BEFORE THEY WERE EVEN ‘SAMOANS’, Samoans had come from over the sea, and they never stopped traversing it. Fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Samoans were in regular contact with neighbouring islanders. Like other Pacific Islanders they were voyagers: witness 4000 years of Pacific maritime history and the thousands of square kilometres of far-flung Pacific settlement. In a sense the Samoan present echoes this past. As Epeli Hau’ofa has observed: ‘The resources of Samoans . . . are no longer confined to their national boundaries; they are located wherever [they] are living permanently or otherwise. This is as it was before the age of Western imperialism.’

Hau’ofa’s insight is an important reminder of continuity and an invitation to new ways of looking at Pacific Island histories. but to begin it is necessary to be attuned to the relationships that Samoans and islanders had with themselves and each other, relationships that were never constant but specific, historical and changing.

Given these millennia-long histories, it might seem a little surprising that most studies of Samoan mobility either deal with the period predating the arrival of Europeans (circa 1700s) or begin after 1950. It is archaeologists, anthropologists and sociologists that have been most concerned with the movement of Samoans and an errant 200-odd years seems the exception, an instance of historians’ relative neglect. This essay is but a small attempt to engage with Samoan mobility in this less-studied period and is particularly concerned with the second half of the nineteenth century through to the beginning of World War I. This is not a time normally considered to be important with regard to Samoan ‘migration’, since compared to the Samoan migrations of the last five decades the numbers involved are far less spectacular. However, it is my argument that these years are critical in ways that have not been much considered. To grasp fully their significance, though, it is necessary to complicate the ways in which Samoan mobility has generally been investigated and to consider the avenues Samoans took both within Samoa and beyond. by studying mobility in this fashion, it becomes apparent that Samoa was fundamentally transformed in the last half of the nineteenth century. Samoa and its ala (paths) were ‘re-wired’.

People do not move about randomly, and Samoans are no different. Movements are not only guided by people’s intentions and needs but also by such things as the constraints of geography and waterways, habit, politics, means of transportation and history. These factors meant that the Samoan encounter with Samoa was constituted as a circuitry, a network through which the movement of people, material and communications was directed. Samoa was rewired because the network along which Samoans moved changed dramatically in the nineteenth century. Such change was not unknown in Samoa, nor entirely unprecedented. Clearly it was not only the arrival of Papalagi (foreigners) that
could generate transformation: at times prior, as archaeologists have found, Samoa had undergone other dramatic developments. The circuitry of Samoa is clearly not a natural object, then, but a human one; a cultural artefact that has history and is imbued with meaning. For all these reasons, the rewiring of Samoa was ubiquitous and powerful.

Samoans ordinarily experienced Samoa by moving through it. In doing so, they also continually re-enacted and recreated it, giving meaning to the entity understood as ‘Samoa ’uma’ (all Samoa), an entity that predated Papalagi and was centuries old. The circuitry of Samoa was an artefact that not only shaped what Samoa meant to Samoans, but had by century’s end partially shaped the Pacific Island region and influenced what the region meant to other Pacific Islanders. Samoa became part of an emergent nineteenth-century circuitry that extended far beyond Samoa to the opposite ends of the Pacific, and islanders experienced this in diverse ways. In one instance, a Rarotongan missionary working in Samoa prayed for God’s grace: ‘here in Samoa, and Aneityum, Tana, Eromanga, Efate and all the islands thereabouts as well as Mare and Lifu’. In another instance, but looking further in the opposite direction, the most widely used local currency in Apia was Chilean. People, in richer ways even than objects, became entangled in the nineteenth-century Pacific. As with Samoa, the Pacific, too, had been rewired.

Like the rewiring of Samoa, the rewiring of the Pacific was over-determined: a work crafted by both islanders and Papalagi. Although coincident with the arrival and actions of Papalagi, it was a process that complicated agency, a process necessarily both shared and contested. The making and remaking of nodes or paths within the circuit created fractures and generated new associations, not only between islanders and Papalagi, but also among different groupings on all sides. Not simply a means of connecting people and places, the circuitry had high stakes: not merely shaping the destinations of people, but influencing also their collective and individual destinies. It was hardly surprising, then, that control over the mobility of islanders, as with island sovereignty and the control of island resources, animated relations of power. Localities were brought into new relations with places and peoples, new mechanisms and formations of power, often on a different scale or different register than before. A rewired Pacific led to other reconfigurations, especially in the practices of islanders as they developed new approaches to engaging with the Pacific. Islanders formed the great majority of those who travelled the circuitry of the Pacific in the nineteenth century and afterwards. They were the people who articulated and gave meaning to the island circuitry. Even with new, ‘foreign’ complexities, it remained a ‘Brown Pacific’.

