

*LABOUR IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC*

edited by

*Clive Moore*  
*Jacqueline Leckie*  
*Doug Munro*



Townsville  
James Cook University of Northern Queensland  
1990

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLASS ANALYSIS IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC

Vijay Naidu and Jacqueline Leckie

1.

Vijay Naidu

This volume with its collection of essays dealing with labour history and conditions pertaining to labour in the South Pacific is an extension of existing class analysis in the region. It has covered the creation of the labouring and working class in South Pacific societies, the treatment of migrant workers, the organisation of workers in trade unions, the role of the colonial states in promoting and impeding the formation of a class of workers in island societies, the regulatory measures adopted by the state in relation to various categories of workers, industrial actions by workers and the formation of political parties based on workers' movements. This collection has built upon the foundation of scholarship directed to the study of the evolution and the contemporary situation of the working class in the South Pacific region.

It is argued here that the notion of class analysis in the context of a concluding chapter for a book entitled *Labour in the South Pacific*, must be taken at its most coherent and theoretically comprehensive form. Such a variant is to be found in Marxist discourse. The chapter begins with a definition of class analysis and of social classes. This raises the problem of how the model can be applied to the material contained in this volume and if the question of context mediates our understanding of class analysis. A major gap here has been the absence of class analysis in the study of Pacific societies. To help explain this the chapter will follow with a brief discussion of the literature on Pacific societies and signpost some important contributions to the development of class analysis. In the second section of the chapter, Jacqueline Leckie will raise some new questions in relation to class analysis, cultural change and the development of class consciousness within Pacific societies.

The concept of class or social class may be defined from the perspective of at least three different schools of thought within sociology. Weberian scholars would insist that the labour market is crucial in allocating class positions to individuals and groups depending on what skills, qualifications and experience they have. The life styles of these individuals and groups which are dependent on the workers' income determines their class positions. Studies in this volume, such as that by Ron Adams in Chapter Ten, have illustrated the inappropriateness of simplistically applying class models based on lifestyles to societies with radically different cultures to those in the industrialised West. Followers of Emile Durkheim would pick on the centrality of the division of labour in society where specialisation ensures that the complex demands of an industrial society are fulfilled. Again this does not adequately account for the division of labour in much of the Pacific's labour history where the co-existence of pre-capitalist and capitalist forms of labour may be integral to capitalist development under colonial rule. The fact that this division of labour is exploitative is not the primary factor for consideration; more important is how wider societal solidarity can be established to bring together the specialised

components. In contrast to these two approaches to class analysis, Marxists focus on production relations which engender exploitation by those who own and/or control the means of production of those who through their labour produce wealth in society. The idea of appropriating the fruits of labour of a productive category of people by a non-productive group defines a class society.

For Marxists, inherent in capitalism is the division of society into social classes; particularly a class of workers who have their labour power to sell having lost their direct access to land and other means of production and a class of capitalists who own the means of production – land, machinery, raw materials and money (capital). The former class, the proletariat, are deprived of their surplus labour by the appropriation of surplus value by the latter class of the bourgeoisie. This in essence defines the exploitative nature of capitalism which is central to the notion of class contradictions and class struggles. Although both Marx and Engels were especially concerned with analysing the transformation of Europe from agrarian feudalism to capitalist industrialisation, their notion of class has had wider appeal. According to Marx, "it is always the direct relation between the owners of the conditions of production and the direct producers which reveals the innermost secret, the hidden foundation of the entire social edifice". In this sense, Marx expected that social classes were to be found in societies other than those permeated by the capitalist mode of production.

The systematic analysis of the structure of pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial societies using Marxist analysis has been a very recent phenomena. Indeed, the proliferation of Marxist and Neo-Marxist writings in general has occurred over the last two decades. It is hardly surprising therefore that in the South Pacific, class analysis is of very recent origins. However, the terminology associated with an examination of social classes and class formation has a longer history. Non-Marxist scholars from an early period, rejected what appeared to them the notion of 'primitive communism' advocated by Marxists. Thus Bronislaw Malinowski declared:

The opinion that primitive humanity and savages have no individual property is an old prejudice shared by modern writers, and especially in support of communistic theories and so-called materialistic history.

