TERRITORY OF PAPUA.

Sentiments and Leading Ideas in Native Society

BY

F. E. WILLIAMS,

M.A. (Adelaide); Dip. Anthropology (Oxford),

GOVERNMENT ANTHROPOLOGIST.

With Introduction by

SIR HUBERT MURRAY, K.C.M.G.,

Lieutenant-Governor of Papua.

Anthropology, Report No. 12.

1932.

PORT MORESBY:

EDWARD GEORGE BAKER, GOVERNMENT PRINTER.

(Minute from the Lieutenant-Governor to the Government Secretary.)

Ever since the days of Sir William MacGregor it has been the policy of the Government to preserve native custom so far as possible; but it has occurred to me that there may be certain delicate and almost impalpable sentiments pervading a native community, which can not be classed as customs, but which have an influence for good upon native life, and the disappearance of which would be a distinct loss. And yet it would be difficult to get a sufficiently definite grasp of such sentiments as would enable us to weld them into a scheme of practical administration.

Take, e.g., the sentiment of *Meh*, the moral sanction among the Orokaiva which Mr. Williams describes so graphically in his book; it would be a thousand pities if this moral sanction should disappear, and yet I do not see how one could enforce it by administrative action. There are probably other influences similar to *Meh* which Mr. Williams has met elsewhere in the Territory.

What I should like Mr. Williams to do is to assist me by drafting a notice which might be sent out to Resident Magistrates, inviting their attention to sentiments or influences of this kind, and suggesting means by which such sentiments and influences may be encouraged and preserved.

J. H. P. MURRAY,
Lieutenant-Governor.

Port Moresby,
31st August, 1931.

CONTENTS.

Sentiments and Leading Ideas in Native Society.

IT is now well recognized that the sentiments play an essential part in the life of a society. The position may be summarized in the words of Radcliffe-Brown, representing the Functional School of Social Anthropologists. "A society depends for its existence on the presence in the minds of its members of a certain system of sentiments by which the conduct of the individual is regulated in conformity with the needs of the society" ("Andaman Islanders," pp. 233, 4).

There is no quarrelling with this as a general thesis. Apart from our private sentiments we have certain wider sentiments in common, and these by virtue of their uniformity and, it is claimed, their usefulness, constitute the basis of our social life.

I will deal briefly with some of the major sentiments common to native life as I have observed it. The list is rather a random one and of course makes no pretension to completeness. It is clear moreover that in what follows I have here and there over-stepped the mark that would be set by a discussion of true sentiments. But sentiments, I take it, are always bound up with cognitive modes of experience, with knowledge or with belief, right or wrong; and it is important to grasp some of the major beliefs which are correlated with, or underlie, the major sentiments. The phrase "Ruling Ideas" should cover the extra ground.

We should also bear in mind that the above-quoted thesis refers to society *as it is constituted*. Applied anthropology, however, in the service of administration must concern itself not merely with native society as it is, but also with native society as it ought to be: it must contemplate adaptation to new conditions. The old society

may need reforming, and the sentiments which have been so essential to its existence hitherto must not, on that account only, be regarded as desirable for ever.

Whether our practical attitude toward these sentiments and ideas should be one of encouragement, or opposition, or a neutral one of mere toleration, is a matter of policy. If it were our aim to preserve native society in its present condition then we should encourage these sentiments, or at least do nothing to oppose them. But that is not our aim, and each must be judged upon its merits, or upon the measure in which it contributes toward what we envisage as the new ideal.

1.—Native Conservatism: The Attachment to Tradition.

The conservatism of natives is a matter of common observation. It is possible to look at it from two different angles, however. It is the result in part of entirely negative qualities, such as we should call lack of originality or initiative. It is largely true that the native can do only what he has been taught to do: he is a slave to physical and intellectual habits.

But from time to time we meet with conservatism of a more positive kind: the native may definitely oppose change because of his genuine attachment to the past. He commonly feels that he should or must do things in the way his fathers did them, and this moreover is the way he likes to do them. This or that ceremony for instance must be performed detail for detail after the pattern of previous ceremonies. It may be possible to search out theoretical reasons on the native's part—such as the fear of offending the spirits of the dead if the traditions are broken: but these are more in the nature of secondary explanations, and are not necessarily in the native's mind when he is following the traditional course. The real motive is, I think, his strong sentimental attachment to the past, to the fashion of his fathers.