A conventional history of Samoan migration in the nineteenth century would likely be sparse and focus on changes in Samoa’s connection with the world beyond. Such an approach would occlude consideration of Samoa’s ‘circuitry’, though it would still be revealing and useful. A tentative periodization can be suggested with three overlapping periods when Samoa’s relations with the world beyond changed significantly. The first of these would begin as early as the 1820s when Samoans started boarding whale-ships and journeying to the ends of the earth, to the Old England of Europe and the New England of America.
En route, Samoans also visited Pacific Islands that had beforehand been beyond the Samoan orbit and called at relatively adjacent lands including the Australian colonies, California and South America. Before the arrival of Papalagi shipping, voyages to neighbouring island groups had been regular but infrequent, tied as they were to smaller-scale economies, societies and polities. Yet within decades of the first landing of Papalagi in Samoa in 1789, the number of annual visits was in double figures. In 1830 the first missionary vessels arrived and by the later 1830s the number of vessels annually dropping anchor in Samoa was often in the dozens. At the time, however, with the invention of written Samoan, the Samoan discovery of European and American goods and technology, and the mass conversion of Samoans to Christianity, the few Samoans going overseas appeared to be of only minor importance to Samoans. But discovery was mutual: Samoans discovered Europe just as Europeans discovered Samoa.

The domination of Samoa’s shipping by missionaries and whalers remained until the 1850s. By then the whaling industry had shrunk and the missionary presence had altered with the Wesleyan Missionary Society and the Marist Fathers joining the dominant London Missionary Society. The 1850s became a key decade of transformation in Samoa’s relationship with the world as whaling faltered and the Hamburg firm Godeffroy und Sohn chose Samoa to be the centre of its Pacific operations. This commercialization constituted a second period and was especially significant as, unlike other archipelagoes in the Pacific, there had been no rushes on sandalwood, flax, sealing, and export pork in Samoa. The arrival of Godeffroy’s and other large, foreign-owned companies increased shipping and spurred a concomitant transformation of Papalagi interest in Samoa. Their focus shifted from the more immediate concerns of missionaries in search of souls and vessels in need of victuals, towards the longer-term concerns of foreign capital in land-ownership, profit, management and labour. The commercial presence increased the number of sailings between Samoa and other islands and between these islands and Europe and America, again altering the meaning of distance, allowing Samoans greater access not only to the goods and technologies of these places, but continuing to provide access to these places themselves.

These changes were augmented by the arrival of steamships in Samoa from the 1870s. This can be taken to herald the third period, in part because the speed that steam allowed brought Australia, New Zealand and Hawaii (as well as, at times, different parts of Samoa and the Pacific) closer. This was the ‘obliteration of time and space’ that Victorians were fond of observing. But the most important change that steam brought was not speed but regularity. This was important even in the context of a nineteenth-century Samoa which had seen enormous changes. Steamers meant fast and predictable travel, and new kinds of travellers both to and from Samoa. Some Samoans left, but tourists and white women came to Samoa in new numbers, if only to visit. There were important spin-offs too, not least more reliable mail and a postmaster in Apia. Thus, the advent of steam, along with whalers and missionaries and commercial shipping, were perhaps the three key developments in the changing mobility of nineteenth-century Samoa. Yet to describe these developments in isolation, as important as they seem, is only to scratch the surface.
Even though a focus on steamers and commercial shipping suggests otherwise, in another sense there was no new ‘way’ to travel in Samoa. The way that Samoans went from place to place in the nineteenth century, even if for new reasons, followed the contours, the *ala*, of established practices. The same footpaths, seaways, moorings and village paths continued to constitute Samoan transport. There was a little significant road building and most of these roads were actually ‘improvements’, the widening and paving of already existing roads. New road building was expensive, difficult and risky. The few entirely new roads that were built were constructed to enable foreign-owned plantations. The most important ran west from Apia on the north coast of Upolu and was largely an improvement of a number of existing *ala*. New roads did not begin their major transformations until after formal colonial rule, cutting across Samoan plantations and through villages, forging new connections. State rule was too weak and too poor to facilitate such large-scale interventions, especially in the nineteenth century when local polities were more powerful. Particularly in Savai’i, this did not change much until the Second World War.

There was, therefore, no ‘Grand Trunk Road’, nor even railroads as in Hawaii or New Zealand. Horses did not become ubiquitous as in New Zealand as conditions were much harsher and quite often the tricky Samoan trails were difficult or impassable on hoof. Apart from the few important roads, the main nineteenth-century changes to the complex of Samoan movements within Samoa were limited to the coastal trading of copra vessels and the steamer run that was intermittently plied between Pago Pago and Apia. Within nineteenth-century Samoa there was no massive population upheaval as stationary populations went on the move, no transportation revolution as new roads or railroads brought places closer together.

