

Name of Applicant: Solow, Jody Fran 1990
SURNAME FIRST MIDDLE

3

20. Aim and scope of project:

The Strategy of the Commons: Transformations in the Meaning and Management of Communally Held Resources

Common property resource management has recently emerged as a topic of important theoretical debate. Furthermore, a precise understanding of these systems is central to sustainable and equitable use and management of tropical resources. Yet common property relations are being seriously challenged as societies become increasingly articulated with a global cash economy, and many systems of common property resource management are being replaced by new systems of privatization. Anthropologists have made a substantial contribution to our present understanding of common property systems (e.g. see volume by McCay 1987), however we have only begun to scratch the surface in attempting to clearly understand the complexity of how common property systems operate, and why they break down.

The best arenas in which to investigate theoretical issues of common property resource management are those societies undergoing rapid changes in land use, because change brings conflict, and conflict brings into sharp relief the rules and norms by which these systems operate. Vella Lavella is one such society. The island is presently facing a new era of social and ecological transformation. While its size is insignificant on a global scale, Vella Lavella is representative of the types of social and environmental problems facing much of the Pacific, and indeed, much of the tropics. Restructured property relations, terrestrial and marine resource depletion, a 3.8% population growth rate, and a growing reliance on imported foods are placing the survival of the island's people and resources in doubt

I propose to study the structures and processes by which common property resource management systems on Vella Lavella have operated, the processes by which they are transformed, and the ways in which conflicting and contradicting ideologies are reconciled in an attempt to construct a unified plan to manage the island's resources.

Specifically, I will:

- 1) *Examine the past and present cultural and political mechanisms by which common property resource systems operate.* The research will investigate the roles of political, social, and religious institutions in regulating access to and use of the island's resources. It will also examine the complex interrelations between numerous social and ecological factors, such as the ways in which laws of resource use and allocation differ according to the ecological conditions in which they are applied (inland forest, coastal flats, reef, seasonality).
- 2) *Document the ways in which external forces have transformed common property resource systems on Vella Lavella.* A key force in transforming customary systems of resource management was the integration of Vella Lavella into the global capitalist economy, through the activities of traders, planters, and missionaries. The research will investigate the process by which these agents alter the ways that resources are defined, valued, allocated, utilized, and managed on Vella Lavella. This will include an analysis of the changing relations between people, and between people and resources, and an examination of (a) how the power of customary priests, chiefs, and individuals; and (b) how the social meaning of resources and customary money have been transformed, and what impacts this has had on the use and management of the island's resources. In particular, I wish to compare the differential process of transformation in three villages with sharply contrasting tenure relations and consumption patterns in order to identify the key factors which have structured a heterogeneous pattern of change on the island.
- 3) *Investigate how conflicting ideologies between villages, and contradicting ideologies within villages are reconciled by Vella Lavellans as they attempt to construct an island-wide plan to manage their natural resources.* Though "communalistic development" is an ideology widely shared among islanders, its precise meaning is unclear, and exists within communities with very different forms of property relations. Patterns of land tenure on the island contrast sharply, from a system of communal tenure in the west to subdivided, individually-owned 'blocks' in the east. Members of both regions claim that their system is more just than the other, yet it remains to be seen how each will be incorporated into the island's development plan and its goal of equitable resource use. Furthermore, there are ideological contradictions within each village which must be addressed as the islanders work out the details of their development plans. First, while they are presently questioning the authority of their customary chiefs (*lekasa*) due to their cooperation with logging and mining companies, there is simultaneously a desire to strengthen customary practices by reintroducing the *lekasa's* role in regulating common property resource use. Second, they are seeking to develop a culturally relevant form of island government based on customary institutions while operating under the auspices of a western model of the bureaucratic state. The proposed investigation will necessarily attempt to understand how, with regard to resource use, the multiplicity of meanings are reconciled—especially at a time of intensified transformation on the one hand, and a conscious attempt to control the direction of transformation on the other—in the ideologies and actions of individuals, of households, and of communities. The empirical data from Vella Lavella will therefore provide an insight into the question of changing patterns of land and resource use stemming from a gradual transformation of decisions based on plural (and oftentimes drastically conflicting) sets of assumptions, social norms, and meanings.

