

years of relative neglect from the changing governments in charge of it, the improvements spurred by an indigenous rights movement, and recent attacks threatening its very existence, all reflect changes in global economic and social processes" (218). Indeed, their essay serves to illustrate the similarity between what has happened over time in Hawai'i to the indigenous people and what has happened in other places around the world, and the complicity of local institutions and "reformers" who have failed in their efforts to protect Hawai'i's lands and people.

In reading through this collection of essays, I'm struck by the extent to which social science and public policy can be at times strange, if not uncomfortable, bedfellows. The distance between most of the authors and those in power seems quite far, which on the one hand might be attributed to the habitués of academia versus those frequented by government officials, or perhaps to the extreme differences between those who make public policy and those who write about it. Ira Rohter's appendix (Formula for Political Change), where he advises, "find support from friendly elected officials" (236), may be an admission of the gulf between ideas and action, or at least between the type of analysis contained in this volume and the policies that have proliferated.

Perhaps it is because the world has so completely embraced the neoliberal agenda of free trade, trickle-down investment, civil service reform, cutting taxes and needless regulations and bureaucratic red tape, that no one really hears the voices and arguments espoused by these authors. Per-

haps it is because many local entrepreneurs, business people, corporate executives, and government officials really don't understand the complexities and contradictions, and the resulting crises associated with a "highly developed supranational mode of production" (26). Or perhaps there is need to go beyond the simple prescriptions offered up in this volume, such as "Don't Worry, Be Happy, Be a Revolutionary" (24).

KARL KIM

University of Hawai'i, Mānoa

* * *

A Compensation Claims Procedure for Papua New Guinea: Report to the Institute of National Affairs, Port Moresby, by Deborah Dwyer, Terence Dwyer, Graham Ellis, Michael Ward, and Daniel Fitzpatrick. Canberra: Asia Pacific Press (Paragon Printers), 2000. ISBN 0-7315-3655-X; xxxiv + 170 pages, summary, appendix, bibliography. US\$25.00.

High compensation demands are a serious and growing problem in contemporary Papua New Guinea. Claims for a variety of losses include homicide, personal injury, land, mineral, timber rights, and maritime resources. Those responsible, which may be government agencies, multinational corporations, local businesses, or development organizations, often perceive the compensatory demands as exorbitant, while failures to compensate adequately and in a timely fashion anger the plaintiffs. These grievances disrupt public development efforts, private sector activities, and the provision of essential services.

In response to the need to do something, a project funded in part by AusAID (the Australian government aid agency) and undertaken by the National Centre for Development Studies, Australian National University, investigated the situation. The work proceeded in four phases: research, two weeks of fieldwork, a public seminar, and report writing. Fieldwork centered on interviews with statutory authorities, including Elcom and Telikom; provincial and national officials; nongovernmental organizations and representatives of landowner groups; others from mining, industrial, and agricultural sectors; and academics, judges, and lawyers. This volume summarizes the project's results and proposes a uniform, national system for dealing with compensation claims in Papua New Guinea.

One of its conclusions is that the existing substantive law on compensation is adequate. The problem it sees, rather, is the need for "a logical framework for the awarding of compensation which is equally fair to claimant and the organisation responsible" (xviii). The authors of this report never clearly define what they mean by "compensation," but believe that "land represents the greatest cause of compensation disputes" (49), and it is clear that land claims have occupied much of their attention and shaped their proposals. Accordingly, two major approaches were considered: creating a national tribunal, or utilizing the existing court system. After a public seminar highlighted the strengths and weaknesses of both approaches, a hybrid system, consisting of a panel of compensation experts sitting under the courts, was favored.

Studies in legal development typically fall into one of two camps. Lawyers, who most often concentrate on substantive law, tend to favor top-down approaches, whereas anthropologists, who more frequently focus on procedural law, prefer a grassroots perspective. This volume is solidly in the former group. The authors and consultants proffer three main proposals: (1) creation of a national database (on land claims and alienated land), (2) creation of a Compensation Panel under the auspices of the courts, and (3) creation of a Compensation Settlements Administration Board.

The compensation experts need not be lawyers, although the authors believe, "The qualifications and experience most commonly required in the assessment of compensation claims are those of the lawyer" (112). The panel president would be a serving or retired judge. A given compensation panel would consist of at least two full-time members and a third, who might be a part-time member, would be chosen for relevant experience or expertise. The Compensation Panel would use conciliation and mediation to facilitate consensual agreements, and could also order compensation payments either to current claimants or to future generations through trust funds. The panel would not be bound by the rules of evidence, and decisions could be appealed to the National Court. Furthermore, the panel could "bring justice to the people" by meeting not in Port Moresby, as a formal court might, but by traveling to wherever needed.

An important component of the proposed system is the Compensation Settlements Administration Board,

which would “supervise payments of compensation to the correct beneficiaries, handle complaints about failures to implement orders or agreements, and supervise the administration of trust funds and provide co-trustees” (xxxii). The report envisions the panel and the board to be funded through charges levied on settlements and income from the administration of trust funds. Trust funds would be established whenever compensation payments are large, or involve a class of claimants like a tribal group or future beneficiaries.

What is included under the rubric of “compensation” in this volume seems to be much narrower than what anthropologists understand as “kompensesen” in Tok Pisin. This highlights the fact that “compensation” means many things to many people, and its wide use has resulted in it becoming a somewhat loaded term. The authors suggest (but do not develop) the idea that a more neutral term such as “restitution” might be substituted (134). This seems like a promising proposal, as the formalization of customary legal structures results in entirely new institutions, for which fewer assumptions and expectations exist.

Unfortunately, it is hard to be optimistic that the structure recommended in this volume can successfully address existing problems. While a Compensation Board would bring a measure of uniformity and simplicity to a system in which procedures vary widely, those officials and institutions that currently deal with compensation—including mining wardens, land courts, the Land Titles Commission, the National Land Commission, village courts, and dis-

trict courts—have had great difficulty resolving these claims. Compensation demands are often so extravagant as to be beyond the ability (or inclination) of the responsible parties to pay. Difficult cases that a Compensation Panel could not satisfactorily resolve would likely be appealed, resulting in further delays. Also, the Compensation Settlements Administration Board could be a problem. Accusations of corruption and siphoning of funds plague many institutions in Papua New Guinea, and it is hard to imagine that an organization that handles large trust funds, especially one that finances itself, would be exempt.

RICHARD SCAGLION
University of Pittsburgh

* * *

Sālote, Queen of Paradise,
by Margaret Hixon. Dunedin, NZ:
University of Otago Press, 2000.
ISBN 1-877133-78-7; 239 pages,
maps, tables, illustrations, notes,
bibliography, index, appendix.
US\$39.95.

This is a beautifully presented, informed, well-illustrated, and, above all, accessible biography of Queen Sālote of Tonga: a public figure who, as the author makes clear, was not always so easily accessible as a person. The author, who has produced a number of works documenting life in traditional communities, first visited Tonga in 1987 and began researching this biography soon after. The project's approval by the present king made possible the extensive collection of oral histories concerning his late mother, and an impressive list of over