proclivity for music and often stopped work so that they could sing.

Bouzigue recognized, creatively, that community or family living was important for the young men he was dealing with. In the seminary the seminarians lived like religious in community, reciting the office. Bouzigue lived with them day and night so that a family was formed. The successful culmination of his efforts was the ordination of four priests, three from Wallis and one from Futuna, on 17 January 1886.

Bouzigue begged the new Bishop, Lamaze, to keep the priests together or appoint them to communities. Unfortunately the Bishop, strapped for priests to staff the far-flung islands of his diocese, had to put most of them alone. Meanwhile a Samoan Marist, trained in France, was ordained in 1888. Ultimately he and one of the Wallisians ordained in 1886 got into trouble. The French Samoan left the priesthood and the Wallisian returned after several years penance but pyschologically damaged.

Before the end of the century Father Bouzigue's teaching produced a further four priests, two Samoans and two Wallisians. By this time Bouzigue was suffering badly from elephantiasis and he could only look on helplessly while a new Rector restored strictness and the older way of training. Very few priests were ordained until the Rector retired and then a small trickle of priests - mainly Wallisians - were ordained in the 1920s and 1930s. They were then joined by the first Melanesian priests. Training of the French speaking students concentrated on Paita in New Caledonia and the English speaking students were sent mainly to Australia and New Zealand.

In 1966 Rome erected a full hierarchy of bishops in the Pacific and appointed several Polynesian and Melanesian Bishops. They agreed in 1971 to open a seminary in Suva for the whole of the Pacific except for Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands which had their own seminary at Bomana in Port Moresby. These seminaries now count their students in the hundreds and their former student priests now amount to several hundred. The tide has turned, but those early years of strugle with the well-meaning French missionaries will only have validity if we learn from their tragedies and mistakes. Pope Paul VI expressed it well in his *Evangelii Nuntiandi* when he stated, "what matters is to evangelize people's culture and cultures, always taking the person as one's starting point and always coming back to the relationships of people

among themselves and with God"(St.Paul Publications 1976:n.20). What a pity those words were not in circulation a century and a quarter ago!

Notes

1 Mathieu to Lagniet, April 30,1850, Marist Archives, Rome (hereinafter APM): APM/OW 208.
2 Mériais to Colin, May 9 1849 and Dec 9 1849, APM/OW 208.
3 Dezest to Colin, Dec 6 1849. APM/OW 208.
4 Rocher to Faure, Mar 6 1855, APM/OP 458.
5 For an example of such Catholic training see the chapter by Vitori Buatava in this volume.

References

BATAILLON, Pierre., nd. "History of Central Oceania", Unpub. MS, Marist Archives, Rome.

BOCHARD, Monsignor,1815. *Manual a l'Usage Des Seminaires.* Lyons, Rusard.

HOSIE, John, 1971. "The French Mission: an Australian base for the Marists in the Pacific to 1874", MA thesis, Macquarie University, Sydney.

KOSKINEN Aarne A., 1953. *Missionary Influence as a Political Factor in the Pacific Islands.* Helsinki, Academica Scientiarum Fennica.

ST. PAUL PUBLICATIONS, 1976. *Evangelii Nuntiandi.* Homebush, New South Wales.

WILTGEN, Ralph, 1979. *The Founding of the Roman Catholic Church in Oceania, 1825 to 1850.* Canberra, Australian National University Press.

Samoan Pastors In Tuvalu, 1865-1899[1]

6

Doug Munro

THE introduction of Christianity to the tiny atoll world of Tuvalu (formerly the Ellice Islands) is usually credited to Elekana, a London Missionary Society (LMS) deacon from Manihiki in the northern Cook Islands. Blown off course during an inter-island voyage in 1861, Elekana and his companions drifted westward until, more dead than alive, they were washed up at Nukulaelae in southern Tuvalu. He eventually, and circuitously, made his way to Samoa and excitedly informed the LMS missionaries that there were people at Nukulaelae and the islands beyond just waiting to receive the Gospel. Somewhat cautiously the Samoan District Committee (SDC) of the LMS decided to include Tuvalu in their domains and Elekana, in the meanwhile, was enrolled at the theological institute at Malua. Eventually, in 1865, Rev A.W. Murray inaugurated official LMS activity in Tuvalu when he visited the group in a chartered trading vessel (see Goldsmith and Munro 1992).

The SDC took over Tuvalu by degrees, from the early successes in the south until pagan resistance in the north was overcome a decade later. At no time during the 19th century, however, did European missionaries reside in the group, unlike the Cook Islands. Instead, the thrust of evangelization and its consolidation was undertaken by ordained Polynesian teachers, not Tuvaluans but overwhelmingly Samoans.[2] Indeed on the inaugural mission voyage to Tuvalu, Murray was accompanied by Elekana, by then ordained, and two Samoan pastors, and by 1873 the eight inhabited Tuvalu islands each had a pastor in residence. In organizational terms, Tuvalu itself fitted into the LMS framework as part of the Northwest Outstations of the SDC. The work of the pastors was subject to annual oversight by one of their European 'superiors' on a deputational visit in the missionary vessel SS *John Williams* (Murray 1876:380-423). Under a regime of Samoan pastors, the LMS established a religious monopoly; and the Tuvalu Church, the local successor of the LMS, is still overwhelmingly the dominant faith (see chapter by Goldsmith in this volume).

There were three identifiable generations of Samoan pastors in Tuvalu during the last three and a half decades of the 19th century (see Tables 1 and 2). The pioneers presided over the religious transformation from paganism to a Congregational brand of Protestantism. Some stayed until the 1890s but were joined from the early 1870s by a second generation, who consolidated what had already been accomplished. Such was the unevenness in progress between the northern and southern atolls that the first members of the second generation were arriving in the south at the same time the pioneers were being posted in the north. The third wave has a well defined commencement date with the arrival of four newly ordained pastors in 1895. Referring to this "new generation" of Samoan pastors, the veteran LMS missionary, J.E. Newell, praised their predecessors in terms not altogether consistent with what he and his colleagues had been saying down the years (Newell 1896:16).

Other evidence suggests that the pastors' performance and behaviour was problematic. What manner of men, then, were the first two generations of Samoan pastors in Tuvalu? Were they the selfless pioneers of Samoan celebratory tradition, or the arrogant and grasping individuals of quite different legend?

The pastors' regime and its critics

Tuvalu was a relatively 'soft' missionary target. Once established on each island, Christianity quickly became the dominant local force. The work of the pastors was rapid and was highly visible in the southern islands, and also in the north once the backbone of pagan resistance had been broken. In a fashion familiar to other parts of the Pacific, forceful and dramatic measures were taken, where necessary, to suppress the pagan religion and to impose in its place a strict moral code - what has been termed "magisterial, and usually iconoclastic progress" (Garrett 1982:158). The pagan religious shrines were destroyed or overturned, if they had not already been, and replaced on each island by a church, pastor's residence and school house. The traditional methods of birth control, namely infanticide and abortion, were largely suppressed with the result that the Tuvaluan population climbed steadily for the remainder of the century (from about 2,500 in 1865 to some 3,000 in 1899). Another factor contributing to this

population increase was the missionary ban on fighting, warfare and capital punishment for social deviants. Practices smacking of "heathen darkness", such as tattooing and distending the earlobes, were no longer permitted. Neither were displays of nakedness in public; rather, people were to be "decently clothed and in their right minds", thereby aggravating the numerous and endemic skin complaints. Monogamy was also required and men were compelled to discard all but their favourite wives.

Non-missionary observers viewed the new dispensation - both the means and the ends - with distaste and depicted the pastors' regime in strongly negative terms. In 1883, the Judicial Commissioner on board *HMS Espiègle* commented on the extent to which Tuvaluans suffered "from ecclesiastical rule" and regretted that the LMS had not "taught their native emissaries to temper the wind a *little* to their lambs, which they certainly keep very closely shorn.... We must not, however, think badly of them, for I verily believe that they know not what they do" (Le Hunte 1883:16-17). The following decade a scientist on Funafuti observed that:

> The severity of the Native Teacher towards the gentle, submissive Islanders, [is] remarked on by all members of the Expedition... He seems anxious to obliterate native manners, and to substitute the habits and customs of the European, as he understood them, as to preach the European's creed. The elders often look back to the merry days of heathendom, when the village was not so dull (Hedley 1896:56).

That same pastor was chided by another European visitor for assuming airs and graces and for "lord[ing] it ... just like an old fashioned rector-squire in a country parish in England" (David 1899:79-80).

The theme of narrow-minded bigotry, overbearing oppression and a nostalgia for a world that never was gets a further voice by another visiting scientist on Funafuti. He viewed the scene with utter dismay:

> The population seems absolutely in the hands of the native missionaries of the London Society which rule them with a rod of iron, fine them on all possible occasions. Why they stand it I can't see - compel them to wear clothes from which they get skin diseases, consumption, and the children all dying! Yesterday was Sunday, and women all came out in mother hubbards, bonnets and hats! You never saw such guys and they went to church five times! Today they have again cast off their fine clothes and gone back to a more scanty rig. It's a pity there can't be more common sense infused into this religious cant. As it is now, it's sheer cruelty and enforcing of arbitrary rules against health and decency as the people understand it (Agassiz 1913:368).

