PREFACE

Fieldwork for the *The Yaganon people of the Rai Coast* was undertaken for Highlands Pacific Limited from 17 Sep-3 Oct and 25 Oct-14 Nov 1998, and was based at the company’s Basamuk Camp. This has now been supplemented by two shorter visits, 5-9 April and 30 April-10 May 1999, to address the circumstances of the acquisition of the Mindiri Plantation, also known as Basamuk.

The study is confined to Ward 30 of the Rai Coast Local Level Government. Together with the inland wards centred on Orinma and Mebu, and adjacent areas to the east, I have adopted the overall name ‘Yaganon’ following the designation by linguists of their languages as belonging to the Yaganon Family, and the designation by the government of their area as belonging to the Yaganon Census Division.

Accompanied by Douglas Duka, at times by Tony Naguwean and Matias Gulas, and from the second period on by Tony Friend, I held many dozens of interviews with informants—from the villages of Kulilau, Ganglau, Mindre, Kubup, Segi, Dumon and Dein together with their satellite settlements. The interviews lasted anything from a few minutes to eight hours, and were usually held in the village. In November, though, a number of informants from distant places chose to come to the camp office to present information that I had not previously been able to obtain. In 1999, the specific nature of my inquiry led me to hold rather formal sessions at Ganglau and Mindre villages to record on tape oral historical accounts that the rival ‘Sibiyag’ groups wanted to tell me.

While few informants were fully literate, at almost all interviews they chose themselves either to present genealogical charts of their own construction or to refer to family lists of varying completeness. They did this without my prompting and I choose to assume genealogy really is a key principle of Yaganon local organisation that this heavy emphasis on it would suggest.

I am very grateful for the way this worked out; all the people who assisted are too numerous to mention. I thank them all.

The text is accompanied by a cultural map of Ward 30, *Lands and people of the Gawar-Yaganon River area*, at approximately 1:30,000 scale, a set of genealogical charts corresponding to the bush domains identified on the map, and a database of landowners in Village Population System format.

The first edition of this report did not contain a formal set of recommendations, a conclusion, or an executive summary. This was deliberate. I presented the information as a working document and, as I explain in the text in the discussion of the genealogies (p. 3), not just by Highlands Pacific—there are many components that required, and still require, vetting by the informants who contributed the information. It was possible in April and May 1999 for me to carry my actual report to villages and to read it back as part of the process of public ‘tabling’. I again invite comments from all readers, and make the request at this stage that the whereabouts of the extant copies be kept track of.

Additional information in the revised edition

Subsequently to the completion of the original edition, I was able to spend some time at the Lutheran archives at Ampo in Lae. Among the things I found there was a complete set of correspondence between Jerome Iloa, the Samoan teacher based in the 1920s at Sangpat, and Lutheran Headquarters. I include here Jerome’s map of the Rai Coast, drawn by him by hand.
Secondly, I was able to locate John F. Mager’s map of the Lutheran Mission field as it was in 1936, at the National Library of Australia. This fairly conclusively shows what stations and plantations had been started by that time: apparently not Mindiri.

Thirdly, I was able to locate J.K. McCarthy’s 1934 patrol report of the Mindre-Mebu-Bau Plantation area, and again this shows that no activity had commenced at Mindiri Plantation by that time. Intriguingly, McCarthy did a compensation assessment for the acquisition by the Lutherans of the land at Sangpat, and listed various Mindre people as the beneficiaries. (We do not know if the purchase proceeded as the land at Sangpat had already been vacated.)

I have also included various illustrations from the scarce Tumarkin edition of Miklouho-Maclay’s diaries, including that of a hamlet within the Yaganon area.

These additions add substantially to the picture of land acquisition along this coast, although the question of ‘grants’, or intended grants, of land during the German administration, and that were not at the time taken up, must be left open.

John Burton
Thursday Island
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TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Agnate  A person in a genealogy whose descent from the founder is traced exclusively through males.

Austronesian Language family extending from S.E. Asia through the Pacific to Polynesia.

CD  Census Division.

Cognate  A person in a genealogy whose descent from the founder is traced through either males or females.

Enate  A person in a genealogy whose descent from the founder is traced through at least one female, a non-agnatic cognate (Lawrence 1984: 48); this term is not in widespread use.

F/M ratio  Total females/total males: an indirect measure of health delivery bias useful where no other statistics exist.

Graged Language of the Yam Islanders or ‘Siars’, used by the Rhenish Mission for evangelism in the Madang area. Same as ‘Kranket’, ‘Gedaged’.

LLG  Local Level Government, referring specifically to the implementation of reforms from the 1996 Organic Law on Provincial and Local Level Government. Still referred to as a ‘Council’ in most areas.

MCH clinic  Mother-Child Health clinic.

Non-Austronesian Collection of languages not belonging to the Austronesian family, found across the New Guinea mainland, in Timor, and in the New Guinea islands. Another name: ‘Papuan languages’.

No.1 Raikos  Astrolabe Bay to the Mot River.

No.2 Raikos  Mot River to the Morobe border.

PDS  Provincial Data System. National system for collecting village census and service accessibility data; active 1977-84.

PMB  Pacific Manuscripts Bureau, at the Australian National University. PMB has microfilmed most extant archival records from Papua New Guinea. Many patrol reports are available in microfiche format. Earlier government records are on microfilm.
| **Rai** | The south-easterly, dry season wind along the Papua New Guinea north coast from May to November. |
| **Rhenish Mission** | Lutheran mission society based in Barmen-Wuppertal, Germany, active in Madang 1887-1932. |
| **‘Siar’** | In the Yaganon area, loosely used to refer to all people from Siar, Panutibun, Bilai or Kranket. |
| **Taleo** | The north-westerly, monsoon season wind along the Papua New Guinea north coast from December to March. |
| **Yam Islands** | The inner islands of Madang harbour: Siar, Panutibun, Bilai and Kranket. |
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Identity of the study area

The people living between the Gawar and Yaganon Rivers use the term ‘Raikos’ (or Rai Coast) as a marker of identity, distinguishing themselves from neighbouring areas with more or less certainty under various ‘big names’. To the extreme west are people described as ‘big name’ Bogati; to the south of the Finisterre Range are the Nahu-Rawa; to the east are the Bonga-Malalamai people (two villages on the coast) and Tapen-Teptep (further inland).

The term ‘Rai Coast’ itself is often though to be a corruption of ‘Maclay Coast’ after the Russian explorer Miklouho-Maclay, who called it this himself (some villagers even suggested this) but the name is more likely to come from the pidgin name, the length of the north coast, for the south-easterly coastal wind, or rai (Mihalic 1971:163).\(^1\)

The Raikos are by no means definite about these descriptions, and they neither identify a sharp edge to the cultural area they live in, as do say the Motu, nor draw attention to smaller ‘tribal’ divisions within it, as is found in some areas of the country, such as in the Middle Fly or parts of the highlands.

Within Raikos, ‘No.1 Raikos’ means Astrolabe Bay to the Mot River, and ‘No. 2 Raikos’ from the Mot River to the Morobe border, with the Arop people of Long Island being additional, offshore Raikos. From Bibi west to Astrolabe Bay, Raikos people can also be called ‘Siroi’, after a notable mountain behind Cape Rigney.\(^2\)

The study area coincides with Ward 30 of the Rai Coast Local Level Government (the ‘Rai Coast Council’), but no one name is used for the people who live between the two rivers. I have chosen to use ‘Yaganon people’, simply following the grouping together by linguists of the languages of the study area into the ‘Yaganon Family’ and the long-time designation of the area as Census Division 06 Yaganon within the Madang Province. Note that CD06 includes the inland villages centred on Orinma and Mebu, and the area east of the Yaganon River as far as Kepler Point and the Yangdar River. Still, given the close relationships among all these people, the overall cultural designation ‘Yaganon people’ has a satisfactory fit.

At a lower level, the study area comprises:

\(^1\) The north-westerly monsoon season is the taleo, which necessitates the use of landing places on the opposite sides of the bays to those usually used.

\(^2\) Siroi, a coastal hill, was climbed by Miklouho-Maclay in 1877; see p. 17.
five villages, located on customary land, and inhabited by speakers of the ‘Dumon’ and ‘Ganglau’ languages of the Yaganon Family (see below);

- Mindre village, with an oral history of migration from Madang and its own language, ‘Mindiri’;

- at least 16 ‘settlements’, on land acquired by customary purchase or otherwise, and inhabited by speakers of the ‘Saip’ and ‘Kar’ languages of the Yaganon Family whose own land is located in inland council wards without road access.

Within the villages and settlements are groups referred to by villagers as ‘clans’, typically four to six in each village and one or two in each settlement. In reality, entities identifiable as clans in a normal sense are absent, and the precise nature of the things called ‘clans’ is a central matter for investigation in this report.

Contents of the study

This is a social mapping study. Social mapping is the sum of three parts: (i) gaining an understanding of social organisation and the historical background to the contemporary pattern of settlement, (ii) mapping out actual connections between people through genealogy and census, and (iii) mapping out the distribution of rights to land across the physical landscape.

History

In Papua New Guinea, informants invariably refer back to deep historical matters which affect their lives in the present day. The Rai Coast is no exception and villagers continue to feel the reverberations of two catastrophic events: the ‘Time of Darkness’ eruption of Long Island more than 250 years ago, and the German appropriations of land in the Friedrich Wilmhelmshafen (Madang) area from 1887. Both resulted in movements of people to the Rai Coast. In the first case, the oral history of the Mindre people links the settlement of their village to the ‘Time of Darkness’ when Yomba, the island of their ancestors, became uninhabitable and ‘sank’. (The exact whereabouts of Yomba remains a matter of conjecture.)

The second event led to rebellions of Madang villagers in 1904 and 1912, which were harshly suppressed and led to the forced exile, in 1912, of the entire population of the Yam islanders—called locally ‘Siars’, though people from islands other than Siar were involved—to Rai Coast villages, including Mindre. In 1950, the luluai of Mindre claimed to have been a witness to the execution at Madang of the ring-leaders; if this refers to the events of 1904, he could have done so as a six-year-old boy. At all events, the punishment of

---

3 The spelling of this name in patrol reports alternates between ‘Mindiri’, which is also the name of the eponymous plantation in documents, ‘Mendiri’ and ‘Mindire’. Villagers today prefer Mindre. Other spellings are ‘Medize’ and ‘Medise’, in documents influenced by the Lutherans. This derives from the use of a Graged orthography, in which ‘z’ represents a ‘khl’ sound which would come out in other languages to a sound intermediate between ‘r’ and ‘l’ (and the ‘s’ being a misspelling for ‘z’).
the Siars had a profound effect on black-white relations in the whole of the Madang area and was seen as a factor in the Yali Cult of 1945-50.

Although, the Siars who settled for a short time at Mindre soon returned, confusion in land transfers forced on the Rhenish Mission after WWI by the Australian government appears to have conferred stronger titles on Lutheran-held land parcels in the study area than they actually possessed. Thus the portion ‘Medize’ is held in freehold when my findings show that it is (a) extremely unlikely that any land dealings were finalised east of Cape Rigney before 1916, and (b) further acquisition of land in freehold was stopped in May 1916 by Colonel S.A. Pethebridge, the Administrator of the former German possessions (Rowley 1958:91).

These are all parts of social mapping, and I have given extended treatment of them in Chapter 2.

Genealogy and census

A large part of my time in the field was spent collecting genealogies and, with small exceptions known to me, I was able to get complete coverage for the census villages of Kulilau, Ganglau, Mindre and Kubup, together with their connections in other Rai Coast villages like Lamtub, Galeg and Baded. I have a large collection of genealogies for Dein, Segi and Dumon, where for obvious reasons of accessibility I spent less time. All in all, the people I interviewed, whose immediate families in the study area were made up of 633 people, had another 452 living relatives in seven other census divisions in Madang—Mot, Kabenau, Bogadjim, North Amenob, Bagasin and Madang Urban.

All of this data is in a Community Express\(^4\) database, which I do not describe at length in this report. Community Express has many report types: among them descendants charts in several styles, various field updating forms, a ‘Village Book’ style of ledger, and statistical analyses such as a life table derived from genealogical information (this uses a new ‘cohort survival’ method). The database itself, and software, is on a companion CD to this report.

A discussion of population and health, including statistical results from Community Express, is given below.

The genealogical charts may be found (in Excel format) on the CD in the back cover of this report.\(^5\)

Relationship with informants and status of the information collected

A comment is required here on the basis upon which the work of genealogy was done.

\(^4\) At the time of the first report, this software was called ‘Village Population System’.

\(^5\) A large format Hewlett-Packard, or similar, inkjet plotter is required to print paper copies with paper size adjusted to the roll width (the most suitable size is 24 in x 36 in).
My informants and I worked in collaboration with each other and, as mentioned in the preface, almost all presented genealogical charts of their own construction in my ‘interviews’, which in reality were joint working sessions.

None of the people participating in this process—perhaps numbering 40 or 50 in all—needed much explanation of why we should work on genealogy. It seemed obvious to all that it was an essential preparation for the plant site project that they should sort themselves out in relation to their individual rights of access to land likely to be touched by it, and further that this was the way to do it in their society.

I frequently raised the point that, even if the project was delayed, or failed to proceed in this area for some reason, good genealogies would be useful for their own purposes in any other development projects they might engage in. This was met with a good deal of agreement.

The status of the genealogies is that they are accurate to rather better than a ‘first round’ standard—I was able to re-check my first versions in quite a number of cases—but are not yet fully public documents. That is, all informants were excited to see and check their own charts, where I had copies ready, but they have not yet ‘released’ them for free public scrutiny.

As such, all the genealogies need to be vetted first by their owners, added to or corrected to their satisfaction, passed fit for public use, and finally ‘tabled’ in a properly attended public meeting. This final task has two objectives. The first is to show that the individual owners have each had their chance to present their own connections; the second is to let would-be ‘family tree extenders’ know that everybody’s connections are so well known that they cannot take advantage of uncertainties to make illicit connections to ancestors that would give them more favourable access to project benefits.

The ‘tabling’ of the genealogies should also have two audiences: the people who are in them, on the one hand, and Highlands Pacific and the government on the other.

Copies of the charts were requested by all interviewees, and I recommend that as well as an office set being kept by Highlands Pacific, individuals be able to get copies on request—a list of these requests needs to be compiled.

Map of Ward 30

In visits to villages, I was able to extend the information on land holdings in the Yaganon area to cover Ward 30 in its entirety.

What I have just said about the genealogies applies in similar measure to the map (which accompanies this report). The information on which it is based comes from many sources and I am satisfied that the broad boundaries I have identified exist in the approximate positions I have given them. However, caution is needed. These are not surveyed boundaries and are deliberately represented as wide dashed lines.

Here are some comments on quality. South of Segi my knowledge is very general and there may be mistakes there. Between Kubup and Dumon my information is rather good and I expect much less error. On the other hand, time did not permit a proper walking of areas
quite close to the coast and inland of Ganglau where there is a proliferation of small bush areas (this should be put right in any future work).

The map of Ward 30 is also on the CD (in AutoCAD 2000 format with a copy of Autodesk’s Voloview CAD viewer). All maps of this nature should be considered ‘works in progress’.

**Discussion of population and health**

While census was not a primary objective of my present work, it is an obvious byproduct of recording detailed genealogies with the places of residence of the living members and I briefly summarise my findings here.

**Post-war population figures**

Census figures show the extraordinarily poor state of the Yaganon population after the disruption of the war. Figures are not available for all years, as the summary figures were not always attached to the copies sent to head office, and which have thus entered the microfiche run. However, two sets of figures are available from the 1950s (Table 1).