Supported by funds from a National Science Foundation Graduate Fellowship and various grants from Cambridge University, I was able to conduct a preliminary investigation in the Solomon Islands from July through September 1988. Six weeks were spent on Vella Lavella during which time twelve villages were visited and interviews were conducted with over fifty individuals, including tribal chiefs, church leaders and Provincial Members. Three research sites—Leona, Sambora, and Walapata Villages—were chosen for their contrasting patterns of tenure, consumption, plantation development, and access to markets. The population of each village is roughly 200, or approximately forty households.

ITEM 20 CONTINUED:

Vella Lavella is a volcanic island situated in the Western Province of the Solomon Islands. Its steep interior is densely covered with tropical rain forest, and dotted with impermanent garden plots. Most of the island's coastal areas have been converted to coconut plantations. The island is fringed with coral reefs which are most extensive in the north and west. Today's population lives in coastal villages and has a mixed economy of gardening, fishing, hunting and collecting for household consumption, and cash crop cultivation (coconuts, cocoa) and shell collecting for export markets. Mbilua, the language of Vella Lavella, reveals that the people are of Papuan, not Melanesian descent (Lanyon-Orgill 1953). There are no roads, electricity or plumbing on the island.

Customary utilization of resources on Vella Lavella was based on the fulfilment of biological needs (nourishment, shelter) and social obligations that were enmeshed in a sacred understanding of and relationship with nature (of which humans are seen as an integral part). Although this relationship may have been dramatically altered, it is not merely vestigial; the sacredness and supernatural powers with which some plants and animals are imbued is still a vital element in peoples' perception of nature, as is the social significance of land and resources. This view clearly opposes the (relatively new) perception of 'resources' as commodities. Recognizing the importance of sharing and generosity—attributes which have been widely observed throughout the Pacific (e.g. Carrier 1987, Johannes 1981a)—is vital to understanding the logic of customary resource allocation, use, and management on Vella Lavella. Linked with these is a web of social norms, including 1) the contempt for material accumulation; 2) a great respect for chiefs, priests, ancestral spirits, and Gods; 3) the asking of permission; 4) the paying of compensation; 5) close kin relations; and 6) other cultural and political functions and institutions which may have been more critical in determining patterns of resource use than, for instance, relative resource abundance or other such environmental factors.

Still, social relations and human-environment relations are simultaneously interrelated, and the complexity of laws concerning resource management—while not being necessarily determined by—may be mirrored by the perceived complexity of the resource base. That is, laws controlling access to and use of resources may vary with ecological conditions. On Vella Lavella there are numerous types of land and resources, each with its own pattern of allocation, utilization, and consumption. For example, if we examine three of the land types on Vella Lavella, these contrasting patterns become clear. 'Bush', comprised of steep, dense, tropical forest, is held communally by tribe (*toutou*), and is utilized for hunting (wild pig, opossum, and flying foxes) and collecting housing materials, medicines, ceremonial plants, and firewood for domestic consumption or ceremonial purposes. Garden plots, on the other hand, are allocated to individuals who then have temporary usufructory rights. Gardens are utilized for growing produce which is consumed domestically, given as a gift, or used for ceremonial purposes. Coconut plantations (relatively recent—since the late 1800's) are held under private ownership, and are utilized for producing copra (dried coconut) which is sold for cash. Similarly, there are numerous sea types (distinguishable zones) and marine resources, each associated with a set of different laws of use and control.

Another aspect of resource use and management is the unequal social and economic significance attributed to each 'resource'. For instance, Bonito are highly valued, sharks are sacred, and dolphins and whales are considered 'friends' to people. Furthermore, the various species of giant clams comprise a wide range of value, from 'God' to good-eating to fair-eating to 'rubbish clam'. Certain birds and turtles are kept as pets, and other animals such as beche-de-mer and trochus had no meaning until their recent economic importance for foreign markets. Crocodiles were sacred until guns were introduced by traders at which point they were fervently hunted. Various species of ginger were cultivated in womens' gardens, and eaten to control fertility. (This practice was prohibited by missionaries and abolished, though a few women continue to grow them [*pazapaza* and *anga*] secretly in their gardens). The laws associated with the many species of wild and cultivated gingers are numerous, and the meanings with which ginger is imbued ranges from political to medicinal to supernatural (See Somerville 1897 on use of ginger in nearby islands). The above discussion illustrates that several meanings or 'functions' operate simultaneously in determining patterns of resource use and management on Vella Lavella.