Now this attachment to the past obviously has its bad side in that it presents an obstacle to progressive change. But naturally it does as much to maintain the good in native culture as what we consider the bad. Save for the existence of this general sentiment we should probably see

a very speedy destruction by European influence of elements in native culture which are genuinely distinctive and, I believe, of true value.

2.—Corporate Self-Regard: Pride in Culture.

Furthermore this attachment to the past is correlated with a pride in native culture as it exists. Every native community or tribe in which there is a good tone, i.e., a general social healthiness, is prone to think itself superior to its neighbours. I do not imagine this involves a feeling among its members of physical superiority or greater power: they may be very much afraid of their neighbours as warriors or sorcerers. But they feel that their own manner of life is the proper thing, while that of the neighbouring tribe or people is incorrect, or queer, or even offensive. If they speak another dialect of the same language, then it is the true dialect gone crooked, or perhaps the speakers cannot control their tongues; if their versions of the legends are different, then they have been telling lies; if their ceremonies vary in this or that detail, then it is because they have made bad copies of those that belonged to our particular tribe from the beginning.

This kind of attitude, which in other people we call naïve, misinformed, illiberal, and what not, seems to be almost as common among civilized as among primitive tribes. It may go to the length of becoming ridiculous or harmful; but it seems that a little of it at any rate is not wholly a bad thing; and it is certainly necessary that every community should at least retain a good conceit of itself.

Under the weight of European influence this sentiment, which may be referred to as Corporate Pride, is in danger of breaking down—especially where Europeans are trying to Europeanize. Such people usually think that the native way of life is wholly inferior, and they find the best way of gaining their end—a worthy but mistaken one—is to harp on this inferiority. Even in the absence of any studied belittlement native institutions often cut a poor figure in comparison with European, and a feeling of inferiority is probably inevitable.

I think it is highly important to allow the native to keep a good deal of what he already has, and to sow oc-

casional seeds of approval and encouragement, so that he will have a culture distinctively his own, and one of which he may continue to be proud.

3.—Individual Self-Regard: Self-Display.

The self-regarding sentiment is made much of by psychology as essential to happiness and effectiveness. Its importance is even more obvious in the individual than in the group. Among natives, perhaps even more than among Europeans, it finds particular expression in self-display. If a native succeeds in attracting the favourable attention of his fellows his opinion of himself rises in proportion. Indeed one might almost say exactly in proportion, for I do not suppose a native goes in for any cool self-appraisal: he probably takes himself at the valuation accorded by his group.

Self-display may seem childish or objectionable to us, but we should at least tolerate it where it is accepted as good manners. Among natives it will find typical expression in the many forms of personal enhancement. I regard it as a futile act of unkindness to discourage the use of paint and feathers. Even bodily deformations—the puncturing of ear-lobes, tattooing, the scarring of breasts, and so forth—are surely none of our business; and if the native chooses to endure the pain in order to enjoy the consequences I think we should let him go to it.

Since the native's traditional forms of self-enhancement suit him so much better than any of ours it is hardly necessary to deprecate such practices as the wearing of European clothes for ornament or display. But it does not follow that the native's more concrete ideas on this subject are above correction. One may see very striking contrasts in the tastes and habits of different peoples, and one, for instance, that must attract our notice lies in the observance of personal cleanliness. Among some of our natives this has set into a tradition: it has come to possess real value in their own eyes as a form of personal enhancement. Among others the tradition seems hardly to have formed, and the European may well be disappointed, even amazed, at the apparently unthinking tolerance of dirt and untidiness. The explanation lies partly in laziness, but partly also in the fact that the natives in question

have not fully developed an idea that cleanliness is an essential of attractiveness. It may perhaps be possible to overcome this second difficulty at least by working on the native's love of self-display.

The same tendency helps of course to provide an impetus to other and perhaps more important activities, such as decorative art, trade and the accumulation of wealth, the improvement of houses and villages, and especially the production of food. I shall refer to this last point again.

4.—Loyalty to the Group: Clannishness.

The tendency of the primitive group to stick together is too well recognized to need any dwelling on. The interests of the individual are so bound up with those of his group, and his way of life differs so little from that of his fellows, that conflict between individual and group arises relatively seldom. On the other hand there is always the possibility of strife with outsiders, and if that should arise the group is likely to act as one man. This takes effect most strikingly of course in the feud, with its implication of communal responsibility and communal revenge.

This spirit of clannishness however has plenty of peaceful applications. At dances, feasts, ceremonies and so on, the group likes to stick together, and all hands co-operate to make a good showing. The competitive spirit moreover is often strongly in evidence, and, provided it stops short of strife, certainly deserves encouragement.