Patrol officers were concerned over an excess of deaths over births in the immediate post-war period, thereafter mystifyingly reporting that health conditions in the area were ‘satisfactory’. This defies their own census data, which show a decline in population for six of the Yaganon villages during the 1950s. The cause was assuredly a very high rate of infant mortality, and of women of childbirth-related causes, rather than a shortage of births. Of the seven deaths recorded between 1951 and 1952 (Saidor PR 2 of 1952-53), five were in children under four years, one was of a woman in childbirth, and only one of an older male. More ominously, there were twenty less adult women in 1959 than there were in 1952 in this tiny population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>August 1952</th>
<th>December 1959</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  F  M  F  M  F</td>
<td>M  F  M  F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dein</td>
<td>4  8  12  20  44</td>
<td>7  11  20  19  57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindre</td>
<td>18  19  25  19  81</td>
<td>9  18  23  16  66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubup</td>
<td>9  4  19  25  57</td>
<td>9  5  13  10  37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumon</td>
<td>4  1  10  9  24</td>
<td>7  8  12  13  40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganglau</td>
<td>6  5  16  15  42</td>
<td>7  9  20  15  51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulilau</td>
<td>4  4  12  9  29</td>
<td>5  3  9  4  21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>45  41  94  97  277</td>
<td>44  54  97  77  272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. Census figures for some Yaganon villages, 1952-1959**


The overall numbers of children have risen by 1959, but, with a caution on the inaccuracy of age reporting in patrol censuses, the depleted numbers of children *in relation to adults* make chilling reading: in the Yaganon language family villages only 20%-28% were children in 1952. Only at Mindre did children exceed 45% of the population. In ‘normal’ circumstances—in patrol censuses of the 1960s for example—50% of all village numbers are children.
Substandard conditions of hygiene would have contributed to this, but food shortage following the destruction of gardens, the fleeing of most villages into bush camps in 1944, and the burden of rebuilding village life from 1945 would have been the underlying factors until about 1950, as they were in all parts of coastal Papua New Guinea in this period. Few written observations of the Rai Coast are to hand for this critical period, but unpublished reports in the Lutheran archives in Lae show that missionaries returning to war-impacted areas of neighbouring Morobe Province found them wracked by epidemic outbreaks of meningitis, pneumonia, whooping cough and other unknown diseases (e.g. Horrolt 1947).

After 1950, patrols were frequent in this area but patrol officers—inexperienced and often in their first posting—seem to have been blind to the parlous state of village health.

This survey

I do not have accurate figures for Dein or Dumon. At Dein I recorded only resident members of descent lines connected to bush areas west of the Yaganon River. At Dumon I have only recorded resident members of some of its bush areas.

A key source for birthdates and place of residence was the Ward 30 village book, compiled by the Ward Recorder,6 Matias GULAS of Mindre. Matias started the village book in 1995 and some births and deaths have been added to 1997. Training was given at Saidor in how to make the entries and he has followed this very well in most instances. There are many full length birthdates and these corresponded well to the birthdates of infants that I was able to see on their MCH clinic books. Unfortunately, the birthdates of older people are intermittently reliable and in some cases the birthdate order of older children in the book does not match the birth order as given by the parents. This short-coming stems in part from the high incidence of inter-family adoption in the Yaganon area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>1978 PDS*</th>
<th>1990 National Census†</th>
<th>Village Book ca. 1996</th>
<th>This survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU007 Dein†</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU010 Dumon†</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>not counted</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU013 Ganglau</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU019 Kubup</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU020 Kulilau</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU025 Mindre</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Resident populations of Yaganon villages 1978-98.

* Provincial Data System, NSO (1982); † NSO(1993); ‡ 1998 survey does not represent whole population of village

At Mindre I have accounted for all but one family of eight people in the village book; they are not connected with any other families. At Ganglau, Matias listed one family who now live at Kulilau and added two families comprising thirteen people to ‘Ganglau settlement’. For Kulilau, Dumon and Kubup my data are comparable to Matias’s.

6 This was a local government position with a three monthly stipend paid from Saidor.
However, my figures for Mindre and Ganglau exceed those of Matias by a considerable margin; I suspect the differences arise from me listing as residents people on genealogies who may live elsewhere. This is not merely a matter of overlooking the actual place of residence, as informants recounting genealogies bias their information to saying people on them live ‘with’ them—when they may actually have their dwellings in other census villages. Further work is needed, after the scrutiny of my genealogies by the informants who gave me the information, to validate the places of residence.

Similar remarks of comparison cannot be made of the government’s 1990 National Census. As is now acknowledged by the National Statistical Office, the 1990 census was so poorly conducted that its data are unusable. This area is no exception with hopeless undercounts at Ganglau and Mindre, and no count at all at Dumon. The 422 counted at Kulilau probably mixes villagers with settlers (Matias and I have 61 and 63 at Kulilau respectively).

Earlier data are the 1978 data from the PDS Rural Community Register (NSO 1982), believed to be reasonably reliable, and post-war figures from 1952 and 1959 (see Table 1). These enable interpolated annual growth rates to be calculated: about –0.2% p.a. for the 7½ years from August 1952 to December 1959, 2.04% p.a for the 19½ years from December 1959 to mid-1978, and 2.28% from 1978 to the present. This recent rate matches the surmised 2.3% national rate (UNFPA 1995).

**Female to male (F/M) ratios**

Clinical health statistics do not exist for this area, but Yaganon health conditions remain substandard. A useful indirect measure is the ratio of females to males, long noted for showing a deficit of females in Papua New Guinea populations (e.g. Lea and Lewis 1975; Burton 1993).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>F/M ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978*</td>
<td>2251</td>
<td>2142</td>
<td>4393</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*all villages in CD from Provincial Data System


Sen (1993) shows how, in the absence of other measures, female-to-male ratios can be used as indicators of the overall success of health care. In world terms, female-to-male ratios of around 0.95 are seen in populations without good health care and particularly with poor, and discriminatory, attention to the health problems of women and girls. In Papua New Guinea terms, this translates into men and their sons travelling more and attending more distant, better health facilities than women and girls.

Regions with a good all round health effort, whether ‘developed’ or not, achieve ratios of about 1.02, that is more women than men. The explanation is that men continue to be exposed to higher workplace risks, while the health risks to women are comparatively low because of a more even delivery of health services to both sexes—regardless of its overall
quality. An example given by Sen is the predominantly Catholic Kerala State in India, which is poor but where a high proportion of boys and girls complete secondary education.

The Yaganon figures go up and down but hover around 0.95. It should be borne in mind that everyone is still beset with malaria and many other health risks, and men die of these in numbers as well as women. The F/M ratio reflects the extra deaths of females.

Life table comparisons

The life table is a statistical technique able to give an estimate of life expectancy at birth. The means of calculation normally used by census bureaux (birth and death registration, intercensal comparison, and the single census method) are not present in Papua New Guinea, but the genealogical data available in the Community Express database allow a cohort survivorship method to be used instead.\(^7\) With present data, \(e^0\), or life expectancy at birth, can be stated at between 50 and 52 years in the Yaganon villages.

The figure should be understood in terms of the life time experience of all currently living people. For example, deaths that occurred half a century and more ago, when health

\(^7\) The statistic \(l_x\) rather than \(q_x\) or \(d_x\) is estimated from the database in respect of each cohort, using the actual survivors as a proportion of those ever born, discovered through genealogy.
conditions were very different, are factored into the table and therefore affect the life expectancy at birth quoted for today. Still, more than 50% of the ‘years lived’ in the table reflect the last 25 years (1973-1998), during which time conditions have probably changed little.

The figure of about 51 years characterises the health situation in the Yaganon villages as poor. It fits the Yaganon into the lower end of a group of rural communities studied by the same method (Table 5). The quoted national average for life expectancy in PNG (seen in UN tables for example) is around 58 years, though there is no known statistical basis for its calculation in data collected after 1980.

The five cases reflect many different factors; nevertheless, the Yaganon study area and the two cases similar to it in Morobe Province are reflective of typical rural communities in mainland Papua New Guinea with moderate levels of literacy and other social development indicators, and intermittent levels of access to health facilities that work only some of the time.

Compared with the nominal national average—though itself one of several indicators that consistently ranks Papua New Guinea worst in the Pacific—the overall health classification for Yaganon can be stated as ‘not very good’.

The implications are obvious for the study area: a major campaign to improve village health is mandated by principles of Best Practice if an industrial development goes ahead in the area. It is highly predictable that the Madang provincial government will say it will take steps to improve matters, but that there will be long delays before any action is taken.8

Whatever tensions will inevitably arise in the relation between the developer and the state over provincial or national government commitments, let health be the one area not affected by them.

---

8 The Porgera hospital is a cautionary tale. Written into the agreements as a government responsibility in 1989, it opened only nine years later, in late 1998, and initially was understaffed and had few supplies of drugs.
CHAPTER 2
THE STUDY AREA: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Prehistory, oral history

Unusually in Melanesia, a sequence of culturally meaningful events can be sketched for the last 300 hundred years.

Yomba and foundation of Mindre

The Mindre people say they originated on an island called Yomba, formerly located somewhere in the Bismarck Sea, and moved to their present home after an earthquake caused their home to ‘sink’ and become uninhabitable. An extended analysis of the Yomba legend among the Kranket, Yabob, Bilibil people of Madang, who also include people who trace their origins to Yomba, was done by Mary Mennis (1978). Mennis’s findings in Madang led her to Mindre in August 1977 where she interviewed Wanggum KORE of Luanpanu and Dimbai IMAI of Panudan.

Mennis obtained many versions of the Yomba legend, but they condensed into two schools of thought. Her Madang informants tended to describe Yomba as a large volcanic island midway between Long Island and Bagabag at Hankow Reef, with the destruction of the island taking place as an event separate from the seventeenth or eighteenth century eruption of Long Island (see below). Wanggum, on the other hand, linked the two events together and described Yomba as a small coastal island like Yabob near Madang.

The likely dating of this event can be approached from two directions. The first is through genealogy, which is a notoriously unreliable way of estimating an elapse of time. Mennis took Wanggum’s genealogy starting from his lineage’s founder, Ulsimba; she quoted him as saying his father, Kore MER, told him ‘I am the number six since Ulsimba came here and you are the number seven’ (Mennis 1978:47). I recorded the same genealogy from Gulas KUSUP and Udd KUSUP, nephews of Wanggum, prior to consulting her research (and before the latter’s death in October 1998). In my version (Figure 1), Kusup is the founder and Gulsimbe (not ‘Ulsimba’) follows him; the next two generations do not match the order Mennis has them in, but the conclusion is the same: Wanggum was the seventh in the descent line counting from the founder.

I also have other Mindre genealogies, of course, but there are disputed connections between known people of this century and the founders who may (or may not) have originated at Yomba. The descent lines at Mindre each has its own distinct origin story. Panudan, to which Dimbai belongs, originated at Mindre itself. Kiaufukun Wateng is an arrival

---

9 In the German orthography, ‘y’ was rendered as ‘j’. Thus, Yomba is also seen as ‘Jomba’.

10 Panudan from panu = ‘land, place’, udan = ‘root, as’. Therefore: ‘as ples’.
group, but what appears to be the authentic version of its genealogy is disrupted by a disputed attachment. The Luanpanu\(^{12}\) genealogy is the only one clearly tied to Yomba at the moment.\(^{13}\)

![Genealogy Diagram]

Figure 1. **Sketch genealogy of Kusup of Luanpanu**

Udd KUSUP was a fourth child and his father’s birth is estimated at 1895 with reference to this and to his siblings, who appear in other genealogies. Remaining dates estimated on the basis of about thirty years, on average, between fathers and sons.

In my interview with Luanpanu, Yomba was destroyed (‘ailan i lus’) and the people dispersed (‘ol i ronawe nabaut’). Kusup came to Mindre. Both my version and that of Mennis suggest a date in the 1730-1750 range (Figure 1).

**The Time of Darkness legends**

The second means of dating the event comes from a connection pointed to by many regional oral histories:

Garia speak of two events as outstandingly important in their recent history. The first was a devastating earthquake and fall of ash, which have been reported also from other parts of the north-eastern Papua New Guinean mainland, and which destroyed their gardens and forced them to turn to cannibalism during the emergency. My informants in 1952-53 placed the cataclysm towards the end of the nineteenth century, but recent research … suggests that it

---

\(^{11}\) **Kiau** = Ficus, **fukun** = ‘base of’, **wateng** = ‘drift’. Therefore: Kiaufukun Wateng = ‘drift ashore and attach like a Ficus’.

\(^{12}\) **Luan** = ‘middle’, **panu** = ‘place’. Therefore: Luanpanu = ‘middle place’.

\(^{13}\) After reading this report, Douglas Duka added the information that the Milelka clan of Kaliku, west of Ileg village, may also have been Yomba refugees, although they knew the island by a different name.
was probably caused by the eruption of Long Island (Arop) more than two hundred years earlier (Lawrence 1984:20).

The ‘recent research’ was that of R. Blong (1982) linking Tibitu Tephra found at several archaeological sites in the highlands to ignimbrites in the Matapun beds on Long Island, produced during its most recent eruption. Two preferred radiocarbon samples from carbonised logs in the ignimbrites have a pooled mean age of 210 ± 50 years BP, while three preferred samples from the Kuk archaeological site near Mt Hagen have a pooled mean age of 240 ± 45 years BP. Granting that the Tibitu and Matapun dates relate to the same event, the pooled mean age of all five samples is 230 ± 40 years BP (Blong 1982:191-192).

In calendar terms, this corresponds to 1720 AD with a one standard deviation range of 1680-1760 AD.\textsuperscript{14}

However, as is well known ‘radiocarbon years’ are subject to calibration against tree-ring dates which, in this time period, tend to make the age older by between 70 and 130 years: a eruptive date of around 1650 AD is preferred by Blong (1982:193).

Various European navigators passed through the Bismarck Sea from 1545 AD (see Appendix A), frequently (de Retes, Tasman) noting erupting volcanoes. Long Island was named by Dampier when he sailed past in 1700. Dampier sketched a profile of the island in his log, showing to be in essentially the same condition as it is today, and well-vegetated. This fits with a 1650 date for the eruption, though a post-1700 date is still possible as no further observations are available until Dumont D’Urville sailed past in 1827.

The Kusup and other genealogies have a better fit with the uncalibrated radiocarbon date sometime after 1700 AD.\textsuperscript{15}

The adoptive mother of Suwang KAUMBE of Ganglau, Burep AMBUA from Guguk, told him of the ash fall from the point of view of the people already living in the Yaganon area.

A light coloured ash (sam, lit: ‘ash’) fell from the sky and became so heavy on the roofs it threatened to collapse the houses. Following our custom concerning house construction (that no one may enter a new house before an eldest son), first-born sons had to climb up onto the house roofs and plead for the ash to cease falling: ‘You must stop now. You are harming us.’ Then these first-born cleaned the ash away.

After the ash fell there was a very strong earthquake. At this time women believed that if they walked around normally the ground would open up and they’d fall in. So during an earthquake they were careful to draw their grass skirts up between their legs to cover themselves. Another thing that people did was to run into thickets of a cane grass called maikng and crouch down holding onto clumps of it.

\textsuperscript{14} Radiocarbon dates quoted ‘Before Present’ are relative to 1950 AD.

\textsuperscript{15} In 1998, I ran this possibility past Ian Hughes, who with others investigated the archaeology and oral history of Long Island. Hughes’ opinion was that he had always preferred the later historical window for the eruption.
This is what they did during the earthquake after the ash fall. One thing they noticed was that all the clay pots and wooden bowls rattled together and actually began to talk. When it was over, everyone was all right and they were able to go back to their houses. It was the time that Yomba Island sank and the Yomba people came to Mindre.