Resident Europeans in Tuvalu, namely the company traders, also deplored the pastors' assumption of temporal power. There was, to be sure, a pronounced racial dimension because traders often viewed with distaste the sight of an Islander administering the White man's religion. They equally resented being subordinated in local estimation to one whom they regarded as an arrogant usurper.[3] It is significant that the only trader (or non-missionary European for that matter) to venerate a Samoan pastor in Tuvalu did so precisely because he *was* different: in addition to other sterling qualities, this "stalwart young Samoan ... did not forbid his flock to dance and sing, nor prohibit the young girls from wearing flowers in their dark locks" (Becke 1897:148-49). Ioane of Nanumaga was indeed an exceptional pastor (Garrett 1982:158-59) but the trader's attitude should be recognized as a "qualified racism", or the "cult of the exceptional Polynesian" (Pearson 1970). In other words he exhibited that combination of adaptability, tolerance and Christian conviction which characterizes some of the most effective LMS Pacific Islander evangelists. He was, in a word, "exceptional", without question the most remarkable pastor ever to come to Tuvalu.[4]

The negative contemporary depiction of Samoan pastors in Tuvalu, which later academics have endorsed to varying degrees,[5] has ample justification. Such a view, however, misses some of the subtleties that underpinned the relationship between pastors and their congregations. Most of our information about Samoan pastors in Tuvalu comes from European observers, especially the visiting LMS missionaries. But the European missionaries who looked in occasionally were probably never very close to the day-to-day religious and social processes which went on in their own way, and not necessarily as depicted in their letters, journals and reminiscences. Indeed, it is questionable whether the directive function of the Samoa-based European missionaries was as important as their own histories make out. Rather, the shaping of distinctive atoll churches resulted from interaction between the

Samoan pastors and their Tuvaluan congregations. What the European records indicate, if sometimes obliquely, is the quality of the power relations between 19th century European missionaries and colonial administrators. This is one focus of my chapter. The other is the relationships that developed between Samoan pastors and their Tuvaluan congregations.

Structural bases of power

Despite the repressiveness of the pastors and the new dispensation that they represented, Tuvaluans had good reason to be acquiescent.[6] On the one hand, they sought access to the beneficence of a more powerful god through the correct forms of worship and behaviour; on the other, safety from the threat of sanction from their old system of island-wide and household gods. In a sense one set of prohibitions and observances was replaced by another, a good deal less severe. Given that missionary rule rapidly degenerated into oppressiveness, it needs to be stressed that Christianity was welcomed as an emancipation from the even greater tyranny of the traditional religion (Munro 1982:96-97). Moreover the Samoan pastors, who presented themselves as God's representatives on earth (Crawford 1977:238), were locally regarded as having the requisite knowledge to proceed with the correct rituals to mediate Jehovah's bounty.

Another basis of the pastors' power and position was structural, and stemmed from their consolidating the scattered hamlets on each island into single unified villages.[7] Either that, or, perhaps, the pastors strengthened existing tendencies to village consolidation. The villages were divided into two feitu (sides) separated by an open area on which stood the church (Brady 1970:45-57; A. Chambers 1984:36-37; Noricks 1981:67-91). In others words the pastors achieved in Tuvalu what the LMS missionaries in Samoa had been unable to accomplish - the bringing together of people into larger settlements. Since Samoans had refused to desert their villages in favour of larger mission settlements, the SDC had to sanction the development of churches at the village level and with it a proliferation of pastors (Gilson 1970:98). Unified villages, being more susceptible to mission control than the dispersed hamlets, could be harnessed to the LMS system of church contributions, which formed an important basis of the pastors' place in the community.

To that end the pastors encouraged the formation of feitu as

competitive units along the lines already practised in Samoa. As a means for mobilizing resources this intra-village rivalry was extraordinarily successful, as testified by the sudden appearance throughout the group of churches built from expensive European materials. The same spirit of competition applied equally to the regular contributions, both in cash and in kind, to the LMS and to the pastors themselves.[8] To put these on a perpetual footing the pastors introduced the practice of setting aside one day each year for households to present an accumulated offering. On Nanumea this occurred, and still does, at six monthly intervals. The Me, as it was called throughout the Pacific (after the month of May), was instigated in Tuvalu without directives from the European missionaries, who in fact were pleasantly surprised. As S.J. Whitmee reported from Nui in 1870, pastor Kirisome:

> went to a box and brought out of it a bag of money, which he handed to me saying: Early this year, I told my people of our custom in Samoa to hold meetings in the month of May to consider the work of extending the Kingdom of Christ all over the world; and that for these meetings we gave money to help in sending the Gospel everywhere. They said to me, why should we not do the same? We have the Gospel now, why should not we help to send it to other people who are without it? He said, he encouraged them in this. They therefore set to work and made coconut oil, which each sold to the trader, and we had a missionary meeting. This is the result. I poured the money on the table. It amounted to £40.9.0. This was the first free gift of 212 people... They had known the Gospel of Christ's salvation only four years, and this was proof of their appreciation of it (Whitmee [1917]:86).

Feitu competition was successful as a fund raising device partly because it could be grafted onto the Tuvaluan concept of reciprocity which demands sharing and generosity and confers prestige accordingly. Thus the issue of giving was contested fiercely and at many levels; the evenly matched households within a feitu strove to outdo one another and the whole island took pride in the size of its donation. In other words Tuvaluans were effectively compelled to make their 'free will' offerings to both their pastor and the LMS. The pastors did nothing to discourage the notion that church contributions and salvation were inseparable. Missionary donations were also regarded, in part at least, as placatory in the

same way as offerings to the pagan deities had once been, and to neglect this duty was to invite disaster. The Nanumeans have a tradition to this effect which illustrates one rationale for the Me. Once Christianity had been accepted, the tradition goes, the islanders collected food for their pastor. The aliki (chief) agreed to this but later, in about 1890, demanded that half the food should go to him and so the people were forced to break their promise to their pastor. Soon after a severe drought came upon the land; coconuts and other food became very scarce, the sun shone down remorselessly, and even fish and shellfish began to disappear. Eventually the aliki realized his error and relented, allowing the people to make gift offerings to their pastor. Rain fell and the island gradually came back to life. Since then part of Saturday has always been put aside to gather produce to present to the pastor after the morning service the following day (A. Chambers 1984:41, 251; K. Chambers 1984:146-47, 155).

The Nanumea tradition provides an insight into the pastors' perception of church contributions. To the pastors it was the means by which they could 'legitimately' obtain wealth beyond their needs, an attitude unwillingly encouraged in 1854 when the SDC authorized the payment of a separate contribution to the pastors in addition to the usual one for the LMS (Gilson 1970:130). Not surprisingly, when Murray was organizing the first LMS voyage to Tuvalu in 1865, he could only find two pastors willing to accompany himself and Elekana. "[N]one of the others cared to follow up," wrote Elekana, "because of coconuts being the principal food of these lands". There was a stiff argument at Nukulaelae before one of the Samoans was persuaded to be posted ashore, such was their dismay at the sight of the atoll (Elekana 1873:177, 196). In this unpromising land they and their successors put high priority on their material well-being. Just as pastors were cared for by their congregations in Samoa, so too in Tuvalu and for the same reasons. In Samoa, pastors were not permitted by the LMS to hold traditional titles or to work in their own villages. Nor did they receive a salary from the LMS. However, the dependence of the pastors on their congregations was offset by the congregations' need for a pastor as God's representative on earth, and so the relationship which developed was in the nature of a feagaiga (covenantal relationship whereby the pastor took care of the congregations' spiritual welfare); they in return attended its material needs (Crawford 1977:238-42; Gilson 1970:27-28; Goldsmith 1989:246-47; Wetherell 1980:136-37).

These were the Samoan pastors' expectations when they started going to Tuvalu a decade later. A similar feagaiga was made with Tuvaluans, and as strangers of standing from 'high islands' the Samoan pastors became incorporated within the local reciprocity system as permanently privileged guests.[9] In their pursuit of material gain the pastors diverted the flow of goods and services from the aliki to themselves by manipulating the system of church contributions. Similar to the aliki of pagan times the pastors were freed from manual labour so to give their attention to their spiritual and educational duties,[10] the latter of which was especially time-consuming in the early years because adults as well as children had to be taught literacy skills. In return the Tuvaluans provided for their pastor and his family. As well as feeding and paying him, each congregation erected a pastor's house with unmarried women as domestic help on a roster basis. At Nukufetau in 1872, pastor Sapolu enjoyed the comforts of a "large stone house, and retinue of 23 servants" (Pratt 1872:13); a few years later the missionary Davies wistfully opined that the pastors were "better off than many poor hardworked ministers of the old country" (Davies 1880:9). The Tuvaluans, eager for salvation, were as much concerned about their pastors' standard of living as were the pastors themselves.

