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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report was commissioned by the Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (Australia), and is submitted to the Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts and the Department of Environment and Conservation (Papua New Guinea) as part of work under the Joint Understanding between the Australian and Papua New Guinea governments of 2008.

The report is a desk study, with inputs from preliminary consultations and fact-finding in Port Moresby.

Chapter 1 sets out the results of our preliminary fact-finding visit to Port Moresby and profiles the Area of Interest (AOI).

Chapters 2-5 set out what is known of the history, languages, anthropology and archaeology of the AOI. The aim of the chapters is to set out what is already known that is of relevance to the design of a field phase of social mapping.

We found good historical documentation of the 130 years of contact with missionaries, colonial administrators and the modern state, the 105 years of traffic on the Kokoda Track between Sogeri and the township of Kokoda (New Guinea’s first inland road), excellent scholarship on the Koiarian family of languages, and that archaeological work in the area has discovered the greatest density of known rock art sites in Papua New Guinea.

But we also found that basic information on land tenure and social organisation, such as is needed to assist with the development of the communities of the Area of Interest, manage biodiversity conservation, and implement REDD schemes, is thin.

Chapter 6 contains recommendations for a landowner engagement strategy and a field phase of social mapping in the Kokoda Track area.

We note the repeated public airing of grievances by landowners about Track matters and give an explanation of why this is occurring.

We suggest ways to improve matters through a programme of social mapping, other field investigations, improvements to the conduct of engagement with landowners, and capacity building in the communities themselves.

The Sources Consulted point to the compendium of existing information on the Area of Interest which is intended to be a platform for future work.

Appendices A-I add extra data; Appendix J provides fuller answers to questions raised in consultations with DEWHA and DEC; Appendix K contains draft Terms of Reference for a programme of social mapping field work (per TOR, for development in consultation with DEWHA and DEC).
Plate 1. N. Haley and V. Genorupa discussing points with J. Kivo, R. Maleva and P. Namono at the Department of Environment offices in Port Moresby, 13 May 2009 (see Table 1).
## ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANU</td>
<td>Australian National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGAU</td>
<td>Australian New Guinea Administrative Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOI</td>
<td>Area of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>Department of Environment and Conservation (Papua New Guinea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEWHA</td>
<td>Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIGO</td>
<td>Defence Imagery and Geospatial Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographical Information System – software to manipulate geographical information in digital form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILG</td>
<td>Incorporated Land Group (under <em>Land Groups Incorporation Act</em> 1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JU</td>
<td>Joint Understanding between the PNG and Australian governments signed on 23 April 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDA</td>
<td>Kokoda Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTA</td>
<td>Kokoda Track Authority (in full: Kokoda Track Local Level Government Special Purpose Authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDP</td>
<td>Kokoda Development Program (lead agency: AusAID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTDP</td>
<td>Kokoda Trail Development Project (lead agency: National Cultural Commission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLG</td>
<td>Local Level Government LMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Missionary Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>National Cultural Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSO</td>
<td>National Statistical Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDS</td>
<td>Provincial Data System (lead agencies 1977-82: National Planning Office and National Statistical Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD</td>
<td>Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDA</td>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Special Purpose Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPNG</td>
<td>University of Papua New Guinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDC</td>
<td>Ward Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHA</td>
<td>World Heritage Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMA</td>
<td>Wildlife Management Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## KOKODA TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Rev. William Lawes set up LMS mission at Port Moresby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Andrew Goldie opened store; arrival of Rev. James Chalmers; Chalmers and Lawes went with Goldie one day’s walk beyond the Laloki River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Rush by 100 white miners to Laloki and Goldie Rivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Chalmers explored mountainous country along the course of and between the Goldie and Laloki Rivers’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>George Morrison sponsored by <em>The Age</em> to cross New Guinea, speared not far up the Laloki; William Armit sponsored by the <em>Argus</em>, may have reached the headwaters of the Kemp Welch River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Nov 1884</td>
<td>Proclamation of British New Guinea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Naturalist H.O. Forbes set up camp at Sogeri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Photographs by J.W. Lindt of ‚Sadara Makara, Koiari Village near Bootless Inlet’ (see Plate 2, Plate 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>William MacGregor made Lieutenant-Governor of British New Guinea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>MacGregor climbed and named Mt Victoria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>First coffee planted at Sogeri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898-99</td>
<td>Approx. 150 white miners on the Yodda (Upper Mambare) and Gira gold fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Government Surveyor, H. H. Stuart-Russell, patrols through the Mountain Koiari to find a ‚road’ from Brown River to the Yodda gold field; probable first contact with Uberi, Naoro, Kagi etc; writes of ‚Koriri’ and ‚Biagi’ people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1899</td>
<td>Northern Division created from Northeast Coast area and the Mambare district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>First rubber planted at Sogeri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Kokoda Station established; Papuan police commence escorting the mail in pairs between Sogeri and Kokoda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Naturalist A.S. Meek attacked by ‚hillmen’ near Kokoda station; Royal Commissioners J.A.K. Mackay and C.E. Herbert take the Track from Kokoda to Port Moresby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Septimus Carr and Benny Tavodi establish Seventh Day Adventist base at Bisiatabu, Sogeri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908-10</td>
<td>Annual Reports say ‚severe dysentery’ in the ‚main range’ and at Kokoda: death rate unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1909</td>
<td>Northern Division divided into Mambare and Kumusi Divisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1909</td>
<td>Matt Crowe and the Pryke brothers report gold finds on the Lakekamu River; gold rush to Lakekamu starts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1910</td>
<td>120 miners and 800 labourers on Lakekamu field; dysentery epidemic kills 255 labourers Jan-Jun 1910.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1910 Decline of Yodda gold field to five miners.
1913 Missionaries Carr, Lawson and Tavodi visit inland villages establishing Seventh Day Adventism among the Mountain Koiari (Appendix H).
1919 Last white man speared to death at Sogeri (Dowsett 1925: 526).
May 1920 Mambare and Kumusi Divisions combined to form the Northern Division.
1923 Geological mapping of area between Kagi and Mt Obree by Evan R. Stanley, Government Geologist (Appendix I).
1924-27 SDA missionary William Lock and family reside at Efogi.
1926 Major gold claims at Edie Creek registered at Salamaua; 2 miners working the Yodda field.
c1931 Kokoda airstrip opened.
1942 Northern Division renamed the Northern District.
21 July 1942 Japanese landing on the north coast of Papua.
8 Aug 1942 Australian 39th Infantry Battalion move forward from Deniki and temporarily re-capture Kokoda: 2nd Battle of Kokoda.
9 Aug-14 Sep 1942 Period of Japanese advance from Isurava to Ioribaiwa, the furthest point reached by Japanese forces.
14 Sep-2 Nov 1942 Australian counteroffensive: Kokoda re-taken.
16 Nov 42-22 Jan 43 Fighting to re-capture Buna, Gona and Sanananda by joint Australian and US forces.
1954-1963 Laloki Hydroelectric Scheme and Sirinumu Dam construction.

1972 Kokoda Trail gazetted with 10km-wide reserve along its length.
1975 Papua New Guinea gains Independence; Central and Northern Districts become Central and Oro Provinces.
1993 MOU between Keating and Wingti governments.
1994 Kokoda Trail Development Project launched at National Cultural Commission.
Sep 1995 40 bed Kokoda Memorial Hospital opened by Paul Keating, financed by Australian government, constructed using Rotary volunteer labour. Programme of building 12 Aid Posts underway.
1996-2002 KTDP Phase I projects carried out worth K570,000.
May 2000 Track closed by Oro Province Governor Sylvanus Siembo.
May 2000 Olympic torch relay from Owers Corner to Port Moresby.
2001 Track re-opened: 76 trekkers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Jun 2003</td>
<td>Proclamation of Kokoda Track Special Purpose Authority by Governor-General.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Kokoda Track Foundation created by Charlie Lynn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 May 2004</td>
<td>KTA Interim Management Committee established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-Jun 2004</td>
<td>Awareness patrol by Interim Management Committee Members. May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>12th Rotary Aid Post constructed, with double classroom, at Abuari. Prefab buildings made in Lae, flown in by Australian Army Chinook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 April 2006</td>
<td>Kokoda Track Foundation presents draft Strategic Plan to Prime Minister Somare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 April 2008</td>
<td>Signing of „Joint Understanding between PNG and Australia on the Kokoda Track and Owen Stanley Ranges“ between Somare and Rudd governments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 1

PRELIMINARY CONSULTATIONS WITH STAKEHOLDERS IN PORT MORESBY AND THE COMPOSITION OF AOI COMMUNITIES

Authors: John Burton, Nicole Haley

Relation to the TOR: This chapter gives the outcome of preliminary consultations and fact-finding in Port Moresby, summarises the forms of political representation in the AOI, and looks at the uncertainties in six sections of the AOI boundary as it is currently defined.

Visit to Port Moresby 11-15 May 2009

01 The travel diary below outlines the preliminary consultations with stakeholders in Port Moresby, as undertaken by John Burton and Nicole Haley. At the outset, it must be pointed out that due to time constraints we did not have the opportunity to meet several key stakeholders.

02 Specifically we would have liked to have met with more members of the National Taskforce and a greater range of elected leaders and landowner representatives, including the Member for Sohe Open, Hon. Anthony Nene, the Member for Kairuku-Hiri Open, Hon. Paru Aihi, and the ward councillors for Kokoda Rural LLG and Koiari Rural LLG. We would also have liked to have met with the District Administrators for each district, and some women’s leaders/representatives. We did not speak to any women from within the AOI.

03 During our visit, we sought to arrange meetings with officials in various agencies: Department of Lands, the Land Titles Commission, the National Lands Commission, the PNG Forest Authority and the Mineral Resources Authority.

04 Burton had phone and email correspondence with the Mineral Resources Authority; however, several of the Project Co-ordinators were out of Port Moresby during our visit, including the one for Mt Kodu, in the AOI.

05 Haley spoke by phone with Anton Luben of the Department of Lands, the departmental representative on the National taskforce, to obtain copies of the current Department of
Lands Noting Maps; at the time of our departure, Mr Luben was in the process of preparing a quotation for access to the Noting Maps.1

Table 1. Travel Diary – John Burton and Nicole Haley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>What</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 May 2009</td>
<td>Travel to Port Moresby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11 May 2009    | Initial meeting at Department of Environment and Conservation with:  
• James Sabi – Program Manager, Sustainable Land Management  
• Jaru Bisa -  
• Ted Rowley – Strategic Policy Advisor – Kokoda Track, Brown River and Owen Stanley Ranges  
• Peter Hitchcock - DEWHA Advisor – Natural Heritage  
• Elton Kaitokai – graduate trainee assigned to assist our team  
• Alu Kaiye, Frederick, Malcolm – graduate officers  
John Burton outlined the nature of our visit and what we were hoping to achieve, after which we were briefed about the Kokoda Track – Brown River Catchment team’s key interests and the existing mechanisms for stakeholder consultation, particularly the National Taskforce. We outlined the various people and groups we would like to meet and sought the unit’s assistance to facilitate this. We also requested a letter of Introduction.  
At the conclusion of the introductory meeting we met with Vagi Genorupa (Kokoda Track and Brown River Catchment project team and Secretariat National Taskforce). We talked at length about the issue of landowner representation, including who the key players are and who they represent. We asked Vagi to arrange a meeting with the key landowner representatives.  
Around Midday, we went with Jaru Bisa and Elton Kaitokai to the National Statistical Office (NSO). We had hoped to meet with the Census Director, Bernard Kiele, or with Nick Suvolo but both were unavailable. Instead we met with Ramat Kiramu, who outlined the sorts of data available.  
After lunch we met with Rod Hillman, CEO of the Kokoda Track Authority (KTA). At the time of our visit the track had been shut by disgruntled landowners. Rod briefed us on the source of their discontent, which centred on the distribution of track fees. We learnt that the KTA Board would be meeting the following day. Rod was particularly supportive of a full-scale social mapping exercise, saying that it was much needed. We asked if he might help facilitate a meeting between us and the landowner representatives.  
At 3.15pm we met with Lawrence Selu, co-founder of New Guinea Adventure, a trekking company established 3 years ago. Laurence explained how his company does business, and we sought his advice about the logistics of a full-scale social mapping exercise. We also asked Laurence for his take on track closure and the nature of the current dispute.  
Later in the meeting we were joined by Lawrence’s younger brother, Norris Selu, a former member of the KTA Board. He provided further background to the current dispute and landowner concerns more generally.  
Planned to meet with Barney Jack, and landowner representative from the Mt Kodu/Naoro area. We waited most of the morning but he did not turn up. During this time we made several telephone calls trying to line up other meetings. Nicole Haley made contact with Norm Oliver, who provided advice about the Lands Department noting maps. Further information was also obtained from Vagi Genorupa concerning local politics.  
Late morning we went to the National Mapping Bureau. It holds the pre-Independence Lands

---

1 The Noting Maps (Milinch and Fourmil series) are the primary official source of information on alienated land parcels. We request that the Kokoda Track-Brown River Team follow up on this, if possible.
department noting maps. We were permitted to borrow these and make copies. We obtained 20 maps covering the area of interest and took these to Theodist to be copied and scanned. Photocopies of these were left with Jaru Bisa.