Sibibge, whose land had a boundary with Sibiyag’s in the bay between the two places, and Panudan, were the original inhabitants of Mindre. Then the Yomba people came and joined them. Sibibge moved east toward Dein. The Yomba people put a tambu mark across Yun (Uyun) Point and one of their big men faced our ancestors and shouted ‘Hai Yomba!’, stamped with his foot on the ground—to show that he was taking possession of it—and pretended to let fly an arrow in their direction. They understood him to be saying they must keep out of the village.

The speaker’s genealogy is not as long as in the previous example, but his adoptive mother placed the time of the event before the time of the ancestors named in it (Figure 2).

![Figure 2. Sketch genealogy of Suwang KAUMBE]

In another oral historical narrative, as youths Bresme and Kaumbe survive a fish poisoning incident in which the other inhabitants of Sibiyag perished. If this in fact fits with the lethal smallpox epidemics unleashed on the north coast of New Guinea following the contracting of Javanese and Hong Kong indentured labourers to the plantations of Madang by the Germans, Bresme and Kaumbe could have been the right age around 1893 when the smallpox may have first struck.

A peculiarity of this account is that the eruption is not portrayed as a time of cataclysmic destruction. The ash did not destroy gardens and it only posed a danger to houses, rather than destroying them. At the time of the interview, the speaker, as was everyone along this coast, was fully aware of the devastation of the (July 1998) Aitape tsunami. He said there was no indication that a tsunami had hit the Rai Coast at the time of the eruption. Descriptions of destructive tsunami do feature in Time of Darkness legends from elsewhere (Blong 1982:102-103), but in a personal communication to Mennis, Blong commented that tsunami were unlikely unless seawater entered a collapsing caldera. The scenario of a 1730-
1750 eruption leaving the Long Island caldera essentially unchanged in shape from Dampier’s time would fit with this.

**History**

*Contact history*

Lawrence’s Garia informants referred to *two* outstandingly important events in their recent history.

The second important event was contact with Europeans … (Lawrence 1984:20).

It is a commonplace all over Papua New Guinea that contact with whites was sudden and astonishing. The Madang area is no exception, and it is crucial to emphasise that contact with whites was not an essentially transient event, however dramatic at the time. Here it had profound consequences for entire communities, the ramifications of which we are still trying to unravel today.

Apart from the passing of European ships (Appendix A), significant here only in the context of dating the Time of Darkness, the first lengthy contact was with the Russian Miklouho-Maclay in 1871-72 and 1876-77 (Greenop 1944; Sentinella 1975; Tumarkin 1982; Webster 1984). Maclay’s direct area of interaction was a radius of some ten kilometres around Bongu, where he introduced steel knives, axes and other trade goods, and Bilbil, where a house was built for him during his second stay.
In July 1877 he sailed to Saidor with his Malay cook Sale, and the Bilbil men Kain and Hassan. He noted ‘Cape Tevalib’ (Tabalib, or Cape Rigney or Rigny), and landed on the beach just east of the Gawar River because the wind had died. This would appear to have been the beach known as Kabul on Kamumel ground. From here he walked inland to a village called Bai.¹⁶

Figure 4. A darem in the village of Bai --- Miklouho-Maclay’s sketch.

Having a whole day before me, I went with Kain and Hassan to Bai village. We walked slowly through the jungle, whose variety of vegetation was of great interest to me, and it was only after midday that we arrived at the village. Around the huts—all were completely new—bananas had been planted and much tobacco; but there were no coconut palms, except one. They, as they explained, was because the natives feared that the palm trees should serve, when they grew up, as an enticement for their enemies. A darem [haus tambaran] with special decorations was the only hut which differed from the others in construction. We sheltered in it from the heat of the sun and were brought a meal consisting of taro and boiled chicken (Sentinella 1975:271; also Tumarkin 1982:371-372).

¹⁶ The location is confusing. He refers to the ‘abandoned village of Bai’ just past Cape Rigney (east when on the outward leg of his journey), that is between Cape Rigney and the Gawar River, but later indicates that the party pulled its canoes onto the beach ‘after passing the estuary of the Gowar River’, that is on its right bank, and his map shows Bai within the Kamumel boundary. He says the village ‘had been transferred into the jungle at a sufficient distance from the coast on the right bank of the Gawar’. Informants at Ganglau could not make sense of ‘Bai’, instead suggesting that it should have been ‘Ba’, which refers to area where the Raikos High School is now situated on the left bank of the Gawar.
This might have been somewhere between Mingming and Sipoldi settlements; I did not inquire about it in the field. He was given a live chicken, more taro, and slept the night on the beach with the canoes. The next day he and his companions sailed on, passing Mindre:

At one place Kain pointed out the village of Mendir, but it had been burnt down and was abandoned by the inhabitants, who settled in another place (Sentinella 1975:272).

On the return journey, he landed near Bibi, which was empty, and climbed Mt. Siroi:

On the way I wanted to visit the so-called village of Rai-mana and climb the mountain Serui. As we were passing the coast near Bibi, the shore seemed to be quite deserted and there was nobody in the village. Kain explained that all the inhabitants had gone off into the mountains [to burn the grassland and eat pigs] …

I knew the position of Rai only approximately; from the pirogue with the aid of binoculars I could make out a group of coconut palms with the aid of binoculars in the mountains. I managed to get there without any particular difficulty and the mountain-dwellers could not have received me better. They already knew my name by hearsay, and they guessed at once who had come to visit them. I was sorry that we did not understand one another, but by signs I explained that I wanted to go up on the high hill that lies behind their village and which they called Serui-mana [Mt Siroi]. Guides were found at once and we set off immediately. From the summit … a beautiful panorama of the Maclay Coast for a considerable distance opened out (Sentinella 1975:278).

Maclay\textsuperscript{17} is a significant historical figure on a wider stage because of his efforts to prevent, or at least hold up, the colonisation of what he called the ‘Maclay Coast’ by the European powers. He was familiar at first hand with the cruelty of the blackbirders supplying labour to the Queensland plantations from the New Hebrides, and was concerned that Europeans would attempt to ‘buy’ land for plantations. He instructed his contacts at Bongu and Bilbil to hide all young men and women in the bush whenever a European ship called, and to steer clear of any visitors who did not greet them properly. He would teach only potentially friendly contacts how to do this.

Fleeting visits to Bongu by gold prospectors in 1878 and 1879 were tests of Maclay’s instructions; reports of these ships, the Dove and Courier, made news in Sydney where Maclay was now living (Webster 1984:220). In 1881 H.H. Romilly toured New Guinea as part of a Royal Commission into the labour trade, and put in at Astrolabe Bay. Unlike the gold prospectors, Romilly was instructed by Maclay on how to say he was ‘Maclay’s brother’ and consequently was able to make friendly contact.

Maclay was also promoting with Sir Arthur Gordon, Romilly’s superior and the British High Commissioner for the Western Pacific, a ‘Union of the Maclay Coast’ scheme, with a ‘Great Council’ of village leaders to regulate dealings with outsiders (Webster 1984:256ff.). Significantly, in the light of the prevailing legal concepts in Australia, he wrote to him that land on the Rai Coast was,

\textsuperscript{17} He was well known as ‘Maklai’ in the study area, and quite possibly from their continuous contact with both Bongu and Bilbil people. A man at Mindre is named Maklai.
… entirely owned by different communities engaged in tilling a soil which has been under cultivation for centuries (Webster 1984:258).

And because land was owned by all members of a community, the concept of purchase by dealing with individuals would be problematic and would not be a concept understood by villagers. Consequently,

… I have never considered it right to attempt, myself, the acquisition of a freehold property on this coast (Webster 1984:258).

However, he must have been a poor judge of character. In 1884, he was befriended by Dr Otto Finsch in Sydney, whom he also taught the Bongu greeting. He knew Finsch as an ornithologist and a writer of ethnography; but in reality Finsch had secret order to annex Maclay’s coast for Germany. Finsch used this to his advantage by going straight to Port Constantine in Astrolabe Bay, and raising the German flag.

In an unrelated matter, he also gave a character reference for Jan Kubary, a Polist naturalist then resident in Palau, and who Maclay felt was quite trustworthy (Webster 1984:287, 289). But by 1887, Kubary was in the employ of the Deutsche Neuguinea Kompagnie, living at Bongu, and was responsible for ‘buying’ thousands of hectares of native land in Madang from Yabob and Bilbil islanders (Lawrence 1964:40), land which remains mostly alienated to this day. Worse, Kubary’s contact at Bilbil in 1887 was apparently Kain, who was Maclay’s sailing companion in 1877.

*The Rai Coast and the Rhenish Mission in the German Annual Reports*

The German Annual Reports, available in English for 1900-1901 onwards, provide useful summary information for German activity in the Friedrich Wilmhelmshafen (Madang) and Rai Coast areas prior to WWI.

Before 1900, it is certain that the Germans had only fleeting contacts with the Rai Coast east of Astrolabe Bay.

In the 1900-01, the Rhenish Mission had four stations each with one or more missionaries: Bogadjim (Mr and Mrs Hoffman), Siar (Bergmann, Koolen), Bongu (A. Hanke) and Graget or Ragetta, the small island now called Kranket (H. Helmich). Each had a school for local children: 136 in total.

The 1901-02 report lists all German establishments along the north coast:

1. Berlinshafen (near Bogia)—main establishment of the Catholic Mission of the Holy Ghost;
2. Potsdamhafen (near Bogia);
3. Friedrich Wilmhelmshafen (Madang)—the seat of Administration on the mainland and the headquarters, at Yomba, of the New Guinea Company, its white population was then 19;
4. Stephansort (near Bongu)—former government HQ and Rhenish Mission stations of Bongu and Bogadjim;
5. Finschhafen—Neuendettelsau Mission headquarters and New Guinea Company station;

There was no land acquisition activity anywhere east of Stephansort towards Finschhafen and all plantations were ‘exclusively in the hands of the New Guinea Company’ (Ann. Rep. Ger. New Guinea 1901-02, p.24). A recurring concern of the Rhenish Mission was health; two missionaries (A. Hanke, Koolen) had to leave for medical treatment and smallpox vaccination was restarted around Siar.\(^{18}\) No new mission stations were established.

In 1902-03 the Rhenish Mission prepared to build a new station in the Hansemann mountains, west of Madang.

In 1904-05, illness almost caused the collapse of the Mission and the new station was still not built. The establishment remained: Bogadjim (W. Diehl), Siar (E. Weber), Bongu (A. Hanke, Blum) and Kranket (H. Helmich). Two missionaries died (Outermann and Bergmann) and another left for medical reasons (Hoffmann) as well as three of the mission wives.

In 1907-08, the Annual Report described the Rai Coast:

A centre of constant native unrest is … the Maclay coast from Dorfinsel Point (Sigawa) as the extreme westerly limit of influence of the Neuendettelsauer Mission, to Cape Rigney as the extreme easterly point of the district office control. The Maclay coast itself is generally sparsely populated … They are miserable stocks decimated by skin diseases and epidemic maladies who are in a constant state of feud with the mountaineers … There are no white settlements in the district (my emphasis, Ann. Rep. Ger. New Guinea 1907-08, p.3).

In 1910-11, Rai Coast villages were raided from inland in what is now the Mot Census Division:

Various bloody conflicts with the natives occurred in the Friedrich Wilhelmshafen District Office sphere. The continued raids for robbery and murder by the mountaineers from the Finisterre Mountains against the weaker coastal villages on the Rai coast (Maclay coast) demanded intervention. In October [1907] a bitter fight which lasted for nearly an hour occurred near the village of Kuarong, in the course of which two soldiers were severely wounded and five slightly wounded, while ten men on the opposite side fell. The District Officer, who had only 14 soldiers under his command, was forced to withdraw to the coast. By the beginning of November another expedition with stronger forces was dispatched. The disaffected natives evaded the expected encounter. The deserted villages of Kuarong, Mot, and two other villages which had participated in the attacked on the coast residents were burned to the ground as a punishment. Since then peace has not been disturbed on the Rai Coast (Ann. Rep. Ger. New Guinea 1910-11, p.5).

Also in 1907, Rev. Heinrich Helmich made ‘an exploratory journey to this region’ and entered a ceremonial house ‘of more than local importance’:

---

\(^{18}\) The report notes that dysentery and smallpox, ‘which frequently terrify the people’, did not appear in this year. Smallpox vaccination had been carried out five or six years previously, that is in 1895 or 1896, which would appear to have been a response to the major outbreaks brought to Madang by Malay indentured labourers in 1893-96.
The inside of the ceremonial house proved rather disappointing; there was nothing in it but an old pot with a few broken teeth, a lower human jaw, a small ancestral figure, and a jar with lime. Helmich told his men to leave everything as it was. But the rumour of their venture spread like the wind as far as Ragetta and Bilibili, and there was amazement when Helmich and his companions returned safe and sound. Some people asserted that there had been an earthquake at the time the group had entered the house. Others said they had seen the sun grow dim (Reiner 1986:130).

These remarks reinforce the view that Mindre, and by implication neighbouring villages, were not normal places of visitation for the seafaring traders of Madang, indeed were considered dangerous places.

The *luluai* system—referred in reports as ‘the organisation’—was being extended to the Madang area: all villages between Cape Rigney and Helmholtz Point, near Saidor, had appointed village officials by 1911.

In other words, the act of extending government control to the Ganglau-Mindre area can be dated with confidence to between 1908 and 1910.

Inland from the coast government contacts were later and were sporadic prior to 1914; for example, the Rawa people inland of the Bongu-Marakum area were contacted in 1913 after a woman was killed by them on a coastal plantation (presumably this could have been the Lutherans own plantation at Bongu).

*Depopulation under the Germans*

In 1904-05, A. Hanke, the missionary at Bongu, reported as follows:

> Journeys were made for longer or shorter distances from all stations into the interior. The observations made during these with reference to the population are in the large majority of cases most disappointing. The fact is everywhere forced on the observer that the people are rapidly dying out (Ann. Rep. Ger. New Guinea 1904-05, p.18).

Hanke was not alone in such comments; observers all over Melanesia were very much in doubt whether there would be any Melanesians left at all within a few more decades. Many areas in the New Guinea islands, the Solomons, New Caledonia and Vanuatu were experiencing rapid population decline. For example, between 1840 and 1914, the population of Aneityum in southern Vanuatu dropped from well over 6000 to about 250. In 1860, one third of the population of Erromanga, also in Vanuatu, died of measles. Rather later, the population of Tabar in New Ireland declined from about 3,500 in 1914 to less than 2000 by WWII. In 1932, the island group was described as being in a ‘parlous state’ with ‘almost whole villages having completely disappeared’ (Groves 1934:224).

Contemporary observers failed to pinpoint the causes of population decline. W.H.R. Rivers, in *Essays of the depopulation of Melanesia* (1922), switched the emphasis of explanation to a kind of moral lassitude. In River’s view, decades of indiscriminate labour recruiting coupled with the onslaughts of introduced diseases had reduced the islanders’ *will* to reproduce, to the point that their populations looked unlikely to recover:
‘It is the loss of interest in life [that gives introduced diseases] their potency for evil and allows then to work such ravages upon life and health’ (Rivers 1922:96).

At Madang, Hanke’s explanation was the ‘permanent feuds … inbreeding which has gone on for hundreds of years, and the consequent general degeneration, infanticide, abortion, and the frequent sterility among the women which results [from] the fundamental ignorance of even the most elementary hygiene laws’.

This, however, was ignorance laced with contemporary prejudice.

Of Hanke’s list, fighting was indeed likely to have been a common cause of death, at least among men, but sterility among women caused by an unchecked spread of gonorrhea was probably the key, along with things not mentioned—notably the catastrophic smallpox of 1893-96, and lesser epidemics of dysentery, pneumonia and the like (see Scragg 1957 for an explanation of depopulation in the New Guinea islands).