For Tuvaluans, the system of church contributions had wider ramifications. Fund-raising was a cornerstone of the church which, in turn, was the ideological foundation of village (and therefore island-wide) unity and solidarity. Throughout Tuvalu, the church became synonymous with society: each island had one village, and each village the one religion. Paradoxically, the feitu were a primary means by which this feeling of community togetherness, so important in Tuvalu culture, was brought about: although explicitly competitive units they were a unifying force because their activities centred around the accomplishment of common goals. They began life basically as fund-raising mechanisms - the secular enabling arm of the new religion - but were soon incorporated into society at large to provide "the structural basis on which the entire [round of] organized village activities can be played out" (A. Chambers 1975:37).

Temporal power

Christianity in Tuvalu had a political as well as an economic aspect with the pastors seeking an influence in village affairs exceeding that of their counterparts in Samoa. Whereas pastors in Samoa recognized the status and authority of chiefs, this was the part of the feagaiga which they did not generally observe in Tuvalu. Ironically, aliki support in the southern islands paved the way for the pastors' spiritual authority being translated into temporal power. At Vaitupu in 1865 the ulu aliki (high chief), Fakamua:

> so enthusiastically received the first bearer of Christianity and his message that he ordered a house to be built for the missionary and that he be given lands and well cared for, because he came to Vaitupu with no means of livelihood. Furthermore he transferred his chiefly prerogative of receiving the head of any turtle to the pastor who thereby became his political equal or surrogate (White 1965:45).

Fakamua, moreover, fined anyone disrespectful of the pastor (Gill 1872:8-9). The extent to which the traditional authority structure gave way to pastor dominance is dramatically symbolized by Fakamua's grave being buried under the raised walkway surrounding the church at Vaitupu, with only the tip of the tombstone showing. The position at Funafuti was not much different. By 1897 the power of the aliki had been so eroded that a visitor to the atoll remarked:

> I tried hard to see the advantage of being a king in Funafuti, but couldn't. The king's hut was not so good as the native pastor's, his clothes were no better than those of his subjects; and his food was the same - cocoa-nut, fish and taro. He had only one voice in the making of laws on the island, and seemed to look up to the Samoan pastor as an authority in things temporal as well as spiritual. He certainly received a salary of five dollars per annum from his subjects (that is, one-tenth of what is considered necessary for the pastor), and he had a fair amount of cocoa-nut and taro land, but less than some of his subjects. Since the island has been under British protection the king is a nominal king only, an ornamental, but not very expensive head to a nice little republic (David 1899:118-19).[11]

In the northern islands, by contrast, pastors took longer to gain an ascendancy which, in the event, was often nowhere as extensive as the pastors' powers in the south. Some pastors, such as those on Niutao during the 1870s, were notably ineffectual individuals; but more often the initial lack of progress is attributable to the northern Tuvaluans being less compliant than their southern neighbours. This was due in some measure to the strength of the pagan system in the north when the missionaries arrived; the way had not been 'prepared' as it had in the south. Far from being anxious to receive pastors, the aliki of the northern islands were only, and with difficulty, persuaded to allow their presence after repeated assurances that the newcomers would not interfere with existing chiefly prerogatives (Munro 1982:ch.5).

Subsequent events also indicate that the aliki of the northern islands, or at least some of them, were less inclined to share their authority with the pastors. Thus to gain powers commensurate to the pastors in the southern islands, those in the north were required to be more forcefully assertive. Some were not capable of this but Emosi of Nanumea had little compunction. Contention between Emosi and the aliki over the boundaries of their respective authority persisted into the 1890s, resulting in at least one ugly incident. According to the aliki:

> I went to the House of the Samoan Teacher to arrange properly the conduct of the Samoan and myself the King, and enquire into peacefully and in a straightforward manner the work of the King, and the work of the Samoan, so that we could amicably, in performing our respective duties. The Samoan worked himself into a fearful passion lifted up his hand to Smite me, he also spoke haughtily and informed me he the Samoan was the Ruler of the Land, and rudely drove me the King away to my own house. On Sunday 18th September 1892 The Samoan Teacher preached in the chapel he the Samoan mocks me the King violently and informed me before all the people that he would not obey my Government.[12]

Pastors were in a strategic position to exercise a considerable degree of domination whether or not they enjoyed aliki support. Given that the church had become a central part of Tuvalu culture, the pastors (as "visitor-chiefs") assumed an indispensable and privileged place in island affairs by virtue of their spiritual authority. Moreover the LMS held a religious monopoly

throughout the group, meaning that withdrawal from its influence and that of the pastor was impossible.[13] Instead the local LMS church became the cornerstone of island solidarity with the social standing of every adult being dependent upon their being admitted to full church membership. The position of pastors as a group was further strengthened in 1875 when they were finally given sole discretion over the admission and expulsion of church members.[14]

The pastors also influenced secular affairs at the highest level since most of the deacons, the men who assisted him with the work of the church, were drawn from the kaupuli (council of elders). At Funafuti, and perhaps also other islands, the kaupuli were ostensibly elected, "but in reality [they] are nominated by the [mission] teacher who 'recommends' candidates" (Bridge 1883:2). Church discipline, and with it the pastor's position, was maintained by a system of fines imposed by the kaupuli for breaches of the church's moral and 'civilizing' code. These ranged, on Nanumaga for example, from 50 cents or 100 coconuts for swearing to $15 or 3000 coconuts for absence from church on three consecutive Sundays (Becke nd). The proceeds of the fines were divided between pastor, kaupuli and the village police, which tempted the kaupuli "to multiply laws in order to pocket the results of their infringement" (Maxwell 1881:2; see also Woodford 1884:17). Some of the visiting European missionaries disapproved of the pastors receiving "the wages of iniquity" (Phillips 1884:17) but the practice continued. In all this the authority of the aliki on each island was downgraded while the kaupuli became an adjunct of the church, though not necessarily the creature of the pastor. In other words traditional secular authority remained structurally intact but the character of its legislation was overlaid by a theocratic bias. Accordingly the power of the pastors was actual but not formal.

No less important was the pastors' racial pride, their reverence for fa'a Samoa (the Samoan way)[15] and their perception of Tuvaluans as "rough, uncultured boors" (Hedley 1896:22) whose lack of a strongly defined, multi-tiered chiefly system, as in Samoa, constituted grounds for further contempt; it may even have provided a pretext for pastors ignoring the reciprocal part of the feagaiga which demanded that pastors respect the position and authority of chiefs. Such feelings of superiority and cultural chauvinism partially explain the predisposition of many pastors to rule the land as well as to preach the Gospel. The most striking example of political opportunism concerned Sapolu who left

Nukufetau on account of ill health in 1879 after ten years' service on the atoll (Powell 1879:1-2, 7, 36). A recurrence of his eye complaint prevented his scheduled return but he went back anyway in 1884 under instructions from the central Samoan government to annex Tuvalu with himself as "Governor". The SDC was horrified. The missionary Phillips, shortly to leave on the annual inspection of the Northwest Outstations, tried to dissuade Sapolu

> but to no purpose. I then requested him to return his Ordination Certificate & to feel henceforth that he was no longer in any way connected with our Mission. Our worst fears were realized on his arrival at the islands. At this place [Nukufetau] he had at once hoisted the Samoan flag; wished to drive out the King and government & appoint others that would be subservient to himself. He further began fining right and left in the most indiscriminating fashion & threatening with unheard of punishments if the fines were not paid (Phillips 1884:16).[16]

Samoan pastors versus European missionaries

The European missionaries in Samoa disapproved of the outstation pastors' economic and political opportunism but there was little they could do to prevent it. At the heart of the matter was the lack of regular supervision. The policy was to visit each island annually in the hope that ultimate (European) control from Samoa be retained. On each annual inspection progress was assessed, problems attended to, pastors supplied with teaching materials and provisions until the next deputational voyage, and contributions collected. However, only 60 to 75 days of the *John Williams'* time could be spared each year for the Northwest Outstations with the result that the visiting missionary spent less than one-third of that time ashore and the rest at sea. Murray expressed regret during the inaugurating voyages in the mid-1860s that his visits were limited to a few days on each island; he was fortunate by comparison with those who followed. On the voyages of 1881 and 1885 the missionaries counted the number of hours spent ashore at each island and then took an average: the results were respectively 18 hours and 10 minutes and 23 hours per island (Murray 1876:304; Phillips 1881:27; Newell 1885:3).

The fleeting and superficial nature of these inspections meant that the Samoan Mission was in no position to control effectively

the activities of its outstation pastors or to know what was going on in Tuvalu. Part of the problem, too, was that the European missionaries had limited opportunities to renew their acquaintance with Tuvalu. Between 1865 and 1899 the Samoan Mission organized 33 deputational voyages to the group involving over 22 missionaries, half of whom visited on the single occasion. During this period two went in successive years and three others visited on three or more occasions (Munro 1982:143-45), meaning that no missionary was able to build up a detailed and informed knowledge of church affairs in Tuvalu. Declining numbers of European missionaries in Samoa also had a bearing on the effective oversight of the Northwest Outstations resulting in the deputation being reduced from two to one in the early 1870s.[17] The single visiting missionary, moreover, had to maintain a punishing schedule to get through his work (Cullen 1895:16 June). The European missionaries realized the problem and remedies were suggested from time to time. There was talk in 1880 of handing over "the expensive Gilbert Group" to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and thus reduce the extent of the Northwest Outstations, but the Americans were not interested.[18] The limitations of one annual voyage were semi-privately acknowledged but insufficient European staff and the limited availability of the *John Williams* put the obvious solution beyond reach.[19] So instead of being properly supervized, the Samoan pastors in Tuvalu were left largely to their own devices. Nor were the pastors often caught unawares by the arrival of the mission barque; the *John Williams* was known to be in the vicinity well before it appeared over the horizon because pastors gave each other a few days' warning by sending messages on the legs of tame frigate birds (Vivian 1871-72:74-75; Turner 1876:7-8; Gill 1885:17).