At Midday we met with Linus Digim’rina, senior lecturer in Anthropology at the University of Papua New Guinea. We discussed the scope for UPNG’s possible involvement in the full scale social mapping exercise. Following our meeting Nicole Haley made further attempts to arrange a meeting with the landowner representatives, while John Burton searched the catalogue of the New Guinea Collection for materials concerning the AOI.

Mid afternoon, we collected the noting maps from Theodist and returned them to the National Mapping Bureau. The afternoon was spent following up various leads and trying to arrange further appointments.

13 May 2009

Wednesday morning John Burton returned to National Mapping and the Theodist to have the remaining map copied and scanned. Nicole Haley spent the morning in the office writing letters to the Lands Department and Department of Provincial and Local Government Affairs seeking access to the up-to-date noting maps and LLG proclamations for Koiari and Kokoda LLGs.

Late morning we met with John Kivo, Kokoda Rural LLG President, Ruben Maleva, Interim Vice Chairman KTA, and Paul Namono, Deputy Administrator Oro Province. They outlined the nature of the Kovelo dispute and local politics along the track, indicating that people on the Kokoda side want wards 3 (Mamba Estate) and 6 (Koagea Block) included in the SPA. They also indicated that people on the track are frustrated by delays to promised development projects and that there are moves afoot to create a new Open electorate in Oro Province. They talked too about the need for proper and detailed landowner consultation.

In the afternoon, Nicole Haley and Elton Kaitokai visited the Land Titles Commission and the National Lands Commission and met with Chief Commissioner, Maicah Pitpit. He explained that their records were still manual and as such were tiresome and cumbersome to search. He explained that there had been an AusAid project to digitize their records but that it had ended prematurely. Chief Commissioner Pitpit also explained that the Land Titles Commission deals with disputes between indigenous people and the State concerning acquired land. He said he was aware of at least one ongoing dispute in the AOI concerning the power/water easement. The matter has notionally been resolved, with a payment having been awarded to the claimants. The payment is yet to be made due to confusion over the date of effect of the new payment schedule.

At the conclusion of that meeting he visited the National Archives in order to identify available archival material concerning the AOI.

14 May 2009

Returned to the National Archives. Examined listings concerning the 1958 Tax Census. Ordered key records of interest.

Late morning John Burton and Elton Kaitokai visited Air Niugini and Airlines PNG and obtained information concerning routine and charter flights to Kokoda.

Later in the afternoon, they met with Jacob Simet at the National Cultural Commission. The NCC has a long standing Kokoda Trail Development Program

15 May 2009

Friday Morning Nicole Haley went the PNG Electoral Commission and met with Grace, the enrollments officer. She was able to provide us with copies of the Proclamations for Kokoda Rural and Koiari Rural LLGs.

John Burton and Nicole Haley, then met briefly with John Kalamoroh, at the National Boundaries Commission. He explained that they are about to conduct another round of national consultations to review PNG’s electoral boundaries ahead of the 2012 National Elections.

We then spoke to Dr Joseph Ketan at the PNG Law Reform Commission. He was able to provide us with copies of the new ILG legislation.

At Midday we met with the Kokoda Track – Brown River Catchment Project team for a short debrief meeting, before travelling to the airport and back to Canberra.
Haley also made numerous efforts to obtain the relevant proclamations for the Koiari and Kokoda LLGs from the Department of Provincial and Local Level Government Affairs, but was unsuccessful.

Haley was, however, able to gain some of this documentation using personal contacts at the PNG Electoral Commission and the AusAID funded Electoral Support Program (neither of whom are members of the National Taskforce).

**Preliminary insights into local political representation in the Track area**

As is evident from our travel diary, we met with only a handful of landowners/landowner representatives. Nevertheless we did gain some preliminary insights into local politics in the Track area (in the first instance). At present there are competing types of political representation for Track interests.

*Inter-departmental – the Central Agencies National Taskforce Committee*

‗The Taskforce‘ is a committee comprised of government stakeholders. It remains to be seen whether, as this grows in size, the committee is able to make and implement decisions effectively: original comprising 13 agencies, this grew first to 17 and now 20 agencies.

There is no landowner presence at this level of representation.

*Donor*

It was not in our remit to examine this sector. The Kokoda Development Program Landowner Representative Committee, which is consulted on service and infrastructure delivery matters, is the primary representative body.

While it is an objective of representation at this level to be inclusive of landowners, those currently on the KDP committee appear to have been invited to join or are self-selected, and the extent to which they represent a cross-section of community interests is not clear.

*Local Level Government / LLG Special Purpose Authority*

The two local level governments in the Track are the Koiari Rural LLG and the Kokoda Rural LLG. Elections are held every five years and are supervised by the Papua New Guinea Electoral Commission. The most recent elections were held in 2008.

The two provinces concerned, Central and Oro, have different constitutional arrangements for the election of LLG Presidents. In Central Province, candidates stand in their individual Wards in the first instance; the elected Ward Members then meet to select the President. In Oro Province, by contrast, candidates may nominate either for their Ward or for the Presidency, but not both; voters directly elect the LLG President.
Historically, the number of local government representatives, or their colonial equivalents, has fluctuated. In the early 20th century, the administration of the Territory of Papua appointed ‘Village Constables’ in this area, given the term Luluai after the administrative amalgamation with the Territory of New Guinea. In 1958, the villages of the Mt Koiari ‘Linguistic Division / Census Division’ were represented by 19 Luluais (Appendix B).

In 1973, the Mt Koiari Census Division was still a ‘non-council’ area and had 21 Census Villages (Department of the Chief Minister and Development Administration 1973), presumably still retaining luluais. A Koiari Council was introduced soon after this.

When the local government system was reorganised in 1997, the Koiari Rural LLG comprised 17 wards. Two of these, Mountain Koiari 1 and Mountain Koiari 2, with a single Ward Member each, covered the area once represented by the 19 luluais.

Subsequent amendments to the proclamations saw four new wards created in 2002. The Mountain Koari communities are better represented and are now divided among five wards: Ward 14 Suria, in the Brown River area, and Wards 15-18, Boridi, Kagi, Efogi and Manari (Map 2).

The Kokoda Rural LLG comprises 24 Wards. We are currently unsure how many of these are made up of Biage people – speakers of ‘Northern Koiari’ (Map 13) – but four seems likely: Wards 1-2, Asimba and Kovelo, and 8-9, Alola and Abuari. Narrowly, only one more ward, Kokoda Station, lies on the Track. The remaining 19 wards are probably made of Orokaiva people, whose large culture area extends eastwards to the Oro coastline, and settlers on agricultural blocks from a wide variety of locations in Papua New Guinea.

Representation at this level is partly the representation of traditional landowners, but the divergent interests of non-landowner residents are also catered for, including those living in a gazetted urban area (Kokoda township).

In recognition of the fact that the two LLGs represent wider constituencies, the Kokoda Track Local Level Government Special Purpose Authority was formed in 2003 to look after landowner interests in the Track area. We examine this at length below.

A fourth tier of government – Ward Development Committees

The Local-level Governments Administration Act 1997 provides for a fourth tier of governance in the form of a Ward Development Committee in each LLG ward charged with drawing up a ‘rolling five-year development plan for the ward for submission to the Local-level Government’.

In theory, these should provide representation at the level of the community itself. In practice, a lack of guidance in what their the functions are, and scant resources for things like meeting places or record-keeping, means that Ward Development Committees are operational in only a few areas of Papua New Guinea.
World Vision’s Begasin Bugati Rural Development Program, an AusAID-supported project in the Madang Province between 2002 and 2006, is an example of attempting to empower existing but under-utilised Ward Development Committees to advance project aims; this is reported as being successful (Haley 2008).

On the other hand, a workshop Governance At The Local Level: Melanesians Responding to Governance Issues held in the State, Society and Governance in Melanesia program at the Australian National University in 2008 heard that a wide range of alternative local governance forms were being trialled by community activists in Papua New Guinea given the State’s neglect of local government (see also Hegarty 2009).

We heard that Ward Development Committees were planned in the Track area, but not that they were operational.

Community associations

Community associations in the form of at least one landowner association (Mt Kodu Landowner Association) and two Incorporated Land Groups (Kokoda ILG and Rouna ILG) operate in the Track area.

We expect many others to exist such as women’s groups, youth groups, and Church groups, but have not attempted to catalogue them from a distance.

Informal landowner groups in villages probably exist and may be among the reputed 10,000 pending applicants for ILG status (J. Fingleton pers. comm.). It should be noted that landowner associations have an unpredictable dual status as both pressure groups and representative bodies.

In their guise as representative bodies, landowner associations are not necessarily democratic; indeed, a level of notoriety has sprung up over the infrequency and non-transparency of elections for office bearers across the country. There is therefore a paradox that the bodies supposedly closest to the traditional interests of the people, and allegedly least Western in conception, can give rise to a despotic form of leadership.

As with self-selected or invited spokespersons, the extent to which landowner associations can or should represent a cross-section of community interests is not clear.

We draw attention to the fact that the nature of landownership in the Koiari and Biage areas is incompletely understood and specifically does not resemble a clan system with easy to understand correspondences between lineages and areas of land, or between lineages and leadership positions, for that matter (para 201 et seq.).

Community associations

A danger for the objectives of the Joint Understanding (para 47), in our view, is the preempting of the findings of social mapping by local groups making ILG applications on the basis of poorly articulated concepts of group organisation.

As discussed in the section on anthropology (para 201 *et seq*.), there is a local group concept – *uhea* – but it does not appear to have the kinds of functions that would suit it to a process of incorporation. Before social mapping results are available, extreme caution should be exercised in endorsing such a process (e.g. in the context of a REDD scheme).

**The Kokoda Track Local Level Government Special Purpose Authority**

The Kokoda Track Local Level Government Special Purpose Authority (the _KTA_) was established in 2003 in order to manage the trekking fees paid by people walking the Kokoda Track, which were in the early stages of a period of rapid growth (Table 2). Indeed, we understand no other organisation is empowered to collect trekking fees.

The SPA comprises six of the 21 Koiari Rural wards and eight of the 24 Kokoda Rural wards (Appendix A; Map 2; Map 3; Map 4).

The basis for the inclusion of wards, we understand, is a mixture of proximity to the Track, shared ethnicity and, at the Kokoda end, the political solidarity shown by particular representatives at the time of the Track closures that surrounded the issue of the Olympic Torch relay in 2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Trek fees collected</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>K 7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>K 36,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>K 107,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>K 158,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>K 412,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,747</td>
<td>K 740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5,117</td>
<td>K 895,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.** The growth in trekking along the Track, 2001-2007.

We can also observe that the Track does not cross all KTA wards, and there are some that include a mix of landowner places and non-traditional places with divergent interests (e.g. _Kokoda Trail Motel_, _Ilolo Estate_, _Bahai Centre_).

In the Koiari Rural LLG, Ward 15 Boridi lies wholly off the Track but the situation is unlike that of settlements on plantation estates and agricultural blocks.
Map 2. Four of the six wards of the Koiari Rural LLG included in the Special Purpose Authority: Mountain Koiari villages.

Map 3. Remaining two of the six wards of the Koiari Rural LLG included in the Special Purpose Authority: Census Units at Sogeri.

The inhabitants are from the same ethnic group as the strictly Track villages, will be closely intermarried with Track landowners, are likely to prove to own land along the Track when social mapping looks into this, and undoubtedly supply porters for those who trek along the Track.
All wards in the Koiari Rural LLG that lie in the Track corridor between Rouna No.2 and the border of Oro Province are included, but in the Kokoda area there are non-KTA wards – apparently agricultural blocks – interdigitated among KTA wards (Map 4).