In a similar vein Raymond Firth maintained that:

we find here no trace of the artificial concepts by which the economic behaviour of primitive man has been sometimes interpreted: the opposed figments of 'primitive communism' and the individual search for food now appear equally barren principles of interpretation.

Following these early functionalist anthropologists, two generations of scholars eschewed class analysis of the South Pacific island societies that were experiencing capitalist penetration, disarticulation of spatially limited economies and their incorporation into the global capitalist system, emergence of completely novel forms of ownership of property and labour relations, imposed bureaucratic organisation and class formation. Instead of examining the structural transformation of Pacific societies, much effort was devoted by non-Marxist scholars to describing pre-European cultural organisations, kinship systems, trade networks, the achievements or failures of discrete groups such as explorers,

traders, missionaries, beachcombers and colonial administrators. Pacific history and the study of Pacific societies were largely within the tradition of imperial scholarship. Island-centred studies emerged at the time of decolonisation but were hijacked by Pacific Way scholars who substituted Islander nationalism for critical examination of the restructuring of island societies.

The lack of theoretical rigour has been a marked feature of studies of Pacific societies. Many studies do not indicate what their basic premises are. Prejudices and psychological reductionism take the place of systematic analysis and explanation.

Sometimes retired colonial officials turned academics, or academics turned colonial administration experts, wrote about their exploits. Their publications are informative about discrete events but their "balanced accounts" are permeated with apologia for colonial rule. While general histories have been written and do play a useful role in bringing together a variety of experiences, allowing for comparison, they tend to be moulded into pseudo-scientific notions such as cultural adaptation, continuity in change, and neo-tradition, which do not delve in any systematic way into the structural re-orientation of these societies. Some of these studies justified colonialism. In their surveys of Pacific societies Douglas Oliver in 1951 and Ron Crocombe in 1971 justified the subjugation of the indigenous populations of Australia and New Zealand in terms of the overall gains to larger numbers of Occidentals and as part of the on-going historical process of population mobility.

Opposition to colonial rule and therefore emergent class divisions was down-played by many writers, and leaders of anti-colonial movements were imbued with unsavoury motives. Protest movements by indigenous masses have been called cults. One leader of such a movement in Fiji, Apolosi Nawai was described by a colonial administrator turned historian in this way:

This man by reason of his genius for subversive intrigue, his quasi-religious influence over his dupes, his utter lack of scruples, his abnormally developed and sustained sexual appetite and the ease with which he secures the victims of his lust, his real eloquence, his faith in himself and his irrepressible persistence in all sorts of evil doing, may well be described as the Rasputin of the Pacific.

Those who collaborated with colonial rulers are given special mention by historians of colonial administration in the region. Simone Durutalo's "The Liberation of the Pacific Island Intellectual" provides a strong criticism of the historiography of the region, which has by and large failed to be critical of colonialism and its beneficiaries.

The dualist approach to the study of Pacific societies which perceived two mutually exclusive and self-contained sectors – the subsistence rural/traditional and the monetised urban/modern sectors also impeded class analysis. This approach failed to recognise the interdependence of the two sectors. The Pacific region has undergone considerable transformation, and the two sectors are interdependent. Bryan H. Farrel states this bluntly in his chapter in *Man in the Pacific*:

During the past 400 years islands once isolated have become dependent on world markets for the sale of their produce, ... and most

communities have experienced a partial or even complete transformation of traditional ways.

Part of this transformation is the harnessing of labour to the production of raw materials for world markets. Colonial enterprises were subsidised by the extraction of cheap labour from the Islanders. It is worth reiterating that since the late nineteenth century the use of island labour in capitalist enterprises has extended from relatively resource rich volcanic high islands and Queensland to the barren atolls of Micronesia and Polynesia, as the case study of Nukulaelae by Doug Munro and Niko Besnier in Chapter Seventeen testifies. The transformation of Pacific societies into labour reserves has continued in the contemporary period with the movement of workers within island states, as described in the study by John Connell in Chapter Nine of Wallis and Futuna workers in New Caledonia and to Pacific rim countries, as depicted in Chapter Thirteen by Paul Spoonley on Pacific island migrant workers in New Zealand.