The research objectives are to deepen our understanding of how common property systems operate, how these systems are transformed, and to advance anthropological theory. Specifically, I will (a) document the roles of institutional leaders such as chiefs, priests, and government officials in regulating access to resources; (b) identify the ways in which specific cultural beliefs and social norms influence resource use; (c) identify the different laws governing resource use and ways in which they vary in relation to their ecological setting (e.g. inland forest, exposed reef) and intended economic use (e.g. domestic consumption, sale); and (d) record fluctuations of tenure laws associated with seasonality of resource use. In order to obtain an understanding of how common property systems are transformed, I will (a) document historical interactions between outsiders and islanders and their effects on the laws and patterns of customary land use; (b) trace historically and spatially the increasing use of cash in social transactions, and its effect on the meaning and use of resources; (c) reconstruct and compare the historical changes in land use which have resulted in the dramatically contrasting patterns of tenure operating in the three villages; and (d) document the levels of socioeconomic differentiation within each of the communities. Lastly, I hope to contribute to broader theoretical debates on (a) local access to and control of resources; (b) the persistence and transformation of common property resource systems; (c) the political economy of natural resource use; and (d) new models for ecologically sustainable and socially equitable rural development.

21. Outline of methodology:

The proposed dissertation research will begin in February 1990 and last eighteen months. During each three-month period, ten weeks will be spent on Vella Lavella and two weeks will be spent in Honiara (the state capital) working in the National Archives or in government offices. Travel will be by kayak for short distances and by dugout canoe outfitted with an outboard motor for longer distances. Arrangements have been made for housing, and invitations to reside in all three villages have been received by the respective chiefs and Area Council Members. Interviews will be conducted with a translator for the first six months or so until a spoken fluency of Mbilua, the language of Vella Lavella, is attained. I will also be assisted periodically, depending on need (e.g. cartography, surveys), by other members of the Vella Lavella community. The comprehensive nature of the study is possible due to the small population size (approximately 200 in each of the three communities) and length of fieldwork (18 months). The three focal research topics will be investigated by a variety of methods, discussed below.

J. Interviews

Interviews will be conducted in the three focal communities in order to obtain information on: (a) the historical division and use of land; (b) the social and environmental factors which shaped the customary system(s) of resource management; (c) transformations in the role of the chiefs, customary priests, government officials, church leaders, and other individuals in regulating resource use; (d) changes in the perceived social and economic meanings of specific resources; (e) differential responses to external influences in the three villages, and the resulting transformation or persistence of common property systems; and (f) local needs and aspirations for the development of the island's resources and society.

Initially, every household will be interviewed for base-line data on population dynamics which will enable me to construct an overview montage of the origins, relations, and locations of all community members. During these initial interviews, information of a more general nature will be sought in order to obtain the necessary familiarity with each household's situation so that representative households can be chosen for all subsequent interviews. Ten households will be chosen from each village based on their contrasting socioeconomic strata, age and gender structure, formal education received, family histories on the island, and participation in community politics. Interviews will be simultaneously taped and written into field notebooks. In the evenings data will be entered into a laptop computer and cross-referenced for easy access. This methodology is essential in order to realistically deal with the voluminous, diversified, and complex nature of the data which I expect to obtain (based on the enormous amount of relevant information obtained during the six week preliminary

22. How does the project relate to other research on the topic or problem, and how will it contribute to anthropology?

In contrast to Garrett Hardin's (1968) arguments that common property systems would eventually lead to resource depletion, the regulation of common property resources is an integral part of many customary systems of resource management (Johannes 1984), and has enabled societies throughout the Pacific and elsewhere to maintain a sustainable supply of resources for several thousand years (Ciriacy-Wantrup and Bishop 1975; Wright 1985; Zann 1985). Misconceptions of common property systems arise, in part, because authors neglect to distinguish unregulated, open-access commons from regulated, limited-access commons; (e.g. Hardin 1968). Further attempts to theorize these systems have stressed the importance of environmental conditions and perceptions of risk in prompting their development and persistence (e.g. Acheson 1981; Chapman 1985; Dyson-Hudson and Smith 1978; Gilles and Jamptgaard 1981; McGoodwin 1983; Zann 1985), while ignoring the role of social and cultural context. Another approach points to population size as the major influence. For example, Swadling (1982) asserts that the recent depletion of turtles in Papua New Guinea is due to human population increase, but fails to note the fact that some regulatory mechanisms such as marine tenure were abolished by colonial powers, and that new values were attributed to turtles due to the introduction of a market economy. While it can be argued that certain environmental conditions such as resource abundance, population, and risk should not be dismissed as unimportant (e.g. see works by Legesse 1973, Netting 1982, and Peters 1987), what results from considering these factors alone are analyses that tend to be environmentally deterministic and Malthusian.