As has been reported for some years, at the time of our visit there was discontent about the non-disbursement of benefits by the KTA, apparently stemming from the nature of representation of customary interests in the Track area.

Map 4. The eight wards of the Kokoda Rural LLG included in the Special Purpose Authority. Adjacent non-KTA wards shown in purple.

While we cannot diagnose the root cause of such problems without undertaking field investigations, we can point out some anomalies in the manner of representation. Two landowner representatives sit on the board of the KTA at the nomination of the Minister for Inter-Governmental Relations) in addition to the Presidents of the Kokoda and Koiari Rural LLGs.

The current landowner representatives, James Enagi (Koiari) and Ruben Maleva (Kokoda) are the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the new KTA board and are from places situated on the track.

By contrast, it is only fortuitous if either of the two LLGs presidents originates from the Track area. At the present it happens that John Kivo, the Kokoda Rural LLG president, is from a KTA ward (Amada), while Ogi David, the Koiari Rural LLG president LLG elected by his fellow ward members is not. His ward is off the track and is not included in the KTA.
As will be seen, the fit between the KTA area and the Area of Interest also has anomalies.

**The Area of Interest**

The Area of Interest is intended to bound the area of programme activities under the Joint Understanding of April 2008. Our Terms of Reference say these will focus on:

- Improving the livelihoods of local people in the Kokoda Track corridor.
- Improving management arrangements for the Kokoda Track.
- Support to PNG Government to maintain the Brown River Catchment, due to its national importance as a potential water and power supply for Port Moresby.
- Assessment of the Owen Stanley Ranges, along with other locations as potential sites for demonstration REDD activities within the PNG – Australia Forest Carbon Partnership.
- Assessment of World Heritage values in the Owen Stanley Ranges, and if appropriate, protection of these values.

In the above, the first two point to an area of coverage no smaller than that of the Special Purpose Authority, while the remaining three point to a larger area extending some distance away from the Kokoda Track corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Local Level Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Kairuku – Hiri Open</td>
<td>Koari Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Kairuku – Hiri Open</td>
<td>Hiri Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Rigo Open</td>
<td>Rigo Central Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Rigo Open</td>
<td>Rigo Inland Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oro</td>
<td>Sohe Open</td>
<td>Kokoda Rural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Provinces, electorates and LLGs in the AOI.

An _indicative boundary_ for the AOI was supplied to us in the form of a low resolution map in our terms of reference, and a photocopy of this was in use during discussions on our visit to Port Moresby. As presently defined, this includes portions for five rural LLGs in three electorates, in two provinces (Map 1; Table 3).

We understand that the boundary is the product of high level discussions but that a cadastral exact definition has not been constructed. The southeastern corner, in the Rigo Inland Rural LLG, is evidently bounded by the lines of longitude 148° 00’ E and latitude 9° 30’ S, being part of the boundary inherited from the Sogeri-Efogi forestry concession; another section follows the Oro-Central Province border; in the northwest, a section
follows the crest of the Brown River watershed for part of its length, though arriving at the crest by straight lines.

Apart from these naturally defined or map grid derived sections, it is not known to us the extent to which local considerations have guided the positioning of the AOI boundary.

The southeast corner – the Sogeri-Efogi forestry concession boundary

In this part of the AOI two wards in the Rigo Inland Rural LLG are included because of their location in the Sogeri-Efogi forestry concession: Ward 14 Upper Mt Obree and Ward 15 Central Mt Obree (Map 5), having a total population of 1194 people in 2000. These people are evidently speakers of Barai, a language in the Baraic sub-family of Koiarian languages (see para 176 and Map 11).

At this stage, we are uncertain whether all the speakers of the Barai language in Rigo Inland Rural LLG are included, or whether further speakers would be found in the wards immediately to the south at outside the AOI – Lower Mt Obree, Upper Mt Brown etc.

The area requires further investigation, in the first place by obtaining Tom Barker’s PhD thesis (see para 52, noting that Barker lived among Barai speakers outside the AOI) then by paying a visiting to the area. We imagine three scenarios:
• There is a language boundary roughly where the edge of the AOI is, and the two wards happen to be distinguished ethnically from others in their LLG – in which case dealings with these people may be feasible and reasonably straightforward.

• There is no simple boundary between these two wards and others in their LLG, and it would be wisest to move the AOI boundary north to cut out the Rigo Inland Rural LLG entirely because of the likelihood of resentment by people in neighbouring wards in this LLG and the potential for disputes to arise.

• There is a natural boundary between ethnic groups further south in this LLG and the AOI boundary should be extended southwards onto this boundary, which should be determined by means of fieldwork.

Map 6. Location of the AOI boundary, as best interpreted (red line), passing to the south of Sogeri Estate, viewed on Google Earth. Width of map approximately 2.3km.

The Sogeri area

55 In response to a query we raised on this issue, we received the clarification that:

The Sirinumu Dam and the old rubber plantation area around Sogeri will not be included in the Area of Interest.

56 Nonetheless, inspection shows that the current AOI boundary – as best interpreted, passing as it does to the south of the main Sogeri road – does in fact take in the following plantations: Koitaki Plantation, Itikinumu Plantation, Subitana Plantation, Tarinumu Plantation, Sogeri Plantation (Map 6).
This section of the AOI boundary is unsatisfactorily defined; field visits and further discussions are needed to determine exactly where it should be drawn.

The southwest corner – a polygon in Rigo Central Rural LLG

The AOI boundary cuts across a corner of the Rigo Central Rural LLG and takes in a polygon about 24km² in area (Map 1). While there are no villages in the polygon, at least some of the land seems likely to belong to Doe village which is situated in the extreme southeastern corner of Koiari Rural LLG, while the remainder may belong to Anahadabu village in Ward 23 Rigo Koiari Iove of Rigo Central Rural LLG.

The area requires further investigation but should very likely be cut out of the AOI, since the management overheads that will be incurred in dealing with landowners in different LLGs are likely to be high in relation to the value of the small area involved.

Map 7. Location of the AOI boundary, as best interpreted, in the Kokoda area.
The northwest corner – the Kokoda area

60 Three wards included in the proclamation of the Kokoda Track Local Level Government appear not to fall within the AOI, as best interpreted, while three others are split in two by the AOI boundary (Map 7).

61 We presume it is the intention to include all KTA wards with the AOI, but we do not recommend a extension of the AOI boundary in this area by means of desktop analysis. Our approach would be to undertake social mapping in this area to determine the best fit of social boundaries to the objectives of the project, then to propose a new line for the AOI boundary in consultation with the Ward members at Kokoda.

Western edge of the boundary

62 The AOI boundary cuts across country from the Sogeri Plateau to the Hiritano Highway, which it follows for a number of kilometres before turning northeast to follow the northern side of the Brown River catchment.

63 As shown in Map 8, the line cuts through the village of Motu Motu, population 186 in 2000, in the Brown River ward of the Hiri Rural LLG. It probably also cuts through the land of other villages in this ward, notably Iomare No 1 and No 2 villages, population 327, and Rubulogo Settlement, population 71. It is in general undesirable that the boundary should cut through a ward like this.

64 Our approach would be to undertake brief consultations in this area with a view to moving the line so that it either excludes this ward, or encompasses the land of all villages in it, taking into consideration possible biodiversity values in this area.

The boundary on the northern side of the Brown River catchment

65 From the Hiritano Highway, the AOI boundary cuts northeast to follow the northern side of the Brown River catchment, as shown in Map 9.

66 Once the line reaches the crest of the watershed, the chances of it following a natural line of delineation between ethnic groups is quite high, but this will only be known for certain following field inquiries.

67 A problem for understanding this area is that Google Earth imagery passes from high resolution coverage in the Motu Motu area to low resolution over most of the rest of the Brown River catchment. Google Earth coverage across the AOI – the advantage of which is that is it free to view for all interest groups in the AOI – has improved markedly since the time of our 2008 report.
Map 8. Location of the AOI boundary, as best interpreted (red line), following the Hiritano Highway and crossing Brown River, viewed on Google Earth. Width of map approximately 2km.

Map 9. Location of the AOI boundary, as best interpreted (red line), cutting northeast from the Hiritano Highway to follow the crest of the Brown River watershed, viewed on Google Earth. Width of map approximately 15km.
Our approach would be to locate more detailed satellite imagery and undertake brief consultations in this area, by road if the indicated logging tracks are passable, to investigate the ownership of land in this area in broad details. As before, it is undesirable that the boundary should cut through wards outside the Koiari Rural LLG.

**Note on mapping**

Our TOR request that we use a GIS to represent features in the AOI (see TOR Content Index, p. xiii). A footnote continues:

> This will need to be in ArcGIS software to be consistent with other current DEC mapping projects. If the consultant is using other GIS software, he or she will need to make the data ArcGIS compatible.

We have a master GIS using the software MapInfo, with its layers duplicated in the ESRI ArcGIS format.³

Map 10. Section of GIS window showing features in the vicinity of Kokoda Station, including topographic and cadastral map overlays. Width of map approximately 8km.

Map layers (Map 10) at present include:

---

³ Burton has exchanged GIS data with both private and public sector organisations in Papua New Guinea in the past in which MapInfo has been the standard, including the National Mapping Bureau. Inquiries were made at DEC regarding GIS data they may have had in the Track Area, but none was produced.
• 31 sheets of the T601 1:100,000 topographic series digitised as .ECW raster images;
• Census Unit point data for the Hiri Rural, Kairuku Rural, Koairi Rural, Kokoka Rural, Rigo Central Rural, Rigo Inland Rural, and Woitape Rutal LLGs;
• The Central and Oro Province, and NCD boundaries;
• 19 sheets of the Milinch Series cadastral noting maps as JPG rasters;
• Miscellaneous labelling layers.

Summary recommendations for revision of the AOI boundary

The boundary of the AOI should be revised so as to respect in a commonsense way the existing LLG and ward boundaries. Specifically:

• As a general principle, the external boundary should not cut through wards in any LLG such that some villages are included and some excluded – and this goes for the land belonging to the villages as well;

• The south east corner of the AOI, which falls within Rigo Inland Rural LLG, needs field investigation to determine whether the AOI (a) can stay where it is, (b) should be extended south to take in a more viable chunk of Rigo Inland Rural LLG, or (c) should be withdrawn northwards to the boundary of Koiari Rural LLG (see para 52 et seq.).

• The portion of the AOI lying within Rigo Central Rural LLG should be excluded (para 58 et seq.).

• All Kokoda Track Authority wards should be included, unless a major change of policy is signalled, both at the Sogeri end of the Track where the precise location of the line needs clarification (para 55 et seq.) and the Kokoda end of the Track where Asimba, Amada, Kokoda Station, and Waju fall outside the AOI, and only parts of Kovelo and Kebara are included (para 60 et seq.);

• The portion of the AOI in the Brown River ward of the Hiri Rural LLG needs to be reviewed to see whether it is necessary to go outside wards of the Koiari Rural LLG in this area (para 62 et seq.);

• The portion of the AOI along the northern side of the Brown River catchment needs to be reviewed to see where the broad ethnic boundaries lies (para 65 et seq.).

• It is not possible to draw up a map of proposed changes without conducting the field inquiries needed to resolve the uncertainties we have highlighted (see also Appendix J).
CHAPTER 2

HISTORICAL RECORDS RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

**Author:** Hank Nelson

**Relation to the TOR:** This chapter fulfils the requirements of Deliverable 4: it lists the historical records consulted, directs attention to those not examined in the time available, and notes those of most value in the second phase of social mapping. The chapter also addresses Deliverable 3, listing of available national census data.

The sources are evaluated and placed in historical context. What stands out is the length of contact that the Mountain Koiari have had with a range outsiders, the uneven but still extensive documentation of more than a century of contact, and the possibility of completing social mapping which is more detailed and has a greater time depth than is possible in most parts of Papua New Guinea.

Chapters 3 Linguistics, 4 Anthropology and 5 Archaeology add to the listing of historical sources and complete a record of scholarly engagement with the area.

**Summary**

74 The Mountain Koiari of the southern half of the Track have known Europeans for over 130 years. Few other inland peoples have had contact with Europeans from before the British and Germans claimed their New Guinea colonies in 1884. All peoples within the Area of Interest have over a century of contact with foreigners. It is therefore possible to establish base lines and trends and so secure more detailed and credible oral testimony.