The main reason for this stemmed from a fundamental attribute of Samoan economic, social and political life. Samoans were already mobile. A vital feature of nineteenth-century Samoan life were *tafatafao* or *malaga*, customary visits to relatives and villages throughout Samoa and perhaps even as far away as Fiji and Tonga. Samoans, as one well-known commentator put it, were ‘travel-happy’. These visits often involved inordinate amounts of preparation and huge displays of generosity, particularly by hosts, and the hospitality was punctuated by political conversation and critical exchanges in goods. Throughout Samoa’s long nineteenth century, many of the events central in traditional Samoan politics were associated with *malaga*, from the killing of the famed leader Tamatafaiga to the birth of the first anti-colonial movement, the Mau of Lauaki Namulau’ulu Mamoe.

The popularity of *malaga* not only survived the changes of the nineteenth century but actually increased. New things, people and practices were all appropriated as elements of *malaga* as Samoans continued to be a people in motion. Missionaries would often come upon villages that were almost entirely abroad, having left only a handful of people behind to mind village productions and property. Most strikingly, the arrival of cricket in Samoa was quickly conjoined with *malaga*. It quickly supplanted older sports such as boxing and stick fighting. Cricket, like the feasts that accompanied it and the *malaga* which made it possible, was strongly politicized. Traditional Samoan politics
at the national/island-wide level were impossible without *malaga*. During visits alliances would be forged, reaffirmed or modified; key political marriages would be made and other kinds of relationships built. For these reasons the post-1899 colonial governments were all concerned with restricting or regulating *malaga* for, as much as any Samoan practice, *malaga* troubled colonial intentions of controlling and disciplining Samoans and Samoan politics. Nor was this only because of its political dimensions, but also because the behaviour was seen as unruly and driven by Samoan desires rather than values the colonial governments promoted, such as disciplined labour, the paying of taxes and the general domestication of ‘natives’.

But *malaga* were built into the very architecture of villages. Most villages maintained a *fale tele*, a ‘big house’, the primary purpose of which was to house visiting parties. The villages modelled many of Samoa’s tenets in numerous ways. The dynamics of Samoan relations were one such thing. Marked and often paved paths (*ala*) joined up the various parts of a village, connecting families together. Even the way the village was subdivided flowed from these connections with the basic unit or plot, *fua i ala*, stemming from the way a village was ‘wired’. In related ways, but on a larger scale, the *fale tele* made visible the interrelations of Samoans and their shared mobility (even when there were no guests). Indeed, there were only two successful incursions into the layout of most Samoan villages in the nineteenth century — the church and, sometimes, a trader’s store — and it was telling that the *malaga* was capable of appropriating or aligning with both of them. Religion and trade were, by century’s end, yet more reasons to travel.

This Samoan mobility ensured that the notion of ‘Samoa’ was as vibrant after the arrival of *Papalagi* as it had been before. This was an identity articulated against other identities, notably those of Tonga and Fiji, but made real through travel within Samoa and shared language, traditions, histories, *gafa* (genealogies), and in music, dance, technology and material culture. As Malama Meleisea has aptly described it, Samoa at the time of the arrival of *Papalagi* was a ‘unitary system of dispersed power’. Travel, visiting, journeying — call it what you will — traversing the circuitry of Samoa, was fundamental to the Samoan way of life and Samoan politics. Travel enabled politics to occur at district and national levels. Genealogies, *fa’alupega* (constitutions or corporate honorifics) and formal oratory kept the unitary and dispersed nature of Samoan politics in their productive tension. The concept of Samoa as understood by Samoans altered significantly during the arrival of *Papalagi* and colonialism, but unlike other parts of the Pacific it was a binding force long before their coming. Missionaries grasped what was meant by ‘Samoa ’uma’ soon after their arrival, and it was a term in use throughout the nineteenth century, just as it had been centuries beforehand.

Yet although Samoans travelled through Samoa during the nineteenth century in ways similar to their predecessors, the dynamics of their travel had begun to change. By the end of the nineteenth century Samoa was ‘rewired’. This is most apparent in one dramatic development. Before the mid-nineteenth century, the most important centres in Samoa politically (and in other ways) were locales such as Safotu, Leulumoega, Lufilufi and Manono. By the end of
the century these places, as well as their rivals, had been eclipsed in numerous and vital ways by a single place: the bay at Apia. Not a little of the power of the nineteenth century and its legacy for twentieth-century Samoans rested on this transformation. This was not, however, simply the re-centring of Samoa around Apia. It is better understood as a re-wiring because although the rise of Apia was the most prominent development, it entailed a complex set of changes. Samoa grew some smaller but vital centres, especially around the missions at Piula, Malua and the Marist mission in Apia, and also around the harbour at Pago Pago. The development of plantation agriculture that refocused local movement on these smaller economic centres, and the later growth of Church buildings and schools within the villages, were also parts of this rewiring. So too was the creation of Apia township which drew upon pre-existing villages. Each of these developments had particular histories and most were innovations from conjunctures of Samoan and *Papalagi* elements. In this way the older Samoan circuitry was not discarded, but refigured. Leulumoega, Lufilufi and Sapapali‘i remained political centres and powerbrokers but they now looked to the *malae* (village green) at Mulinu‘u at the western end of Apia bay as they had never done before. Samoans trafficked both new and old through a rewired circuitry that continued to connect Samoa and also brought Samoa into new relations with elsewhere in the Pacific.