Other theories have been based on questionable assumptions regarding the nature of social action dealing with common property resources (e.g. Hardin 1968, Olson 1965, Ostrom 1986). First, it has been implied that the universal basis for human behavior is a western capitalist rationality. This view is problematic because it does not illuminate our understanding of how these systems work in societies which operate under a different logic of resource use. Second, the individual has been conceived as an independent actor within a social vacuum. McCay notes that in the parable of the commons used by Hardin to describe his pastoral tragedy, each individual acts independently—there is no community. A third assumption is that coercion—rather than cooperation—will effect responsible resource management, and overlooks the sociocultural laws by which many societies operate. Hardin argues that "the social arrangements that produce responsibility are arrangements that create coercion, of some sort" (1968: 1247). Hardin speaks of "mutual coercion", but never of mutual consent. Slocks (1987) has traced these ideas back to Thomas Hobbes, who assumed the "natural human" to be instinctively selfish and driven to accumulate, and that only the state could inhibit selfish actions and their consequences. Yet the literature offers many accounts of cooperation whereby groups of people are able to coordinate their actions, and to develop ways of managing a commons (Acheson 1987; Blaikie and Brookfield 1987; Fernandez 1987; Pinkerton 1987). Cooperation is oftentimes embedded in, or a product of, a set of rules defining social norms and regulations that control access to resources (Gilles and Jamptgaard 1981). Slocks adds that "ritual behavior, birth control, kinship systems and other sociocultural practices may serve to regulate human relations with their environments" (1987: 110). These interpretations directly oppose those which overlook community-based laws (and practices) of resource management, and therefore argue for either coercive states or private property. *In order to further common property resource theory, then, it is essential that the role of cultural meanings and social relations in structuring common property*

ITEM 21 CONTINUED:

investigation). Files (both paper and computer) will be kept for each household. A gridded reference sheet for every individual will be inserted at the beginning of each file with squares corresponding to the various topics to be covered. Squares will be checked off as particular information is obtained. This will provide an easily accessible reference to the progress made with each individual and to the topics still to be covered. In this way interviews can be unstructured yet focused in order to obtain the desired information from every individual in each of the focal households.

2. *Surveys*

Household marine, land, cash, and space and time use surveys will document current patterns of resource use in order to examine inter and intra household variations within and between the three villages. Surveys will be conducted for a one-week period at six-week intervals using a random sample of 10 households per village (roughly 25% of total). Research assistants will participate in the collection of survey data.

1) *Marine use surveys*—marine activities including collecting, hunting, and fishing, as well as numbers, sizes, techniques used, and locations of each species. Reason for procurement, permission sought, compensation paid, ages, sexes, and relationships of individuals aboard canoe(s), ownership of canoe and fishing gear, distribution of catch, and use of harvested resources, as well as any controls or restrictions followed (or disobeyed), will also be recorded.

2) *Land use surveys*—activities involving bush, garden, or plantation resources including (a) location of hunting, collecting, or gardening site; (b) ages, sexes, and relationships of people in each party; (c) size and amount of each species taken; (d) 'owner' of site; (e) any paid employment (e.g. clearing of garden plot); and (f) distribution of harvest

3) *Cash use surveys*—all cash transactions will be recorded, including purchases made, and any wages earned or paid. If possible, information will be sought concerning the cumulative value of each household's assets, including material possessions (e.g. outboard motor) and savings.

4) *Space and time use surveys*—in order to understand differential resource use within and between households and communities, space and time use will be assessed for members of the focal households, and will be analysed in conjunction with data obtained in the above three surveys. I will note (a) time spent traveling to and from each location; (b) time spent at the location; and (c) activities performed there.