75 The result of the early encounters by goldminers, missionaries and naturalists was that the Europeans knew something of the difficulty of travelling in the area, the prevalence of malaria, had heard of the possibility of crossing the Owen Stanleys to reach the north coast, and had found the Koiari friendly, but few in number beyond the Sogeri plateau. They knew, of course, of the spectacular tree houses and of the Koiari and had made a few observations on their material culture.

76 After the proclamation of British New Guinea in 1884 and particularly after the appointment of William MacGregor as Lieutenant-Governor in 1888, foreign penetration of the perimeters of the Area of Interest increased. By the late 1890s the Mountain Koiari had white-owned plantations and their labourers on the Sogeri plateau to their south. Government patrols and miners were attempting with varying success to travel up the Vanapa, cross the Owen Stanleys west of Mt Victoria and reach the Yodda Goldfield. But most miners were reaching the Yodda by going up the Mambare to Tamata and then going overland. The Mountain Koiari then had a concentration of miners and labourers on their northern border, and patrols and prospectors were pushing into their lands. The Mountain Koiari were now to have frequent movement through the heart of their lands.
77 Once there were more than 100 white miners and 500 Papuan labourers on the Yodda Goldfield, there was an obvious need for a shorter and safer route. When miners and storekeepers began landing at Buna and going overland to arrive at the eastern end of the Yodda field, the demand for a track connecting the Yodda to Sogeri and Port Moresby by crossing the ‘Gap’ increased. The Kokoda Track was surveyed at the end of the 1890s and was in regular use after Kokoda Station was established in 1904. The imposition of government control in the Kokoda area and through much of the Northern Division was often marked by violence.

78 By 1910, those Mountain Koiari near Sogeri, along the line of the Track and on the northern side of the Range near the Yodda had been through a decade of varied and at times close contact with many foreigners: miners, labourers, government officers, police and the occasional naturalist. But the Mountain Koiari had lost almost no land, and some had rarely seen foreigners. The Orokaiva near Kokoda had similar experiences to the Mountain Koiari, but the location of the government station meant a permanent foreign presence, and their higher population and the easy access to the plains and low hills of much of their homelands resulted in a different history. While the government had generally imposed peace through the area, small groups were still under pressure from more numerous and warlike neighbours and labour deserters or other foreigners without protection were at risk.

79 In the thirty years after the decline of the Yodda as an alluvial field in 1910 to World War II, the Kokoda Track was used by a variety of official and unofficial travellers: the police on the overland mail, government officers, indentured labourers (legally and illegally), missionaries, adventurers and naturalists. The quality of the documentation is increased in detail and reliability because of the material that patrol officers were expected to provide in their reports and because the Seventh Day Adventist missionaries were entering the homelands of the Mountain Koiari from their base at Bisiatabu and mission station at Efogi. To gain insight into the location of villages, their populations and leading men, and something of their histories, it is essential to read through the government patrol reports. These give sixty or more years of sequential documentation. It cannot be assumed that the patrol officers always understood or interpreted what they were seeing and hearing or that villagers told them the truth (or all of the truth). But the information derived from the patrol reports provides an excellent starting point for those going into the field to talk to people.

80 Where the main missions of the area surrounding the Mountain Koiari (the London Missionary Society, the Anglicans, the Catholic Order of the Sacred Heart) have histories, books by and about pioneer missionaries, scholarly and popular studies by outsiders and have placed many records in public institutions, the Seventh Day Adventist missions are less well-known to those outside the Adventist community. But the Seventh Day Adventists have now had over 100 years of close association with the Koiari. They were the first foreigners to learn the Koiari language and live alongside the Koiari and interact with them in ways which were different from that of say the planters who took up land.
near Sogeri. The SDA records, some of which are online, are the second major
documentary source for this period. The elderly Adventist missionaries, such as Lester
Lock, and staff at the Pacific Adventist University and at the Australian headquarters
should be approached for further oral and documentary material.

81 The books and articles by the government officers, adventurers and naturalists lack the
detail and precision of the patrol reports. Except for the early years when there were no
patrol reports, most of these offer a poor return for time invested by those engaged in
social mapping.

82 The sum total of the extensive publishing on the Kokoda Campaign is that for Australians
Kokoda has more scholarly and popular attention than almost all topics in Australian
history, but for those people in whose country the battles were fought there are no accurate
and comprehensive histories readily available. Through translation and the work of
Japanese historians, there is an increasing amount of material coming from Japanese
writers, available now.

83 The war was certainly significant for the Mountain Koiari, but in terms of loss of life and
damage to property it was less catastrophic than in some other areas of long Japanese
occupation, prolonged battle and intense bombing. Some Koiari living in villages along or
near the track left their homes and lived on distant lands or with allies. Many Koiari were
recruited to work on the Track, although they were a minority of the total of Papuan
labourers and carriers. Koiari also worked at other sites determined by the armed forces.

84 The war stimulated detailed mapping of the area and resulted in the production of reports
by the Australian New Guinea Administrative Unit now held in the Australian War
Memorial, several important diaries of servicemen who worked closely with the carriers
and the post-war patrol reports which assessed war-time damage.

85 The specific reports assessing war damage compensation need to be located because they
not only provide a careful measure of the impact of the war but set a base of the location of
villages and the numbers of inhabitants as the Koiari entered the post-war. The improved
mapping of the area means that it is possible to locate villages accurately and use later
maps to trace the movements of villages. The people living near Kokoda suffered more of
the trauma of the war, saw more of the Japanese and were more likely to be drawn into the
labour forces of the armed services. For both the Koiari and the Orokaiva the war was
complex with old divisions between communities re-emerging, and people behaving with
exceptional humanity or opportunistic brutality towards foreigners in a time of rumour and
violence.

86 To the 1970s the patrol reports remain important, but the sheet maps, many produced by
National Mapping, and the Village Directories provide important checks on the names and
locations of villages. After the Independence of Papua New Guinea other sources created
by local authorities and the census and tax records are uneven, but sometimes detailed.
Early Contact

The Gold Rush

Andrew Goldie had visited New Guinea in 1875 and he returned to settle in Port Moresby in 1877. He set up a store, but he was also an explorer and collector of plants. Within months Goldie had reached the Goldie River and travelled some distance along it. He was within the country of the Mountain Koiari and close to the southern end of what would become known as the ‘Kokoda Track’. Goldie and one his employees, a New Caledonian, reported finding traces of gold.

A brief and unsuccessful gold rush from north Australia ensued, with 100 white miners prospecting from a camp on the Laloki River, who elected John Hanran as their warden (Nelson 1976: 78).

In 1878, a couple of the prospecting teams reached the head of the Goldie River and explored the Brown River, named after Peter Brown who drowned when attempting to swim across. The ‘Kokoda Track’ had been crossed in several places and the prospectors had reached two or three days walk from Owers Corner.

The Mountain Koiari of the southern half of the Track have, therefore, known Europeans for over 130 years. Few other inland peoples have had contact with Europeans from before the British and Germans claimed their New Guinea colonies in 1884.

William Ingham, the Queensland representative sent to Port Moresby to monitor the gold rush, wrote reports and he named the ‘Coiairies’ and praised them: ‘These men are very superior to [the coastal Motu and Koitapu].

Ingham noted that the ‘natives’[the group not named] said that from the ‘gap’ it was ‘only five sleeps to the big water on the other side’, that is to the north coast. John Hanran, leader of one of the prospecting parties, reported on the difficult country, the scarcity of people (‘just a few miserable huts’) in the most inland areas near the Brown River, and a village at the head of the Goldie built in the tree tops.

Both Hanran, who camped on the Goldie River close to a village of about 800 people, and Ingham wrote of the friendliness of the people who carried for the miners and showed them tracks (Nelson 1976: 79).

Missionaries

Before Captain John Moresby entered ‘Port Moresby’, there were already South Sea Islander teachers of the London Missionary Society working on the Papuan coast, and in 1874 the Reverend William Lawes set up house at Port Moresby. When Octavius Stone arrived in Port Moresby in October 1975, he said Lawes was then the only white man living in the area. Stone during his brief visit went beyond the ‘Laloki’ River and made
sketches of the Koïari, including a tree house. He was, he said, some 18 miles inland from Port Moresby (Stone 1880, p.120).

Lawes' colleague, the Reverend James Chalmers, joined him in Port Moresby in 1877. Previously Lawes had crossed the Laloki River, and in 1877 Chalmers went with Goldie one day’s walk beyond the Laloki. At about 1100 feet above sea level they entered a village. Chalmers wrote: „We were surprised to see their houses built on the highest tree-tops they could find on the top of the ridge“ (Chalmers 1886, p.33). In July 1879 Chalmers, Ruatoka and other mission workers left on a longer expedition. He „explored the mountainous country along the course of and between the Goldie and Laloki Rivers“ (Chalmers 1886, p.95).

Chalmers was away for over ten weeks and, while it is not possible to be exactly sure where he went, he often gave compass directions, heights and village names. On 1 August he refers to the view from on Mt Bellamy, but he was at 2360 feet, and the Kokoda Track near what is now known as Mt Bellamy is over 6000 feet. It seems that Chalmers' Mt Bellamy was not today's Mt Bellamy.

His description of the country was accurate: „Of all my travelling in this land, to-day beats all; it was along mere goat tracks, on the edge of frightful precipices, down precipitous mountain sides and up steep ridges, on hands and knees at times, hanging on to roots and vines, and glad when a tree offered a little rest and support“ (Chalmers 1886, p.111). Chalmers expressed his regret that he could not cross New Guinea. He said that Oriope of Uakinumu told him that to cross New Guinea it was necessary to go to Yule Island and travel inland from there – a route later used by diggers going (or trying to go) to the Yodda goldfield. Chalmers himself did not carry arms, but members of his group had guns which they used to shoot game.

There is no obvious correlation with the villages named by Chalmers and those listed in the 1973 Village Directory. Some of the groups named by Chalmers occur in Williams' 1932 paper, e.g. Sogeri, Munikahila/Munegapira, Eikiri/Ekiri, Taburi. Williams classed Ekiri and Taburi as grasslanders although he thought they could have been classified with the Sogeri hillmen except for „dialect“. (Chalmers 1886: 129; Williams 1932: 54) (As Williams was writing 50 years after Chalmers, people may well have shifted – by place and culturally.)

Adventurers and Naturalists

In 1883 two rival newspapers in Melbourne sponsored expeditions to cross New Guinea.4 George Ernest Morrison (later „Chinese‘ Morrison of The Times; Pearl 1967) sponsored by

---

4 Morrison’s articles appeared in the Age, January 1884, and have not been consulted as there is no evidence he entered the area of interest. Armit’s articles in the Argus of October-December 1883, may be of marginal interest, but have not been read.
the *Age* left Port Moresby in July. After several weeks of travel Morrison was speared twice and the party forced to return with the seriously wounded Morrison. Although Morrison claimed to have gone further inland than Chalmers, this was generally not believed. Lindt said that in 1885 he saw the point where Morrison was wounded and it was not far beyond the Laloki (Lindt 1887, p.35). William Armit, sponsored by the *Argus*, went further, but just how far is uncertain. Gavin Souter (1965) says he went _south-east of Port Moresby_ but in fact it seems that he went inland and then turned southeast taking him into the headwaters of the Kemp Welch River (Souter 1965, p.55). He probably went north-east. Again Chalmers claimed to have gone further and probably did. Nearly all members of Armit's expedition suffered from malaria and Professor William Denton, an American who believed his spirit had already travelled to New Guinea and other places, died on the trip (Souter 1965, p.55)

*Early contact: conclusions*

100 The result of these encounters was that the Europeans knew something of the difficulty of travelling in the area, the prevalence of malaria, had heard of the possibility of crossing the Owen Stanleys to the north coast, and had found the Koiari friendly, but few in number beyond the Sogeri plateau. They knew, of course, of the spectacular tree houses and of the Koiari and had made a few observations on their material culture.

*Colony and Territory*

*The Founding of British New Guinea 1884*

101 On 6 November 1884 the British declared a Protectorate over Southeast New Guinea. General Sir Peter Scratchley, the first Special Commissioner, effectively the head of the new administration, made a tour of inspection in 1885, going two days' inland from the Astrolabe Range to where the naturalist H.O. Forbes had established a camp, the _furtherest settlement inward hitherto attempted_ (Lindt 1887: 149).