Clannishness, although so much more characteristic of primitive culture than of our own, is still of course only a tendency. There are any amount of examples of individuals breaking away from their groups and joining others for reasons of their own: and the observed development of individualism under Government control and through contact with the "commercials" is in itself sufficient proof that clannishness can be broken down. I do not think however that there need be any hurry about breaking it down. Since it is by no means entirely evil, and since moreover it is so characteristically native, we might on the whole aim at controlling it rather than

destroying it. The encouragement of competitive events (prizes for best villages, etc.) serve a useful purpose; and if competition is used as a means of stimulation I think it might be communal just as much as, or even rather than, individual.

5.—Intra-Group Sentiment: The Sympathetic Sanction.

I have elsewhere drawn attention to the marked contrast between native morality within the group and without the group. When we speak of Clannishness we usually have in mind the common attitude of the fellow-members of a group towards those who are beyond its pale; but the native's close identification of himself with his group controls in equal degree his conduct toward the other individual members of it. It is my own conclusion that we may postulate a Sentiment of Friendliness or Fellowship as existing between these individual members; and this, I believe, lies at the very root of intra-group morality.

It has often been remarked that within the primitive society each man as a rule manages to hit it off very well with his neighbours; and, in the frequent absence of any judicial mechanism or central authority, it remains rather a puzzle how he manages to do so. It is true that the fear of retaliation in one form or another, and the susceptibility to public opinion combine to keep the individual in the approved path; but apart from any such deterrent, I believe that what tends in the first place to prevent one member from injuring another is simply this sentiment of friendliness or fellowship.

I have referred to the group within which this sentiment obtains as the "Sympathy Group," and to the influence which it exerts over conduct as the "Sympathetic Sanction." Its explanation is probably to be found in that close identification of the individual with his group, or that extension of his feeling of self to his fellow-members which makes, as far as intra-group conduct is concerned, for a rather high degree of unselfishness. The groups to which we confess allegiance are, by the very fact of civilization, much wider than any the native knows; but we have progressed in the direction of individualism as well, and, except perhaps in the case of the immediate

family, the European does not belong heart and soul to any group in the sense our native does.

The growth of individualism as a result of contact with Europeans is probably inevitable; but it will have its drawbacks as well as its advantages: the even tenor of village life will be disturbed by new kinds of competition and self-seeking. There is no need therefore to hurry the process on.

6.—The Sense of Shame.

We have all noticed the frequency with which natives for one reason or another declare they are ashamed. The word "shame" is thoroughly embedded in pidgin-English, and we have *hemarai* as its counterpart in pidgin-Motuan. It is probable that in every native language in the Territory we should find a roughly corresponding term and concept (Orokaiva, *Meh*; Elema, *Maioka*; etc.).

The native is not a psychologist, so we cannot look to him for any direct aid in the analysis of this feeling which so often comes over him. It arises in so many connections that we shall probably be correct in assuming that several more or less complex emotions are lumped together under one general term. The feeling of self-abasement however is always present and is no doubt the principal component.

The most frequent occasion of shame in a native is the exposure to public disapproval, whether in the form of reprobation or ridicule. In the great majority of cases such disapproval implies a definite sense of guilt in the individual concerned, since his ethical standards (unless he be something of a progressive) are simply those of his tribe. He may be led to repentance and atonement for the breach or wrong he has committed, or if the chance of atonement has passed he will be affected by remorse, sometimes so bitter as to end in suicide. Of course there must be many cases where the native puts up with his highly uncomfortable situation and finally rids himself of it without seeking to make any amends at all; but the risk of shame is not one that he braves willingly.

It is very noteworthy that breaches of custom or propriety by others will arouse emotions which pass under

the name of shame although the people who experience them in this case are in no way responsible. Perhaps this kind of shame is felt most strongly when the guilty party is closely connected with the observer, for the idea of self extends to one's associates. But we know that if an outsider, even a European, behaves himself in a manner which to the native appears unseemly, then the native himself will be affected once more by what he calls shame. In fact any infringement of the accepted code of manners may evoke this feeling even in those who are only indirectly involved.