**Land dealings under the Germans**

Available sources are the German Annual Reports (see also Lawrence 1964:40, Tables 1 & 2), and the files of the Custodian of Expropriated Properties after the Australian possession of German New Guinea (see Appendix B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Coconut plantings hectares</th>
<th>Area bearing hectares</th>
<th>Total area hectares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich Wilhelmhafen</td>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>137.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jomba</td>
<td>208.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>401.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephansort</td>
<td>325.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>619.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erimahafen</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konstantinhafen</td>
<td>154.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>154.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6. The New Guinea Company’s holdings in the Madang area in 1902-03.*


As a general statement, the Germans fell far behind in bringing land such as they did acquire into production (Table 6). Apparently only 3,230 hectares (of a total of 33,000 hectares alienated prior to 1914 alienated between the Madang north coast and Saidor) was planted by 1906, according to the *Annual Reports*. Between this date and 1914, seven further plantations were acquired north of Madang (Sarang, Matupi, Meiro, Walog, Dylup, Siar and Gamoi), but apparently none in Astrolabe Bay and on the Rai Coast.

At the outbreak of WWI, a plantation at Cape Rigney was in the process of acquisition (it was certainly Bau) as well as a last north Madang plantation (Matokar-Mugil). Cape Rigney was first planted in 1916.

These partial facts shed light on the study area. The Lutherans had made no contact with the study area up to the time when the *Annual Reports* begin to make references to plantation acquisitions. It is obvious that little previous contact had been made, and it is hard to imagine any commercial land acquisitions. It is a certainty that the Lutherans had not made land acquisitions themselves before 1907, when Rev. Helmich put ashore at Mindre.
The exile of the Siars

Another event impacted on the Rai Coast after the appointment of luluais. This was the banishment, in 1912, of all the Madang islanders following an uprising allegedly planned against the Germans.

Accounts of the discontent among the Siars, Yabobs, Bilbils and others, and the attempted ‘Madang Rebellions’ in 1904 and 1912 are given in several places (e.g. Rowley 1958:90; Lawrence 1964: 68ff., Bade 1977:337ff.; Reiner 1986:114ff.; Hannemann 1996:63ff.). The basis of the islanders grievances was the loss of their land, dating back to Kubary’s astonishing dealings of 1887-88, backed by the force of arms. A key ingredient was the initial belief that the outsiders were probably powerful spirits, rather than human beings, and were connected to the well-known Kilibob-Manub myth that explains the origins of the Austronesian settlers in Madang and along the Rai Coast. But in 1900, New Guinea police revealed the foreigners to be mortals by shooting dead three Europeans and a Chinese at Astrolabe Bay. The islanders plotted to kill all the Europeans in Madang (numbering only about twenty-six in 1904), but were betrayed at the last minute. Nine were executed, according to Hannemann (1996:60).

Probably connected with the negotiations for further land acquisitions in the north Madang area in 1910-11, a fresh wave of resistance arose.

In October 1912, a conspiracy occurred amongst the native villages in the vicinity of Friedrich Wilhelmshafen. The cause was the dissatisfation of the natives with the sale of portion[s] of their land near Friedrich Wilhelmshafen, which was unavoidable unless the development of this place was to be altogether retarded ... The conspiracy was betrayed by natives and the ringleaders arrested and banished to the Bismarck Archipelago. The villages of Siar, Ragetta, Panutibun, Beliao and Jabob, which participated, were settled on the Rai coast and Magiar near Cape Croisilles and their land near Friedrich Wilhelmshafen was confiscated (Ann. Rep. Ger. New Guinea 1912-13, p.3).

A trial indeed took place in 1912 resulting in the banishment of most of the Madang, Bilbil and Yabob people to the Rai Coast, specifically the Siar, Bilia and Bilbil people to the Austronesian-speaking area around Biliau (Hannemann 1996:64; Lawrence 1964:72), the Kranket and Panutibun people to Migiaz on north coast, and a smaller group of Siars, accused of being the ring-leaders, to Rabaul (Hannemann 1996:64).

Of those sent to the Rai Coast, one party of Siars went not to Biliau, but to Mindre.

Lawrence says that the exile marked a watershed in the relations between villagers and the Lutherans. Few converts had been made up this time (there were only 83 baptized Madangs in 1911), as the mission struggled against the meziab cult, but the exiles apparently now welcomed their attention. Lawrence says the Lutherans now made ‘periodic visits’ to the Rai Coast after 1912 to maintain contact with them (Lawrence 1964:73). In 1914, the Lutheran’s Field Conference decided to establish a ‘long-planned mission station’ on the Rai Coast

---

19 *Meziab* was not so much a ‘cult’ in the sense of an institution like the church, as a complex of secret-sacred knowledge connected with *mulung*, boys initiation, bullroarers and other sacred items, and the men’s house, or *dazem* (Graged language) / *daram* (Mindre language). See Hannemann (1996).
(Reiner 1986:131). This again rules out the possibility that they had already done this; in fact the war intervened and no station opened until 1923.

On the outbreak of war, Australian forces took control of Madang in September 1914, and were successfully petitioned by the exiles, who returned home without delay.

At Mindre, the sojourn of the Siars is well known, but it was so short they neither took brides from Mindre, nor left brides or children at Mindre. The only visible trace of their stay comprises a dozen or so remaining coconut trees, distinguished by being extremely slender and as much as 10 metres taller than more recent plantings, just outside the southern boundary of the village.\(^{20}\)

**The Rai Coast under the Australians**

An Australian military administration was in place from 1914, and peacetime regulations did not return until 1921, when the League of Nations approved the transfer of German New Guinea to Australia. The principal, but delayed effect of this was to again allow commercial dealings (for example, the first post-war *Mining Ordinance* came into effect shortly afterwards, legalising mining in Morobe from 1 January 1923).

The Rhenish Mission may well have found it difficult to resume its pre-war programme, because in 1921 the new Australian administration made the two German Lutheran missions in New Guinea give up control of the affairs to Australian and American Lutheran groups.

Nevertheless, a Samoan pastor of the Rhenish Mission, Jerome Ilaoa, in Madang since 1912 and fluent in the Graged language, started a Lutheran station at Sangpat, between Galek and Swit in January 1923 (Figure 5).

![Diagram of the Rai Coast in 1923, as drawn by Jerome Ilaoa](image)

**Figure 5.** Rai coast in 1923, as drawn by Jerome Ilaoa

Source: Galek half-yearly report, June 1923.

At this time, Rai Coast villages were conversant with both mission and government, but were essentially untouched by both.

\(^{20}\) This information and attention drawn to these coconuts by Cllr. Maing KUNING.
Jerome was at Sangpat until 1930, when he was replaced by German, and then American missionaries. In 1932, the Rhenish Mission quit New Guinea and the Lutheran station was moved to Biliau, where it remains today.

Only occasional patrol reports from the period 1914 to 1947 have survived—for example, one in WWI (in the Rabaul Record, see Jinks, Biskup and Nelson 1973), and those of individual officers who kept their own copies, such as J.K. McCarthy (see Bibliography).

On the other hand, extensive files exist in the Australian Archives relating to the expropriation of German properties by the incoming Australian Administration; war time reports are available in the Australian War Memorial; and a complete set of patrol reports from 1947 is accessible in several locations on microfilm.

The picture built up by the sources we do have is that the Lutherans were responsible for almost all sustained contact with the area. Jerome had Madang-trained assistant teachers in six villages along the Biliau coast in the 1920s. The nearest was at Lamtub. The government appointed luluais and tultuls and conducted census, but did little else. Labour recruiters supplying the Morobe gold fields worked the north coast during the 1920s and 1930s, but we have scant knowledge of them.

World War II

The No.1 Rai Coast was by-passed as a battleground during the war, though key actions took place east of Saidu and at Shaggy Ridge to the south of Astrolabe Bay. Japanese troops may have lightly garrisoned the Rai Coast. For example, at Mindre the Japanese made a small camp and the mouth of Mungokuan Creek was widened to hide Japanese boats of some description (and the creek is now brackish as a result). The Americans bombed the Japanese camp and one bomb made a crater where the community hall was being built in 1999.

At the time of the fall of Lae in early 1942, Yali of Sor village, then in the police force, helped returning Rai Coast labourers find their way home through the Markham, then joined Capt. G.C. ‘Blue’ Harris in assisting evacuees from New Britain. In May and June 1942, Harris and Yali were on patrol between Madang and the Rai Coast, where Harris is remembered, at least, by Gulas KUSUP. At Segi village, Yali met Skum HOMBE, whom he took as his first wife after the war (Lawrence 1964:123, 126-127). Later in the year Yali and Harris went to Queensland for jungle warfare training. In a famous raid on Hollandia, Harris was killed in action while Yali made an epic escape through Japanese lines to Aitape with a man called Mas from Karkar (see Appendix A for chronology).

On the No.2 Rai Coast, the villagers encountered direct action:

Many Japanese had passed through the area during late 1943 and early 1944, looting villages of livestock, burning houses and robbing gardens (Saidor PR 3 of 1947-48).

US forces established at base at Saidu on 2 January 1944 to block the coastal retreat of the Japanese from Finschhafen as the Fifth Australian Division engaged in pursuit the along the coast from Sio to Saidu. Retreating Japanese evidently attempted escape inland: post-war patrol officers investigated Japanese graves at Segi and between Segi and Meibu (Saidor PR
Kehlem HOMBE of Segi says a party of retreating Japanese came up from the coast to Segi with a horse, which they ate, then continued further inland.

In 1944, men like Udid YUM of Ganglau, aged about sixteen, and Mizibong BAGLTAM went to Saidor ‘to carry for the Americans’. Indeed this was the Fifth Division, which resumed its movement along the coast to Madang in April 1944, not now opposed but confronting the problem of crossing swollen rivers in the rainy season (Australian Military Forces 1944:110, 118-122, 131). The Americans built what a road survey patrol later called the ‘US Army Road’ and made an aborted attempt to build a bridge across the Gawar (Saidor PR 7 of 1952-53).

The war period was marked by the emergence of long gestating cargo beliefs in the Rai Coast and at Madang concerning Europeans, the Japanese and an imagined future prosperity. A Biliau villager, previously a mission helper at Kuder and Freyberg’s pre-war Lutheran station, persuaded the villagers of Sibog, inland of Biliau, to kill the coastwatchers hiding near their village, Lieut. Bell, Lieut. Laws and a mixed race man with them. In the study area, Utei DAMDAM of Kubup was tried at Rabaul for collaboration with the Japanese, but was released.

The Lutherans returned and by 1949 had opened schools all along the Rai Coast: in the study area at Ganglau, with 16 pupils, and Mindre, with 8 pupils (Saidor PR 1 of 1949-50). An extraordinary event was the suicide of Rev. Georg Hofmann, who returned from internment in Australia to Biliau, at Orinma in November 1952 (Saidor PR 9 of 1952-53; also mentioned by informants).

After the war, the cargo beliefs culminated in the well-organised movement led by Yali, now a distinguished war hero. Yali’s career is discussed in detail by Lawrence (1964); Yali’s first wife, Skum (‘Sunggum’) of Segi, gave him a stronghold in the Yaganon area. In 1950, Yali was arrested and the OIC at Saidor was instructed to collect evidence for his defence:

[the Rai coast villagers’] bitter anti-white feelings obviously date back to the native revolt against the Germans in Madang. The German land alienation policy brought this about – they divorced so many people from their land so that coconut plantations could be planted, that the peoples’ resentment culminated in a revolt. The luluai of MINDIRI (now a man of about 50) told me that he was an eye witness of the hanging of 10 and the shooting of six of the ringleaders of the attempted revolt. The rest of the people concerned were deported to the Rai Coast. Their descendants are now living at GALEK, SUIT, MINDIRI and other places along the coast (Saidor PR 4 of 1949-50).

The luluai in question was Lima KARKAR (who was the luluai at least as early as July 1949 - Saidor PR 1 of 1949-50). Lima, according to his son Walon LIMA, was an early Lutheran convert and that he sat with Dr Kuder in a church ceremony at the ‘3rd Synod at Bogadjim’, after which the war came. If taken at face value, this must have taken place sometime after 1934, when Rev. Kuder began his New Guinea service (Wagner and Reiner 1986:658). However, it is hard to see how Lima would have been an eye-witness to the nine 1904

---

21 Lawrence (1964:135) says the Biliaus were ‘notoriously pro-Japanese’ during the war and that the Sibogs were ‘severely punished’ after the re-capture of the area by the returning Australians (1964:109).
executions—which of course were carried out in Madang—as it seems more likely he was born between 1900 and 1910. In the 1912 rebellion, the ring-leaders were banished to Rabaul where they petitioned Otto Hahl for their return (Hannemann 1996:64); there do not seem to have been executions at all. It is incorrect that the descendants of the exiles were then living in the villages mentioned; the Mindre ones, at least, returned in 1914.

Economic life restarted on the Rai Coast only slowly, with Yali cult adherents holding sway and opposing government initiatives until about 1951 (Yali was in gaol from 1950). In 1952 copra smoking houses (haus paiaman) were established at Ganglau and Kulilau (Saidor PR 4 of 1952-53) while 20 bags of rice were harvested at Orinma (Saidor PR 7 of 1952-53).

---

22 If Lima did see the 1904 executions, he must have had some Siar/Bibil connections that his son is not telling us about. In fact, the purported genealogy leading from Lima’s father Karkar is questioned by other Mindre people, so this evidence adds to the puzzle. According to his son-in-law, Gulas KUSUP, Lima was a noted wood carver.
CHAPTER 3

ETHNOGRAPHY OF THE RAI COAST

Ethnography in the study area

Madang, including the Rai Coast, has been the subject of written description since the Miklouho-Maclay’s time in the 1870s. From 1887, the Rhenish Mission of the Lutheran Church sought converts in the Madang town area and using the Graged (Kranket) language (Mager 1952). Until recently, the writings of the Rhenish missionaries on cultural matters were hard to obtain (e.g. Inselmann 1944, Hannemann n.d.), but the Kristen Press in Madang has now re-published several works in English (Inselmann 1996, Hannemann 1996, Kunze 1997). Other German scholars include Schmitz, with several articles on cults, myth and legend (e.g. 1957, 1959).

Peter Lawrence did substantial periods of fieldwork among the Garia in 1949-50 and among the Ngaing, south of Saidor, in 1952-53 and 1958, resulting in two major books (Lawrence 1964, 1984) and a range of academic papers (e.g Lawrence 1965, 1967, 1970, 1973). Lawrence’s work touches on three themes: land tenure and social organisation (among the Garia only), traditional religious systems, and the political development of the Rai Coast. He is best known for his study of the Yali cargo cult in Road belong cargo (Lawrence 1964). A planned monograph on the Ngaing of the Rai Coast was not completed by the time of his death.

The work most relevant to the trading linkages of the Rai Coast is the work of Harding (1967, 1985) among the Sio, some 60 km along the coast from the Yaganon, at the eastern extremity of the Rai Coast, and the farthest mainland point visited by Bilbil sailors in traditional times.

Subsequent anthropologists have been Morauta (1971), who worked in the inland area behind Madang town, and McSwain (1977), on Karkar. Both were concerned with social change and political development, particularly in the widening horizons of village society in the context of an emergent district-level economy.

Directly in the study area, previous work of an ethnographic nature comprises a short visit by Patricia May and Margaret Tuckson to Mindre in 1973 to study pottery making and the very short visit by Mary Mennis in 1977, already discussed. May and Tuckson’s book shows pottery techniques and firing at Mindre, and two potters, Murupen WANGGUM—who remembered the visit very well and showed me her photographs—and Elizabeth (May and Tuckson 1982: 166-175). The female, paddle-and-anvil potters of Mindre, and the Madang islands of Yabob and Bilbil clearly form a single craft tradition, and contrast with the male, spiral coil potters of inland Madang.