102 With Forbes were two other Europeans and 25 Malays – Forbes had previously been collecting in Timor and Celebes. Forbes was said to have a native material house close to a river and a village, and densely wooded spurs led to Mount Owen Stanley. Forbes was collecting _botanical and natural history_ specimens, preparing to plant maize, rice and vegetables and planning to climb Mount Owen Stanley (later named Mount Victoria) (Fort 1942: 73; Lindt 1887: 35, 139, 145-149).

103 Fort thought that Forbes was fifty miles inland. He was probably in the Sogeri area and closer to Port Moresby than fifty miles (Lindt, 1887, p.139). Forbes established friendly relations with the Koiari, and was said to be known to those further inland. After a brief time at Samarai, in 1887 Forbes led a government supported attempt to reach and climb Mt Owen Stanley. Just how far he got is unknown.
Later, MacGregor could not identify the geographic features that Forbes described vividly. Forbes wrote of his exploits in the *Scottish Geographical Magazine, Royal Geographical Society Proceedings*, and the Annual Report and defended himself from Macgregor’s criticism (Forbes 1890). Walter Cuthbertson, leader of another expedition of 1887 into the Owen Stanleys, was in the Mt Obree area well to the east of the Kokoda Track. Hume Nisbet may have been closer as Mt Nisbet is just to the southeast of Myola, and his reminiscence (Nisbet 1896) should be checked.

J.W. Lindt's contribution was his superb photographs of the tree houses at ‘Sadara Makara’, a village of 20 houses within sight of the Motuan village of Tupusereia on the coast and due east of Taurama (‘Pyramid Head’; Lindt 1887: 39). This places the village in...
the foothills of the Astrolabe Range where the contemporary Koiari speaking village of Labuka\(^5\) is today (Map 12).

**MacGregor and Gold on the Yodda**

106 In 1888 William MacGregor arrived in Port Moresby as the first Lieutenant-Governor of British New Guinea which now became a possession of the British Crown. With the appointment of more field officers, the setting up of additional government stations, the establishment of the police and MacGregor’s own vigour, more official patrols went inland.


107 In 1889 MacGregor himself climbed – and named – what had been known as Mt Owen Stanley. He re-named the peak, Mt Victoria, and Owen Stanley became the name of the range. By going inland from Galley Reach, ascending the Vanapa, MacGregor had approached Mt Victoria from the west.

\(^5\) Dutton’s spelling = _Labuka_; Census Unit 006 _Rabuka_, in Ward 8 of the Hiri Rural LLG, had a population of 116 in the 2000 census.
In 1894 MacGregor went up the rivers that drain north from the Owen Stanleys: the Gira, Mambare, Opi and Kumusi. Having exploited navigable rivers and made several long inland patrols, the government now knew much about the terrain and something of the Goilala communities on the west and northwest of the Area of Interest, the Binandere on the Gira and the Mambare below the Yodda and of the numerous Orokaiva peoples of the plains to the north of the Mambare to the coast. Macgregor had found traces of gold in the Mambare and prospecting parties soon followed.

The leader of the first group, George Clark, was killed by the Binandere and government patrols attempting to enforce peace established a station at Tamata on the Mambare. Through the next ten years there were frequent clashes between miners, labourers, government officers and police and local villagers. More Europeans died in the Northern Division than in any other area, and at times groups of thirty or more villagers were killed in violent clashes.

There were two main mining areas north of the Owen Stanleys: on the Gira River to the west and on the upper Mambare, or the Yodda as it was commonly called, and along the creeks flowing into the Yodda from the Owen Stanleys west to the Chirima River. The Yodda, officially declared a goldfield in 1900, then had a peak of about 120 white miners and about 600 Papuan labourers mining or carrying. In its early years, most men and stores reached the Yodda by boat up the Mambare to Tamata (later Ioma government station) and then overland to the Yodda. But from 1897 miners were trying to reach the Yodda from the south coast – starting near Rigo or Port Moresby or going up the Vanapa or Alabule Rivers. The few who reached the Yodda from the south coast came up the Vanapa. The peoples on the Yodda, Chirima and the creeks flowing into the Yodda were now in frequent contact with miners, government officers and Papuan police and labourers.

Given the violence faced by miners and carrier lines moving through the Binandere and Orokaiva, the high incidence of malaria and the difficult tracks, there was a strong incentive to find a better track. By landing at Buna and then crossing Orokaiva country, the miners and storekeepers began using an overland track rather than the Mambare River. Government stations at Bogi and Papangi, just north of the Mambare provided some protection and were bases for patrols through the Orokaiva villages. Both stations closed with the opening of Kokoda in 1904. Once the overland track from Buna was opened and miners were approaching the Yodda from the eastern end of the field then the search for a track from Port Moresby across the Owen Stanleys, passing through what was already known as the „Gap“, became more urgent.

At the same time the first plantations were being developed in the Sogeri area. Burns Philp had land at Warirata and in 1897 David Ballantine, the treasurer in MacGregor's administration, began planting coffee further inland. In 1902 Charles Garrioch and Henry Greene started another coffee plantation near Ballantine’s and the next year they planted the first rubber on the plateau (David Lewis, 1996, pp. 26, 8 and 38).
By the late 1890s the Mountain Koiari had white-owned plantations and their labourers on
the south; government patrols and miners attempting with varying success to travel up the
Vanapa, cross the Owen Stanleys west of Mt Victoria and reach the Yodda Goldfield
resulting in a concentration of miners and labourers on their northern border. Patrols and
prospectors were pushing into their lands. The Mountain Koiari were now to have frequent
movement through the heart of their country.

The report by the Government-Surveyor, H.H. Stuart-Russell, of his 1899 attempt to find a
"road" from Brown River through the Gap to the Yodda is the most detailed account of the
early patrols through the Mountain Koiari.

Other patrols by C.A.W. Monckton and Ballantine supported Stuart-Russell. In the area for
three months, Stuart-Russell named many villages and groups of people, but except for a
few, such as Uberi, Naoro, Kagi (some white men had called it ‘Agi’) and Kale (Kaile),
most names are unfamiliar. As had been the experience of the miners, he had a friendly
meeting with the Neneba of Iuoro, near the Iura (Eoro?) which flows into the Yodda.

Stuart-Russell reported conflict between the Neneba and ‘Koriri’ – six Neneba had been
killed a month or two earlier - and he himself was involved in a violent clash with the
‘Koriri’ or ‘Biage’ north of the Gap and south of the Yodda:

Not being familiar with the effect of a bullet from a M.H. [Martini Henry] or Snider rifle,
they imagined their shields sufficient protection, and came on with confidence … . Though
they came on again and again with the usual bravery of all natives belonging to that district,
they were repulsed every time with loss, and eventually drew off (Annual Report, 1898/99,
Appendix J, p.43)

Stuart-Russell had previously patrolled among the Orokaiva and was aware of the bravery
of the villagers who made repeated charges against well-armed government officers, police
and miners. He did not record the number of ‘Koriri’ of Kale and neighbouring villages
who died in the repeated assaults. He was aware that the ‘Koriri’ would probably take
revenge against those peoples who had been thought friendly to his patrol. Stuart-Russell
reported that as he approached the Gap there was already a ‘well-defined native track’ . He
concluded that a ‘road’ across the Gap was ‘practicable’ and if work gangs of fifty started
at both ends it could be completed in two years. It was a wildly optimistic report.

In early reports by government officers and miners, there are references to the Neneba
(sometimes Bida or Beda) people, who were always characterised as friendly and honest
and in spite of being under attack from more war-like peoples were often lightly armed and
ready to provide assistance to strangers. In the early reports they were said to occupy
villages from just north of the Gap to the Chirima River. By 1914 they were restricted to
the northwest in the Chirima area. When Assistant Resident Magistrate (ARM) Jackson
visited them in 1914 he called them the ‘Karukaru tribe’. He said that they had come from
‘Biagi’ and that the ‘present generation spoke both Fuyuge and Biagi languages with
almost equal facility'. These people as a distinct group over time disappeared from the records. It seems that the Neneba lost territory and then their culture.

119 Note also the uncertainty of the classification of the Biagi/Biage. Stuart-Russell in 1899 wrote of the ‘Koriri’ or ‘Biagi’. Jackson in his 1914 patrol report claimed that the distinction between ‘Biagi’ and ‘Isurava’, often made in the records, was unnecessary as these were one people. He preferred to call them all the ‘Isurava’ tribe. Jackson also said that ‘Biagi’ was a term imposed in the early years of administration and was adapted from the villagers’ salutation and request for friendship.

120 The 1960 Village Directory has a separate Biage Census Division of 7 villages and 608 people within the Kokoda Subdistrict. In the 1969 Village Directory the Biage villages are within the Kokoda census division of 17 villages and 2,018 people. Dutton in his classification of the languages in 1969 placed the ‘Biagi’ villages within the larger Northern Dialect group of the Mountain Koaiari.

The Track

121 Once Kokoda station was established in 1904, the walking track from Sogeri to Kokoda came into regular use. It was essentially Papua New Guinea's first inland road.

122 The police mailmen were the most frequent and best known of the early travellers. Started soon after the founding of the Kokoda station, the overland mail linked Kokoda with Ioma and Buna as well as with Port Moresby. Usually two policemen walked all the way from Port Moresby to Kokoda, or sometimes handed the mail to another pair who continued to Kokoda. Later the mailmen were organised to leave Port Moresby soon after mail had arrived in Port from Australia. At times, too, the mail was passed from villagers to villagers. The Kokoda station journal noting that in March 1905 it had taken 17 days for the mail to reach Kokoda and in April 1905 the Biage came in with the mail which had been 20 days on the Track.

Sources: While there are a number of reminiscences (Griffin 1925, Mackay 1909, Meek 1913, Monckton 1921, 1922), and there is much detail of the foreign presence in Papua in the Royal Commission Report of 1906, the most informative sources are the reports of the government officers on patrols. They provide descriptions of peoples and places, and sometimes give names of villages, village leaders and - after their appointment - village constables. The early Annual Reports of British New Guinea reprint some reports of exploratory and administrative patrols and the annual reports from particular Divisions. MacGregor's report on the Neneba people in the Annual Report of 1896/97, Appendix 4, has an extensive description of their material culture and includes sketches. The most important station journals (available for early years only) and patrol reports are from Kokoda. Before Kokoda was established, the papers from Tamata, Bogi and Papangi are relevant.

Beaver spent a term in the Northern Division as ARM and in the Kumusi and Mambare Divisions as RM and with E. W. P. Chinnery wrote some basic ethnographic material on the Division; however, his book (Beaver 1920) has little on the Northern Division. The mapping of Mambare and Kumusi languages by Chinnery and Beaver is in the Papuan Annual Report 1914-15.

Hawthorne (2003) is a well-researched general history of the Kokoda Track/Trail.
For the Biage to go down to Kokoda was to pass through dangerous country. In November 1905, S. C. Marriott, ARM, noted in the station journal that 12 Biage men had come in with the mail but were reluctant to sleep at Kokoda, and the annual report from Kokoda said that except for bringing in the mail the Biage village constables rarely visited the station: _like their fellow tribesmen, [they] are very reserved and apparently nervous of coming down from the hills_.

They were right to be cautious. Early in 1906, a Biage _returning from delivering an overland mail_ was killed by _KOKO and AUSEMBO_ who cut up and distributed the body, which was then eaten in various villages. The government officers responded with _severe measures_ (Kokoda Annual Report, 1906, G91 416A).

A.S. Meek, the naturalist, collector and traveller, who had first visited British New Guinea in 1990s, arrived at Kokoda in January 1906. His carriers on their way to the coast were attacked and one killed and another wounded by _hillmen_ less than a mile from Kokoda station. An indignant Meek threatened to take matters into his own hands unless the government acted. Forced, he said, _to give way to the ferocity of the natives_ Meek left the area, but returned again on another collecting expedition in 1907 (Meek 1913: 167-169).

More distinguished visitors came to Kokoda later in 1906 when two of the Australian Royal Commissioners into the _present conditions … of the Territory of Papua_ and accompanying officers, police and carriers arrived. The two commissioners, J.A.K. Mackay and C.E. Herbert, continued overland to Sogeri and Port Moresby. In addition to the royal commission report and the extensive recorded testimony of witnesses, Mackay wrote an account (Mackay 1909), but there is little information about the people living between Kokoda and Sogeri.