Another preoccupation of scholars in the South Pacific which has inhibited class analysis is that of looking at ethnicity as the primary motivating force in inter-group relations. Workers are first regarded as "natives", "Indians", "Chinese", etc., rather than as workers. Protest and industrial actions by such workers have been described as an "Indian strike", a "Chinese uprising", or a "native cult movement", thereby undermining analysis that looks at the categories and dynamics of labour and capital. Chapter Twenty by Ian Frazer, on Maasina Rule in the Solomon Islands and its significance as a labour movement, is a welcome correction to the way that proto-nationalist movements have often been depicted.

The belated development of the study of gender and women's reproductive and productive activities in the Pacific has provided little basis upon which any understanding of the relationship between class and gender might be conceived in the colonial and post-colonial development of Pacific societies. This question has been increasingly attracting attention, as indicated in the studies in this volume: Chapter Four by Caroline Ralston and Chapter Twelve by Shaista Shameem.

Thus far we have considered why class analysis does not have a long tradition in the South Pacific, but this state of affairs is being gradually rectified by the development of systematic studies that have utilised political economy, dependency and underdevelopment approaches as well as articulation of modes of production analysis. Following on from this there have also been attempts to locate gender, culture and class ideology within Pacific societies.

Before outlining this change in scholarship, we will consider some studies that have used class-typologies and nomenclature from non-Marxist perspectives. Authors who have discussed the development of plantation agriculture or plantation economies have invariably addressed the issues of land, labour and capital. Scholars examining the specific topic of migrant labour have had to write about labour extraction and recruitment and systems of indenture. A quarter of a century ago, Ben Finney wrote about Polynesian peasants and proletarians. Adrian Mayer's classic, *Peasants in the Pacific* provided a glimpse of the possibility of examining Fiji society as a product of economic forces beyond race. As long ago as 1934 Felix Keesing's *Modern Samoa* dwelled on the plight of the landless mixed race or 'part-Europeans' of Apia, differentiating

them from the relatively wealthy merchant part-European class. In *Cultures of the Pacific*, Thomas G. Harding and Ben J. Wallace asserted that:

Most Pacific Islanders today are peasant farmers, dependent for their livelihoods on the production of cash crops and the import of industrial products. Many are proletarian labourers, working on plantations or in mines and towns. Many aspire to higher technical and professional training .....

Unfortunately this succinct commentary was not accompanied by an in depth and systematic analysis of the emergence of these classes. Neither the process of peasantisation nor proletarianisation was analysed.

Harold Brookfield and Doreen Hart have gone a considerable way in describing the transformation of Pacific island societies in Melanesia. Their description of the centralisation and concentration of capital in Burns Philp and Carpenters is cogent.

The two dominant Sydney-based companies have both invested heavily in Australia, and their Australian business provides at least half the profit of each. This metropolitan investment, financed originally from profits made in the islands, has enabled these highly integrated firms to overwhelm most of their island-based competitors.

In 1972 Brookfield observed that most of the ruling elements in island societies:

... are western-educated, and comparatively affluent. Such elites might even have a deeper vested interest in the status quo of society than the colonial administrators they replace.

He also anticipated the advent of the "night of the generals" in the Pacific. With the coups of 1987, Fiji became the first Pacific state to experience military intervention in civil government and direct military rule.

In the recently published *Class and Culture in the South Pacific*, Epeli Hau'ofa wrote about the transnationalisation of ruling elites. "These elite groups are locked to each other through their privileged access to and control of resources in the region ....." However as with, *Race, Class and Rebellion in the South Pacific*, edited by Alex Mamak and Ahmed Ali, the above volume edited by Antony Hooper *et al.* falls short of a systematic study of social classes in the South Pacific.

Writers such as T.S. Epstein and Ben Finney have written about the emergence of indigenous entrepreneurship and "capitalists" in Papua New Guinea. Numerous studies have described social transformation in Pacific island societies, both at micro and macro levels, which have not used class analysis but the materials provided do contribute useful raw materials from which class analysis may be fruitfully made.