It was not only Samoans who traversed the circuitry of Samoa. The rewiring of Samoa that privileged Apia and other ‘new’ sites coincided with the arrival of unprecedented numbers of *Papalagi*. The lion’s share of historiographical attention has gone to white Americans and Europeans. In certain respects this is justifiable, for it is they who generally brought the technologies and customs that had the most obvious effects in Samoa. It was European and American Christianity that was fundamental in transforming Samoan spiritual life; it was European and American shipping, as we have seen, that conjoined with such developments to make Apia the place of significance that it became. But the circuitry of Samoa intersected with other networks, particularly through the bay at Apia.

A rewired Samoa was a part of a wider Pacific island circuitry and it was a circuitry that was filled with people who were not white, nor European, nor American: a ‘Brown Pacific’, so to speak. By far the greater proportion of those who passed through, worked or resided in nineteenth-century Samoa were from other Pacific islands. There were small numbers of islanders from just about everywhere and larger concentrations from a handful of places. There was enormous variation. Some arrivals were more important than they seemed on the basis of numbers alone: the Tokelau castaways that landed in Samoa in 1846 and those that followed in 1848 instituted new and intimate relations between Tokelau and Samoa. Others were clearly important because of the numbers involved, such as the more than 2500 Gilbertese who came to Samoa between 1867 and 1895 to work on plantations (mostly around Magia and Lata). The *Papalagi* role in establishing these avenues was necessary, but it was islanders themselves who gave meaning to the new circuitry. By the end of the nineteenth century, a rewired Samoa had not only refashioned points on which Samoan life could focus but had new nodes fashioned by other islanders. Fijians had
formed A’ai o Fiti, behind Vaimoso, Niueans the A’ai o Niue, Tuvaluans had settled at Elise Fou, Tokelauans had assembled A’ai o To’elau, and there was the ‘Rarotongan village’ near Apia. These were not only labouring populations concentrated on plantations, or individuals incorporated as partners of Samoans, but communities that were interacting in a Samoan political and social universe. The rewired Samoa, with new people and populations engaging with it, was complicated in new ways.

Matters are even more complex when one considers relations with, and the presence of, people from Tonga and Fiji. Unlike the Gilbertese or Tokelauans, whose presence in Samoa dated mainly from the nineteenth century, Tonga and Fiji had long been extensively involved with Samoa. As is evident in pre-Christian Samoan cosmology, traditional Samoan histories and Samoan politics, both Fiji and Tonga were integral parts of Samoan understandings of the universe. Indeed, one can hardly understand nineteenth-century Samoan and Tongan histories separate from each other. The *Lotu Toga*, as the Wesleyan Church is known in Samoa, remembers that it was Tongan teachers that brought the religion to Samoa and kept the church alive in Samoa between 1839 and 1853 (*Papalagi* missionaries left in 1839 and did not return until 1857).  Until 1860s the *Lotu Toga* continued to rely mostly on Tongan vessels which also brought the family of the Tongan king, and in 1847, the King himself. Historic ties between Tonga and Manono remained and the nineteenth century saw important Tongan settlement in places like Toamua and Saina. Samoan and Tongan cricket teams played each other. Although Samoans and Tongans often focus on moments of conflict in their shared histories, the nineteenth century had no such differences. Indeed, religiously the Tongan–Samoa connection continued to be critical. The first missionaries were guided around Samoa by a Samoan returning from Tonga, and such was the currency of knowledge about Samoan affairs in Tonga in the 1850s, that in Tonga Roman Catholic opponents of the Wesleyans compared John Wesley to the Samoan religious leader Sio Vili (Joe Gimlet) in the hope of discrediting Methodism.

Likewise, Fijian connections with Samoa found new elaboration in the nineteenth century. In his important work Morgan Tuimaleali‘ifano has detailed this relationship from its ancient roots, where oral traditions detail the origins of Samoa’s islands in Fiji, to more recent developments such as the Samoan role in the establishment of Christianity in Fiji. Other changes stemmed from the British annexation of Fiji in 1874 that signalled the emergence of Fiji as a regional centre. By this time it was already common to see larger numbers of Samoans going to Fiji, whether for education, for the church or for less salubrious reasons. This was by no means a one-way traffic: indeed, the numbers of Samoans moving to Fiji were proof of Fiji’s growing importance to Samoa in ways unprecedented. Even these older circuits were behaving in new ways.