The Biage and Kokoda peoples were soon travelling out of their home region. In the Kokoda station journal for September 1905, Marriott, recorded that Mami of _Biagi_ came in and said he wanted to go Port Moresby, and Marriott said he would send him with the overland mail. A few days later he noted that Saiwo of Isurava had been to Port Moresby with the mail.

In 1905 two Biage joined carriers travelling to Buna (Kokoda Journal, 28 Feb 05). Some did not volunteer. In January a prisoner charged with murder and 12 witnesses (9 men and 3 women) with police and carriers left for Port Moresby (Kokoda Station Journal 13 and 15 Jan 09). Labourers hoping to escape their contracts were soon trying the Track.

Early in 1905 the Orokolo and Kiwai labourers working for miners and storekeepers were said to know about the _road_ and the overland mail arriving on 11 February 1905 said that six Orokolo deserters were already in Port Moresby. Just when labourers began escaping north is uncertain, but early in 1909, the police picked up _4 deserters from SOGERI plantation … all in very bad state of emaciation through the ravages of dysentery_ (Kokoda Station Journal 14 Jan 09). These were said to be _local_ men but then signing-on was still
new to the people around Kokoda. Henderson, the acting ARM, had to explain to _30 local natives from KOKO villages_ what it mean to sign-on as plantation labourers. They went off _in high glee_ to Buna (Kokoda Station Journal 6 October 09).

130 The reference to the returning labourers suffering from dysentery is significant. There were a number of outbreaks at this time, many resulting in high mortality. Just how severe it was among the Mountain Koia is unclear, but the Annual Report for 1908-09 (p.74) reported severe dysentery in the _Main Range_ and the next year there was said to be dysentery at Kokoda, including among the prisoners (Annual Report 1909-10, p.94).

131 Through the early records there are references to _Biagi_ as a particular village as well as to Biage as a group. On a war-time map _Biagi Village_ is located about two miles west of the Kokoda airstrip (Kokoda and Environs, 1:25,000, Australian War Memorial). Dutton (1969 p.8) has both a _Biagi Tribe_ and a _Biagi_ village, but that is on a map of the past not of the 1960s. There is no Biagi/Biage village in the post-war village directories. In what may be an illustration of the ambiguity of Isurava as a village or a group of villages, J. Henderson (Acting ARM Kokoda) refers to _several ISURAVA villages which are scattered and at enormous heights in the mountains_ (Kokoda Station Journal, 13-14 November 09).

132 By 1909, the number of white miners on the Yodda Goldfield, rarely over 100, had declined to 24 and they employed 437 labourers, but a year later there were only five white miners. Most had left for the new field on the Lakekamu. Many of the men on the Gira and the Waria as well as the Yodda made their way overland to Port Moresby. The government officers at Kokoda recorded many groups of two or three miners and twenty or thirty indentured labourers leaving every day or so. One group of eight white miners had 100 labourers with them (Kokoda Station Journal 31 Dec 09). This was the most traffic on the Track until 1942.

**Between Gold and War: 1910-1941**

133 Almost deserted after the opening of the Lakekamu field, the Yodda continued to be worked by a few miners through much of the 1920s and 1930s. In January 1919, J. G. Fowler, ARM Kokoda, reported that there was only one miner (Blyth) and his nine labourers on the Yodda. In 1926 there were two miners, W. Parkes and M. Crowe, but the major find at Edie Creek was about to induce miners to leave for Wau. In turn, the success of the Edie and later the Bulolo fields, stimulated prospectors and investors to return to the old Papuan fields. In 1931 there were three men on the Yodda and J. Ward Williams, an American mining engineer took an interest in the area. The newly built Kokoda airstrip and another strip further down the Yodda served the men testing the potential of the alluvial for a dredging operation. From 1935 Ward Williams had shifted his main interests elsewhere, but some of those who had come as miners stayed on, including Bert Kienzle. The development of rubber plantations in the Kokoda area increased the chances of village men finding work close to home. Some villagers started their own small rubber plantations.
The occasional naturalist continued to visit the area. In 1933 Evelyn Cheesman, an English traveller and collector, was flown to Kokoda and established bases towards the Gap at Orori and Oquali. Her comments in *Things Worth While* (1958) on Papuans are brief and superficial – “the Biagi … were some sort of offshoot of the Ora-kivas’ (p.210). Cheesman refers to the ‘native trail’ (p.206) and she had used ‘trail’ before World War II. Her *Two Roads of Papua* (1935) was not sighted.

Phyllis Bridges, the sister of the Governor of South Australia, Sir George Bridges, also walked the Track. Accompanied by a government officer and police, she walked from Rouna Falls, reached Kokoda in eight days, and continued to Buna (Bridges 1923-24).

The Papuan Annual Reports, although not including as much detail as the early reports from British New Guinea and Papua include important material. For example, the Papuan Annual Report 1927-28 includes the patrol report No 7 1927/8 by ARM R. Cawley from Kokoda along the Yodda to the Chirima. The map locates all villages and indicates ‘tribes’. The patrol reports from the government stations, now typed and conforming to a more standard pattern, continue to be the richest source on names of leading men, village populations and locations. For example, C. F. Jackson ARM, Kokoda, wrote long reflective reports. The following is from his report of a patrol in March-April 1915:

I may mention that the ground known as KUKUWE was the original site of the BIAGI villages, from which they gradually worked towards KOKODA. Some very old gardens lie here on the slopes both above and below the Port Moresby track.

On referring to BIAGI people as distinct from ISURAVA, it is of course well known that they are all one people, correctly known under the collective tribal name of ‘ISURAVA’. BIAGI is a distinction which crept in concurrently with the establishment of the Government Station at KOKODA, the word roughly corresponding with the Motu word ‘Turana’ (friendly). It was bestowed as a name on the nearer section of the ISURAVA people owing to their continued use of the expression: ‘Biagi, kausara!’ in their relations with the police, and their use of the same expression as a call, when the government parties first moved about among them establishing friendly and peaceful relations ….

Jackson’s patrol has a map attached showing the northern section of the ‘Port Moresby Road’, various creeks and villages.

Another of Jackson’s Kokoda patrol reports (to Vetapu beginning in July 1914) is over 60 pages and it too has maps attached. In Appendix A to the report he wrote about the Neneba:

they originally migrated from BIAGI whose hunting territory has always extended along the Range towards Mt Scratchley. This is quite borne out by their language … the present generation speaking both Fuyuge and Biagi languages with equal facility (C. F. Jackson, July 1914).
As it was the younger generation born at Neneba who spoke the Fuyuge of Simola and the older people who retained ‘Biagi’, Jackson was confident that ‘Biagi’ was the original language.

A third example of the relevant material in patrol reports is taken from J. G. Fowler, Acting ARM, Kokoda, patrol report 7 of March-April 1920, to ‘Biagi South and Isurava Districts’:

Passed along the Port Moresby road, swampy in places but clean, for about 8 miles. Turning to the West on to a small track leading up a very steep hill 4000 ft high at least, we reached the village of KUKUWE, Biagi South District under the supervision of V. C. Latuvi. The site is a healthy one, the houses good, and the village clean. We were welcomed by men, women and children …. These people are known as the Gila tribe, the old Gila village where dysentery was so bad last year being abandoned. About a mile further on a higher ridge the new village of EVORA is situated. There are about 7 good houses and 45 people …. V. C. Latuvi deserves much credit for the concentration of these people in this place. Previously they wandered all over the place and it was difficult to get in touch with them …. NAMARA, Isurava tribe under V. C. Babila. There are 7 houses in good repair and 25 people were present.

In addition to contemporary information there are references to past movements – Gila has been left and a new village formed at Evora – and to government policies such as the pressure on people who lived in scattered hamlets to form concentrated villages. The villages named in this report do not appear in the 1960 Village Directory. As elsewhere in Papua New Guinea, settlement patterns changed and villages shifted location and were sometimes re-named.

The Seventh Day Adventist Mission

The Anglicans were extending influence among the Orokaiva, the Catholic mission of the Sacred Heart were advancing from Ononge among the Fuyuge on the headwaters of the Vanapa River to reach related people north of the Owen Stanleys. Cawley’s map of his 1927-28 patrol has a ‘RC Mission Site’ in the Chirima Valley.

The most significant development for the Sogeri and Mountain Koiari people was the arrival of the Seventh day Adventists who became the most influential missionaries in their area.

In 1908 Septimus Carr and Benny Tavodi established a base at Bisiatabu, a small Sogeri plantation of 150 acres. In 1913 Carr and Brother Lawson made a long trek through the Mountain Koiari lands, visiting Kokoda and making contact with ‘fourteen tribes … seven of them for the first time by any missionary’. Carr noted that some of the ‘inland boys’ who had worked at Bisiatabu, were already having an influence at Kagi and Efogi (see Appendix H).
Pastor William Lock arrived in 1924 and he and his family were to be long associated with the Koiari. With Albert Bateman he built a mission station at Efogi (Plate 4), and the SDA then had a base in a central position within the Mountain Koiari and on the Kokoda Track. After the Lock family left Efogi in 1927, another family, the Mitchells, took over, but for much of the pre-war period the Efogi mission was under the control of Fijian or Koiari converts.

Lester Lock, who had gone to Efogi as a young boy, completed his education in Australia and returned to Bisiatabu. He could speak Koiari, patrolled into the Mountain Koiari and worked on translating and printing Koiari material. Lester Lock wrote an autobiography, *Locks that Opened Doors* (Lock 2000), and he is living in retirement at Lake Macquarie, New South Wales.

The *Australasian Record*, the journal of the SDA, has numerous relevant articles (e.g. Appendix H). Other sections of the SDA archives should also be surveyed.

An approach was made to the Pacific Adventist University, Koiari Park, but no reply was received. Another approach should be made to see what, if any, relevant material is held there. There also needs to be a check of the extent to which Australian and Papua New Guinea records have been released online.

**World War II**

In the last decade in excess of 3000 pages have been published in Australia on Kokoda in World War II. The three popular accounts have been Brune (2003), FitzSimons (2004) and Ham (2004). Among other readily available publications are:
• Guide books – James (2008), Baker (2006);
• General biographies – McDonald (2004);
• Biographies and autobiographies of the Australian military commanders (Blamey, Rowell, Allen, Potts, Honner, Kingsley Norris);
• Campaign histories: McCarthy (1959), Horner (1982), Day (2003);
• Unit histories – and they include militia and AIF units – provide more soldiers’ perceptions of the fighting.

150 From the release of Damien Parer’s *Kokoda Frontline*, in 1942 there has been a number of important documentary films and there is one feature film, Alister Grierson’s *Kokoda*, 2006.

151 Few of the books or films have added to knowledge of the Kokoda battles as experiences for the peoples of Papua New Guinea. The exceptions are the documentary film, *Angels of War* by Andrew Pike, Hank Nelson and Gavin Daws, 1981, and the unit history of the New Guinea Administrative Unit (Powell 2003).

152 The sum total of the publishing outlined above is that, for Australians, Kokoda has more scholarly and popular attention than almost all topics in Australian history, but for those people in whose country the battles were fought there are no accurate and comprehensive histories readily available. Through translation and the work of Japanese historians, there is an increasing amount of material coming from Japanese writers, available now.

153 Particularly valuable is the translation of the relevant section of the Japanese official history (Bullard 2007, and see also Toyoda and Nelson 2006, and Bullard and Tamura 2004).

154 In two articles, Hank Nelson has outlined what happened to the Papua New Guinean people who had the Kokoda campaign come to them or were directed to participate in it (Nelson 2003, 2007). A brief summary is presented here:

• The Track so often characterised as remote and unknown was indeed unknown to most Australian soldiers but it had a long history and was used regularly for forty years by many peoples in Papua.
• Traffic on the Track increased immediately before 1942. With the army’s increased demand for labour, men recruited in the Northern Division walked to Port Moresby, sometimes in groups of over 100.
• The highest number of Papuan labourers on the Kokoda Track during the Kokoda campaign was about 1,700, and that was towards the end of the campaign. Because there was much sickness, desertion, replacement and casual employment of labourers, the total who worked on the Track for the Australians might have been close 3000. By contrast about 5,500 Papuans were being employed by the armed forces in the Buna area at the end of 1942.
• The Japanese brought 2000 conscripted labourers from Rabaul and recruited men in the Northern District. (The administrative area changed from Division to District early in 1942.) They used carriers on the Track, but fewer than 2000.