As shown in Jacqueline Leckie's introduction to this volume, there is currently a greater appreciation in the Pacific of the works of scholars of African societies. French social anthropologists including Claude Meillassoux, Emmanuel Terray, Georges Dupré, Pierre-Philippe Rey, Catherine Coquery-Vidrovitch, Jean Suret-Canale and Maurice Godelier have examined pre-capitalist societies,

especially in Africa using the mode of production analysis. They have rectified three major shortcomings of earlier anthropological studies. These are first, the preoccupation with describing phenomena such as kinship, rituals and magic; second, the emphasis on kinship and subsistence self-efficiency with little attention to the inequalities in pre-capitalist formations; and third, giving the impression that many of these societies were autarchic. Similar weaknesses may be identified in anthropological studies in the South Pacific. It is hoped that as the modes of production approach becomes more widely used and refined a better understanding of pre-capitalist South Pacific societies might be gained.

The concept of modes of production is an analytical tool which identifies the forces of production (technological level and 'know how') and the relations of production (social organisation, especially of labour) in a given social formation (or society). This notion considers the material basis of the existence of a given formation, giving particular attention to the relations of production. A number of modes of production have been suggested for pre-capitalist societies such as communal, slave, tributary, petty commodity, Asiatic, and feudal modes of production. In the introduction to this volume Leckie suggests the applicability of two major modes of production in the South Pacific: the communal or lineage mode of production, found in Melanesian societies; and the chiefly or tributary mode as found in Polynesian communities. In his study of Pacific modes of production, Godelier has also identified at least two transitional forms between the communal and the chiefly modes of production.

Since the late 1970s there has been an increase in the number of studies that have used class analysis and the modes of production approach. Some of these studies have also utilised the notion of articulation of modes of production which goes some distance in accounting for the persistence of pre-capitalist or traditional social structures long after the capitalist incorporation of island societies. As pointed out by Rey, this articulation of the capitalist modes of production with pre-capitalist modes of production is possible because of class alliances between capitalists and dominant agents of pre-capitalist structures.

Authors such as Azeem Amarshi, Ken Good and Rex Mortimer, 'Atu Bain, Simone Durutalo, Stephanie Fahey, Adrian Graves, Peter Fitzpatrick, Mike Howard, Jacqueline Leckie, Jay Narayan, Vijay Naidu, Nii-K. Plange, John Samy, and William Sutherland among others, have used class analysis and the modes of production approach to examine the transition of island societies.

The work of other writers, generally non-Marxists, who have dealt with the development of plantations and mines, trade relations, company histories, commodities, trade unions, labour migration, protest movements, socio-economic changes and foreign investment have also provided raw materials for class analysis.

2.

Jacqueline Leckie

Throughout the debates about modes of production, and with the apparent irreconcilable rift between those who emphasise material forces or cultural forces in the process of historical change, an important consideration needs to be kept in mind. That is the centrality of the people who labour. This point may seem obvious but Bergquist has asked why social scientists of virtually all ideological persuasions in the period after the Second World War have managed to put

forward theories of world development and historical change that still put workers on the periphery of their enquiry. In this volume we have tried to not just focus on the modes of production or the incorporation of Pacific Islanders into a world system as passive victims of the "logic of capitalist expansion". We have tried to show how labour and capitalist expansion is not a static structure or an impersonal force but a historically grounded dynamic that at essence concerns real people.

Where we may find disagreement among ourselves is over the question of human agency, the social and cultural incorporation of peripheral areas into the world system and the way we interpret this. This is epitomised in the debate over the relevance of class analysis to Pacific societies. This stems not only from interpretive or ideological differences, but also from differing methodological approaches and as G.E. Marcus and Michael Fischer note, from the problems of representation or textual construction. Many of us following from the lead of Eric Wolf and Peter Worsely, want to see people, culture and ideology restored to broader analyses of economic and political forces. This is not to advocate that analyses of the political-economy should be discarded but that there is a need to pay more attention to process and human agency within this. As reflected through most of the studies in this volume we are aiming to broaden our approach to class, to move a step further from merely criticising 'bourgeois scholarship' which has so often marginalised the real life situations for villagers in the Pacific, migrants, destitutes, the self-employed and most of all, the largest group of producers neglected in the study of labour in the Pacific: women.