---

23 HPL’s slurry pipeline route crosses Garia territory in vicinity of the Bigei River.
Language

Language classifications, reflecting ‘linguistic communities’, provide a clue to the nature of ‘groups’ in a given area.

The most comprehensive survey of the study area is that by Z’graggen (1980) based on fieldwork in 1971-73. His work forms the basis for this section of Würm and Hattōri’s (1981) Language atlas of the Pacific area. No further linguistic work on these languages seems to have been published since the 1970s; the SIL Ethnologue database notes ‘further work needed’.

Non-Austronesian languages of the Rai Coast

Z’graggen, following an SIL linguist, Claassen (killed in an air crash in 1972), distinguishes among the non-Austronesian languages of the area a Rai Coast language stock with 29 members. Within them, six family-level groups were recognised of which the two nearest the project area are Kabenau and Yaganon (Table 7). The Yaganon Family lies on the eastern border of its parent Phylum, beyond which lies the Finisterre-Huon Phylum, of which the Gusap-Mot Family, with seven languages, meets the Yaganon Family area on the east and south.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Madang-Adelbert Range Phylum</th>
<th>Finisterre-Huon Phylum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rai Coast Stock (29 languages)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Finisterre Stock</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kabenau Family</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yaganon Family</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arawum</td>
<td>Dumun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolom*</td>
<td>Ganglau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemio</td>
<td>Saep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulabu</td>
<td>Yabong*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siroi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*note: east of the Yaganon River

| Table 7. Non-Austronesian languages in the project area |
| Note: Only ‘Saep’ is given here, whereas informants distinguish ‘Saip’, spoken at Orinma and Segi, from ‘Kar’ and its variants, spoken at Mebu, Gahu and other places. |

Z’graggen had less information on the Yaganon languages than for other families, and was only able to place ‘Dumun’ with it on the basis of a handful of words. The names of the Yaganon languages are in question. I have attempted with many informants to elicit the name by which they refer to their own language, or to that of their neighbours, but with little

---

24 About 750 non-Austronesian or ‘Papuan’ languages are spoken across the mainland of New Guinea, with outliers in Timor, Halmahera and the Solomon Islands. The languages form a geographical grouping only, and genetic relationships between languages at even the ‘phylum’-level are somewhat problematic (see Foley 1986).
success. This is less likely to be because no names can be found, rather than that it reflects the forced nature of all group distinctions in this culture area.\textsuperscript{25}

All the same, the ‘Dumun’\textsuperscript{26} and ‘Ganglau’\textsuperscript{27} languages shown in Table 7 do correspond well with what informants say about the coastal members of the family—that the people of Dumon and Kulilau government villages speak one language, while that spoken in Ganglau, Dein and Kubup government villages is intelligible to them, it is distinct enough to be called another.

But even within these government villages, people say there are dialectal differences apparently cross-cutting the groups ostensibly resident in them. For example, Kuehng was given as a ‘clan’ at Ganglau, but at the same time it was linguistically bracketed with Dumon and Kulilau.

Where necessary in this report local language terms or place names followed by (D) or (G) will refer to the Dumon and Ganglau languages respectively.

\textit{Austronesian}\textsuperscript{28} languages of the Rai Coast

Austronesian languages are spoken in pockets along the Rai Coast: ‘Mindiri’, spoken at Mindre village, Biliau and Wab, whose speakers are called Sengam and Som, respectively, by Lawrence (1964: Map 3 & 19 ff.). These three form a sub-family closely associated with the languages of the Madang town area, Bilbil and Graged.

East of Saidor are Arop, spoken on both Long Island and the mainland, Malalamai and Roindji. The cultural connections of this sub-family lie to the east with the Siassi area (Chowning 1986).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belan Sub-Family</th>
<th>Astrolaban Sub-Family</th>
<th>Vitiazan Sub-Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gedaged (Graged or Kranket)</td>
<td>Mindiri (at Mindre)</td>
<td>Arop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilbil</td>
<td>Biliau (at Biliau)</td>
<td>Malalamai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{25} Informants frequently responded with particular words (e.g. ‘no’) or phrases (e.g. ‘olsem wanem’) which could serve as markers of dialectal difference, and thus language names. But each time I raised such possible names with fresh informants, they elicited a dismissal as contemptuous as the original proposal had been apparently reasonable. D. Dumbu and D. Duka had no greater success than I.

\textsuperscript{26} ‘Dumun’, though, is misleading. The village of ‘Dumon’ speak this, while ‘Duman’ is an inland Kar-speaking village, also with a coastal settlement near Ganglau village. I will refer to the ‘Dumon’ language henceforth.

\textsuperscript{27} A possible name for the Ganglau, Kubup and Segi variants of the Ganglau language are ‘Bining’, ‘Baning’ and ‘Ba’ (not in order), but until a convincing explanation of these terms is given, I will not use them.

\textsuperscript{28} Austronesian is the world’s largest language family with some 600 members spread across Southeast Asia and the Pacific, and including Tagalog (Philippines), Bahasa Indonesia, Motu (Port Moresby), Kuanua (Rabaul), most of the languages of Island Melanesia, and all the languages of Polynesia. There is a genetic relationship between all family members, with a hypothetical language called proto-Austronesian spoken some 6000 years ago somewhere in coastal Southeast Asia.
Takia (S. Karkar)  
Wab (at Saidor)  
Roindji  
Megiar (N. Coast Madang)  
Matukar (N. Coast Madang)  
Ham (Gogol River)  

Table 8. Austronesian languages near the project area.

In this report local language terms or place names followed by (M) will refer to the Mindiri language.

**Yaganon local organisation**

People in the Yaganon area comply with what is probably a very widespread variety of social organisation in coastal north coast Papua New Guinea. Unfortunately, because of what anthropologists have seen as its ‘looseness’, it is of a kind that is poorly described.

For example, Harding (1985:24), following Lawrence (1971), describes the social organisation of the nearby Siō in terms of the first, ‘patrilineage societies’, of eleven increasingly elaborate types of organisation distinguished by Lawrence. The Garia to the west of the study area are classed as the eleventh and catch-all type, ‘cognatic societies’, but my knowledge of Yaganon organisation leads me to suspect that all three are actually variants of the same thing.

Of the Siō, Lawrence says ‘neither lineages not affinal alliances between descent-based corporations are prominently developed’.

This is to describe something in terms of what it is not.

Actually, none of the Yaganon, the Garia or the Siō, have things that can be distinguished as ‘lines’ or ‘clans’.

At this point clarification of some concepts is required.

**Concepts used in describing local organisation**

A *group* is a collection of people unified by regular encounters, and a common objective or shared activity, which typically identifies what the group is. The size, frequency of assembly, and permanence of a group are not as important as the unity fostered by the common objective. Thus a church group meets once a week for religious service; an army is permanently recruited from a nation-sized society for military duty; and so on.

In respect of groups, a special kind of function is *politics*, which concerns external relations with like groups in the neighbourhood, and with people and bodies beyond the neighbourhood area. A special type of group with its own territory and a sufficient range of
political functions to be able to function autonomously in respect of its external relations is a polity. A city-state like Monaco is a polity; small tribal ‘nations’ are also polities. 29

Descent concerns the descendants of a person. Descent lines are made up of traceable genealogical connections stemming from a person—with no assertion of whether they form ‘groups’ or not. If patriliny is reckoned, people with purely male connections to the founder are agnates or agnatic members of the lines, while descendants with at least one female connection between them and the founder are enates or enatic members (Lawrence 1984:48). In any circumstance, when all descendants are counted, the collection of people are cognatic kin.

A descent group is mistakenly defined in terms of a collection of people identified by common descent. In this incorrect definition, and by virtue of their shared descent, the royal families of Europe are a descent group. However, but since they almost never meet or do anything together, the concept of them as a ‘group’ is meaningless. Perhaps a better term, also used in anthropology, is to say that they all belong to the same cognatic stock. (On the other hand, the Windsors, say, are a descent line.)

A descent group is correctly defined in terms of people identified by common descent and who fit the ‘shared activity’ definition of a group just given. A clan is a special kind of descent group, namely one which at least pretends to adhere to unilineal descent. In some parts of Papua New Guinea, clans are sections of large tribes and among their functions are common defence and some aspects of land tenure. People in these kinds of clan normatively live together on the clan’s single territory within the overall boundaries of the tribe. For this reason, it is reasonable to speak of such clans having a wide range of automatic political functions; they are sometimes called corporate clans.

However, without even considering proprietary functions and reserved functions, there are still some difficulties equating actual clans with the corporate clan ideal that outsiders can conveniently deal with. A significant number of clans throughout Simbu and Western Highlands, for example, have become fractured in warfare and live scattered in pockets among people of other tribes, and may even live in different districts. In Eastern and Southern Highlands, village settlements typically aggregate clan and non-clan people together; here it is problematic to speak of what clans ‘do’, even if they exist other than as ‘large families’.

Dispersed clans are found in some coastal areas; that is, clan territories are not present and members of one clan live and own land in many villages. At the same time, clan identity is strong, and typically linked to a special origin story and a totemic animal like a bird or a fish. Dispersed clans have few residual political functions; they cannot act as polities.

29 Obviously, when aimed at a resource developer, the point of the discussion is to be able to say where in the social landscape political functions are to be found, and at which of several possible locations are external dealings (e.g. entering into agreements with a mining company) most likely to be legitimized.
The study area

In the Rai Coast as a whole, the traditional village is described in terms of a ‘place’ with as a marker of its existence a *daram kamba* (M) / *bilim ba* (G), or *haus tambaran*. This is seen in many early accounts—for example, in Maclay’s visit to Bai on the right bank of the Gawar (see p. 15).

The *haus tambaran* was not a men’s sleeping house, but rather a place to keep secret/sacred objects which were shown to boys at the time of their initiations (*’soim tambaran’*). The objects included bull-roarers, gourd trumpets, and probably some ancestral bones or trophies. It also formed the focus of ‘efficacious knowledge’ for the small community that built and maintained it. That is, practical tasks could not succeed if the *kastom* or *lo* pertaining to the *haus tambaran* was not followed properly. The ambit of *kastom* extended to growing crops, preventing earthquakes, safe passage at sea, making and firing pots without breakage in pottery-making villages, indeed to all aspects of practical life.

Another marker of identity arose in the matter of the disposal of the bones of the dead. Traditionally, corpses were bound in mats and the resulting package suspended vertically in the dead person’s house, in which a fire was lit. When the body fluids had all dispersed, the bones were removed to customary places in the bush that a particular hamlet group used as its ossuary: a surviving example is at Tubuk where skulls and long bones are lodged in a large Ficus (although I have not seen this).

These things raise the question of how we describe the people who built a *haus tambaran* together, formed an initiation community, and collected their bones in the same ossuary.

Lawrence says of the nearby Ngaing that they comprised ‘about twenty named bush areas’:

> The inhabitants of each can be called a bush group and were a political unit. They avoided bloodshed among themselves, combined for offence and defence, and had a common war god. Bush groups were allied by trade relationships and linked, at the personal level by intermarriage.

> The bush group was divided into a number of small, named, exogamous patriclans, each consisting of patrilineages of between three and five generations deep. The patriclan was the basic unit of local organization, forming either a settlement on its own or part of a settlement. It had its own land and ritual property for the Male Cult. It had its own ornaments with which it could decorate its settlement cult house (around which dwelling houses were grouped); its own slit-gong, gourd trumpets, and sacred melodies, from the gong beats of which its members took their personal call signs; and its own sacred or spirit pool. It normally had its own leaders although, if it were small or ineffectual, it would have to place itself under the aegis of another patriclan in its settlement or bush area (Lawrence 1964:15).

This description fits the Yaganon well. However, as it is unlikely Lawrence investigated the Ngaing as a whole with the broad coverage I have been able to achieve with the Yaganon,

---

30 Mikloucho-Maclay described the procedure as it was done at Bongu (Tumarkin 1982:362-364). The corpse in its wrappings formed a cylinder some two metres high hung over a beam under which two fires were kept burning (Tumarkin 1982:Illustration on p. 363)
his identification of patriclans may need correction—or at least applies with a different emphasis for the Yaganon.

By my count, Yaganon lands in Ward 30 are divided, at the moment, into approximately thirty-six named, well-bounded parcels I concur in calling ‘bush areas’. These are not territories owned and defended by clans, but land divisions surrounding current, or former and now-abandoned settlements. The difference is as follows. If a clan (in an area with a clan system) grows in population it will eventually overwhelm a neighbour, absorbing it in some way and folding its territory into that of its own (demographic mechanisms and various peaceful ways of the two groups merging are more likely than conquest). Alternately, if a clan dwindles in numbers, it becomes vulnerable to losing its separate identity and disappears with the death of its last member. The probability of its land never having been lived on, or fought or hunted over by any members of other neighbourhood clans is vanishingly small and title over it automatically defaults to the next clan with a claim to it. Typically it becomes the hunting bush or pig grazing land of its neighbour.

But bush areas exist independently of the existence of clans, remembering that these are special, unilineally defined groups. Among the thirty-six I have counted, many have no claimants agnatically connected to the settlement founders, and one has no traceable claimants at all—but all still exist in their own right.

Discussions among and about claimants to the bush areas are significantly different than one hears in clan societies. The likelihood of clan members referring the claims to a piece of bush to people living in another district is slight—yet this is a common occurrence among the Yaganon. Similarly, the attribution of sole ownership to a woman defies the logic of clan systems in areas that do not have matriliny as their operative principle (it is not even automatically the case in matrilineal clan systems). Yet this too makes perfect sense to the Yaganon.

Discussions about the relations of kinship are significantly different as well. In the recent sections of genealogies, the bush area of each spouse’s male line is known by informants—who call them ‘clans’ in pidgin—and is always different between husband and wife. But in the earlier generations, informants often give the same ‘clan’ name for both spouses and confusingly say ‘taim bilong pait’ and ‘ol i marit insait long ples yet’. In the logic of clans, they are saying their ancestors married their sisters, which of course is impossible today, as it is in all societies. How can this be?

Land ownership and social organisation: bush areas in the ‘Yaganon model’

Indefinitely into the past, settlement founders built new hamlets in the bush from time to time. When they thought of their identity, they thought in terms of the name of the bush area covering all the places they had lived in and bounding the area within which they could establish future hamlets. The bush area had its own bush spirits and what informants called stori ples, ‘story places’.

The inhabitants of a hamlet so created comprised the members of a handful of extended families and formed, with the members of nearby friendly bush areas, a mutual ‘security circle’, to use a phrase coined by Lawrence (1967:101). Men and women found spouses from other extended families within their own hamlet or from families in other hamlets of
their security circle. Living informants often dogmatically assert that there is only one descent line from a single founder. In reality, there are likely to have been several descent lines stemming from the collection of extended families that may have lived at a particular hamlet. That only one is left—or claimed to be left—in a given case, is more likely to be due to the happenstance of demography than to the sole proprietorship of its ancestor. The case of Tubuk, where about five separate descent lines lead to present-day claimants, shows what happens when rival lines fail to die out.

Each single-settlement bush area had its own haus tambaran and, presumably, ritually dangerous areas off-limits to women and strangers for initiating its boys. An example of such a bush area is Guguk, lying between the southeastern flank of Mt Dibim and the west bank of the Yaganon River. Guguk’s settlement, or ‘old place’ since its owners have all moved to the coast, was situated in a defensive position on a ridge and also took the name of the bush area, Guguk.