• The Papuans working for the Australians on the track, came from a wide area. Many had volunteered to work on plantations in the Sogeri area or on the Papuan coast or in various tasks in Port Moresby and were drafted into labouring for the army. Others were compulsorily recruited by government officers (now serving in ANGAU, the Australian New Guinea Administrative Unit). As a result, the men working to improve the track and carry stores, ammunition and wounded came from Milne Bay to Daru. A minority came from the Koiari whose villages were along the Track and some came from the Orokaiva and other northern peoples. Although their lands were occupied by the Japanese, they had been recruited to work on plantations and were transferred to the Track. After the recapture of Kokoda in November 1942 and the development of the battles near the coast at Buna and Gona, many Orokaiva were employed by the Australian and United States forces. (Those working for the Americans were recruited by Australians and may have been managed by them.)

• The carriers on the Track, especially the stretcher bearers have been much praised. It might be thought that there was much exaggeration and that the Australians were in fact seeking to praise themselves – they were presenting themselves as deserving of the loyalty displayed by the ‘Fuzzy Wuzzy Angels’. But those Australians who had been in Papua before the war wrote in admiration, even surprised admiration, of the carriers, and Australian soldiers in diaries and letters noted the commitment of the carriers before there was any publicity.

• Many Koiari who lived close to battle sites escaped from those areas before the fighting and suffered few casualties. High casualties of up to a third or a quarter of a population occurred elsewhere in Papua New Guinea among peoples who suffered long occupation by the Japanese, were exposed to extensive Allied bombing and strafing and were in areas of prolonged battle.

• Some Orokaiva and Koiari took advantage of the absence of government officers and missionaries to attack traditional enemies and deserting labourers. Some Koiari took risks to guide Australians to safety and other Koiari killed stranded Australians. Orokaiva killed some Australian civilians or servicemen cut off by battle and handed others to the Japanese. The returning Australians hanged some 22 Orokaiva at Higaturu for crimes committed during the period of the Japanese occupation. Some of the New Guineans who came to Papua with the Japanese recovered from their ordeal, joined the Papuan Infantry Battalion, later transferred to New Guinea Infantry Battalions and fought through the war as Allied soldiers. For many peoples, the war was complex and disturbing, a time of disaster and opportunity, and one not to be reduced to faithful service as the gentle, uncomplaining carrier – accurate as that image may have been.

• All those who laboured for the Australian army were fed and paid. In the post-war all were compensated for any injuries or loss of property such as houses, trees, pigs or pots and pans. They received compensation whether the damage was a result of enemy or Allied action, and they were paid if they worked for the enemy as long as they had not been willing and influential leaders for the Japanese. As civilians, the labourers could not receive military awards, but a few were given Loyal Service medals for outstanding work.
Archival sources

155 The ANGAU War Diary in the Australian War Memorial and its appendices are basic. Patrol reports – or their wartime equivalents – are included in appendices as are reports of labour recruiting and the location of labourers.

156 As the war moved north and ANGAU officer resumed roles similar to those of pre-war field officers something approaching normal patrolling began. The patrol reports detail the impact of war and the patrols assessing damage for the payment of compensation are most informative. Members of the team preparing this report have seen such patrol reports for other areas, but have not had time to locate and read those for the Mountain Koiari. Hank Nelson will attempt to do so after the submission of this report.

157 There are two important diaries in the Australian War Memorial, those of Bert Kienzle (n.d.), officer in charge of the labourers on the Track, and Dr Geoffrey Vernon, medical officer to the carriers (Vernon 1942-1943). Tom Grahamslaw was in the Northern Division before and during the war and his reminiscences are also informative (Grahamslaw 1942-73).

Maps

158 Before World War II there were few accurate and detailed maps of Papua. The demand became urgent in 1942. The expanded Army Survey Corps and new units, concerned with aerial photography and especially the Allied Geographical Section, established in July 1942, began an ambitious program to produce maps and handbooks. Unfortunately the Allied Geographical Section did not complete a Terrain Study of the Kokoda Track, although there is one of Buna.

159 Material was collected on overland tracks between Port Moresby and Buna, but that is now held in the United States. Bowd (2005) located the material in _Box T-1220, GHQ SWPA and USAFP General Correspondence 1942-46 (Overland Routes from Buna to Port Moresby), NARA [National Archives and Records Administration], College Park, Virginia, USA. See also folders 2 & 3 in Box s-200, Intelligence Reports (Buna-Kokoda-Moresby: Additional and Miscellaneous’. It could be that some of this material is also held in Australia.

160 Maps in the Australian War Memorial are in accord with this general description. In any case, other maps held in the War Memorial provide basic information on the location of villages, for example, 1:63,360 sheet map of Uberi based on aerial photographs and surveys of 1943, and the 1:63,360 map of Kokoda-Myola from a survey in 1942. The War Memorial also holds maps of battles and some of these include locations of villages. The sketch map of the Kokoda-Ilolo Area showing the disposition of troops at Isurava on 29 August 1942 includes villages (as spelled): Naro, Pitoki, Deneki, File, Siga, Kaile, Missima, Isurava, Abuwari, Alola, Eora Creek.
The stimulus to mapping continued into the post-war. Some post-war maps are held by Cartographic Services in the College of Asia Pacific, Australian National University and others are in the Australian National Library. The holdings in the National Library could not be checked because of a fault with the compactus. Geoscience Australia does not hold old copies produced by National Mapping. Incidentally, both the National Library and the War Memorial have copies of a Japanese map of Kokoda. The best readily available recent map, 1:220,000, was obtained from the Map Shop, Adelaide, printed 2009, and is said to include ‘data developed from the DCW, the NASA SRTM Project and satellite imagery’. The map on the reverse is Owers Corner to Kokoda at 1:80,000. To assist in the tracing of the establishment, abandonment and shifting of villages, an obvious step is to take sheet maps at various times and compare those with the 1942-43 maps.

**Post-War**

Given the dislocation of war, payments for war-time labour and compensation, the improved road from Owers Corner to Port Moresby and the attraction of an expanding Port Moresby, the Mountain Koiai had greater inclination and opportunity to leave home villages. Other changes meant increasing activity on the borders of the Mountain Koiai. While prices were high, rubber plantations flourished beyond both the northern and southern ends of the Track and cocoa was planted in the north from the mid 1950s. But the overland mail which had continued through much of the war ended in 1949 when it was replaced by a regular air mail service to Kokoda.

A patrol post was established at Sogeri and patrol reports are available from 1956 to 1961. (See Appendix to this section for an indication of the number and scope of the Sogeri patrol reports.) The Kokoda patrol reports continue to 1974 and those from Port Moresby until 1976. The creation of Local Government Councils, later Local Level Governments and Special Purpose Authorities provide other avenues to demographic data. The first National Census was in 1966 and the most recent in 2000. The use of census and local tax data is referred to in Chapter 1 of this report.

**Village directories and censuses**

There have been three village directories, naming villages by census division and providing a total population for the census division:

- *Territory of Papua and New Guinea Village Directory*, 1960, Department of Native Affairs, Port Moresby;
- *Territory of Papua and New Guinea Village Directory*, 1968, Department of District Administration, Port Moresby;
Changes in census division boundaries make simple comparisons difficult, but the directories are still basic sources.

The 1960 Directory, compiled immediately after the 1958 Tax-Census revision (see Appendix B), gives a population for the Mountain Koiari Census Division of 1,665 and 608 for the Biage Division.

In the 1973 Directory the Mountain Koiari are said to total 2,128 and Biage 601. The boundaries for the Mountain Koiari are consistent; those for the Biage had changed.

To the 1970s the patrol reports remain important, then the T601 1:100,000 topographic series maps held by the National Mapping Bureau, and the Village Directories provide important checks on the names and locations of villages.

No complete national census was undertaken in Papua New Guinea prior to Independence; hand-compiled patrol censuses were replaced by the computer-based Provincial Data System between 1977 and 1982, and PDS field guides formed the basis for planning the 1980 national census. The PDS was defunded in the 1980s and the whereabouts of most of the primary data, at one time on magnetic tapes, is unknown.

Decennial census is now the responsibility of the National Statistical Office, usually with support from the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, the US Census Bureau, AusAID, and other international donors:

- 1980 – generally accepted as a reliable census, the first with full national coverage;
- 1990 – it is accepted by the NSO that this census was erratic and the results not reliable;
- 2000 – this census received considerable donor support, all census points were given GPS locations for the first time, and the results are considered quite good in most areas;
- 2010 – signs of preparations for this census have not yet come to light.

Gap analysis / recommendations for further work

The following points refer to gaps in knowledge which should be redressed in parallel with a field phase of social mapping:

1. The patrols reports generated in Kokoda, Port Moresby and Sogeri warrant more detailed examination to extract information about the location of villages, cultural affiliations, village populations and the names of leading men.

2. The maps, especially those created from aerial photographs beginning in 1942 and the post war series, provide basic data at fixed times. The search for maps at the Australian National Library and the Australian War Memorial should be continued.
and an approach made to the Defence Imagery and Geospatial Organisation. The maps known to be in the USA (para 159) may be among those held by DIGO.

3. The Seventh Day Adventist Mission records, described briefly in paras 147-148, require further study, and checks need to made on the extent to which relevant records from Papua have been released online.

4. Apart from the reference to Lester Lock of the Seventh Day Adventist Mission (para 146), those people who may have potentially valuable recollections have not been identified. Papuan Seventh Day Adventist pastors who served for long periods among the Mountain Koiari but who were from other areas, government officers, such as those stationed at Kokoda and Sogeri or who opened the first schools in the AOI should be sought and their oral testimony recorded.

---

7 www.defence.gov.au/DIGO
CHAPTER 3
LINGUISTICS

Author: Chris Ballard

Relation to the TOR: This chapter reviews the history and current state of knowledge of the languages of the AOI communities.

In the absence of a detailed ethnographic understanding of these communities (Chapter 4), the linguistic picture provides the best means of characterising the AOI communities: it sketches the origins and evolution of the communities, and their relationships to each other and with their neighbours.

The linguistics help with tracking population movements in both the deep and recent past (Deliverable 3) and the reconstruction of historical records (Deliverable 4).

Linguistic research

172 Professional linguistic research in the Port Moresby area dates back to the pioneering work of Sidney Ray, who distinguished between Melanesian (or Austronesian) and Papuan (or non-Austronesian) languages in the area, and identified a large „Koiari Group“ of languages in the Port Moresby hinterland (Ray 1929). For his material, Ray appears to have relied almost entirely on wordlists compiled by government officers patrolling in the Koiari area. Later, Arthur Capell (1954, 1962) collated wordlists including Koiari and „Efogi“ as part of his regional review of New Guinea languages; his field notebook indicates that he visited Eilogo Plantation on the Sogeri Plateau (Tom Dutton pers.comm.).

173 Tom Dutton laid the foundations for serious linguistic research in the study area with fieldwork beginning in 1966 and extending over some thirty years from a base at the village of Kailakinumu, at the eastern edge of the Sogeri Plateau. In addition to his work on Koiari, Dutton has also collected field materials in the languages of Barai, Koita, Mountain Koiari, Managalasi and Ömie, all of which are now available amongst the Dutton Papers, archived at the ANU’s Pacific Research Archive (Dutton n.d., see Appendix A).

174 Teams from the Summer Institute of Linguistics (based at Ukarumpa, in Eastern Highlands Province), have also worked with several of the languages in and around the study area, including Mountain Koiari (Roger and Susan Garland), Barai (Peter Evans, Michael Olson), Ömie (A. Tobitts, J. Austing, Randolph Upia), and Managalasi (Jim and Judith Parlier).
Language Origins and Relationships

175 The study area is dominated by members of a single, closely related group of languages, the Koiarian Language Family (Map 11). The Koiarian Family is composed of two sub-families: Koiaric, which includes Koita, Koiari (or Koiali) and Mountain Koiari; and Baraic, which includes Barai, Managalasi and Ömie (or Aomie).

176 Koita is now restricted between the Laloki River and the coast, Koiari extends from the coastline southeast of Port Moresby inland to the Laloki Valley, the Sogeri region and the foothills of the Astrolabe Range, while Mountain Koiari covers the area from the lower Laloki River up to and over the Owen Stanley Range, as far as Kokoda. Of the Baraic sub-family, only a portion of the Barai-speaking community is included within the study area, in Upper Mt Obree and Central Mt Obree Wards of the Rigo Inland Rural LLG (para 52).
Biage people, often cited as a group distinct from the Mountain Koiari, actually speak a dialect of Mountain Koiari.