Many papers in this collection articulate the exploitative nature of capitalist incorporation in the periphery. Some, especially those of Ron Adams and Clive Moore in Chapters Ten and Eleven, emphasise what meaning this may have had for the Islanders concerned. Their analysis points more in the direction of recent arguments by Marshall Sahlins and Roger Keesing who are concerned with how the culture of capitalism was incorporated into the Islanders' cosmology. Sahlins does not suggest that "we ignore the modern juggernaut" but:

Yet ... precisely because they cannot be resisted the relations and goods of the larger system also take on meaningful places in local schemes of things. In the event, the historical changes in local society are also continuous with the superseded cultural scheme, even as the new state of affairs acquires a cultural coherence of a distinct kind. So we shall have to examine how indigenous peoples struggle to integrate their experience of the world system in something that is logically and ontologically more inclusive: their own system of the world.

However turning capitalist incorporation on its head should not necessarily negate the formation of class consciousness. This is illustrated in Ian Frazer's analysis in Chapter Twenty of Solomon Island labourers being incorporated into capitalist production. He depicts this from the Islanders' perspective but emphasises their perception of exploitative relations and that they certainly did resist. With Maasina Rule, cultural idioms, some indigenous, others incorporated from the hegemonic class/culture became synthesised into new idioms to become expressions and popular *movements* of labour and political discontent. This can be placed within the continuum of Solomon Islands labour history, where new

classes emerged through the struggle between labour and capital. Frazer's study emphasised that new labour relations were not just incorporated into the Islanders' cosmology but gave rise to a new form of class-based consciousness.

Sahlins has also suggested that we might consider how the encroachment of the world system on the periphery offered the potential for the 'local system' to be enriched. This relates to not only how commodities from capitalist production were utilised but what meaning (and value) was attached to them within Islander frameworks. This point needs to be weighed against the reality that foreign ideologies, values and technologies did draw Pacific Islanders into a shared 'world system' which altered the life-styles and division of labour within indigenous communities. We need to also address the issue of who was "enriched" within the local system? For many Pacific societies the encroachment (or for Sahlins, incorporation) of the world system enlarged the potential for consolidating the hegemony of the elite groups, which played a powerful part in strengthening differentiation within and between societies. Modes of production analysis locates this in relation to the control of the means of production and the way this promotes class formation and class consciousness. Many of the studies in this volume also depict the importance of considering class formation and power in relation to control of distribution and consumption, which is where we need to be sensitive as to how commodities were valued and which groups had access to these within Pacific societies. We should also not forget how the control of reproduction and 'domestic' production may have been affected by these processes.

As noted earlier Hau'ofa has described how the encroachment of the world system gave way to the development of a new Pacific elite; a new dominant class. He has viewed this as a process developing over a long period through the greater integration of privileged groups in Pacific societies, not only with the outside world system but also between Pacific societies, especially in Polynesia. If the emergence of new elites can be identified then what of the subalterns or the "growing poor" Hau'ofa refers to? Are they a distinctive class, even if separated by regional, linguistic and ethnic divisions? The problem of class consciousness is further compounded by the question of ideological hegemony where dominated groups may take on the ideology of the elite. Although such groups are exploited, their expressions of this has often been articulated in the discourse of the dominant classes, which in part is the discourse of capitalism Sahlins describes. 'Tradition' has also become part of the discourse of the elite but Hau'ofa perceives the poor's adherence to this as a reflection of their economic (and class) subordination.

The poor adhere to some of their traditions because they have been consistently denied any real benefits from their labour. Their adherence to tradition is a matter of necessity, of economic security.