Yet, for all the ways in which older networks in and around Samoa were transformed, the nineteenth century also saw the emergence of new circuits carrying new traffic. The ‘labour trade’, the most important nineteenth-century mass movement in the Pacific, has been widely studied. Unfortunately, apart from a few key works, the Samoan end of this network has not been as fully explored. The organized labour trade in Samoa began as early as 1864, when...
German companies began bringing workers from New Guinea and the Solomon Islands to work on plantations. Fifty years later, when the German period came to an end, there were still nearly 1000 Melanesians living in Samoa.\textsuperscript{29} Though the great majority of them soon left Samoa, in the course of this half century many thousands of Melanesians travelled to and resided in Samoa.\textsuperscript{30} And while they constituted only a fraction of the tens of thousands of workers who left Melanesia during these years, their number was large enough that scholars suspect that \textit{Tok Pisin}, pidgin English, had some Samoan origins.\textsuperscript{31} As the work of Malama Meleisea has shown, the \textit{tama uli} had equally significant effects in Samoa. Many of the \textit{tama uli} who stayed on to live in Samoa clustered around Sogi, Mulini’u and A’ele Fou, Faleula.

The circuitry between Samoa and Melanesia was busy with labourers in the last quarter of the nineteenth century but this traffic flowed along similar lines to already established movements. By the time that the Melanesia–Samoa labour traffic began, Melanesia had become the focus of several mission organizations and Samoan teachers had long been serving there as missionaries. These numbers were much smaller than those of the labour trade but perhaps not less important. Indeed, apart from the labour trade, it was Christianity that most strongly helped colour the Pacific brown in the nineteenth century. Islanders not only transported Christianity throughout the Pacific but they translated it for each other. The London Missionary Society was the \textit{Lotu Taiti} in Samoan, the ‘Tahitian religion; yet at Lifu, in the Loyalty Islands, the Drehu language called it \textit{hmi Samoa}, ‘praying Samoan’.\textsuperscript{32} Other denominations had a Samoan face as well.\textsuperscript{33} This was reminiscent of the mechanics of Christianity in Samoa: just as Samoans had been the main proselytizers in Samoa, converting families, individuals, villages and chiefs and mediating the politics of conversion, so they were in other places throughout the Pacific. The circuitry beyond Samoa was consequently an extension of the circuitry within; alongside the Samoans who had come from throughout Samoa to train in the seminary at Malua were Niueans and Tokelauans. They were destined to serve in varied places, not only Samoa, but neighbouring archipelagos or more distant Melanesia, especially Papua.\textsuperscript{34} In Melanesia the circuitry placed Samoans in startlingly new contexts, not only with regard to new languages and new people, but also with that great killer, the \textit{fiva Niukini} (malaria).

By the end of the nineteenth century religion was a customary reason for Samoans to travel overseas or to resettle within Samoa: as one of their number put it, ‘do the work of the Lord’.\textsuperscript{35} Many hundreds of Samoans, pastors with their wives and families, left Samoa not knowing if, nor when, they would return. Most went elsewhere in the Pacific though a handful even visited England. In doing so they followed the lead of Mamoe and his wife, who had gone with John Williams to England in 1846–1847, where his ‘warm eloquence and stirring appeals on behalf of his countrymen’ were noted.\textsuperscript{36} Many more Samoans went to Sydney, and scores, if not hundreds, went to Fiji. Eastern Polynesia, especially the Tahitian group and Rarotonga, was also a destination for many, though increasingly the focus had shifted to other islands. In Niue Samoan pastors became dominant figures as they brought Samoan Christianity to their neighbours.\textsuperscript{37} In Tokelau Christ was brought by both Europeans and Samoans
but even the English missionaries spoke Samoan. For many generations all Protestant Tokelauans were bilingual, speaking both Tokelauan and Samoan, and as Tokelauans went to Samoa to train, Tokelauan took on many Samoan language expressions. This was just another measure of the significance of a circuity extending from Samoa to Tokelau, Niue and Melanesia.

But Tokelauan or Melanesian connections seemed almost local compared to the Asian connections in the labour trade. Though not to the same extent as in Fiji and Hawaii, the arrival of Asian indentured labour was crucial in Samoa. Indentured Chinese labourers began to arrive in 1903 and by 1914 there were over 2000 residing in Samoa. This was a significant number: in 1917 the total population of Western Samoa (where the Chinese were located) was 37,331, meaning that in 1914 more than 5% of the population was Chinese. Most of these labourers eventually left Samoa, but their influence proved to be lasting and significant. Their mobility was equally telling. Between 1903 and 1948 at least 5000 Chinese workers were returned to China, making the link between Samoa and Asia a more noteworthy avenue of settlement and migration than contemporary links with Australia, New Zealand or the United States.