But in other circumstances, families were forced to leave their own places and go to live with people in other bush areas with whom they could find some connection of kinship. Reasons might be a spate of mysterious deaths in a settlement, the likelihood of attack by stronger enemies or, in the case of children, by being orphaned.

When this happened, or when numbers built up by natural population growth in an existing hamlet, a secondary hamlet might be established in the same bush area and subsequently a child bush area would come into existence as a sub-division of the parent. Two scenarios are likely. The first is that the inhabitants of the child bush area would dwindle in numbers and the relict family members would move to another bush area or rejoin the parent. In this case, the child bush area would be remembered as an alternate for the parent, or as one of the things informants call a ‘subclan’ of the parent. Examples are Bzar and Zubokng as child places within Kuehng bush area; Kuehng’s founder, Gien, had two sons Durongo and Kubok, probably born in the 1850s. Durongo gave rise to Zubokng and Kubok to Bzar.

The second is; in the fullness of time the parent-child relationship might be forgotten and now separate bush areas would exist in their own right. For obvious reasons examples of this can only be arrived at by speculation; but logic suggests that this could happen. If Zubokng and Bzar had been on the coast, instead of inland where people do not now want to live, then perhaps this could have happened in their case. In fact, the entirety of Kuehng bush area is uninhabited and such parts as are gardened lie on its coastal edge only. Also the whereabouts of the Zubokng successors are not clear: the former custodian, Udd BUT, was murdered by rascals in Lae and his children have not been heard of for some years. In consequence, this leaves the whole of Kuehng in the hands of the two men who are the successors to the Bzar bush area and people are beginning to discard the child names, referring to these men as Kuehng or Bzar interchangeably.

A different situation arises when the inhabitants of an autonomous bush area dwindle in numbers. There are three scenarios. The first is that the remaining agnatic descendants are found elsewhere for various reasons. In this case, the bush area has living owners, but they

---

31 Actually quite unlikely. Although population numbers are growing today, this is a trend only established in the 1960s, as seen on p. 7. Endemic tropical diseases are now the cause of poor life expectancy today; in the past, with the addition of warfare, life expectancy would have been considerably poorer.
do not live in it. An example is Misge bush area: the fourth son, Koi ADAIAU, of the owner in the 1920s, Adiau DADOK, went to work on a plantation at Bogadjim and he settled there. He would not have known at the time that his elder brothers would fail to have male descendants. His own children and now grandchildren at Lalok village, Astrolabe Bay, now add up to more than 52 people; they are the rightful successors to the Misge bush area.

The second is where the last successor is a woman who marries a man in an adjacent bush area where her descendants continue to live as members of her husband’s descent lines. An example is Zelfek, a division of the Mengale bush area between Kulilau and Dumon. Kiwan ZU’s father, Zu KADAM, himself the last Mengale, had a Zelfek mother, the only Zelfek descendant in my genealogies. Kiwan ZU makes gardens within Zelfek from time to time. He says he has never seen a living member of a Zelfek descent line; Zelfek is a ‘subclan’ of Mengale, a second usage of this term. However, although there is no indication of a parent bush area, I think Zelfek was originally had co-ordinate status with Mengale, like Zubokng and Bzar.

Another example is Mbirge; Mbirge has descendants at Dein and elsewhere, but because one of its ancestors married a woman from Tubuk, some informants also say Mbirge ‘is really a subclan’ of Tubuk. In this example, I am not sure if Mbirge was originally a child bush area of Tubuk; it may have been.

The third scenario is where a bush area has no remaining inhabitants, no descendants in other areas, and it is not known to originally have been the child of a parent bush area. In this case the neighbours will be slightly puzzled as to who owns the land. However, as the balance of opinion firms for the empty area being ‘looked after’ by a particular neighbour, the likelihood is that it will be taken over by that neighbour and merged with it. In contemporary terms, this is a third instance where pidgin speakers say the empty area is a ‘subclan’ of its guardian. An example is Mehng, an empty neighbour of Ahurgra at Kubup.

*Usage of the term ‘subclan’*

In the above, informants have used ‘subclan’ (in Pidgin: *sabklen*) in three ways with radically different derivations:

- the *sabklen* is a land division within a parent bush area;
- the *sabklen* was actually a ‘brother’ of the bush area now taking control of it;
- the *sabklen* had no original connection with the bush area taking control of it.

Only the first case reflects the genetic connection usually surmised when the word ‘subclan’ is used.

Further idioms used by informants are as follows:

... *bikpela boundary tru em i Tong*

said Suwang KAUMBE when showing me where the old places and associated bush areas Dimamgra, Vahuk (his mother’s place), Tong and Amigra were on the flank of Mt Dibim. That is, we were looking at land divisions within a larger area.
he said, making an allusion to one ‘house’ with several ‘doors’. On another occasion, men at Basamuk said the bush area Gipking (inland of Ganglau) covered Baleng and Sibiyag.

Gipking, em i haus boi ... i gat tupela dua

**Principles of custodianship: the succession of ownership**

In the Yaganon model, rights over a bush area are organised in a hierarchical succession with potentially many groups of claimants ranked in order of genealogical closeness to the founder.\(^{32}\)

In the *first rank*, agnatic members of the founder’s descent line are automatic custodians of his bush area, wherever they live today. Among agnates, the principle of seniority applies, except where infirmity or soundness of mind are in question, or the most senior male has been adopted into a different descent line and has relinquished his claims to his bush area of birthright.

In the case of Tubuk, the senior living agnate is a teenage boy living at Bogati with his mother and step-father. As things stand, all other claimants must defer to him, or will do when he is old enough to assert his guardianship over Tubuk; though this could change if he relinquished his claim voluntarily. In the case of Mbirge, the senior living agnate is not of sound mind; his younger brother is the principal guardian. The successors to the Misge bush area live at Lalok village; they have nominated a locally-resident cousin to be their agent.

In the *second rank* are living men who are descendants of female members of the founder’s descent line. Normatively, men with a single female link to the founder have priority over men with two female links in their genealogy. In the same way, men with the more recent female links have priority over those with more ancient links (a man whose mother was on the decent line should outrank a man whose grandmother was).

In the *third rank* are living women who are descendants of the founder’s descent line. If no men of the first or second rank are extant, the most senior female descendant, ranked using the same principles of seniority, may become the principal guardian. An example is Kamumel, ‘wholly owned’ by a woman.

A comment is necessary concerning active possession of the land; in true clan systems, group duties are important. This usually means only resident clan members are rewarded with stewardship over clan property, and the position of absentee members can be precarious. Where they work in town, annual visits to participate in feasting and contribute

---

\(^{32}\) Note that the situation in a true clan system is generally much simpler: overall rights are vested in the ‘body corporate’ of the clan (or its local branches), and then individual rights over small parcels are vested in family owners or equal status.
to brideprices and death payments are essential to prevent their rights weakening or becoming extinguished altogether.\textsuperscript{33}

In the Yaganon system, absenteeism does not affect land succession in the present generation. On the other hand, successional disputes are common in earlier, less well known generations over the purported ‘strength of connection’ of ancestors to bush areas. This will be seen in the examples.

\textit{Classification of bush areas today}

The foregoing discussion has considerable implications for land dealings today. For convenience, Yaganon bush areas can be classed into four main types:

\textbf{Type I.} Bush areas with locally resident male successors on the unbroken male descent line from the founder

\textbf{Type II.} Bush areas with locally resident successors on female descent lines from the founder.

\textbf{Type III.} Bush areas with successors living outside the local area who outrank successors within it.

\textbf{Type IV.} Bush areas with no known living successors.

In general land dealings in respect of Type I bush areas are \textit{likely to be the most secure}: the custodians promise to be well identified and to exercise, to all intents and purposes, full rights of disposal over the land. The most senior of the agnatic descendants cannot be challenged as the principal custodian of the land in normal circumstances.

Dealings in respect of Type II bush areas are \textit{potentially insecure}. However, they may be made secure if the, probably several, groups of enatic successors are properly consulted. A ranking will exist among them but it is weaker than among agnates and it is risky to deal with what appears to be the most senior group. Such a bush area may have a nominated principal custodian, but if he—he will normally be male—fulfils his role properly he must act in a far more consultative manner than in a Type I bush area.

Dealings in respect of Type III bush areas are \textit{very unlikely to be secure} and carry significant social impact risks. As the primary successors live outside the area, they are unlikely to understand local history and politics, or even speak the same language. In a mine or plant site project, any other than minimal dealings with the long-distance owners will automatically invite the immigration of unnecessary numbers of people and cause resentment among bona fide local residents. (It may well be argued that as these are the rightful owners, they may do as they please. However, if they were so concerned about their land, they could have settled people on it earlier and made it into a Type I area.)

\textsuperscript{33} Zimmer-Tamakoshi (1997) recounts the fatal misjudgment of a Yandera man who had been absent for thirteen years and returned to find ‘his’ land in use by another: he had failed to keep up with customary payments. Her extended discussion is highly relevant to HPL’s Kurumbukari operations.
Type IV bush areas are not common—Mehng is the only known example in Ward 30. Land dealings are *potentially secure*, but perhaps only if it can be demonstrated that a neighbouring area has already annexed it, and others acknowledge this, or, alternately, that dealings over it are *pro bono publico* and will not profit any at the expense of another.
CHAPTER 4

EXAMPLES OF BUSH AREA SUCCESSIONS

The concepts set out in the previous chapter can be set to work with reference to actual examples of the four types of bush areas and the genealogies that document the people who are the living successors of the original founders.

The full-sized genealogical charts should be consulted when examining the examples; here I only present outlines of them.

The first examples come from Sibib, no longer inhabited, but the settlement for ‘Sibibge’ (the people of the Sibib), ‘Ibabge’ (the people of Ibabguang) and Misge bush areas. When Sibib was last inhabited is not known: perhaps it was abandoned late last century or in the early years of this century.  

Dagui was the founder and he had three sons who gave rise to Sibibge, Ibabge and Misge. They were Garang, Singui (or perhaps Siwei) and Argwei. 

Ibabge — Type I

As shown in outlined in Figure 6, the founder was Singui, though this name is unclear in different accounts; it may have been Siwei. Iwa SIWEI was his son, then there are three brothers: Guman IWA, Kasan IWA and Wing IWA. Four generations later without a break in the male line, Guman IWA’s descendants reaches the present spokesman for Ibabge, Lapiu SIWEI, which is why I have classed Ibabge as a Type I bush area.

Kasan IWA may have been adopted back to Sibibge; at least, his descendants do not continue in Ibabge. Wing IWA also left the place Sibib and went to live with the Banpanu at Mindre.

*HPL’s Ibabge schedule of owners*

At Dein: Lapiu SIWEI, Tom FRII, Bauk FRII, Sali FRII
At Mindre: Walon LIMA, Dariure WALON, Nus WALON

The principal custodian, Lapiu SIWEI (or Lapiu KAUT, his father had two names) is a full agnate on the descent line from the founder. However, there are some difficulties. Firstly his

34 Note that testimony seen earlier placed the Sibib people at Mindre with Panudan before they lived at Sibib.

35 Another name, seldom heard, is Knantuge. This (according to Isak ZISMAM) is a bush area along the Yaganon and is also under ‘big name Sibib’.
father’s elder brother, Lapiu NABIE, married at Karkar and may have descendants there. Present day informants do not know who they are or even if they exist.

As can be seen in Figure 6, people with secondary rights in Ibabge are the children of Masin LIMA (who is herself dead), Walon LIMA and his children, since their mother, Sendanding, was the daughter of Wing IWA.

Maklai SEB and Ping SEB could in some circumstances have rights—even exclusive rights were there no other successors—having been raised by a grand-daughter of Guman IWA. In this instance, though, they have only very weak rights.

In HPL’s schedule of landowners, I do not know who Tom FRII, Bauk FRII, Sali FRII are.

**Sibibge — Type II**

Sibibge itself is a Type II bush area, because after three generations the successors are connected to the founder, Garang, through a woman, Wada ASRE (Figure 7).
Garang’s own descent line is small, but he also looked after Dauk, who gave rise to a larger descent line. Exactly who Dauk was is unclear. Walon LIMA says he was the son of Kasan IWA (see Figure 6), but by my reckoning Dauk and Kasan were about the same age. More information is required.

As a result we can distinguish two lines of successors, the one directly from Garang and the other from Dauk (Figure 8), which is broken by a woman in the second generation.

_HPL’s Sibibge schedule of owners_

**From Line 1**

At Dein: Wada ASRE
From Line 2

At Mindre: Dauk SIROI, Chris DAUK, Sangarai SIROI

Comments on Sibibge schedule

The schedule is as we would expect. However, the successors in Line 2 have not listed themselves in full. Logically, Serarbe SIROI and Matthew SIROI, as other sons of Siroi should automatically be listed. There is no real reason why their sisters, Gabar and Marus should not be listed as well.

Misge — Type III

Misge has two descent lines starting from Argwei DAGUI. Informants connect the two together but in such a way as not to make sense (Figure 9).

![Figure 9. Misge — ancestral connections](image)

The detailed outline of Line 1 starts with the fourth generation successor, Dadok ARGWEI, born around 1860 (Figure 10).

From here the fourth grandson of Dadok, Koi ADIAU, left Dein to be a plantation worker in Astrolabe Bay, settled at Lalok village and raised a large family there. All informants agree that the more than 52 people who are Koi ADIAU’s descendants are the primary successors. For this reason, Misge is a Type III bush area—one with successors living outside the local area who outrank those within it.

Line 2 begins with Gull ARGWEI who was supposedly the brother of Biku of Line 1. This is difficult to reconcile because he was a contemporary of Dadok ARGWEI, a grandson of Biku. Perhaps he should be the younger Dadok’s brother. Further information is needed here (Figure 11).

In Line 2 leads to an enate, Kore WANGGUM, who is the overall spokesman for Misge, presumably because he has been picked by the Lalok successors to represent them in the project area.

HPL’s Misge schedule of owners

From Line 1

At Lalok, Astrolabe Bay: four brothers Gasan KOI, Igag KOI, Girit KOI, Felfel KOI + their sisters Wai KOI, Ebiana KOI, Gorona KOI, Bring KOI and Buk KOI.
At Dein: Dik SIBI, ‘Igag KORE’ — apparently a misspelling for ‘Igag KAI’.

Figure 10. Misge — Line 1, Dadok ARGWEI

From Line 2

At Mindre: Kore WANGGUM + first two sons Wabur KORE, Sobe KORE
Comments on Misge schedule

The schedule is logical in listing Koi ADIAU’S children, but even so, none of his grandchildren are there; these include seven grandsons who are obviously in line to be automatic custodians. Three of the grandsons are over eighteen.

In Line 1, Dadok ABIN, the son of Amime, adopted by Kasan ADIAU of Misge, was in turn adopted by Usi KATEI of Misge. He has other affiliations at Mindre following his mother’s husband and his step-father, Abin SIWAI, but it is hard to see how he fails to figure here.

Two of Kore WANGGUM’s sons are listed—but he has three other sons (Brian, Nason and Stanley) and it is unclear why they have been omitted. It should be noted that Kore has three other brothers, though one (Gull) was adopted at an early age by Saufu LAKI of the Prien bush area.

Other enates have been left off the schedule from both Lines 1 & 2.

Figure 11. Misge — Line 2, Gull ARGWEI

Tubuk — Type III

As the absentee ownership problem is potentially serious, I will give another example: Tubuk.

Tubuk, the place, was a settlement about 1km east of Kubup village; it is no longer inhabited. It has an ossuary in a Ficus, where skulls and long bones have been placed. In Tubuk accounts, ‘Tubuk’ can be understood in two ways: by itself and as a covering name for three bush areas: Mbir, Lumuguang and Ibabguang.
Figure 12. Names attributed to Tubuk.