3. *Mapping*

Mapping will be done in four parts:

1) *Base maps*—Topographic maps of Vella Lavella (1: 50,000) will be photocopied onto vellum in order to produce black-lined base maps of the three focal villages and surrounding regions. Copies of these base maps will be taken into the field upon which a variety of specific maps will be constructed (#3, below).

2) *Aerial photo interpretation*—Aerial photos of Vella Lavella are available from the Department of Lands and Surveys in the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands in Honiara, Solomon Islands (1948, 1957, 1965, 1982), and the Directorate of Overseas Surveys in Southampton, England. Data from aerial photos will be charted onto a map of the island as a whole, as well as the three base maps in order to access the relative changes in patterns of land use.

3) *Field mapping*—Maps will be constructed directly onto base maps while in the field using a plane table and Brunton compass, and will be done with the assistance of Milton Mitau, a cartographer from Vella Lavella. In order to obtain a spatial illustration of regional variation and transformation, past and present locations of the following characteristics will be mapped: (a) tribal land and sea tenure boundaries; (b) "ownership" of plantation lands; (c) allocation of garden plots; (d) sacred sites, fresh water sources, and important bush materials; and (e) settlement patterns.

4) *Computer analysis*—The completed maps will be analysed at the computing facility in the Department of Geography at the University of California, Berkeley. Data from the three base maps will be digitized into a Macintosh II Computer using a Cal Comp 9100 digitizing table. This will create files of latitudinal and longitudinal data. Using MapMaker Program from Select Micro Systems, the latitudinal and longitudinal data will be converted and combined with corresponding information from field notes taken while mapping and from interviews to create maps in Macintosh PICT files are available at the computing facility in Berkeley. These will be put into MacroMind Director which will enable me to create animated maps that illustrate temporal and spatial transformation within and between the three villages. With this method data from each village can be fed into the computer, manipulated, and compared according to specified variables such as an historical period (e.g. the arrival of missionaries), a particular resource (e.g. turtles, nali nut trees or coconut plantations), or social factor (e.g. socioeconomic status or gender). This method will enable me to simultaneously compare and contrast patterns of land use and change between the three villages, and to integrate information obtained from interviews, surveys, mapping, archives and government documents in order to construct a more complete picture of the interrelated factors involved in transforming patterns of resource use and management on the island. Used primarily as an analytical tool, the resulting 'moving map' would greatly facilitate the presentation of a complex situation in a clear, concise, graphical statement of spatial and temporal transformation.

4. *Archival Research*

A total of two months will be spent working in the National Archives in Honiara. The reports of missionaries, traders, and colonial officials will be used to help reconstruct the historical forces which influenced the transformation of customary systems of resource use and management on Vella Lavella, and will serve as a check for information obtained from elders on the island.

5. *Government documents research*

Research will be conducted in various governmental offices in Honiara, including the Ministries of Agriculture and Lands, Natural Resources, and Economic Planning; and in Gizo in the Provincial Offices where relevant documents pertaining to Vella Lavella will be consulted.

ITEM 22 CONTINUED:

resource use be recognized and understood.

Many common property theorists have struggled with definitions for such terms as 'ownership', and 'common property'. For example, McCay notes Malinowski's definition of ownership as "the concrete facts and conditions of use" (1987: 8). This definition is too vague for our purposes, and is problematic in that it (1) can be (mis)interpreted in exploitative ways (for example, in English law, which regarded "conjugal affection" as part of a man's property Otyan 1987), or in reference to slavery); and (2) does not implicate any notion of limitation. Ciriacy-Wantrup and Bishop assert that the term 'common property' "refers to a distribution of property rights in which a number of owners are co-equal in their rights *to use* the resource" (1975: 2, italics in original). And Godelier very eloquently affirms that "what a society claims in appropriating a territory for itself is access to, and control and use of, both the visible realities and the invisible powers which constitute it and which seem to share between them the mastery of the reproductive conditions of human life—both the human beings' own life and that of the resources upon which they depend" (1986: 83). *It is clear from the above that any definition of common property must include a conception of use. It must also incorporate (1) the idea of access to and control of resources; (2) the fact that there are material and ideological laws associated with these; and (3) a notion of social boundary (somewhere between the individual [private property] and everybody [open access]).*