The numbers of Samoans voyaging or settling overseas in the 1890s seem small alongside these figures but they are nonetheless important. Their reasons for travel, their destinations and the time they spent away from Samoa were diverse, but it is increasingly apparent that the paths they were following, towards Apia or Malua or Pago Pago and onward, were the same circuits that Papalagi were following. In 1896 Tonu'u of Matafele was going to Fiji to take his son to school; Letaga and Fuli of Salelavalu were accompanying a Tongan man home to Vava'u. Aiga of Siumu was going to live with her ‘tane papalagi’ (white husband) in Fiji, just as Epinesa of Faleata was joining hers. Vele of Fasito'outa was going there to visit his sister in Suva, as was Tofa of Fasito'otai. For a similar reason, Simi of Fasito'ota'i was going to Tonga. Aisake and Katopau of Apia were going to Fiji to assist in preparing Samoa’s laws. Some Samoan lepers had been sent to the leper colony in Hawaii. A large group of Samoans was recruited to create a Samoan village at the Columbian exposition in Chicago. Another group went to Europe, as a ‘Samoarer Truppe’ where they made a living as the ‘First genuine troupe of Samoans exhibited in Europe’. Dozens of Samoans voyaged to Hawaii and to the west coast of the United States. Whole groups rode the steamer to ‘Toga’ or ‘Fiti’. The reasons for people’s movements parallel those given in the literature concerning more recent Samoan travellers: economic motives, to visit family, for education, to follow the heart. Others went for the adventure; Fineaso Sauni had ambitions to learn about the world and Tusa, not unlike Fineaso, went to Toga simply to ‘Tafao’ (wander about). Samoa and Samoans continued to be travel-happy, but the circuits of travel extended beyond Samoa to reach across what seemed much less like a blue than a Brown Pacific.

Because Samoa was now entangled — ‘bound together’ — with other networks throughout the Pacific, there were any number of intersections in which imperial, colonial or state intervention could be crucial. But in 1899 the ‘malo tetele’, the ‘great powers’ of the United States, Britain and Germany, cast a much wider blanket, annexing all of Samoa and apportioning the west to
Germany and the east to the United States. This is traditionally the privileged moment in histories of Samoa, the supposed end of independence and the onset of colonialism. But it was not such a stark change as is sometimes presented. German and American control was tenuous for many years after 1900, and for many years before Samoans had dealt with what had often amounted to colonialism. In particular, the busiest intersection in all of Samoa, the bay at Apia, had for decades attracted foreign interventions. Though this had been ongoing, it was made official in 1879 when Apia became a municipality. Thus, although Apia remained formally part of Samoa (meaning it was not ceded), a convention signed between the three powers circumscribed Samoan sovereignty within the municipality and gave the municipal government, dominated by whites, an enormous amount of independence. Control of the most critical juncture in Samoa was dominated by a small group of troublesome and often adversarial whites, backed by large commercial interests, three governments, their local representatives, and their navies. Samoans were still the majority of Apia’s citizens and wielded not a little power; but within the few square miles of the municipality lay control of the harbour and much of the commerce of Samoa. The key node in Samoa’s circuitry, a key node in the Brown Pacific, had been regulated.

Attempts to regulate, monitor or discipline traffic were similarly taking place Pacific-wide. The most ambitious were imperial or colonial, most famously as the British began to enforce a code to regulate the Melanesian labour traffic. The French, British, Germans and Americans made other attempts to monitor and discipline the movement and activities of people through the dispatch of consuls and similar officials. On the one hand, the three powers commonly interfered in Samoan national politics and fighting; on the other, these same countries began to exercise control over their subjects residing in Samoa, exempting them from Samoan customary law. Britain went further and deputized a regional body, the Western Pacific High Commission (WPHC), due in no small part to the problems raised by a transient or mobile population. Centred on a newly annexed Fiji, the WPHC with its trans-Pacific extra-territorial jurisdiction was well designed for dealing with the issues of places like Samoa which were clearly both complex and in motion. For similar reasons, navies continued to be crucial instruments of policy, being mobile and bringing to bear the deadly arbitration of force.

The behaviour of these states, whether the United States, Britain, Germany or the nascent municipality at Apia, differed enormously from the way power had previously operated in Samoa. Modern states were radically different to governments Fa’a Samoa, prior to the late nineteenth century. This was so not only in their apparatuses — bureaucracy and the police, for instance — but in the ways that modern states actually constituted people, places and objects. But by this time Samoan governments had also begun to adapt, both by choice and by necessity. Confronted by a rewired Samoa, the growth of a centralized national religion, land alienation, increased commercial activity and continued foreign interventions, certain characteristics of a centralized modern state seemed to be emerging. Moreover, foreign recognition had become a necessary attribute for a functional Samoan government and this seemed likely to be extended only to a Samoan government with a state-like formation. The rewiring of Samoa was
both a generator and a result of movements toward state formation.