But the sense of shame may come into force again in a more private transaction, when perhaps only two persons are involved, viz., the wrongdoer and the victim of the wrong. If the victim can directly or indirectly bring home his guilt to the wrongdoer, then the latter is strongly affected by shame, a state of mind which in many cases finds its solution in an act of atonement or compensation. This aspect of shame is, I think, intimately connected with the sentiment of friendliness or fellowship: when the native wilfully disregards that sentiment he is visited by shame almost as a matter of course. That is to say, shame forms one aspect of that Sympathetic Sanction which has already been referred to.

7.—Sentiment toward Relatives by Marriage.

The native finds himself a member of a number of different and only partly coincident groups. There are those of his kin, of his village, of his tribe, perhaps of his totem-kin, and so on; and within all of these in differing degree the Sympathetic Sanction makes itself felt. Upon marriage in the normal instance he becomes a member of still another group; and his relations with it are of the greatest importance in primitive society. He is now probably involved in a system of economic exchanges, perhaps the most important in that endless chain of exchanges or reciprocal obligations which are the essence of native economics.

But when two groups are related by marriage their mutual attitude is unmistakably "ambivalent." There appears to be a kind of latent antagonism between them, so that measures must be continually taken to avoid

offence and maintain cordial relations. Thus we find that a tone of hostility often attends the celebration, such as it is, of native marriages; and that thereafter a certain amount of formality and restraint is present—evidenced for instance by the common use of name tabus—while on the other hand there is the obligation to render mutual service and hospitality. Further, the important relationship between the child and the maternal uncle may arise from, or be involved in, the relationship between the child's father and his brother-in-law.

Traces of this mixed sentiment toward relatives-in-law no doubt remain among us, but they have dwindled to comparative insignificance. There seems no immediate likelihood that the sentiment will dwindle to a similar degree in native society, though the growth of individualism and opportunities for travel will probably tend to break it down. Such a matter is best left to take its own course. I mention it here merely because I regard it as a factor of prime importance in the social system: and as such it will be found to bear on a great number of court cases.

8.—Respect for Seniority.

Another influence of great importance in our various native societies is the respect for seniority. The mere use of different relationship terms, as so often, for elder brothers and younger brothers shows that primogeniture is very clearly recognized as a social fact; and coupled with this recognition there very commonly goes the habit of deferring to the seniors.

This finds expression in a variety of ways. Not only do the older men have the main say in affairs of common concern, but they are regarded by the juniors as the holders and exponents of all tribal knowledge and experience. One is continually struck by the diffidence of younger men in speaking on matters of purely native interest—I am not at the moment thinking of the sophisticated and forward young man, but of the youth in his own native environment. He will say, " How should I know? I am not an old man." I am quite convinced that this does not always show that the tribal traditions are dying out with the older generation. Very often, as it subsequently appears, the young man has a good knowledge of custom and tradition, but he positively

cannot bring himself to express it. It is not his place to do so, but that of the old man.

Even where there is a recognition of hereditary chieftainship it is the older men of the community, in my experience, who have the real say. The chief by succession may be still a young man, and as such he is still more or less of a nonentity. He has to reach a good age before he becomes a chief in effect as well as in name. I think then that in most native communities of Papua, the older men, chiefs or no chiefs, are truly regarded as reverend seniors, and that they are the people of real importance.

There are many obvious exceptions to this general rule. In almost every village one may see old men who are and always have been nonentities. Intelligence and personality are always essential: without them age will receive no special deference. Again, even in more or less unaffected native societies, there will be found young men of more forceful character who forge to the front. But the general rule holds good: granted a fair endowment of personality the older men will keep control.

I have heard it argued that it is the young "progressive" generation that should be encouraged and induced to take the lead. But while something might be said for such a policy it would tend in my opinion to a too speedy disintegration of native society. There is no need for hurry: gradual change is better than revolution among natives as everywhere else. In the meantime we should make use of their thoroughly ingrained tendency to defer to their elders.

9.—Sentiments toward the Dead.

Of the greatest importance, probably in all our native societies, are the mixed sentiments toward the dead. It will no doubt be found in every part of the Territory that human beings are believed to survive death in some form or other; and very commonly it will also be found that the spirits of the dead are believed to exert a strong influence over the lives and fortunes of the living. It is Frazer's final opinion that "The fear of the human dead" has been "probably the most powerful force in the making of primitive religion"; and whether this be accepted or

not as a dictum, the existence of the sentiment and its importance cannot be disputed.