Hau'ofa's attention to the use of tradition in contemporary class analysis has also been emphasised by Roger Keesing who suggests that the elite has recreated the past to suit its present dominance and that myths of ancestral ways of life serve as powerful political symbols. In many contexts, as depicted for example, in Peter France's study of Fiji's colonial history, the past and cultural identity has been a colonial construction which reinforced colonial and elite domination. This served to dampen subaltern consciousness and their potential to gain

political power. Keesing further notes that discourses of cultural identity in the contemporary Pacific may claim to produce countercolonial images but in many ways this has also been partly derived from Western ideologies. Jean Chesneaux has discussed this in relation to the formation of Kanak political culture. In many Pacific societies we can not trace the inevitable formation and rise of a working class consciousness expressed in political parties representing the interests of labour. Keesing notes, for example, that the concept of *wantoks* has taken on new meaning in the "urban jungle". He suggests that through colonial myth-making, formerly antagonistic *wantoks* have become administrative and economic fictions in the new setting, with new realities. *Wantoks* (speakers of the same language) have become a substitute for kin, to constitute electorates and become new sources of political mobilisation. Keesing identifies categories such as *wantok* as the symbols of class resistance, but he suggests that these new meanings have been incorporated from the hegemonic discourse. Ralph Premdas also explores the role of *wantoks* in his study of Port Moresby politics in Chapter Twenty-One.

Sahlins and Keesing have focused on what could be described as a cultural analysis of historical materialism and pointed to some problems in the application of class analysis. Reservations with their approach can be noted. Jonathon Friedman, for example, has not denied the way in which the world system may be incorporated in the local system but cautions against underestimating the impact of the world system on indigenous cultures:

Whether this takes the form of externally propelled if internally structured transformation, or of direct externally dominated reorganisation, it ought to be evident that the hinterland is caught in the grips of a process that is largely beyond its control, and which, with all due respect to cultural variation, harbours a certain sinister finality. This, in turn, implies that there are properties of reality that are not included in the cultural scheme of things, not even in the structure of practice, but in the results and conditions of practice.

Michael Hess illustrated this point in Chapter Twenty-Two where he described the creation of a labour force in Papua New Guinea "to partner and fructify capital as a process fundamentally foreign to indigenous society." This process arose "within the colonial order of necessity." Glenn Peterson in Chapter Fourteen noted that, even when societies such as the Pohnpei were able to maintain control over their island and culture, at the same time their lives were being transformed.

We would also hope that studies in this volume suggest that class is not just based on myth and that the struggles of labour have a concrete foundation. The studies in Section Three document examples, whether they be waterside workers in Papua New Guinea or senior civil servants in Fiji, where workers have forged new organisations to represent their interests. These workers' organisations share much in common not just within the Pacific region but internationally. This does not deny differences between trade unions, which can be a reflection of particular cultural idioms, but more often reflects constraints imposed by the state and employers.

Michael Burawoy in the *Politics of Production* has also suggested that we should not overlook how the development of workers' consciousness and

subsequent organisations has roots in the labour process itself, and how new forms of production and new patterns of labour brought workers from other disparate backgrounds together to work, for example, in mines, on plantations, in road construction, and hospitals, schools, brothels, tourist complexes and in other people's private homes. But as our case-studies have shown, only in some of these new labour processes was there potential for greater awareness of a common bond as workers and the overt expression for some control of the labour process. The volume has repeatedly documented the powerful role the state and employers took in dampening workers' resistance although we admit we have not paid perhaps adequate attention to how gender subordination worked against women's class consciousness. In the Pacific special attention also needs to be placed upon migration and how this tied into class formation. We have seen how the dependence upon labour reserves from a subsistence base entailed that throughout much of the initial capitalist expansion in the Pacific, a permanent labour force did not develop. However external migration can be important in an awareness of some kind of consciousness as workers. For example, it would be naive to suggest that all recent migrants from the Pacific Islands to New Zealand have not been affected by their experience as workers in a society with relatively structured labour relations. Circular migration may have impeded the growth of an established working class throughout much of the Pacific but workers carry some of their labouring experience with them back to villages. This may not be overtly expressed in some societies but it is an important consideration when we consider the need to embrace communities, and not just paid workers, in our understanding of class. Obviously, as for example in 'Atu Bain's study of goldmining workers in Chapter Twenty-Four, class formation takes on a more overt form, especially in its expression through workers' organisations, with the establishment of permanent workforces and family communities at labour sites and with more permanent settlement in urban areas. These trends are likely to continue in those parts of the Pacific where urban expansion is possible, especially with projected high population growth rates. But we must be cautious in imposing a dualistic model which equates the growth of working classes with migration from rural to urban areas. For example, studies such as Stephanie Fahey's of Siar in Papua New Guinea, point to an increasingly widespread pattern where villages as social groups are becoming dependent upon the cash economy, not only through cash crop production but also increasingly through wage employment. This points to the problems in drawing distinctions between peasants and proletarians and equating the latter with urbanisation.