The account recounted at the beginning of this chapter places Ibabge under Sibib. Ibabge adjoins both bush areas; the dual status may relate to the crossing over of Smai from Ibabge to Tubuk (see Line 4).

Tubuk’s status as a Type III bush area comes by virtue of the fact that its primary successor is a small boy at Lalok, Astrolabe Bay (unrelated to the Misge successors).

Another complication is that there are at least four lines, as well as a possible attempted Ibabge annexation of the empty Tubuk at a point in its history. The following is essentially Isak ZISMAM’s account.

The Tubuk people lived and had their haus tambaran at Lumuguang. Imsor was the founder; before him the place was bush and no-one lived there. Imsor’s grandson was Ndik KUTER. In Ndik’s time fighting broke out and the Tubuk people were defeated and the place abandoned. The successors are the descendants of those who were absent or escaped from the fighting by some means.

Ndik fled east to the bush area Monspange on the east of the Yaganon River. Duab NDIK had a son Daun DUAB, then died. Duab’s wife remarried at Lalok village. His son, Daun, is at Community School on Karkar Island [Line 1].

Aringem was a Tubuk woman who married at Dein. Her daughter was married twice, the second time to Duab NDIK. Her kinship relationship to Duab is unknown [Line 2].

Inungem BOMBE was a ‘brother’ of Ndik (tupela brata brata). He moved from Tubuk to Hawar, a bush area about 3km to the south [Line 3].

An Ibabge man called Smai settled on Ahurguang, a bush area adjacent to Tubuk. Tubuk remained empty for two generations. Supuire MEMAI, Smai’s grandson, laid claim to Tubuk. His son, Tui SUPUIRE, and grandson, Awak TUI, follow this claim [Line 4].

One couple fled to Kuf, east of the Yaganon; the man’s name is unknown but the wife was called Imusa. Most of their descendants live at Kuf today; Lapiu KAUT of Dein may be a descendant but the connections are unknown.

It will be noticed that Lines 1 and 2 join up, as Duab married his cross-cousin, Imoi. This reinforces the status of Daun DUAB as the primary successor.
There are problems with the assertions in the oral history. By my estimates NDIK and Supuire were born around 1910. If they belong to the time of fighting, this must have been in the 1920s at the earliest. The Rai Coast was certainly beyond administrative control in...
1916, when the inhabitants, described as ‘wild and half-afraid’, fled from their villages as an Australian patrol trekked along the coast (Rabaul Record in Jinks et al. 1973). The date at which this situation changed and the Australians put an end to fighting is in question.

On the other hand, if Smai was a contemporary of the abandonment of Tubuk, then this happened half-a-century earlier.

**Figure 15. Tubuk line 3**

Inungem BAMLE (About 1880-) Tubuk
= Nigaing (About 1885-) Hawar
Son
Isak ZISMAM (1938-) Tubuk
& and his two adopted children at KURITNG
3 people 1 listed

**Figure 16. Tubuk line 4**

Supuire MEMAI (About 1910-) Tubuk
= Seoseo (About 1912-) Igau
Son
Tui SUPUIRE (About 1935-) Tubuk
& son, daughter and adopted son at IMOD, GANGLAU, ORINMA
12 people 1 listed

**HPL’s Tubuk schedule of owners**

*From Lines 1 & 2*
At Lalok village, Astrolabe Bay: Daun DUAB (aged about ?11 years).

*From Line 2*
At Dein: Kuming NARING—identity uncertain, is this Kuming YABI?

*From Line 3*
At Kuritng: Isak ZISMAM.

*From Line 4*
At Imod: Awak TUI (spokesman).

**Comments on the Tubuk schedule**

The schedule is in agreement with genealogy. However, the large number of descent lines tracing back to people who it is alleged lived at Tubuk before the diaspora gives rise to a substantial potential for dispute in the future.

One descent line is said to have living members at Kuf—but these are unknown.
Summary

From my investigations I have comparable data for a further 25-30 bush areas, including all those on the pipeline route east of the Gawar River (I will not present them here). A provisional picture is that Type I bush areas are found at Mindre in Panudan, Banpanu, Kiaufukun Wateng and Luanpanu, and are found at Ganglau in Baleng and Sibiyag, but are uncommon everywhere else.

At Dein and Mindre, the connections to Prien, a potentially important Type II bush area in the proposed townsite area, are very clear but originate in a woman and involve adoptions in subsequent generations.

At Kulilau a few men find themselves as the only successors of a proliferation of Type II bush areas (to which they are each connected to several through women).
CHAPTER 5

EVIDENCE OF LAND ACQUISITIONS IN THE STUDY AREA

This new chapter enlarges on my observations concerning land acquisitions in the study area up to the outbreak of the Pacific War with additional archival evidence I was able to consult in 1999.

The historical discussion in Chapter 2 has already indicated the small likelihood of any land acquisition to the east of Cape Rigney before WWI and the low-key presence of the Lutherans on the entire coast after WWI.

Figure 17. Map of the Lutheran Mission field on the Rai Coast by John F. Mager, 1936 (reproduction copyright held by Australian National Library).

The Mager map

Figure 17 and Figure 18 show the Lutheran Mission field as it was in the middle 1930s according to a map compiled by J.F. Mager in 1936, of which a copy was located in the Australian National Library. As can be seen, only two portions of alienated land are shown...
between Cape Rigney and Kepler Point: Bau Plantation and the Lutheran station at Biliau. It so happens that light can be thrown on the circumstances of both.

**Figure 18.** Key to Mager’s map of the Lutheran Mission field (reproduction copyright held by Australian National Library).

**Bau**

An Australian Archives file (‘New Guinea Expropriated Property Baum, Mr’) contains poignant details of the case of Helmuth Baum, the one time part owner of the ‘Pflugbeil and Baum’ plantation at Cape Rigney. As far as is known, the modern name ‘Bau Plantation’ is a corruption of Baum’s surname. (See below: ‘Bom’ and ‘Pau’.)

Along with all other German planters, Baum was dispossessed of his land after the First World War and offered compensation. In his case, Cape Rigney was declared expropriated
in the New Guinea Gazette of 31 April 1924 and the plantation was sold, fetching the sum of £4000 in 1926 or 1927. Baum, however, stayed on in the Territory eventually making his way to the Morobe gold field, where he set up a camp at Otibanda in the Upper Watut and becoming known to his Watut neighbours as ‘Masta Bom’. He was earning sufficient money in 1927 to make the attempt to buy his plantation back, and petitioned Canberra to allow him to do so, for example writing to the Governor-General on 7 February 1927. Cabinet minutes with marginal comments by Stanley Bruce, the Prime Minister, attest to the level he was able to bring his case. He was supported by Frank Anstey, MHR, who wrote on his behalf to Bruce on 8 June 1927.

This was to no avail and ultimately Baum set off on one last prospecting expedition through Kukukuku country with Biangai and Buang carriers, and was attacked and eaten on the Indiwi River in 1931.

In October 1934, the patrol officer J.K. McCarthy toured the villages and plantations of the Rai Coast, arriving at Mindre on the 23rd of that month. He went inland to Mebu and Orinma, where he met Dr John Kuder of the Lutheran Church on his rounds from Biliau, and returned to Mindre on the 25th. Then he took three hours to walk to Bibi, where he did a census and from where he sent a letter onto Bau Plantation to inform the manager, Mr Tupling, of his impending inspection. On 26th and 27th he inspected Bau and Melamu Plantations, both managed by Tupling, and went on to Bongu (Madang PR 5 of 1934/35).

It is quite clear from this account that there was no plantation or other mission or commercial establishment between Mindre and Bau. If there had been, McCarthy would have stopped and inspected it. He spent most of the 26th and some of the 27th at Bau looking at labourers quarters and so on, but the fact that he took just three hours to reach Bibi after striking out on foot from Mindre suggests he cannot have paused to look at anything at the site of the Basamuk Plantation. This is definite evidence that Bau and Melamu were the only operating plantations east of Bongu in 1934.

Biliau and Sangpat

On this same patrol, McCarthy was required to do a land investigation report for a portion of land at Sangpat, where Jerome Iloa (see page 22) had lived between 1923 and 1930. During the period of Jerome’s stay, it is clear that the mission dealt informally with the landowners, not alienating title to any land.

36 To the Biangai labourers who worked for him, on the other hand, ‘Masta Pau’ seems better known. The substitution of ‘P’ for ‘B’ by the Biangai also occurred in the case of the missionary known as ‘Masta Paia’, the Rev. Bayer.

37 Anstey had previously visited the gold fields in person and very likely met Baum there; he is shown with Doris Booth in her account of the Wau gold rush (Booth 1929, plate facing p. 76).

38 The area was known to later patrols as ‘Baum Country’ and ‘Mt Baum’ is a prominent peak in this area on topographic maps.

39 Dr. Kuder served in the Madang area from 1934, subsequently in the highlands, and was the first Bishop of ELCONG (1956-73).
Jerome a Samoan Mission Teacher … lived on the block for several years prior to its alienation (Madang PR 5 of 1934/35; my emphasis).

The reason for this is that after the war, the Rhenish Mission had all its properties confiscated and was disqualified from making any new applications to the Administration for land. Following the departure of the Rhenish Mission in 1932, with the Lutheran station set up at Biliau, the now American-run mission had decided to apply for the land that Jerome had used and had just surveyed it by the time of McCarthy’s patrol.

McCarthy listed the following as items for which compensation should be paid over the 1.48ha portion:

- Payment to owners: £5/-
- Coconut palms: £8/9/-
- Fruit trees, &c: £1/16/-
- Total: £10/10/-

He listed twenty people as landowners, from the villages of Lamtub, Suka, Singor, Bang and Mindre. The landowners from Mindre were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>My identification from inquiries in 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imai</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Imai of Panudan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yambeng</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yambeng of Panudan, the brother of Imai; their mother was Tautau of Lamtub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bai-a</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Baya of Luanpanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landin</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Landim, Baya’s mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaisam</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yaisam IKOSMAI, the mother of Udd KUSUP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murupen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Murupen IKOSMAI, the mother of Gulas KUSUP; Yaisam and Murupen were sisters who both married Kusup - their mother was Linle of Lamtub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

The evidence of the 1934 patrol report and the 1936 Mager map point to the fact that no other land had been alienated or was in the process of alienation prior to this time. The Mager map shows Biliau and Bau as portions. It ignores the portions known in the 1960s as ‘Medize’ and ‘Mindiri’ and I suggest that earlier references to these in the official documentation discussed in the next section have arisen from clerical or registry errors.

‘Medize’ and ‘Mindiri’

In spite of the above, there is still a possibility that the Lutherans requested land of the German Administration as a way of ministering to the Siar exiles at Mindre in 1912-14.
Two portions between Ganglau and Mindre, Portion 22 ‘Medize’, and Portions 109-110 ‘Basamuk’, also known as ‘Mindiri Plantation’, are notably at issue.

‘Medize’

The 1954 documentation for freehold title on Medize signed by Dr John Kuder says it was a ‘Grant by German Administration to the Rhenish Mission Society’ and cites a ‘vesting order to Trustees 24/12/1926 and 15/12/1933’. The first date corresponds with the transfer of Rhenish Mission assets to the Lutheran Mission New Guinea.

On the question of whether Medize pre-dates 1914, it may also be that Medize is listed in one of the catalogues of the Custodian of Expropriated Properties (see Appendix B, but a further search is required). If not, an administrative mistake may have been made in either 1926 or 1954—only genuine German titles should have been affirmed as freehold. It is worth bearing in mind that Kuder’s testimony on these points must have relied on information from others as he arrived in New Guinea after the Expropriated Property hearings, in 1934.

Medize has the alternative name ‘Naglau’, and according to Walon LIMA who says he attended it, the Lutherans ran a primary school on it from 1960 to 1963. The school was turned into a Bible school which ran until 1969. A patrol officer visited in May 1970. The Lutheran school had had 30-40 pupils, he wrote, but

Now, “ol irunawe pinis”. When asked if parents insisted on attendance, the reply was “ol i-lukim long ai tasol” (Saidor PR 18 of 1969-70).

Mindre had a school years before this (see above p. 24) but I do not know if this was at the same place.

‘Mindiri’

Warren Read, ADO at Saidor, visited Mindre in May 1966 to conduct council elections (Saidor PR 7 of 1965-66). Later in the year he surveyed Mindiri Plantation, but the patrol reports for this period cannot be located at present. The 1966 documentation on Mindiri Plantation states that the first acquisition of this land was in 1923. The two village witness statements in 1966, by Lima KARKAR, the 1950s luluai, and Tabor SKRIENG, say a European called ‘Bom’ planned to work the plantation, but that he did not.

‘Bom’, I can now say, was Helmuth Baum, who is likely to have paid the area repeated visits during the 1920s as he waged a bureaucratic war in the vain attempt to recover the title to ‘Pflugbeil and Baum’, or ‘Bau’, Plantation. Local informants agree today with a relatively early date for the first approaches over Mindiri, and this could accord with visits to them by Baum, and perhaps by others. Any approaches by the church could only have been on an

---

40 The PMB microfiche run of patrol reports has everything for 1965-66 and 1967-68, but 1966-67, which would include Read’s November 1966’s survey visit to Mindiri, is missing. Inquiries at the Papua New Guinea National Archives confirm that the paper originals for 1966-67 are also missing.

41 Footnote 36 on page 58 discusses how Baum’s name was heard by villagers on the Morobe gold fields.
informal basis until after the departure of the Rhenish Mission in 1932. The Mager map shows churches with native evangelists at Mindre and Ganglau, but the church buildings would only have been of bush materials and the sites merely land set aside by the congregations.

Later—the statements say in 1937—a Lutheran missionary started work on the plantation. In one version the purchaser was ‘Masta Anda’, though whether he was from the mission or was a government surveyor is unknown. At all events, everyone agrees no planting was done until late in the 1930s, when a Lutheran missionary called ‘Lina’—in fact an Australian lay brother, Jack Lindner—began work, paying local labourers in beads and axes. In 1939, an internal Lutheran report gives an account of the progress of work here:

*Mindire* new palms are doing well. Unfortunately this station has been without a white man for over two months, Sept.-Nov. That is not advisable where it can possibly be helped. I hear the boys there did not work much. Most of the Mindire boys however were distributed between Lutmis, Amele and Nagada [Lutheran plantations near Madang] during that time. We hope the planting of food, teak, and palms can be continued with soon, but take note of the fact that Br. Lindner is in charge of the fencing at Biliau at the same time (PMB 642).
It is evident from this that Mindiri had not been under cultivation long and informants say the coconuts were not bearing by the outbreak of war. In 1942, they say Lindner warned the villagers of the arrival of the Japanese at Madang, then ‘ran away’.42

The following are accounts of what informants say happened in the dealings with the Lutherans:

Zismam INUNGEM, a Tubuk man, and Tabor SKRIENG, a Banpanu man from Mindre were gardening there in the 1920s. About the time the mission came to the Rai Coast, a Tong man called Litmai died. The mission went to bury him in an earth grave, while his relatives wanted to give him traditional funerary rites, which consisted of smoking the corpse in an upright position in a small house called dib [Ganglau language; see Figure 19]. The Lutherans got their way, but shortly afterwards the Tong had several deaths that they attributed to this breach of custom. They quit this place and went back to their own gardens at Kubup.

At this time the men of Ganglau who laid claim to it were three brothers named Yamag, Kaumbe and Gemai [see Sibiyag genealogy]. Kaumbe and Gemai were absent from the Rai Coast on labour contracts, Kaumbe to work on a boat at Riwo and Gemai to work on the goldfields at Sandy Creek and other places around Wau. The mission came and bought the plantation, dealing with Zismam and Tabor. These two received money and axes.