Samoans responded to the rewiring of Samoa and the apparent need for state-like formations in differing, even conflicting, ways. Most Samoan governments gave especial attention to Apia, which they considered critical. The peninsula at the eastern end of Apia, Mulinu‘u, became ineluctably central to Samoan national politics. The main late nineteenth-century Samoan governments, the ‘Steinberger’ government, (1873–1878), the government of Tamasese Titimaea (1887–1888) and those of Malietoa Laupepa (1881–1885, 1889–1898), treated Apia as the main seat of their government. Even the Pulettua, named for its emergence in the back of Samoa (Pule i tua), felt the need to come to Apia. On the other hand, some Samoans tried to reinvigorate traditionally more important places within the circuits of Samoa, such as when Mata‘afa Iosefo retreated to Malie in 1892, or later when Lauaki Namulaulu‘ulu Mamoe went on malaga in German times. Other Samoans took advantage of these refigurations, such as the efforts of Tutuila to be free of the politics of Upolu, to be a centre to itself. Indeed, the problem of Apia posed a new question: how were Samoans to deal with new kinds of mobility within Samoa that might not always be responsive to Samoan politics and customary law? Key intersections such as Apia were double-edged: sources of both power and danger.

Samoan politics — that ‘unitary system of dispersed power’ — was dependent on mobility to constitute it as a national entity. In this sense a ‘travel-happy’ Samoa was no burden, but a necessity. People were comprehended historically through their genealogy, their connections to various places, and had both multiple and communal identities. The late nineteenth-century state came to see things somewhat differently. As Michel Foucault and others have argued, individuals and populations were constituted and controlled discursively and much came to depend on the making of people into ‘docile bodies’ upon which discipline, with its ‘political anatomy of detail’, might be targeted. Seeing like a state, James Scott has observed, involved making individuals into ‘legible people’: it was intimately connected with the practices of both identifying and writing. These were critical projects in Samoa, if never fully realised. And in such a context a ‘travel-happy’ Samoa was troublesome. Techniques of surveillance or discipline were more difficult to apply to mobile populations and it was more difficult to make mobile people amenable to the application of rules and coercion, to relations of power. These difficulties were experienced by nascent Samoan state formations but were more telling for the colonial regimes that followed and whose aspirations were so different.

Colonial and state responses to mobility in a rewired Samoa point to the difficulties mobility raised, or appeared to raise. Malaga were a particular target. Missionaries and colonial administrators were not impressed with malaga that would often leave a village of hosts impoverished or a village of travellers deserted. In their eyes malaga encouraged laziness, communism, heathenism (through customary dances and songs) and, perhaps worst of all, a wantonness with property. An enemy of ‘progress’ and ‘civilization’, malaga meant that visitors descended upon their hosts like ‘a swarm of locusts’ for reasons as varied as ‘love of change’ to local food shortages. But the real dangers stemming from malaga related to a more general unruliness when malaga were seen as
sources of mischief or trouble, as political occurrences. That colonial officials were cognizant of the political nature of malaga is evident: from the outset of colonialism, officials consciously and universally called their journeys around the islands malaga. This, even as they enacted laws and regulations to try and prevent Samoans from traversing Samoa’s circuitry. But the disciplining of a ‘travel-happy’ Samoa was a state tactic, not just a colonial one. This was an aim of Samoa’s first anti-cricket law, passed not by a colonial administration but by the government of Tamasese Titimaea, targeted not only at stopping the playing of the game but also at malaga.

Pacific Islanders elsewhere were also forced to respond to the conjoined problems of mobility within the grammar of ‘the state’. An especially creative response came from Hawaii. There the Hawaiian Lahui (nation) under the leadership of King Kalakaua (who was guided, like Tamasese, by Papalagi advisers), made several efforts to confederate with other Polynesian peoples. Its most extensive diplomatic involvement was in Samoa, where the Hawaiian envoy John E. Bush arrived in 1886 and was later joined by the Hawaiian state vessel Kaimiloa. Bush extended to Malietoa the honour of ‘The Grand Cross of the Royal Order of the Star of Oceania’, and in February 1887 an agreement between the two Polynesian states was signed. A tragic involvement, it was no mere theatre as is sometimes implied. It had an unfortunate repercussion in convincing the Germans that they had been snubbed and was a partial cause of Malietoa’s consequent downfall. In such moments the energy of the Brown Pacific circuitry and its complicated design is apparent.

Another such moment is the Malietoa Laupepa government’s effort to track the overseas movements of Samoans. Though not recognizably ‘passports’ in the more modern sense, this effort presaged later attempts by colonial states to monitor Samoan travellers. By 1892 Malietoa had established a register of Samoans leaving the islands. He placed a Samoan clerk in the Malietoa government, Tia’i, in charge of keeping this register. The record is not comprehensive and most Samoans listed appear to be those who bought their tickets and formally boarded the steamer in Apia. Yet the very existence of the register over an extended period when Malietoa’s government was struggling to keep a bureaucracy functioning and to retain what sovereignty and independence it had left is telling. The documenting of identity was a mark of the modern state and paralleled other state practices then being asserted in Samoa, particularly regarding land surveying and ownership. If the numbers of Samoans who appeared on these sheets were few, what is important is that there was any urge to do it all; certainly migration registers and passports were hardly necessities in the nineteenth-century world.