The debate about the appropriateness of class models in the Pacific has been confused because the models themselves have not been consistently applied there or throughout most of the Third World. The most heated re-analysis of the categories peasant and proletarian has come from Marxists and neo-Marxists themselves. Development in the Third World has rarely followed a neat unilinear path down the road to modernisation and industrialisation and this is especially so in the Pacific. The growing mass of people in the Third World formerly labelled as a 'sub-class' of marginals, urban poor, members of the informal sector, or as Marx did, the lumpenproletariat, are finally being admitted to a new enlarged view of the world of labour and the working class. Pacific societies are following global trends in developing countries where a rapidly growing percentage of the population are dependent upon wage labour. This has not

however led to a significant growth in the number of 'traditional' proletarians who may enjoy job security, a 'family wage', are free to sell their labour as they please and are predominately male breadwinners. That image of the working class was as much a myth in much of Europe's history as it has been elsewhere. If anything, studies of labour in the Pacific testify to the need to redefine and break out of restricted, outmoded concepts. We share the conclusions of other recent studies of international labour, that this does not deny the centrality of that working class, be it urban, rural-based or both, male or female, paid or unpaid, young or old.

## NOTES

1.

Vijay Naidu

This section of the chapter draws out some significant impediments to class analyses in the South Pacific and identifies some major contributions. It is certainly not a comprehensive review of the development of Marxist analysis in the South Pacific.

A comprehensive critical review of published materials in history and social science disciplines is provided in *The Journal of Pacific Studies* 9:1983.

The quotation from *Capital* III, chapter 47 is taken from Bottomore, T. et.al. 1983, *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, London: Blackwell. References to quotations are from Malonowski (1922:167); Firth (1939:352); Oliver (1961:363); Crocombe 1971:14); Harding and Wallace (1970:335); Brookfield and Hart (1971:251); Brookfield (1972:185). For further details on the new elite in the Pacific see Hughes (1983:255) and Hau'ofa (1987). The quotation on the poor and traditions is taken from p 12. The description of Nawai is by Sir Henry Luke, Governor of Fiji cited by Burns (1963:184).

2.

Jacqueline Leckie

The need to address culture in class and world systems analysis has been extensively discussed by Wolf (1983) and Worsley (1984). Several writers, especially Sahlins (1988) suggest that Wolf did not adequately follow up this issue. Sahlins (1988) also discusses how capitalist labour and commodities are indigenised in other cultural logics. The Sahlins quotation in this chapter is from p 4. Keesing (1989) follows in this line but emphasises the political power emanating from ideological and cultural control. Friedman (1987; quoted from p. 75) provides a critique of recent work by Sahlins, although not explicitly of his 1988 paper. A useful analysis of the debate about world systems theory and interpretative anthropology is in Marcus and Fischer (1986) while Worsley (1984:1-60) provides a helpful discussion of modes of production in relation to culture and world development. For lively examples of attempts to combine political-economy with interpretative ethnographic studies of labour outside the Pacific see Nash (1979) and Taussig (1980). See also Bergquist (1984) for a sympathetic critique of the 'impersonal' side of world systems theory and its tendency to underplay human and workers' agency in world history.

Recent comparative collections of international labour studies which address the changing nature of production in the third world and the complexities of class analysis can be found in Boyd, Cohen and Gutkind (1987)

and Munck (1988). Fahey (1986) explores this in relation to a case study in the Pacific. For a recent collection of articles on contemporary changes in labour and class formation see the collection edited by Pinches and Lakha (1987) although most of the studies focus on Asia.