Yamai SUS of Baleng was the first luluai; the son of his brother, Ndrem, was Yum NDREM. Zismam and Tabor handed over some axes and an adze [Tok pisin: pinsau] to Yamai and Yum.

Now Gemai and Kaumbe came back from their contracts; Yamai and Yum passed the gifts on to them as the ‘real’ owners.

In a Mindre version:

Basamuk was bought by the mission for ‘fifteen Kina’43 between 1925 and 1930. Tabor SKRIENG and Augam SKRIENG were the recipients of the payment. They split the money up: half went to Baleng and half was kept by Tabor and Augam, who distributed it to their families. The mission started planting in 1935 or 1936.

Later, about 1970, the mission came to renew the lease. Tabor (who died around 1976) and Augam (who died around 1974) said they had no money to repossess it and the mission said they would retain it.

The events portrayed in the first account appear to conflate things which, though both connected to the land in question, may have happened at different times: friction between

---

42 In fact Lindner, and Rev. Paul Freyberg at Biliau, were advised by government officers to escape over the mountains; Lindner returned after the war and restored the Kurum plantation on Karkar (Reitz 1986:168; Fugmann 1986:593; PMB 642). Since he served in Papua New Guinea until 1966, he should be known to older Madang residents.

43 The amount unclear but adjusted to ‘fifteen pounds’ and tri pius (three rolls of a hundred shillings) when I said that Kina did not exist then.
custom and church teachings, which may have been brought by native evangelists, and the payments for the plantation.

The dating suggests that the payments took place at the very end of the 1930s. Kaumbe and Gemai were born as late as 1913 and 1919; the strong likelihood is that they went on labour contracts around 1937 or so and therefore that it was Jack Lindner who gave out the pinsau and the axes. Both Zizmam and Tabor were born around 1905 and would have been about 33 years old in 1938; it is unknown whether they were pidgin speakers at the time.

A wild card is that the Lutherans were at this time working through the Graged language of Madang harbour—even the Samoan, Jerome, would have used this at Sangpat—and this would have made it a lot easier to deal with senior men, perhaps not pidgin speakers, at Mindre because the Mindre language is close to Graged. The Ganglau language, on the other hand, is quite unrelated (see Table 7 and Table 8).

Post WWII

After the war Mindiri, or ‘Basamok’, was restarted on a different basis; a patrol officer, D.R. Simmins, visited it in February 1962:

…proceeded to GANGLAU observing work at BASAMOK (Lutheran Mission Congregational Plantation) en route (Saidor PR 7 of 62-63).

In the report summary, he adds further detail:

… The Lutheran Mission Congregational plantations at Mendiri appears to be doing well and the very loose organisation of labour seems to be working out. Many able-bodied men in the Yaganon are able to supplement their income once in a while by labouring on this plantation where payment of labour is worked out on a piece basis (Saidor PR 7 of 62-63).

By now it can be seen that the church has abandoned the idea of a purely commercial venture.

Dispute over Basamuk

The dispute over Mindiri Plantation, or rather the eastern part of it which is sited on the customary land known as Basamuk, illustrates what can happen when a case like that of Tubuk, where different descent lines have arisen from several people claimed to have had a connection to a bush area.

The two claims are those of Sibiyag of Ganglau, whose outline genealogy to Suwang KAUMBE was given on page 11, and ‘Sibiyag 2’, in reality a section of Banpanu at Mindre (Figure 20).

44 The actual object is said to being kept ready for a court hearing over Basamuk.
45 Gemai succeeded Tangka WANGWANG, born around 1900, as a luluai at Ganglau, perhaps in the 1940s.
46 Strictly, Basamuk is the name of the beach at the mouth of Siminge Creek.
Specifically, the Banpanu line say their ancestor, Mad, originally lived at Basamuk and spoke the Ganglau language. For some reason he left this place and settled with Banpanu (of which there is a second descent line).

![Family Tree Diagram]

Mad left Basamuk and settled with Banpanu

- Mad, b. ?1760
- Milit of Prien
- Kliu, b. ?1790
- Tubuak, b. ?1795
- Ikosmai, b. ?1820
- Naron, b. ?1815
- Kaer, b. ?1845
- Abin, b. ?1835
- Skrieng, b. ?1870
- Baloi, b. ?1855
- Kabel b. ?1885
- Yaling b. 1953
- Abin b. 1944
- Baloi b. 1951
- Tabor ?1900-71976
- Augam ?1910-71974
- two daughters
- three daughters

Figure 20. The descendants of Mad, according to Banpanu informants at Mindre.

Note: Tabor and Augam dealt with the Lutherans over Basamuk.

The first branch of this descent line, from Mad’s son Kliu, led to Tabor and Augam who dealt with the Lutherans over Mindiri. As neither had a son who reached the age of marriage, it is the second branch, from Mad’s other son Tubuak, who reaches men living today.

An interesting complication is that when I discussed—with the prior permission of the Banpanu—the existence of Mad with Sibiyag men at Ganglau, the response was:

*Madi ... mipela no save long en. Em bilong Yomba o wanem hap. Madi em i posinman.*

However, I hadn’t said ‘Madi’, I’d said ‘Mad’.

The second time I heard ‘Madi’ was when I did the interview to collect the second half of Figure 20 with Baloi SIWAI. Gulas KUSUP was present and pointed out the discrepancy; he said it was ‘Mad’ without the ‘i’. Later in the day, evidently after this seemingly minor error was discussed at Mindre, Cllr. Maing returned to confirm that ‘Mad’ was right, and references to ‘Madi’ should be corrected.

Madi, however, was an ancestral figure for another community loosely connected to Yomba. In the version of the Kilibob-Manup myth recounted to Lawrence by the Sengam and Som

---

47 But as can be seen, the number of generations on each branch do not match. This may have no significance, of course.
of Biliau and Wab in the 1950s, Madi was a human being put ashore at the village of Teterei by the mythic hero, Manup, in his travel along the Rai Coast (Lawrence 1964:23).

However, this is only a distraction and the deadlock remains that the Sibiyag of Ganglau do not recognise Mad, while the Banpanu of Mindre are adamant that he was the original owner of Basamuk.

Suwang KAUMBE says that a patrol officer called MacIlwain held a hearing over Basamuk in 1964, at which he and the former luluai Gemai GUMAELEM represented Ganglau and Tabor and Augam represented Mindre, at which all the details I have recounted here (and above, pp. 54ff) was brought out. Evidence of this hearing has yet to come to light; I have not located it in patrol reports yet.48

Taped interviews and interview transcripts

In April-May 1999, I recorded the rival sets of statements about the history of Sibiyag on tape, by agreement with the two groups of claimants. I then created transcripts of the taped interviews and distributed them back to the interviewees.

Both agreed on the condition that the transcripts neither be shown to the other party, nor be revealed publicly elsewhere. This basically expresses the fear, held equally strongly by both groups, that the other party might plagiarise their oral history and misuse it to gain an advantage.

Actually I feel this fear is groundless, because the histories of both sides are distinctively different and leave little scope for one side to steal elements from the other. Besides, the genealogical depths of the two sets of accounts are so different, the Ganglau group are probably talking about events in the 1890s, while the ancestor of the Ganglau group, Mad, must have moved to their village sixty years earlier—and in a variant version even longer ago.

Nevertheless, I have respected their wishes and simply list the contents of the two sets of transcripts at the end of the bibliography.

48 Robert MacIlwain is the kiap referred to, but the microfiche copies of PNG patrol reports for Madang are missing the critical period in 1964-65; the originals are also missing at the National Archives.
APPENDIX A

TIMELINE FOR ASTROLABE BAY AND RAI COAST

1545  Yñigo de Retes sails east along coast as far as Astrolabe Bay; ‘vulcanes’ (probably Manam) noted in location of the Bismarck Sea in 1601 Herrera Map.

1643  Abel Tasman sails close to Crown Island, mistakes Long Island for mainland; Karkar in eruption.

1700  Dampier sails past Rai Coast, names Long Island (Arop), Crown Island (Kiau), Rich Island (Bagabag).

1827  Dumont D’Urville sails into Astrolabe Bay, names it after his ship, the Astrolabe.49

1830  A. Morell sails past Rai Coast, saw ‘wigwams’ on Long Island.

1842  F.J. King sails past Rai Coast.

1847-55 Marist Catholics open, then abandon, a mission station on Umboi Island.

1871-72 Nikolai Miklouho-Maclay, Russian explorer, makes 1st stay at Garagassi Point, between Bongu and Gorenudu villages, at ‘Port Constantine’, Astrolabe Bay.

1876-77 Maclay returns to Bongu for 2nd stay.

June 1977 Maclay sails from Madang to Saidor with the Bilbil men Kain and Hassan. Lands at mouth of Gawar River and walks inland to ‘Bai’ hamlet. Stops at Bibi on return leg and climbs Mt. Siroi.

1878-79 Australian gold prospectors in Dove go ashore at Bongu, leave.

1879  Traders in Courier visit Astrolabe Bay, see name ‘Dove’ on tree at Bongu.

1881  Visit by H.H. Romilly to Rai Coast for Royal Commission into labour recruiting; Otto Finsch visits Rai Coast to assess economic potential for Germans.

1883  Ten day stay by Maclay to Bongu, introduces cattle and new crops, including sweetcorn. Labour recruiters operate in Bismarck Archipelago for first time.

1884  Maclay petitions Kaiser Wilhelm not to annex the ‘Maclay Coast’. Otto Finsch uses Maclay’s name to befriend Bongu people, raises flag at ‘Port Constantine’, proclaims ‘Kaiser Wilhelmsland’.

1885  Charter granted to Deutsche Neuguinea Kompagnie to administer Kaiser Wilhelmsland.

---

49 Many Madang people now say ‘Astrolabe Bay’, as if this was a German name. However, D’Urville being a Frenchman, the pronunciation of his ship would have been close to the normal English pronunciation of this surveying instrument.
1887  Kompagnie official Jan Kubary at Stephansort, Astrolabe Bay. Rhenish Mission Society’s first station at Stephansort. Further Lutheran stations established at Siar (1889), Karkar (1890), Ragetta, now called Kranket Island (1894), Bongu (1895).

1887-88  Kubary pays 202.50 marks to Bilbil islanders and 54.40 marks to Yabob islanders for 5,500 hectares of land around Madang town. Land not surveyed but planted from 1892. Kubary also ‘buys’ large areas around Bogati.

1892  Centre of German administration moved from Finschhafen to Stephansort.

1893-96  Smallpox carried by ‘Malay’ plantation workers recruited in Java and Singapore spreads along north coast from Aitape to New Britain with a high death rate.

1897  German administration moved from Stephansort to Friedrich Wilhelmshafen (Madang). Kurt von Hagen shot dead (by a Buka policeman) in Astrolabe Bay.

1899  Deutsche Neuguinea Kompagnie charter revoked; Kaiser Wilhelmsland administered from Berlin.

1904  First Madang Rebellion: nine Yam islanders executed.

1907  Missionary Helmich enters a ceremonial house at Mindre.

1912  Yam islanders banished to Rai Coast, some Siars stay at Mindre.

1914  Last pre-WWI plantation acquisition by Germans: Cape Rigney, first planted 1916. Friedrich Wilhelmshafen occupied by Australians on 24 September 1914; Siars return to Madang.

May 1916  Pethebridge stops further freehold land acquisition in New Guinea.

1916  Tax and census patrol by Australian Military Administration along ‘Rye Coast’, from Sialum to Madang. Villagers run away.

1923  Pastor Jerome Iloa sets up Lutheran station at Sangpat, Galek village.

1926  All Rhenish Mission properties (including plantations) handed over to the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Australia.

1929  Rhenish Mission cedes Rai Coast to Iowa Synod.

1930-33  Rev. Fred Henkelmann at Sangpat.


1933-34  P. Fiehler at Biliau.


1936  Crisis of faith among Lutherans: Prophet Movement on Rai Coast; ‘Elias’ appears with two angels to cult believers; Lutheran Elder Conference bans all dancing in Madang District; Church Executive temporarily prohibits Communion for missionaries until their congregations prove their faith (ban lifted 1939).

ca. 1938-42  Jack Lindner working at Mindiri Plantation.

1940-42  Paul Freyberg at Biliau.

1942  Lindner and Freyberg escape over mountains.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May-Jun 42</td>
<td>Yali with Capt. G.C. ‘Blue’ Harris on patrol in Rai Coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Dec 42</td>
<td>Japanese occupy Madang.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Coastwatchers Lieutenants Bell and Laws betrayed and killed by Rai Coast villagers inland of Biliau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Jan 44</td>
<td>US ‘perimeter defence’ established at Saidor in leapfrog move from Finschhafen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Jan 44</td>
<td>Capture of Sio by Australian 9th Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Feb 44</td>
<td>Capture of Shaggy Ridge by Australian 7th Division, end of Ramu campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Feb 44</td>
<td>Australians and Americans link up at Yaut River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1944</td>
<td>Yali and Harris in raid on Hollandia; Harris killed, Yali escapes to Aitape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Apr 44</td>
<td>Re-capture of Madang.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-50</td>
<td>Height of Yali cult; Yali’s influence strong in Yaganon area through his connections at Segi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Suicide of Rev. Georg Hofmann at Orinma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-55</td>
<td>Yali in gaol for deprivation of liberty and incitement to rape; end of first phase of Yali influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-69</td>
<td>Lutheran primary school, then Bible school, on land portion ‘Naglau’ at Mindre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Site of Ganglau village shifted from Frensi to its present position east of Ganglau Creek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Kubup village accidentally set on fire and destroyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Elections for the Rai Coast Council. First councillor for Mindre, Kubup, Ganglau etc was Isak ZISMAM of Kubup. Warren Read resurveys Mindiri Plantation. Sareng hamlet founded by Isak ZISMAM, other former Kubup residents follow to Jangag etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Foundation of Raikos High School.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

FURTHER POSSIBLE DOCUMENTARY SOURCES OF RHENISH MISSION LAND HOLDINGS

In addition to his examination of the German Annual Reports, Lawrence (1964:40, note 1) lists the following sources:


Custodian of Expropriated Properties (1928) List of New Guinea properties sold by the Custodian of Expropriated Properties as at 1st January 1928.

These and any related documents would throw more light on the properties in the Rai Coast area in general.

As discussed in the text (p. 52), the earliest reference to the portion known as ‘Medize’ is 1926. The background is as follows. In 1921, the Australian government transferred the mission fields of both the Neuendettelsau (Finschhafen-based) and Rhenish Missions to the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Australia, and transferring, in 1926, all the properties of the two missions. The reference to 1926 in the Medize document is therefore likely to relate to this rationalisation of the property titles.

At a conference in Brisbane in 1929, the Rhenish Mission agreed to hand over ‘the Rai Coast with its hinterland and the Mission properties there’ (Reiner 1986:136) to the American Iowa Synod. In 1932, financial difficulties led to the Rhenish Mission quitting New Guinea altogether. Kennedy gives details of archival holdings housed in Germany:

… the archives of the Vereinigte Rheinische Mission (formerly the Rheinische Missions-Gesellschaft) [are] at 56 Wuppertal-Barmen, Rudolfstraße 137-39 … The mission … operated in Astrolabe Bay on the northeastern coast of New Guinea from 1887 until World War I. The detailed records of the latter region include not only the annual reports from the eight main stations established up to 1912, but also frequent correspondence from missionaries in the field, special reports from visiting missionary inspectors and the proceedings of local mission conferences. There are in addition some plantation and station records, together with fragmentary correspondence with colonial authorities during the colonial era. Finally, there are certain private papers, not normally available to external researchers (Kennedy 1977:361).
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