The development of ‘the state’ in Samoa was both reflected in behaviours toward Samoan mobility and partly dependent on its ability to regulate or discipline that mobility. By century’s end, a rewired Samoa and a Brown Pacific had been brought into conjuncture with the state and this conjuncture represented a recognizably modern setting for Samoan migration. Samoan travellers began to negotiate the state and move through Samoa and beyond in ways that seemed to have more in common with the later twentieth century than with the Samoa of 70 years beforehand. Certainly, these contexts of border-crossing and the
nation remain the framework of virtually all studies of Samoan migration in the twentieth century. Few writers have taken up the challenge once suggested by Cluny Macpherson to complicate the privileged position given to the entity of the nation state in the study of migration; nor have many followed Prasenjit Duara’s attempt to ‘rescue history from the nation’. Fewer still have attempted to understand the migrations that followed within their deeper histories of colonialism. The Brown Pacific, the rewiring of Samoa, and the development of the state, as well as seeming to illuminate some occluded histories, perhaps point to ways in which these kinds of studies might begin.

In this context the arrival of colonialism is interesting not only for changes in practice and custom and domination it heralded, but for the changes that it fostered in the ways that Samoa circulated. The partitioning of Samoa in 1900 cast the preceding developments in Samoa’s circuitry into new relief. Not only was the circuitry within Samoa altered but Samoa’s engagement with the rest of the Pacific was subjected to new discipline. What had previously been a short journey between islands was now a border-crossing, if not a heavily patrolled one. These were critical changes to Samoa’s circuitry, though they were not instantaneous ruptures, nor a rewiring on the scale of that which had preceded them. Still the circuitry had been altered in a way that in the longer term meant different parts of Samoa engaged differentially with the Brown Pacific and the world. Eastern Samoa reinvigorated circuits to Hawaii, Guam and California; Western Samoa did so to Fiji, Tokelau, Tonga, and above all, New Zealand. It is revealing that only the formal partitioning of Samoa has been given much scholarly attention and not the processes that followed which disentangled the connections between east and west and gave the 1899 imperial division made by foreigners in Berlin a kind of actuality in Samoa. The nineteenth century weighed heavily on twentieth-century Samoans, as it weighs still on a divided Samoa.

There were tensions in nineteenth-century Samoan politics between local and centralized manifestations, and these were as important as differences between Samoan and foreign forms of authority. These tensions, best described by Meleisea, are just as evident in the rewiring of Samoa. The rewiring of Samoa was not the work of any single author but a project undertaken by different people and entities for what were often radically different purposes. The dominant interests before 1900 in the rewiring of Samoa were Samoans and chiefs at that. Yet chiefs’ interests often diverged or conflicted and by no means did they have the run of the field. Immigrants — Gilbertese, Melanesian or white — as well as missionaries, officials, navies and corporate interests were critical, though usually mediated by Samoans. Still, as can be seen in the growth of Apia and plantations, an economy of mobility increasingly independent of Samoan control was becoming evident as early as the 1870s. The importance of these changes would be consolidated and further articulated by colonialism. Yet in other ways such developments were not only forebodings but insights into the local mechanics of the Brown Pacific. Bringing as it did different political, cultural and geographic entities into relation, a rewired Pacific was on a different scale to a rewired Samoa. No island leadership laid claim to anything but its local forms; the means of connection were largely outside of island control.
Yet if their agencies were circumscribed and complicated, islanders were more than the blood coursing through the veins of a Brown Pacific, driven by an imperial/capitalist heart. Through their decisions, complicities, politics and cultures islanders enabled the Brown Pacific, and oftentimes disabled it. Above all, however, islanders gave the Pacific circuitry not only most of its material, but most of its meaning. 

Before they were ‘immigrants’, Samoans were people and they shaped and inherited many histories. The mass migration of Samoans after 1950, which now sees as many Samoans in the United States and New Zealand as in Samoa itself, reaches back long before the packing of bags or the saving of fares. For all the ways in which such departures transformed Samoa and the places to which they departed, there is an explicit continuity with previous Samoan and colonial mobilities. Experiences of the circuitry of Samoa and of the Pacific did change importantly in the 1930s and 1940s, through increased road building and the arrival of motorized vehicles. New, increasingly important centres grew, especially in the flying boat bays (such as Satapuala) or airfields (such as Faleolo). The Second World War was also critical. But these changes, though sometimes more numerous, were not as radical as those of the 50 or so years after 1850, when Samoa was rewired and rejoined with the wider Pacific and the world. The circuitry of Samoa and the Brown Pacific to which it was connected had coursed tens of thousands of foreigners and Samoans through Samoa in the years before the First World War; and it was a circuitry that recognizably remained to course Samoan migrants outward after 1945. Disciplined though it was, and both old and new simultaneously, at the turn of the twentieth century Samoa was still travel-happy.
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