A major blindspot in the debates on common property theory is an oversimplification of the system—they fail to trace the overlapping patterns of rights and ownership and tease out the interwoven threads of meaning and action—which shape the cultural, ecological, and historical fabric of common property resource management systems. Baines states that "though there is now a greater willingness to know, to understand, and to document these systems, few appreciate their complexity" (in press: 16). Exceptions include Fernandcz (1987), who provides an example of overlapping use rights in Spain, whereby arable lands are allocated to individuals for certain purposes (e.g. agriculture), and are treated as a commons for others (e.g. cattle grazing after the harvest). Carrier's (1981) work on Ponam Island in Papua New Guinea, and Hviding's (1988) in Marovo Lagoon in the Solomon Islands have similarly illustrated the complexity of common property systems in their meticulous studies of marine resource management. Yet these kinds of studies are rare. Further, it became apparent during preliminary investigations on Vella Lavella that these systems incorporate several categories of land types and resources, each having its own set of laws that are constantly in the process of being defined and redefined. And it appears that there are several layers and kinds of 'ownership' and usufructory rights which are in various degrees of being recognized, depending on other sets of interrelated political, economic, social, religious, and environmental factors. *In order to confront this complexity, researchers must recognize that these systems involve highly intricate and fluid interrelations between numerable political, economic, social, religious and ecological forces that are constantly transforming in space and in time.*

While it is essential to understand internal complexity, it is equally important to examine the historical processes which transformed systems of common property resource management. Throughout the tropics, these systems have been challenged and oftentimes destroyed by externally imposed forces, and many of these 'strategies' have been transformed into 'tragedies'. Nature became 'resources' and resources became commodities. As the social value of resources is replaced by a monetary one, overexploitation and resource degradation ensue (Baines 1985; Blaikie 1985; Blaikie and Brookfield 1987; Ciriacy-Wantrup and Bishop 1975; Cordell and Fitzpatrick 1987; Hooper 1985; Johannes 1981; McKinnon 1975, 1976-7; Nietschmann 1972). The introduction of a money economy, and the new values that accompany it, by far had the greatest impact in transforming customary systems of resource management (Baines 1982; Gilles and Jamptgaard 1981; Johannes 1978; McCay 1987; Stocks 1987). Yet capitalism did not just land and stand nakedly on the shores of the Pacific. It traveled through time and space in boats, locked into the ideologies of traders, planters, missionaries, colonial administrators, and now multinational resource extractors. *Therefore, the historical processes which transformed the meanings and functionalities of common property systems must be at the heart of any analysis that proposes to contribute to an understanding of these systems. And the expansion of global capitalism is of central importance in the past two centuries of Pacific history.*

Lastly, the question of 'meaning' must be critically addressed, as it is central to the issue of transformation (see Watts and Carney 1988). What is being transformed? The existence of cash does not in itself indicate that a person should, instead of sharing, demand a bit of shiny money from their mother before she may be given a fish. The transformation is something invisible. It is the meaning with which 'things' and social relations are imbued. To grasp the complex socioecological interrelations that cause changing patterns of land tenure and resource use, it is essential to follow the historical changes in meaning. Peters rightly argues that "without a keener sense of the relations in which individual users are embedded, we cannot penetrate the dynamic of a commons, which is necessarily a social system. And without an attention to the reciprocal interaction between practice and meaning, we shall also misconstrue or miss the dynamic in process" (1987:193). *Therefore, in order to understand the transformations which have occurred and which are presently occurring on Vella Lavella, we must first understand the deconstruction and reconstruction of meaning, as it prevails in the thoughts and actions of individuals.*

Projects designed by experts from industrialized countries to promote rural development have continually failed to meet their stated objectives (Chambers 1983; Harriss 1982; Redclift 1987). They fail in part because they lack an understanding of the complexities of local systems of tenure and resource management (Cernea 1988; Ciriacy-Wantrup and Bishop 1975; Gilles and Jamptgaard 1981; Peters 1988), and because local people are not involved in all aspects of project planning and implementation. What is lacking, but sorely needed, is research which examines rural development within a dynamic framework at the local level in which interrelated social and environmental factors are integrated in an expression of their changing interactions with one another. Without this type of research, it will be difficult to further anthropological debates related to local access to and control of common property resources, and to formulate new models of rural development which promote sustainable and equitable use of tropical resources. The proposed research will provide an empirical study, at a very micro level, in which to draw theoretical conclusions about the ways that conflicting values constrain common property resource management and 'development' planning. Furthermore, it would integrate with the needs of the locally-initiated project on Vella Lavella, and the results of this study will be of interest and use to rural development planners throughout the Solomon Islands and the Pacific (please see attached letters).