Such problems of communication and control were starkly revealed during the 1874 voyage of inspection.[20] The missionary Turner (the younger) arrived at Nukulaelae to find that pastor Ioane had gone to Vaitupu some seven months before, leaving the local church in the hands of his deacons. It transpired that Ioane had left his island because Sapolu of Nukufetau and Kirisome of Nui had suggested that they all meet that year on one of the islands to agree upon a uniform set of rules for church members throughout the group, in preference to regulations that varied from one island to the next. The two Ioanes at Vaitupu suggested that the meeting be held the following year and further that the *John Williams* would provide the necessary transport. Turner was unhappy with this show of independence, which to him smacked of intransigence, and told the two pastors in no uncertain terms that any such proposal would require prior approval by the SDC.

Other problems were brewing. Whatever dissatisfactions the pastors as a group might have entertained against the SDC - and there were times when they justifiably felt neglected and constrained - it was also clear that there were tensions among them. One of Turner's tasks in Tuvalu was to counter their "misapprehension as to the value of the supplies that we give them, and to inform them that we cannot pay any debts which they may contract without our sanction".[21] Tema of Funafuti, however, expressed displeasure at being associated with his fellow pastors' complaints. The two Ioanes moreover, accused pastor Sapolu of Nukufetau of preventing his parishioners from making a contribution to the LMS the year before, and instead to "confine their gifts entirely to his support". Sapolu's denial of the charge was supported by his deacons.[22]

An exasperated Turner had no way of getting to the bottom of the pastors' collective shenanigans. The SDC eventually hardened its stance against unauthorized inter-island travel and threatened to dismiss any pastor after a first warning.[23] But when Kirisome of Nui "persisted in trangressing the Regulation" the SDC opted against losing a good pastor and saved face by issuing a severe rebuke and made his return, from furlough, conditional on his promise not to do it again.[24] The visitation from Samoa was not something to be taken lightly (see Goldsmith 1989:223-24) but it is emphatically not the case that the SDC "kept a tight rein on the missionization process" in Tuvalu by virtue of the annual voyage of inspection (qv. Besnier 1995:41).

In short, the pastors were largely able to follow their bent, and get away with petty breaches of the regulations, because the SDC was disinclined to act decisively. In many cases it was difficult to know how to act or whether to act at all. To begin with, the European missionaries' attitude towards the exercise of temporal power by pastors was ambivalent. So long as a pastor's activities were not causing open strife and divisiveness, and so long as the school results and the contributions were satisfactory, a visiting missionary was unlikely to give himself extra work by looking for fault. At one level the issue could be avoided because the distinction between moral influence and secular authority is unclear. At

another level, there was the problem of reconciling principle with reality. The European missionaries were aware that their Samoan pastors were strongly disposed to "play the despot" yet the missionaries found this quality to be conducive to success in the outstations. Newell provided an indirect explanation when describing a Tuvaluan pastor on his way to a posting in Kiribati:

> Tapugao - appointed to Nikunau was so ill during the voyage, & remained still very weak that I acceded to his request to leave him at this - his Island home [Nui]. We were rather relieved than otherwise that circumstances prevented our carrying out the Committee's appointment. Neither the man nor his wife seemed to be the people to locate at so backward a station as Nikunau (Newell 1885:16; similar comment in Whitmee 1893:13).

Rev John Marriott was even more to the point in his assessment of pastor Mikaio of Nukufetau:

> he exercises very little influence over the people. The last Teacher Sapolu was a most energetic and a born ruler & leader of men. The people obeyed him. This man is too amiable for such a people hence his non success (Marriott 1883:14).

The European missionaries were caught both ways: the 'strong' and forceful men they especially sought for work in the outstations were also the ones most likely to become laws unto themselves. It was the rare pastor who could get results and still be tolerant, even if he had wanted to be.

Confronted with this dilemma the European missionaries took the line of least resistance: unless something went seriously amiss the means would justify the ends that a people once "gross and vile" were now a Christian community. Besides, the European missionaries themselves were also likely to play politics, most notably the younger Turner's part in the Steinberger affair in 1876.[25]

A pastor's position was further strengthened by the SDC's reluctance to remove an outstation agent from his posting for transgressing the regulations. It was done only as a last resort and whenever possible a replacement pastor would be landed at the time of his predecessor's removal.[26] In the first place the dismissal of a pastor was liable to have an unsettling effect on the local church. Of equal relevance the European missionaries had to take into account the probable reaction of the pastor body in Samoa. They had always resented their inferior status vis-à-vis the European

missionaries. The struggle for supremacy was fought on a broad front with the pastors as anxious to expand their power as most of their European colleagues were to restrict it (Gilson 1970:134-37). It was a microcosm of the Samoans' wider struggle against European domination. Indeed, the European missionaries sometimes became obsessive about their authority which, in turn, justifably fuelled the pastors' resentment. At Vaitupu in 1874, pastor Ioane explained to the younger Turner that he had readmitted five of his congregation who had been "excluded" the year before by the missionary Davies for playing draughts. Davies' explanation was that draughts were forbidden on three other Tuvalu islands, and although Turner personally felt that the original exclusion was unjustified, he still considered it necessary to warn Ioane against "undoing the action of a missionary again" without first securing the clearance of the SDC (Turner 1874a:22).

The pastors held the ultimate advantage through political will and sheer strength of numbers. Two overlapping issues were involved in the question of discipline. First, the pastors' political and economic opportunism were not regarded by themselves as abuses but reflect more differing perceptions between the two groups as to the 'proper' role of a pastor. Second, Samoan pastors were generally reluctant to accept the authority of their European 'superiors', in contrast to the Fijian Methodist pastors who worked more harmoniously with their European colleagues: overt tension between the two groups was usually over treatment rather than status.[27] The turning point in the power struggle between Samoan pastors and their European colleagues came in 1875 when the entire pastor body was ordained and their representatives permitted to attend the SDC general meetings. As George Pratt gloomily explained, "[we] bought off their opposition with ordination - not intentionally but really. What other bribe can we offer next meeting?" (quoted in Davidson 1967:36). The pastors then organized their own meetings and successfully demanded that one of them accompany the European missionaries on the annual voyage to the Northwest Outstations.[28] A decade later their demands were such that the European missionaries were complaining that the pastors were openly trying to usurp their authority "to give counsel to native Christians" (although why Samoan pastors should not minister to other Samoans was not explained).[29] On a more personal note the pastors' delegates harassed European missionaries who displeased them by levelling

charges and refusing to work with these missionaries. It was an unpleasant experience.[30] In all this the increasing powers of the pastors coincided with the diminishing number of European missionaries, who reached an all-time low of four in 1885.[31]

Confronted with an increasingly belligerent and uncompromising Native Agency, whose members were quite prepared to put aside their factional and personal differences when confronting their European 'superiors', the latter were loath to provoke further confrontations and proceeded carefully in the matter of disciplining pastors. Accordingly, Emosi of Nanumea was only rebuked when it was discovered that he had concealed upwards of $250 instead of declaring his income. With the pastors in Samoa constantly pressing for the reinstatement of erring or incompetent colleagues, and with Emosi's misdemeanour being a common enough practice among pastors, little would have been gained by dismissing or even suspending him from pastoral duties.[32] However, there was no leniency on either side when the church's moral code was transgressed. When Emosi's predecessor at Nanumea, Tuilouaa, was known to have committed adultery, other pastors in Tuvalu forced him to resign and their action was endorsed by the European missionaries.[33]

Tuilouaa was the only pastor to fall foul of an immorality charge - though others were suspected - but his dismissal was by no means an isolated case. Despite the risks and complications the European missionaries removed almost one-third of the first two generations of pastors to serve in Tuvalu (see Table 1). Mitita at Funafuti was the first to go, recalled to Samoa in the late 1860s for what was vaguely described as having "fallen into error which deprived him of his influence" (Whitmee 1871:13). He was followed in 1870 by Elekana at Nukufetau who disregarded the LMS rule forbidding pastors to engage in trading and, more seriously, attempting to overthrow an aliki who objected to his harsh and petty laws.[34] What the missionary Davies described as "arrogance and covetousness" led to return passages for three other pastors during the 1870s, all from Vaitupu (Davies 1873:5-6; G.A. Turner 1878:6-12; Powell 1879:34-35).