The attitude is not wholly one of fear, however. Feelings of affection survive the death of their object, and the spirit or ghost has to be protected as well as placated: its way must be made as easy as possible. Futhermore the veneration felt for an old man does not simply vanish at the moment of his death. I think it could be maintained that he is regarded as a source of power in the community while he lives: and there is no doubt that the same notion attaches to the spirit or ghost. It is regarded as a source of power for both good and evil. Altogether, no unimportant part is played in native culture by the belief in the existence and power of the spirits of the dead, by the mingled feelings of fear, affection, veneration, and dependence felt toward them, and by the resultant rites and practices.

It may be expected that Christianity where it is taught will provide a substitute for these beliefs, feelings and practices. But they will survive and continue to affect native culture for a long time to come, and meanwhile they deserve as much consideration as we can give them.

10.—Tribal Secrets: The Mysteries.

Among the Papuan cultures of the Territory, rather than the Melanesian, great store is set upon the secrets to which members of the tribe are successively initiated. In some few parts adult women qualify for initiation; but much more commonly it is a prerogative of the male. The system finds its most notable expression in what are virtually the extensive secret societies of the Gulf and the West. The actual secret will turn out to be of little consequence; the important thing is that each boy or man has the ambition to gain entry into the company of those who know. There is a price to pay, usually a pig or part of one, and they must be very few who fail or neglect to provide it. The masked ceremonies of the Gulf and Delta represent the highest achievements in the culture of those regions, and the right to participate in them is a definite object for every man in behalf of himself or his dependant. Moreover their social implications are complex.

and extensive, and they provide opportunity for artistic expression of a surprisingly high order. In these regions a great deal of what makes life interesting is involved in the mysteries, i.e., the rites pertaining to the tribal secrets.

11.—The Economic Balance: Reciprocity.

A marked feature of native life, especially in its economic aspect, is the strictness with which mutual obligations are observed. The fact that many cases of native debt come before the Magistrate does not disprove the rule. There is no doubt that to "pay back" or make things "square" is a fundamental rule of native morals.

Naturally it holds with regard to bad turns as well as good turns, so that it is as much part of the rule to take a life for a life as to repay an armshell with an armshell; and naturally again it holds for practices like temporary wive-exchange as well as for others which the Government would more readily countenance. But on the whole it is undoubtedly one of the principal features of native morality. I think Malinowski uses the expression "reciprocity"; and this reciprocity underlies all manner of native activities.

That it has not always been imported into transactions with the Europeans is rather disappointing. I think that in respect of obligations toward his own people the native usually wants to play the game and moreover he would be ashamed to default: that is to say, he is under the influence the "sympathetic sanction" as well as the sanction of public reprobation. In dealings with Europeans our native is more or less free from either, and he does not look far enough ahead to realize that, from the merely economic point of view, honesty is the best policy.

It is hardly necessary to devise any means to preserve this idea of reciprocity in native life, since it is already so firmly established there. It is the application of it to the new native-European relations that presents the problem. I do not know how this can be met other than by propaganda and by dealing with cases as they arise. Naturally both sides require watching.

12.—Pride in Food Production: The Cult of Food.

Last, but by no means least, we come to the native's sentiment toward food. Malinowski has made much of this in his "Argonauts of the Western Pacific." It is not the native's eating and enjoying of his food that we need consider, but his permanent attitude toward food as that which in the long run means more than anything else to himself and his fellows. Prosperity is first and foremost a matter of food abundance: a man or a community which can produce such abundance is, in the native sense, doing well.

To be able to produce a great quantity of food is felt everywhere to be a matter for pride and congratulation, and the pride finds expression in the feasts which recur so frequently in uncontaminated native society. We are all familiar with the ostentatious display of food on these occasions and the liberality with which it is given away. I find I have written the following about feasts in the Morehead: "It is perhaps on the afternoon of a feast day that the native's life reaches the summit of enjoyment. It is not that he is merely gloating over the prospects of a surfeit; he finds his satisfaction rather in the presence of a host of friends, in the keen activities of preparation, and most of all in the display of great quantities of food. For the givers of the feast it is the day of days, when they offer proof in overwhelming fashion not only of their hospitality but of their wealth and power and industry—in fact of their 'strength.' For in no wise is a man's measure more surely taken than by the quantity of food he can produce and give away." The same, I think, would apply to any people in the Territory.

What we call the "feast" might as a rule be better named the "food distribution." The guests are well fed of course. They may even for the nonce behave like gluttons, though to be sure I have never noticed it particularly myself. On the whole I think they give less thought to the actual pleasures of eating than does the European with his never-ending variety of attractive foods. But however this may be, the fact is that at the largest "feasts" the great majority of the food is carried away by the guests and eaten in their own good time. (If the hosts at such a feast merely provided enough food for their guests to eat on the spot they would be ashamed of themselves.)