Literature Cited

- Acheson, J. 1981. Anthropology of Fishing. *Ann. Rev. Anthropology*. 10: 275-316.
- 1987. The Lobster Fiefs Revisited: Economic and Ecological Effects of Territoriality in Maine Lobster Fishing. Pp. 37-65 in McCay and Acheson. 1987. *The Question of the Commons: The Culture and Ecology of Communal Resources*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Baines, G. 1982. Pacific Islands: Development of Coastal Marine Resources of Selected Islands. Pp. 188-198 in Soysa, C. H., Sien, C. L., and W. I. Collier (eds). *Man, Land and Sea: Coastal Resource Use and Management in Asia and the Pacific*. Bangkok: The Agricultural Development Council.
- 1985. Coastal Zone Management and Conservation in the South Pacific. Pp. 40-53 in Report of the Third South Pacific National Parks and Reserves Conference (Vol.3). Held in Apia, Western Samoa.
- in press. Traditional Resource Management in the Melanesian South Pacific: A Development Dilemma. I. Berkes, F. and Farvar, T. (eds). *Community-based Sustainable Development: The Ecology of Communal Property Resources*. IUCN Conservation for Sustainable Development Series.
- Blaikie, P. 1985. *The Political Economy of Soil Erosion in Developing Countries*. London: Longman.
- and Brookfield, H. 1987. *Land Degradation and Society*. New York: Methuen.
- Carney, J. and M. Watts. Forthcoming. *Manufacturing Dissent Work, Gender and Politics of Meaning in a Peasant Society*. Africa..
- Carrier, J. 1981. Ownership of Productive Resources of Ponam Island, Manus Province. *Journal de la Societe des Oceanistes*. 72-73 (37): 205-217.
- 1987. Marine Tenure and Conservation in Papua New Guinea: Problems and Interpretation. Pp. 142-167 in McCay and Acheson. *The Question of the Commons: The Culture and Ecology of Communal Resources*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Cerneza, M. 1988. Land Tenure Systems and Social Implications of forestry Development Programs (Pakistan). Pp.139-148 in Fortmann, L. and Bruce, J. (eds). *Whose Trees? Proprietary Dimensions of Forestry*. Boulder Westview Press.
- Chambers, R. 1983. *Rural Development: Putting the Last First*. Essex: Longman Scientific and Technical.
- Chapman, M. 1985. Environmental Influences on the Development of Traditional Conservation in the South Pacific Region. *Environmental Conservation* 12(3): 217-230.
- Ciriacy-Wantrup, S.V. and R.C. Bishop. 1975. "Common Property" as a concept in natural resources policy. *Natural Resources Journal* 15: 713-727.
- Cordell, J. and J. Fitzpatrick. 1987. Torres Strait Cultural Identity and the Sea. *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 11(2): 15-17.
- Dyson-Hudson, R. and E. A. Smith. 1978. Human Territoriality: An Ecological Reassessment. *American Anthropologist* 80: 21-41.
- Fernandez, J. W. 1987. The Call to the Commons: Decline and Recommitment in Asturias, Spain. Pp.266-289 in McCay, B. and J. Acheson, eds. *The Question of the Commons: The Culture and Ecology of Communal Resources*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Gilles, J.L. and K. Jamptgaard. 1981. Overgrazing in Pastoral Areas: The Commons Reconsidered. *Sociologia Ruralis* 21 (September): 129-141. Reprinted in *Nomadic Peoples* 10: 1-10,1982.
- Godelier, M. 1986. *The Mental and the Material: Thought Economy and Society*. Thetford: Verso.
- Hardin, G. 1968. The Tragedy of the Commons. *Science* 162: 1243-1248.
- Harriss, J. 1982. *Rural Development: Theories of Peasant Economy and Agrarian Change*. London: Hutchinson Univ. Library.
- Hooper, A. 1985. Tokelau Fishing in Traditional and Modern Contexts. Pp. 8-38 in Ruddle, K. and R. Johannes (eds). *The Traditional Knowledge and Management of Coastal Systems in Asia and the Pacific*. Jakarta: UNESCO.
- Hviding, E. 1988. All Things in Our Sea: Comments on the Dynamics of Customary Marine Tenure, With Examples from Marovo Lagoon, Solomon Islands. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Johannes, R. 1978. Traditional Marine Conservation Methods in Oceania and their Demise. *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Syst* 9: 349-364.
- 1981. *Words of the Lagoon: Fishing and Marine Lore in the Palau District of Micronesia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 1984. Traditional Use of Reef and Lagoon Resources. Pp. 111-113 in Ketching, R. and B. Hudson (eds). *Coral Reef Management Handbook*. Jakarta: UNESCO.
- Lanyon-Orgill, P. A. 1953. The Papuan languages of the New Georgian Archipelago, Solomon Islands. *Journal of Austronesian Studies* 1:122-138.