A comparable number of pastors were dismissed for persistent incompetence and "want of energy". The European missionaries regarded laxness in a serious light because it invariably retarded "progress". But realities were such that matters were generally allowed to drift until patience was exhausted and the pastor dismissed. Mikaio at Nukufetau, for example, was described as "a good man and an honest fellow ... but he exercises very little influence over the people" (Marriott 1883:14). After five years ineffectual service he was returned to Samoa for "want of progress and the general backward condition of the island" (Phillips 1884:16). If Mikaio was easy going and ineffectual, Emosi at Nanumea was lazy but overbearing. Perhaps he became stale at Nanumea because after six years on the atoll the visiting missionaries began to remark on his lassitude until finally he was removed.(Newell 1885:36-37; Marriott 1887:18; Goward 1892:4; Newell 1896:16). Nito at Niutao was equally undistinguished. He was seldom on top of his work and Marriott, who was generally defensive about pastors' shortcomings, confessed his need for patience at Nito's "dullness of comprehension". Eventually it was decided to take him away from Niutao before the work became any more chaotic; this was done the year his furlough was due so at least the appearance of a dismissal was avoided.[35] When the missionary Clarke arrived the following year with Ieremia, the new pastor, he was under no illusions:

> Prior to the service I examined the Sunday School in Scripture. The children were woe-fully ignorant in this as in all other Subjects. 60 presented themselves for examination with slates, but with many of them it was the merest farce & we felt that Jeremia has [an] abundance of work before him (Clarke 1890:5).

For such reasons, individual missionaries, who disagreed sharply on the pace at which Samoan pastors should assume increased pastoral responsibilities, were in accord that "our native pastorate is not yet in a state to be left without the supervision, guidance and constant teaching of European missionaries".[36] The irony is that the pastors were left unsupervized much of the time, both in Samoa and Tuvalu, precisely because the European missionaries were too few and too busy with other things to provide "constant teaching".

The frequency of dismissals made for a high turnover rate of pastors on some islands. Yet it is equally common to find long-serving pastors in 19th century Tuvalu: Kirisome worked at Nui for almost 35 years (1865-1899), Ioane at Nukulaelae for 23 years (1865-1888), Tema at Funafuti for 19 years (1870-1889) and Ieremia at Vaitupu for 15 years (1880-1895). Several others stayed 10 years or more, including Nito and Emosi. This suggests that outstation

pastors generally found the experience rewarding, for apart from the satisfaction of being God's servant, the role of pastor had many other attractions to an ambitious Samoan. Even so, Kirisome, Ioane and their contemporaries had to contend with frustrations and disappointments. Perhaps the most difficult was the break with their Samoan past, because a pastor had to spend 10 years on 'his' island before qualifying for furlough. The mental strain involved could be severe. News of a family crisis back home could have a very distressing effect, as in the case of Tuuaga, who had only been settled at Funafuti for six months when he received news of his father's murder (Newell 1899:16 Nov). More common were the sometimes acute feelings of isolation which beset some pastors and their wives. As the missionary Powell observed:

> It seems as much a trial to the Samoan teachers to be cut off from their old associations and friends as it is to European missionaries, and it occasions no little delight to receive a visit from a missionary and the native brethren by whom he may be accompanied (Powell 1871:10).

Despite the extent to which pastors became integrated into their communities they still experienced deculturation stresses. Another indication that they remained oriented towards Samoa can be seen in the concern of Kirisome of Nui for his son's future. He approached Powell with the problem, whereupon the missionary

> agreed to take his son 10 years old, to Samoa and try to get him in the youth's class at Malua, or failing that to take him into my own family till an opening occur in the institution. The best of our pastors feel a sense of anxiety about their children, that English missionaries do with regard to theirs. Kirisome and his wife appeared to feel deeply about parting with their son (Powell 1879:3-4).

Extended residence on the same island compounded the problem of isolation, producing a staleness in many pastors; this is painfully evident in the case of Kirisome. After long years' of distinguished service at Nui, he went rapidly downhill from the late 1880s and in 1892 it was reported:

> At Nui, pastor Kirisome, things were not very satisfactory; this old pastor who has done very good service, is getting quite too high-minded and important to condescend to the regular routine work that is still sadly needed. The chapel and the house both good buildings were fallen into utter decay for want of care and attention; the school was good as it always is, but here as in so many islands ... real spiritual life and Christianity were lacking in both pastor and people (Goward 1892:5-6).

Then there were those whom the SDC, somewhat callously, left too long in Tuvalu. After 23 years at Nukulaelae, during very difficult times for the atoll, Ioane had become "so slow and deaf" that honourable retirement was the only course (Wilson 1886:6; Claxton 1889:9-10). Ieremia of Vaitupu also served faithfully through hard times and bouts of illness. His work also suffered and he too was decently retired, again belatedly (Newell 1894:7; Marriott, 1887:13-15, 44, 1895:13-15; Goward 1892:6).

The satisfactions, however, outweighed the frustrations and this reveals itself in two ways. The role of pastor was a family tradition; sons of Kirisome and Tema, for example, also became pastors in the Northwest Outstations. Tema himself was the son of a pastor and the brother of another (Ioane of Nanumaga). The second indication that pastors as a group were basically content is seen in their willingness to remain in Tuvalu. Illness sometimes forced a premature retirement, a few pastors took ill and died, and a large number were returned to Samoa for transgressions or incompetence; but very few left 'their' islands of their own accord. Kirisome and his contemporaries remained and their sons often followed their footsteps because power over human and material resources were so readily available to a pastor in Tuvalu.

Pastor and congregation

This is not to imply an absence of local constraints. The relationship between pastors and people varied between islands depending on the personalities involved and the circumstances in which the two parties interacted. In Congregational policy, what the local church says tends to determine practice, a situation which was congruent with the Tuvaluans' notions of community solidarity. It was therefore often necessary for the pastors to effect neat compromises for their own survival and so maintain their dominant position by a measure of compliance with popular custom and requirement on each island. Moreover, a pastor's tenure and the unity of his congregation were integrated. That is why pastors to this day are vitally concerned to prevent outbreaks of factionalism on an island and can therefore be counted upon to assume the role of peacemaker. Should discord continue they take care, if they are wise, not to openly take sides as this will undermine

their position. The thankless task of trying to mend deep social divisions was the unhappy lot of Ieremia at Vaitupu in the 1880s. His tenure was secure as he had the support of both the ulu aliki and the SDC, but the effectiveness of his pastoral work was greatly curtailed until community solidarity was restored (Marriott 1895:14). The need for a pastor to retain public acceptability could usually be adapted by the local congregations in building the type of church which they wanted - a process that is significant in the emergence of distinctive local churches in many other parts of the Pacific.

Moreover, the strict missionary laws which some visitors viewed with such distaste, were not necessarily imposed on an altogether unwilling people. Sometimes this was so, but, in Whitmee's words:

> I have often noted in these young Christian societies in the mission field, that public opinion is far more strict than in England. Indeed, a slight inconsistency is sometimes judged and punished as a grave error. Missionaries are by some charged with too great strictness in their dealings with the failings and weaknesses of these recent converts. If those who make the charges took the trouble to enquire, they would find that missionaries generally take the opposite side, and endeavour to modify the severity of the converts themselves towards their erring brethren. But we are oft times obliged to yield to public opinion... (Whitmee 1871:13).

These sanctions sometimes applied equally to pastors; the amiable Mikaio was "terribly afraid of his tyrannical deacons who objected to him smoking even within the seclusion of his own curtilage [mission compound], and otherwise bullied him in behaving exactly as they thought he should" (Becke 1901:51). Another example of community sanctions concerns the sole Roman Catholic on Funafuti in the 1880s, whom the rest of the island persecuted to the point of distraction (Bridge 1883:2; Bridge 1886:553; Dana 1935:175-79; Moss 1889:170-71). It was not the pastor but his congregation who took the initiative, exercising customary sanctions against an incorrigible deviant.

Given these circumstances the many contemporary criticisms applied to pastors as greedy and overbearing individuals sometimes misses the point, however correct they may have been by European standards. The contributions to the pastor, though grand by local standards, were not seen as exploitative by the Tuvaluans but as material support in return for benevolent concern. Similarly, the pastors' exercise of temporal power was not necessarily viewed askance by their congregations. It was not the exercise of power in itself but the way in which it was done that sometimes offended, with the result that strong-willed aliki on Nukulaelae and Vaitupu forced the visiting LMS missionaries to remove pastors who had overreached themselves (Marriott, 1895:9-10; Marriott 1898:6-7).

Pastors versus administrators

Or were those two aliki really so strong-willed? Another explanation might be the presence of a new player - the colonial administration - upon whom the aliki could depend for support. In 1892, Britain declared protectorates over Kiribati and Tuvalu; although technically separate protectorates they were, for practical purposes, governed as a single unit in whose affairs the pastors had no formal place (Davis 1892).

Colonial rule made little initial impact on the little world of pastor domination in Tuvalu. The first Resident Commissioner, C.R. Swayne, was stationed in faraway northern Kiribati and preoccupied with that part of his domain. At the mercy of irregular shipping services, he had little opportunity to visit Tuvalu and he was, besides, of laissez-faire leanings. His successor, however, was in complete contrast. William Telfer Campbell took up duties in 1895 and for 12 stormy years he made his presence felt. Energetic, domineering and irritable, Campbell was an apostle of direct rule who could brook not the slightest opposition.[37]

One of the most intransigent impediments to Campbell's aim of close central government were the Samoan pastors with their considerable temporal authority within the local communities and a vested interest in maintaining it. Campbell's problem was that the laws of the Mission held greater legitimacy in Tuvaluan eyes than did his own laws, and an insight into this attitude may be seen in the reaction of a group of Funafutians when members of the Royal Society's coral boring expedition of 1897 hastened to put on clean clothes for the arrival of HMS *Royalist*:

> The natives were rather astonished to see us shake off our working garb but we advised them to put on their best clothes too, because, as we put it, "Man-o-war, plenty big boss," but they laughed and said: "No, missionali big

boss" (David 1899:273-74).

