focus of previous chapters. Martin Syljeseth articulates patient ownership over place and space, at times advocating for others. The act of crafting private letters takes motivation and its circulation is often outside the control of the author. Leckie’s inclusion of these private insights frames patients in a more nuanced experience. In conclusion, Leckie affirms that ‘recent reforms in mental health legislation, services, and patient rights appear to be breaking with the past’ (p.212). This remains a significant point of difference for this text, as an advocate piece, since it weaves fragmented and complex readings of how mental illness was colonised.

I commend Leckie for her work, and the details infused throughout. The photograph of Setareki Veikosi (Fig 3.5) alongside a painting he had created while a patient at St Giles Hospital connects faces to places. I am conscious too that many of the colonial medical staff, like Dr Bolton Glanville Corney, alongside mental illness also covered a range of diseases such as leprosy and how this impacted patients. However, similarly with mental health, for colonial leprosy management in Samoa, Samoans were drawn on to care for patients (p.85). Overall, Leckie brings to the fore a range of experiences and these weave throughout the text bringing to life names and events which deeply impacted multiple lives.
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