- Legesse. 1973. Gada. [Precise citation not available at present—with apologies.]
- Macpherson, C. B. (ed). 1978. Property: Mainstream and Critical Positions. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- McCay, B. and J. Acheson, eds. 1987. The Question of the Commons: The Culture and Ecology of Communal Resources. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- McGoodwin, J. 1983. Some Examples of Self-regulatory Mechanisms in Unmnged Fisheries. FAO Fisheries Report No. 289, Supplement 2. Rome: FAO.
- McKinnon, J. 1975. Tomahawks, Turtles and Traders. *Oceania* 45: 290-307.
- 1976-7. Chayanov in the Solomons: A Study of Socio-economic Motives in Resource Use. *Pacific Viewpoint* 17-18: 49-60.
- Netting, R. 1982. Territory, Property and Tenure. Pp.446-502 in R. Adams, N. J. Smelser, and D. J. Trieman, eds. Behavioral and Social Science Research: A National Resource. Washington, D. C.: National Academy Press.
- Nietschmann, B. 1972. Hunting and Fishing Focus Among the Miskito Indians, Eastern Nicaragua. *Human Ecology* 1: 41-67.
- Olson, M. 1965. The Logic of Collective Action. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Ostrom, E. 1986. Issues of Definition and Theory: Some Conclusions and Hypotheses. Pp. 599-615 in Ruskin, F. R. (ed). Common Property Resource Management. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Peters, P. 1987. Embedded Systems and Rooted Models: The Grazing Lands of Botswana and the Commons Debate. Pp. 171-194 in McCay, B. and J. Acheson, eds. The Question of the Commons: The Culture and Ecology of Communal Resources. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Pinkerton, E. 1987. Intercepting the State: Dramatic Processes in the Assertion of Local Comanagement Rights. Pp. 344-369 in McCay, B. and J. Acheson, eds. The Question of the Commons: The Culture and Ecology of Communal Resources. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Redclift, M. 1987. Sustainable Development: Exploring the Contradictions. London: Methuen.
- Ryan, A. 1987. Property. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Somerville, B. T. 1897. Ethnological notes in New Georgia, Solomon Islands. *Journal of the Anthropological Institute* 26: 357-412.
- Stocks, A. 1987. Resource management in an Amazon *Varzea* Lake Ecosystem: The Cocamilla Case. Pp. 108-120 in McCay, B. and J. Acheson, eds. The Question of the Commons: The Culture and Ecology of Communal Resources. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Swadling, p. 1982. Shellfishing in Papua New Guinea, With Special Reference to the Papuan Coast. Pp. 307-310 in Morauta, L., J. Pemetta and W. Heaney. (eds). Traditional Conservation in Papua New Guinea. Port Moresby: Institute of Applied Social and Economic Research.
- Wright, A. 1985. Marine Resource Use in Papua New Guinea: Can Traditional Concepts and Contemporary Development be Integrated? Pp. 79-99 in Ruddle, K. and R. Johannes (eds). The Traditional Knowledge and Management of Coastal Systems in Asia and the Pacific. Jakarta: UNESCO.
- Zann, L. 1985. Traditional Management and Conservation of Fisheries in Kiribati and Tuvalu Atolls. Pp. 54-77 in Ruddle, K. and R. Johannes (eds). The Traditional Knowledge and Management of Coastal Systems in Asia and the Pacific. Jakarta: UNESCO.