Campbell was determined to stamp out this attitude. The ensuing battle of wills and respective boundaries of authority initially revolved around symbolic issues, in particular the question of dancing. His attitudes toward the pastors and their pretensions came explicitly to the fore at Funafuti in 1896 when he sanctioned the holding of a dance:

> which was a most harmless entertainment, and [I] explained to the people that they could dance at certain times. The Samoan Missionary then inquired if the people were to be ruled by the Bible or by the Law. I told him that he was not to interfere with the native government or to dictate to them as to what they should or should not do also that if he had any complaints to make as to their conduct he was to make them to the Resident [Commissioner].[38]

It was only a matter of time before Campbell openly clashed with the unco-operative pastors, who disgusted him by their money-making tendencies, among other things. The particular object of his ire was Kirisome, the only elderly pastor in the group, or "the last of the Dictators of the old style", as Campbell termed him, oblivious to his own dictatorial tendencies. On one occasion Campbell scolded Kirisome for greediness, noting afterwards that the latter "did not appreciate my kindness in enlightening him as to his position as a Missionary and Foreigner".[39] In fact it was Campbell who was the "Foreigner" and this helps explain why Tuvaluans' loyalties tended to lie with the LMS, and more specifically the pastors, rather than the colonial government. Whereas the church had long been internalized into Tuvaluan culture and the pastors absorbed into village affairs, Campbell was the representative of an alien institution and therefore an outsider (Brady 1972:124). From this seeming position of strength Kirisome threw out a challenge, actively obstructing the island government and exhorting the people not to pay the Queen's Tax. The outcome was very one sided with Campbell leaving instructions that the offending pastor be returned to Samoa on the next occasion the *John Williams* called. The dismayed English missionaries had no option but to comply and their subsequent complaints to the High Commissioner were dismissed.[40] When it came to the crunch, the colonial government was always going to win.

Campbell's action against Kirisome was only part of a broader

campaign directed at the SDC to improve their performance in the Protectorates and to control the pastors. For the past two years he had been applying pressure on the SDC to appoint a European missionary in each group; he also urged the establishment of a central school in Tuvalu.[41] He probably got the idea from Goward, the visiting missionary in 1897. Dismayed at the half-hearted manner in which pastors' schools were being conducted, Goward had suggested that the best pupils from Tokelau and Tuvalu be brought to a central school at Funafuti under the management of a resident missionary (Goward 1897:2-4; David 1899:4-5). But the practical difficulty remained that a European missionary could not be spared. What the SDC proposed instead was that Goward, of all people, who detested Samoan pastors (Macdonald 1982:89), become Superintendent of the Northwest Outstations and visit them twice a year. However, his health broke down soon after, the existing system of annual voyages continued, and Campbell's impatience began to make itself felt.

In response to Campbell's promptings the SDC finally decided to appoint Goward as resident missionary in the Northwest Outstations, and eventually agreed to provide him with a cottage at Funafuti, another at Beru, and also a small ship. In the event Goward was stationed at Beru and the Northwest Outstations became a separate missionary district under his care. But, as he had foreseen, the Northwest work was too much for one man alone and in 1902 control of Tokelau and Tuvalu reverted to the SDC as the special responsibility of Newell.[42] The only change to affect Tuvalu was the establishment of mission schools at Vaitupu and Funafuti along the lines originally proposed by Goward (Garrett 1992:217).

The 20th century

Although unsuccessful in his immediate objectives, Campbell's interventions marked the beginning of a decline in pastor hegemony. Reinforcing this gradual trend was the creation of a new locus of authority, the native magistrate. As dispensers of justice and agents of the colonial government, they eroded not only the power of the aliki but also, to an extent, that of the pastors. Some of the magistrates, indeed, became very powerful figures whose arbitrary ways would have evoked the sneaking admiration even of one so authoritarian as Tema of Funafuti.[43] This was followed by the appointment of District Officers who, to varying

degrees, acted as a further check on pastoral power. One of them was the legendary Donald Kennedy who wished an end of Samoan religious dominance and political subordination to Kiribati (Garrett 1992:411). Kennedy's groundwork was continued in the 1940s by a singular Tuvaluan pastor, Lusia from Nanumea, who advocated a self-governing Tuvalu church in which the Samoan pastor would be a thing of the past. In 1947 Lusia went so far as to propose the repatriation of all Samoan pastors. Although many Tuvaluan members of the General Assembly of the Church were in private agreement, they lacked the political will to give the necessary public support and the matter dragged on for another decade (Kofe 1983:119).

The various Tuvalu churches eventually became independent from Samoa in 1958, and by 1969 all LMS pastors in the group were Tuvaluans. It was not so much a case of the church in Tuvalu gaining its independence from Europeans but from Samoans. A Tuvaluan pastorate has resulted in a qualitative alteration in the relationship between pastor and community. No longer are the pastors strangers of high standing from abroad working under minimal supervision. The pastors are now other Tuvaluans whom the individual communities can control more easily and they take pains to do so. To avoid nepotism, no Tuvaluan pastor is permitted to work on his home island, and communities exercise considerable say over the appointment (Forman 1982:84) and retention of their pastor (see Goldsmith's chapter in this volume). The pastors still enjoy tremendous prestige and wealth, but cannot expect a voice in local politics as of old (see Besnier 1995:42, 156), much less claim, as Emosi of Nanumea is alleged to have done, to be the "Ruler of the Land".

Tuvaluans have achieved a degree of separation between spiritual and secular affairs that was not evident when the honoured guest from Samoa occupied the pulpit. The experience of the Samoans may have contributed to these very attitudes that now constrain the contemporary pastors' power.

Pastors In Tuvalu

(appointed before 1895)

TABLE 1: FIRST GENERATION

Name	Island	Duration	Reason for Leaving
Elekana*	Nukufetau	1865-1870	various trangressions
Ioane	Nukulaelae	1865-1888	retired; getting old and deaf
Ioane	Nanumaga	1875-1885	furlough; doesn't return
Kirisome	Nui	1865-1899	Resident Commissioner ordered his removal
Matita	Funafuti	1865-c.1868	recalled for an unspecified "error"
Paulo	Vaitupu	1870-1873	removed under a cloud
Peni	Vaitupu	1865-1870	retired - ill-health
Sapolu	Nukufetau	1870-1879	furlough due; ill-health
Sione*	Niutao	1870-1875	removed; only one teacher necessary
Tapu	Niutao & Nanumea	1870-1878	
Tema	Funafuti	1870-1889	went on furlough; didn't return
Timoteo*	Nanumaga	1871-1873	removed at chief's demand

*(*non-Samoans (Elekana, Cook Islands; Sione, Niue; Timoteo, Tokelau)*

TABLE 2: SECOND GENERATION
(exclusive of *locum tenens* appointments)

Name	Island	Duration	Reason for Leaving
Apeteniko	Nanumaga	1875-1888	died
Nito	Niutao	1878-1890	incompetence
Peni	Vaitupu	1878-1879	interfered in local politics
Emosi	Nanumea	1879-1896	incompetence
Ieremia	Vaitupu	1880-1895	retired; ill health
Lolani	Nukufetau	1884-1894	died; his wife followed shortly after
Luteru	Nanumaga	1889-1894	died
Isaia*	Nukulaelae	1889-1892	incompetence
Isaia*	Nukulaelae	1895-?	?
Mikaio	Nukufetau	1879-1884	incompetence
Simona	Funafuti	1895-189-	?
Tipa	Nukulaelae	1892-1895	chief demanded his removal
Vaega	Funafuti	1890-1894	died

*(*presumably different people)*

Abbreviations

CO 225*	Records of the Colonial Office, Series 225, Western Pacific. Kew, Public Records Office
LMS	London Missionary Society
ML	Mitchell Library, Sydney
PMB*	Pacific Manuscripts Bureau, manuscript series. Canberra
RNAS*	Royal Navy - Australia Station, Records of the Commander-in-Chief, Wellington, National Archives of New Zealand
SDC	Samoan District Committee of the LMS
SSJ,* SSL,* SSO,* SSP,* SSR*	Respectively the South Sea Journals, South Sea Letters (incoming), South Sea Personal, South Sea Odds and South Sea Reports. Records of the London Missionary Society, Council for World Mission Archives, School of Oriental and African Studies, London
WPHC 4*	Records of the Western Pacific High Commission, Series 4, Inwards Correspondence-General, Kew, Public Records Office

* Consulted on microfilm at the National Library of Australia, Canberra, or the Mitchell Library, Sydney.

Notes

1 It is a pleasure to acknowledge the extent to which John Garrett, Michael Goldsmith and Stewart Firth have helped me to think through the issues raised in this chapter.