Further, by virtue of the reciprocity I have already spoken of, the guests on this occasion will be hosts on the next; and it will be a matter of some particularity to pay back pound for pound.

In some parts of the Territory it is claimed that feasts involve serious wastage of food and are to be condemned as a form of native improvidence. Against this it might be argued that the ambition to make a great display is one of the main incentives to hard work in the garden. But there is no doubt that there can be too much of a good thing, and the more extravagant features of the feast are not to be encouraged.

Apart from arguments for and against, however, it is my purpose here to show that the feast, food-display, and food-distribution are everywhere a prominent feature of native life as we find it, and that the sentiment toward food is of basic importance.

13.—Some Reservations.

It appears that many of the major sentiments known to us are also to be traced in primitive society; but in their respective settings they are of different content and intensity.

Civilized and primitive societies both have their general sentiments toward women, for instance; and there is a very marked difference between them. It is rightly claimed that in each case this general sentiment is an essential factor in the social life as it is constituted, or as it exists at present. But it does not follow that the sentiment is entirely of the right kind and incapable of improvement. At any rate it is not a thing of fixed composition. It is notorious that with modern social changes our own sentiment toward women is changing; and it should be equally obvious that, since changes of even greater relative import are in store for the native, his sentiment toward women will also have to adjust itself.

I am far from advocating any very active measures to raise the status of women: the weaker sex in Papua is very well satisfied with its subordinate position, and any chivalrous blundering would probably rouse its resentment. But it is noteworthy that in some of our native societies

women have already achieved a higher standing than in others; and it seems clear that in all of them a gradual elevation of women's status will be one of the results of contact with Europeans. This instance will serve to illustrate the view expressed at the beginning of this paper that the existent sentiments in native society, while essential to the society as it is constituted, cannot on that account only be regarded as desirable for ever.

It is possible to cite contrasts of a more striking kind. We, for instance, have developed in our civil affairs a very strong regard for the sanctity of human life. It may be that we have actually over-done it; but this, which I suppose may be called one of the abstract sentiments, is a very essential part of our existent social structure. Now it could not be said that a similar sentiment is absent among natives, but it is, I think, very much weaker. Anger in a quarrel readily finds vent in bloodshed and homicide; and in war it is not bravery that receives recognition, but rather the mere taking of life. Here again there is no doubt that the new influences of Government and Mission will effect a change. An increased regard for the sanctity of human life will be gradually built up, and thus a real defect will be remedied.

Lastly I may mention a well-established idea which plays an important part in the social life of primitives, and which yet must be regarded as unquestionably an evil. I refer to the *Duty of Revenge*, which actuates the blood feud. We have reached the stage where vengefulness is regarded as a vice, and the thirst for revenge is at best a pardonable sin: the case is very different among our natives. It would no doubt be possible to work up a brief for revenge as a functional element in primitive social life; but very obviously we are not set upon perpetuating the primitive condition in which it might be said to play an essential part. Native administration can never afford to be merely conservative.

Conclusion.

With these few reservations the sentiments and ruling ideas referred to in this paper must be regarded as mainly influences for good; though in no case should we think of them as inviolable or, so to speak, "the last thing." It

would be preposterous to assume that native society had reached an ideal condition before the European butted in —as preposterous as to assume that European society has reached an ideal condition now. The plain fact is that native society, like ours, was and is very far from perfect, and that the sentiments on which each is based are mutable things, bound to suffer change for good or ill with changing conditions.

Whereas formerly native society was in a comparatively stationary—though never entirely stationary —condition, it is now being rather rudely disturbed and called upon to adapt itself to new relations. The sentiments, therefore, which formerly held together a relatively stable society and were themselves in a relatively stable condition, must now inevitably be modified or altered.

But we do not want to see the old society shattered. We want to see it make these necessary adaptions, but otherwise to retain as much as possible of the form which it evolved to suit its own needs. And if this be recognized as a proper aim, then we should respect those sentiments and leading ideas which have determined the old form of society. Even if we detect some evil in them here and there, it must be remembered that they are very strongly established and form an essential part of the social fabric as it exists at present. They certainly deserve all the consideration we can give them.

Orokolo,
December, 1931.

Printed and published by EDWARD GEORGE BAKER, Government Printer,
Port Moresby, Papua.—6348/7.32.