2 The exceptions during the period under review are Elekana of Manihiki (Nukufetau, 1865-1870), Sione of Niue (Niutao, 1870-1875) and Timoteo of Tokelau (Nanumaga, 1871-1873). Tuvaluans enlisted for mission work and received training at Malua. Upon graduation they were usually sent to Kiribati, occasionally to a Samoan village, and later to Papua and Torres Strait.

3 An example of a trader's diatribes against the resident Samoan pastor (in this case Tema of Funafuti) is found in Dana 1935:219-20, 230. Several of Louis Becke's Tuvalu stories disparage Samoan pastors (e.g. Becke 1901:240; Becke and Jeffrey 1901:303-04).

4 Another expression of the "cult of the exceptional" is from Frederick J. Moss, who travelled through much of the Pacific in 1886. He notes the typically harsh and repressive missionary regime of Manihiki, in the Cook Islands, where the "native missonary pulls the wires, and the Government [of the island] becomes in effect a simple theocracy." At Atafu, in Tokelau, the "native teacher" goes about his work "with an exaggeration so extreme as . . . to make religion oppressive or ridiculous". Moss then draws an explicit comparison with the situation at Nui under the enlightened care of Kirisome, who is "striking proof that the natives have in themselves good material for the work" (Moss 1889:110-199).

5 Koch 1962; Brady 1970:21-25, 1975:119-24; Forman 1974:426; Munro 1978; Noricks 1981:13, 37-38; Macdonald 1982:40-50, 88-89; K. Chambers 1984:50; Besnier 1995:41.

6 The various interpretations of the conversion process in Tuvalu are discussed in Goldsmith 1989:121-25.

7 Goldsmith (1989:205-13) provides a somewhat different interpretation to the one offered in this section.

8 The scenario is reminiscent of St Paul's "collection for the saints", described in the letters to the Corinthians and referred to in the Acts of the Apostles, where one gentile church was pitted against another in responding to the needs of the economically depressed Christians of Jerusalem.

9 Goldsmith 1989:226-76, in a chapter aptly entitled "The Visitor-Chief", discusses this aspect of the pastors' relationship with their congregations.

10 The SDC deliberately avoided training their pastors in "mechanical arts" on the grounds that "experience teaches us, that the men who give their undivided attention to their work, as evangelists, are by far the most successful, whether in Samoa or the outstations" (SDC Minutes, 27-29 Oct 1869, SSL 32/2/D).

11 Mrs David may have underestimated the actual power and status of the aliki (qv. Goldsmith 1989:113) but her comparison between the aliki and pastor, especially the latter's wealth, rings true.

12 Vaitoru to Thurston, 16 Nov 1892, translated by E.A. Duffy, trader on Nanumea, WPHC 4, 76/1893. The events just described were almost certainly connected, in local reasoning, with the onset of the prolonged drought at Nanumea.

13 Unlike the solution applied at the Treaty of Augsburg in 1555 which provided the basis for religious peace in Germany between Lutherans and Catholics according to the principle cuius regio, eius religio (whose land, his religion). Under this arrangement, subjects were to abide by their ruler's religion or else be allowed to peaceably leave the state.

14 SDC Minutes, 9-18 Nov. 1875, SSL 34/7/B.

15 The use of Samoan as the language of preaching and instruction (see Besnier 1995:54) is a telling example of this cultural chauvinism. The only pastor to routinely preach in the Tuvaluan language was Emosi of Nanumea (Downs 1944:71).

16 See also Churchward 1887:83-84; Kent 1972:162 (whose garbled account is taken from Churchward); Moore 1884:13; Winchcombe 1881-1888:13-16, 36-37.

17 SDC Minutes, 10-14 Jan 1871, SSL 33/2/D.

18 Whitmee to Foreign Secretary, LMS, 23 Apr 1880, SSL 36/2/B; Davies to Foreign Secretary, 28 July 1880, SSL 36/2/B; SDC Minutes, 8-13 Dec 1880, SSL 36/2/D.

19 SDC Minutes, 3 Dec 1890, SSL 41/4/B.

[20] These details are documented in Turner's private account (1874a:14-15, 18-25).
[21] SDC Minutes, 31 Dec-3 Jan 1873-74, SSL 34/5/B.
[22] None of these allegations and recriminations are detailed in Turner's official account (Turner 1874b:7-8).
[23] SDC Minutes, 28 July 1880, SSL36/2/C;
[24] SDC Minutes, 24 Nov 1887, SSL 39/5/D.
[25] See correspondence in SSL 35/2/A.
[26] Whitmee 1871:17; SDC Minutes, 5-7 March 1873, SSL 34/2/B; G.A. Turner 1878:12; Phillips 1884:16; Marriott 1895:7.
[27] Thornley 1982:131-36, 1996:44-48; Wetherell 1978:166-67, 1980:142-45. Problems over status were usually muted, though still real, because Fijian pastors were more 'respectful' towards European missionaries.
[28] SDC Minutes, 6-9 Nov 1878, SSL 35/4/E.
[29] Marriott, Newell and Claxton to Foreign Secretary, 26 Feb 1886, SSL 39/2/A.
[30] Wilson to Foreign Secretary, 25 Apr 1885, SSL 38/6/A; Newell to Foreign Secretary, 1 Sept 1885, SSL 38/6/D; Phillips to Foreign Secretary, 30 Dec 1885, SSL 38/6/E; Phillips to Foreign Secretary, 1 Mar 1886, SSL 39/2/B. For a later example of blatant victimization, in 1920, see Forman 1982:23-24.
[31] Phillips to Foreign Secretary, 20 Nov 1884, SSL 38/3/C.
[32] Davies 1882:20-21; SDC Minutes, 19-24 Jan 1884, SSL 37/5/A.
[33] SDC Minutes, 6-9 Nov 1898, SSL 35/4/E; Powell 1879:9; Werner 1889:321-22. A reading between the lines suggests that Tuilouaa was dobbed in not so much because his fellow pastors were scandalized but because he was disliked.
[34] Whitmee 1871:17-19. It is likely that in so rigorously applying his code of laws, Elekana was simply following a Cook Islands model, where mission rule was very tight.
[35] Davies 1880:4; Newell 1885:21; Marriott 1887:19; SDC Minutes, 23 July, and 22 Aug 1888, SSL 40/2/D.
[36] Powell 1878:202 (quotation); Pratt to Foreign Secretary, 23 Aug 1878, SSL 35/4/D.
[37] Campbell's tenure in the Gilbert and Ellice Islands Protectorates is assessed by Macdonald (1982:82-93).
[38] Campbell to High Commissioner, 17 Oct 1896, WPHC 4, 392/1896.
[39] Campbell to High Commissioner, 15 Dec 1896, WPHC 4, 68/1897.
[40] Cooper to High Commissioner, 14 Aug 1899, and encls., WPHC 4, 185/1899; French 1899:29-30; Newell 1899:5-6; Newell to Foreign Secretary, 10 Jan 1900, SSL 46.
[41] SDC Minutes, 28-29 July 1897, SSL 44/4/B; Newell to Cousins, 7 Aug 1897, SSL 44/4/B; Arundel to Goward, 11 Jan 1898, SSL 44/6/A; Newell to Foreign Secretary, 21 Jan 1899, SSL 45.
[42] SDC Minutes, 18-19 Sept 1902, and 12-18 May 1903, PMB 95.
[43] David 1899:126-27; Noricks 1981:38; Jolliffe 1912: Friedrich-Koch 1978.

References

AGASSIZ, G.R. (ed.), 1913. *Letters and Recollections of Alexander Agassiz.* London, Houghton Miffin Company.

BECKE, Louis, 1897. *Wild Life in Southern Seas.* London, T. Fisher Unwin.

BECKE, Louis, 1901. *By Rock and Pool on an Austral Shore.* London, T. Fisher Unwin.

BECKE, Louis, n.d. "Notes on Polynesia", Becke Papers, ML A1373.

BECKE, Louis, and Walter JEFFERY, 1901. *The Tapu of Banderah.* London, T. Fisher Unwin.

BESNIER, Niko, 1995. *Literacy, Emotion, and Authority: reading and writing on a Polynesian atoll.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

BRADY, Ivan A., 1970. "Land Tenure, Kinship and Community Structures: strategies for living in the Ellice Islands of Western Polynesia", PhD dissertation, University of Oregon.

BRADY, Ivan, 1975. "Christians, Pagans and Government Men: culture change in the Ellice Islands", in Ivan A. Brady and Barry L. Isaacs (eds), *A Reader in Culture Change,* vol 2: *case studies.* New York, Schenkman.

BRIDGE, Cyprian, 1883. *Report on Islands of the Ellice, Gilbert (or Kingsmill), Marshall, Caroline, and Pelew Groups, visited by H.M.S "Espiegle," in 1883* (print). RNAS 16.

BRIDGE, Cyprian, 1886. "Cruises in Melanesia, Micronesia and Western Polynesia in 1882, 1883, and 1884", *Proceedings of the Royal Geographic Society,* 9: 545-67.

CHAMBERS, Anne, 1984. *Nanumea.* Atoll Economy: Social Change in Kiribati and Tuvalu 6. Canberra, Development Studies Centre, Australian National University.

CHAMBERS, Keith S., 1984. "The Heirs of Tefolaha: tradition and social organization in Nanumea, a Polynesian atoll community", PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

CHURCHWARD, W.B., 1887. *My Consulate in Samoa.* London, Richard Bentley & Son.

CLARKE, 1890. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSR 3/172.

CLAXTON, 1889. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSR 3/171.

CRAWFORD, R.J., 1977. "The Lotu and the Fa'aSamoa: church and society in Samoa, 1830-1880", PhD thesis, University of Otago.

CULLEN, John H., 1895. "Diary kept while on board the L.M.S. S.S. John Williams", PMB 570.

DANA, Julian, 1935. *Gods Who Die: the story of Samoa's greatest adventurer.* New York, Macmillan.

DAVID, Mrs Edgeworth, 1899. *Funafuti, or Three Months on a Coal Atoll: an unscientific account of a scientific expedition.* London, John Murray.

DAVIDSON, J.W., 1967. *Samoa mo Samoa: the emergence of the Independent State of Western Samoa.* Melbourne, Oxford University Press.

DAVIES, S.H., 1873. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSL 34/2/D.

DAVIES, S.H., 1880. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSJ 176.

DAVIES, S.H., 1882. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSJ 179.

DAVIS, E.H.M., 1892. *Papers Respecting the Declaration of a British Protectorate over the Gilbert Islands by Captain Davis, of Her Majesty's Ship "Royalist," and General Report upon the Gilbert, Ellice, and Marshall Islands.* Foreign Office Confidential Print 6269. See also RNAS 17; CO 225/39/23076.

DOWNS, Evelyn E., 1944. *Daughters of the Island.* London, Livingston Press.

ELEKANA 1872. "Elikana's [sic] Story", *Juvenile Missionary Magazine*, 1872: 101-05, 123-27, 147-50, 175-77, 196-98.

FORMAN, Charles W., 1974. "The South Pacific Style in the Christian Ministry", *Missiology*, 2: 421-35.

FORMAN, Charles W., 1982. *The Island Churches of the South Pacific: emergence in the twentieth century.* New York, Orbis Books.

GARRETT, John, 1982. *To Live Among the Stars: Christian origins in Oceania.* Geneva/Suva, World Council of Churches in association with the Institute of Pacific Studies of the University of the South Pacific.

GARRETT, John, 1992. *Footsteps in the Sea: Christianity in Oceania to World War II.* Suva/Geneva: Institute of Pacific Studies of the University of the South Pacific in association with the Council for World Churches.

GILL, W. Wyatt, 1872. "Diary of a Tour of the Gilbert, Ellice, Union and Loyalty Islands in the John Williams ", ML B1444.

GILL, William Wyatt, 1885. *Jottings from the Pacific.* London, Religious Tract Society.

GILSON, R.P., 1970. *Samoa, 1830-1900: the politics of a multi-cultural community.* Melbourne, Oxford University Press.

GOLDSMITH, Michael, 1989. "Church and Society in Tuvalu", PhD dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

GOLDSMITH, Michael, and MUNRO, Doug, 1992. "Encountering Elekana Encountering Tuvalu", in Donald H. Rubenstein (ed.), *Pacific History: papers from the 10th Pacific History Association Conference.* Mangilao, University of Guam Press and Micronesian Area Research Center.

GOWARD, W.E., 1892. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSR 2/142.

GOWARD, W.E., 1897. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSR 4/241.

HEDLEY, Charles, 1896. "General Account of the Atoll of Funafuti", in *The Atoll of Funafuti, Ellice Group*, Australian Museum Memoir 3 (Sydney, 1896-1900).

JOLLIFFE, Sarah, 1912. Funafuti Diary, SSP.

KENT, Graeme, 1972. *Company of Heaven: early missionaries in the South Seas.* Wellington, A.W. & A.H. Reed.

KOCH, Gerd, 1962. "Kulturwandel bei den Polynesiern des Ellice-Inseln", *Sociologus*, 12(2): 129-41 (English translation provided by Ivan Brady).

KOCH, Klaus-Friedrich (ed.), *Logs in the Current of the Sea: Neli Lifuka's Story of Kioa and the Vaitupu Colonists.* Canberra, Australian National University Press.

KOFE, Laumua, 1983. "Pastors and Palagi", in Hugh Laracy (ed), *Tuvalu: a history.* Suva/Funafuti: Instituute of Pacific Studies, and Extension Services of the University of the South Pacific; and Ministry of Social Services, Government of Tuvalu.

LE HUNTE, G.R., 1883. *Six Letters from the Western Pacific.* Colombo, Ceylon Government Printer.

MACDONALD, Barrie, 1982. *Cinderellas of the Empire: towards a history of Kiribati and Tuvalu.* Canberra, Australian National University Press.

MARRIOTT, John, 1883. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSJ 180.

MARRIOTT, John, 1887. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSJ 185.

MARRIOTT, John, 1895. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSJ 189.

MARRIOTT, John, 1898. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSJ 192.

MAXWELL, William, 1881. *Report on the Gilbert, Ellise* [sic] *and Other Islands* (print), RNAS 15; CO 225/7/16817; CO 225/42/19817.

MOORE, W. Usborn, 1884. *Reports of Proceedings of H.M.S. "Dart"* (print), RNAS 16.

MOSS, Frederick J., 1889. *Through Atolls and Islands in the Great South Sea.* London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington.

MUNRO, Doug, 1978. "Kirisome and Tema: Samoan pastors in the Ellice Islands", in Deryck Scarr (ed.), *More Pacific Islands Portraits.* Canberra, Australian National University Press.

MUNRO, Doug, 1982. "The Lagoon Islands: a history of Tuvalu, 1820-1908", PhD thesis, Macquarie University.

MURRAY, *Forty Years' Mission Work in Polynesia and New Guinea from 1835 to 1875.* London, Nisbet.

NEWELL, J.E., 1885. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSJ 182.

NEWELL, J.E., 1896. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSJ 190.

NEWELL, J.E., 1899. Diary, SSO.

NORICKS, Jay Smith, 1981. "Niutao Kinship and Social Organization", PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

PEARSON, W.H., 1970. Review in *Journal of Pacific History*, 5: 240-41.

PHILLIPS, Charles, 1881. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSJ 178.

PHILLIPS, Charles, 1884. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSJ 181.

POWELL, Thomas, 1871. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSJ 160.

POWELL, Thomas, 1978. "South Seas - Tokelau, Ellice & Gilbert Groups", *Chronicle of the London Missionary Society for 1878*: 197-202.

POWELL, Thomas, 1879. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSJ 175.

PRATT, George, 1872. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSJ 163.

THORNLEY, Andrew, 1982. "Custom, Change and Conflict: Fiji Wesleyan missionaries, 1835-1945", in R.J. May and Hank Nelson (eds), *Melanesia: beyond diversity*, vol 1. Canberra, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.

THORNLEY, Andrew, 1996. "Fijians in the Methodist Ministry: the first hundred years, 1848-1945", in Andrew Thornley and Tauga Vulaono (eds), *Mai Kea Ki Vai?: stories of Methodism in Fiji and Rotuma*. Suva, Methodist Church of Fiji.

TURNER, G.A., Jr. 1874a. "Report of a Voyage through the Tokelau, Ellice, and Gilbert Groups in the 'John Williams' during 1874," PMB 129.

TURNER, G.A., Jr. 1874b. Northwest Outstation Journal, SSJ 165.

TURNER, G.A., Jr. 1878. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSJ 173.

TURNER, George, Sr. 1876. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSJ 168.

VIVIAN, J.C., 1871-1872. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSJ 161.

WERNER, B., von, 1889. *Ein deutsches Kriegsschift in der Südsee*. Leipzig, Brockhaus (draft English translation provided by Ian Grady).

WETHERELL, David, 1978. "From Fiji to Papua: the work of the *vakavuvuli*", *Journal of Pacific History*, 13(3): 153-72.

WETHERELL, David, 1980. "Pioneers and Patriarchs: Samoans in a nonconconformist mission district in Papua, 1890-1917", *Journal of Pacific History*, 15(3): 130-54.

WHITE, G.M., 1965. *Kioa: an Ellice community in Fiji*. Eugene: Department of Anthropology, University of Oregon.

WHITMEE, S.J., 1871. *A Missionary Cruise in the South Pacific .in 1870*. Sydney, Joseph Cook.

WHITMEE, S.J., 1893. Gilbert Islands Journal, SSR 3.

WHITMEE, S.J., [1917]. "Recollections of a Long Life". SSP.

WILSON, W.H., 1886. Northwest Outstations Journal, SSJ 183.

WINCHCOMBE, George, 1881-1888. "Journal and Diary", Becke Papers, ML Safe 1, 8.

WOODFORD, C.M., 1884. "Journal of a Voyage from Suva, Fiji, to the Gilberts and Back [on the Fiji recruiting vessel *Patience*]", Woodford Papers (microfilm copy in the Division of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University).

Glossary

aliki	chief
fa'a Samoa	Samoan way
feagaiga	covenantal relationship between pastor and congregation
feitu	village sides
kaupuli	council of elders
ulu aliki	high chief