Genetic relationships amongst the different languages of the Koiarian Language Family are shown in Figure 2.
Dutton proposes, on the basis of linguistic and oral historical evidence, that Koiarian ancestors dispersed from a centre in the headwaters of the Kumusi River, on the northern side of the Owen Stanley Range. The Koiarian languages and dialects farthest from the Upper Kumusi Valley (such as the Koita and Koiari) were probably those that dispersed earliest. Subsequent expansion by the Mountain Koiari, themselves under pressure from inland migration by Orokaiva-speakers of the north Papuan coast, then induced the Koita and Koiari to migrate towards the coast.

Some indication of the relative size of the different Koiarian language communities (during the 1960s) is summarized in Table 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koiari</td>
<td>1176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Koiari</td>
<td>3734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barai</td>
<td>3008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koita</td>
<td>2260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ömie</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managalasi</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Details of the three languages represented in the study area – Koiari, Mountain Koiari and Barai – are provided below.

**Koiari**

Koiari-speaking settlements are centred on the Sogeri Plateau, but extend down to the foothills of the Astrolabe Range and towards the coast (Map 12). Dutton distinguishes
between a more diverse eastern and more homogenous western dialect of Koiari; these two broad dialect groups run parallel to each other from the Sogeri area down towards the coast.

Note: Labuka = location of Lindt’s _Sadara Makara_ (para 105).

183 Oral traditions documented by Dutton and others suggest a general movement from upland to lowland areas, or east to west. Strong competition for the Sogeri Plateau, as the most fertile land in Koiai territory, has seen successive westward displacements of less successful Koiai communities beyond the Astrolabe Range and onto the coastal lowlands south and east of Port Moresby. This process was still under way during the period of early contact with Europeans in the 1870s.

184 Koiai is spoken in the following settlements: Agitana, Boda, Boreberi, Boteka / Haima, Dabunari, Dagoda, Fakonama, Fulimuti / Fulumuti, Futinumu, Gubabegai, Gurumunumu,
Ianabewai, Kailakinumu, Kalakadabu, Kerekadi, Labuka, Luburu, Maiana, Manurinumu / Manurunumu, Mesime, Mokonumu, Ogotana / Boredabu, Semic / Torenumu, Senuku, Serepewatei, Vaigaai, Vaivai / Maiberi, Vesilogo, Wahonodada / Wahonadada (Dutton 1969, 1973). Note that these settlements were documented during the 1960s and some of them may have moved or been abandoned since.

Published Koiari language materials include a dictionary designed for Koiari speakers (Dutton 1992), and a more technical dictionary with grammar notes (Dutton 2003).
Mountain Koiari

186 Speakers of Mountain Koiari occupy a large number of relatively small settlements that straddle the Owen Stanley Range, spilling over west and south towards the Laloki River (Map 13). Mountain Koiari is spoken in six different dialects – southern, central, western, northern, eastern and lesser-eastern’ (Dutton 1975). Amongst these dialects, the most distinct is the southern dialect, which shares a boundary with Koiari, and thus resembles Koiari most closely; the largest single dialect is Central Koiari.

187 Dialect separation within Mountain Koiari probably reflects a lengthy process of differentiation through movement generally from east to west. Dutton proposes the Yodda and Kumusi valleys as the likely most recent points of origin for the Mountain Koiari-speaking communities; some dialect communities have remained largely stationary, while others have moved south and west across the Owen Stanley Range into the headwaters of the Vanapa, Brown and Goldie rivers.

188 Mountain Koiari is spoken in the following settlements: Abuari, Alola, Amaseba (Suku), Auwaiba’iwa (Vioribaiwa), Awoma, Badiloho, Bagianumu, Biage (Biagi), Biniga, Bisiatana, Bodinumu, Boine, Boridi, Boura, Dubi, Ebe, Edebu, Eguru, Elologo, Emoia, Enage, Enivilogo, Gosisi (Tobiri), Hagari, Hagutawa, Haiilogo, Horigi, Hugu, Isurava, Itu, Iworo, Kagi (Agii), Kanga, Karukaru, Kerea, Kotoi, Kovelo, Kovio, Launumu, Luburu, Madilogo, Manumu, Moroka (Meroka), Motumotu, Nadinumu, Naoro, Pelai, Samoli, Savaia, Seiba, Tetebi, Uaribari (Vabari), Uleri, Vadulogo, Wamai, Wowonga (Wawanga) (Dutton 1969, 1973).

189 Note that these settlements were documented during the 1960s and some of them may have moved or been abandoned since. For example, James (2008: 156) indicates that Uleri is now uninhabited.

190 Published Mountain Koiari language materials include grammar sketches and Bible materials by Roger and Susan Garland. A copy of Roger Garland’s unpublished Mountain Koiari-English dictionary is held in the Dutton Papers, as are Dutton’s own field notebooks, wordlists and collections of Mountain Koiari stories.

Barai

191 Barai is spoken in a wide arc, extending on either side of the Owen Stanley Range at Mount Obree, and along the southeastern and eastern boundaries of Koiari and Mountain Koiari, to the headwaters of the Mimai and Laba tributaries of the Kemp Welch River (Map 14). The widespread distribution of Barai-speakers is reflected in the presence of at least eleven distinct dialects. The origins and the direction of migrations of the Barai-speaking communities are not evident from the sources presently available.
Within the study area, Barai is spoken in the following settlements: Doe, Barataka, Waifanomu, Sorikoro, Idagigolo, Tabu, Ipoiduburu, Abowana, Dorobisoro, Mimai. Note that these settlements were documented during the 1960s and some of them may have moved or been abandoned since.


5. The three language communities that have the longest continuous history of association with the study area are Koiari, Mountain Koiari and Barai.

6. Intensive linguistic research has been conducted on all three languages, and a large body of results is available either in the form of publications or as unpublished papers held by the Summer Institute of Linguistics in Ukarumpa (PNG) and amongst the Dutton Papers at The Australian National University in Canberra.

7. High frequencies of settlement relocation and population movement in the study area will have transformed the linguistic distribution since the period when much of this research was undertaken, and a high priority for Phase 2 of this study will be to determine the linguistic identity of the current suite of settlements.

8. Some assessment is required of the relative sustainability in the long term of each of the study area languages and dialects, and of measures that might be adopted to promote vernacular language documentation and learning.
CHAPTER 4
ANTHROPOLOGY

Author: Chris Ballard

Relation to the TOR: This chapter sketches what little is known of the ethnography, movements and history of the AOI communities (Deliverables 3 and 4).

Ethnographic descriptions are thin for the AOI, with the only document offering any substantial data dating from 1932.

Consequently, it is currently difficult to say anything meaningful about the social organisation of the area or map connections to land, making for a greater reliance on the linguistic and archaeological sources (Chapters 3 and 5).

Early descriptions

194 Early ethnographic descriptions were made by Octavius Stone (1875-76: 268; 1876: 43-44, 1880) and C.G. Seligman (1909: 324-326), the missionaries William. Lawes (1879, 1883, 1884) and James Chalmers (Chalmers 1886, 1887, 1895; Chalmers and Gill 1885), but it remains the case that there is a lack of adequate anthropological or ethnographic documentation for the AOI. The Government Anthropologist, F.E. Williams, is the author of what is still the sole document (see para 200 et seq.) that seeks to describe some aspect of the structure of Koiari or Mountain Koiari society.

195 In regional terms, however, there is an exceptionally long record of administrative dealings with people of the study area extending back to the 1870s (see Kokoda Timeline, page vi). The reports of visitors (e.g. Dowsett 1925), governors such as William MacGregor and Hubert Murray, and other administration personnel, including patrol officers and geologists such as Evan R. Stanley (Map 17APPENDIX I), form the core of this valuable archive (see further refs. in the bibliography).

Recent ethnographic research

196 More recent ethnographic material on Koiari and Mountain Koiari society is available through the linguistic research and documentation of Tom Dutton, including transcripts of Koiari myths and origin stories (Chapter 3).

197 One aspect of Koiari lives documented in some detail more recently relates to questions of land access and ownership, initially in relation to the effects on Koiari communities of land alienation for rubber plantations, and subsequently in conjunction with the establishment of the Laloki Hydroelectric Scheme and Sirinumu Dam (1954-1963).
By contrast, the Barai, some of whose settlements occupy the southeastern corner of the study area, were the subject of ethnographic field research in 1973-75 for a doctoral thesis by Tom Barker of the University of Toronto (Barker 1979). However, this fieldwork was conducted with Barai of the Wavaga Valley, east of the Owen Stanley Range, and does not strictly pertain to the study area.

Elements of Koiarian Society

Traditional practices and material culture

There is no comprehensive overview of Koiari or Mountain Koiari society during the colonial period, but elements of Koiarian society can be gleaned from the fragments available in early explorer, missionary and administrator reports.

Williams's 1932 paper (Williams 1932) achieved some intellectual fame for its identification of 'sex affiliation' amongst the Koiari, whereby male children belong to the group of their father, while female children identify with their mother's group. Subsequent research among the neighbouring Barai and Ömie groups to the east suggests that this distinction may not have been as rigid as proposed by Williams (Barker 1979, Rohatynskyj 1990; see further refs. by Barker and Rohatynskyj in the bibliography).

Williams observed that each Koiari village, yaga, was clearly named, and distinguished some 24 groups in the Sogeri area, without being able to say with confidence what they represented. He found a word, uhea, applied to relatives but it did not resemble something like the well-known Motuan iduho – 'clan' in the Port Moresby area – or play a part in setting the rules of exogamy.

Williams said: 'The word —clan— would not, I believe, be applicable' (1932: 55).

At least some of the 24 groups were associated with a totemic plant, idi, but the significance of the totems was not clear either to Williams or to many of the Koiari whom he interviewed.

A long history of migration and raiding had produced, even by the 1930s, a situation in which settlements were composed of uhea groups from multiple former settlements. Group names generally reflect the names of individual peaks in their (former) territories (e.g. the Haveri uhea, which derives its name from the Havenumu peak, numu being the Koiari term for hill). On this basis, Williams detected a trend for east-to-west migration, as many groups now occupied lands to the west of the peaks for which they were named.

8 Williams’ paper was reprinted in his collected papers as Williams (1976).
In 1954, Ian Holmes, then Assistant District Officer at Port Moresby and familiar with Koiari communities both personally and through his reading of the administrative archive, provided the following summary of former Koiari settlement patterns:

…the Koiari lived in small well stockaded villages on prominent ridges – the usual manner of living for mountain peoples, divided into small hostile groups who spend most of their life in raiding and being raided. In one of his earliest reports, MacGregor describes a Koiari village group comprising three separate villages about three-quarters of a mile apart on a long low ridge. Two comprised about ten houses each, and the largest village had thirty to forty long houses divided into two rows, with a fairly wide road between. The houses were raised some four to five feet from the ground with a ladder which could be easily withdrawn, and the house and its concave low sweeping roof tapered slightly to the far end. Each village was surrounded with formidable palisades about five feet high. Within the palisaded area – obviously quite large if it contained forty houses – were about nine large trees in which, at heights of thirty to sixty feet, were small tree houses, reached by a native rope ladder which could be easily withdrawn. These tree houses, in which a reserve of storable food was kept, formed the last line of defense [sic] in case of attack, as well as being used for the confinement of young male initiates. (Holmes 1954: 9)

Traditional Koiarian material culture is also poorly described and illustrated, and – given the long history of European contact – surprisingly limited in its representation in national or international museum collections. However, published sources are available for Koiari stone clubs (Haddon 1900), wooden trumpets (Chinnery 1917), tattooing (Barton 1918), and other aspects of bodily decoration and material culture (Papuan Villager 1930a, 1931b, 1939). Limited numbers of Koiari myths and stories have also been documented (e.g. Weiske 1902, Hamilton 1944, Lett 1946).

The power and prestige of the Koiari was commonly said to benefit from their knowledge of sorcery. Williams, for example, wrote: „The coastal people are afraid of the Koiari, and give them a great reputation for sorcery of the particular kind which is usually called vada in Papua‘ (Williams 1932: 53). But again there is no detailed study of the Koiari beliefs and practices in benign or malign sorcery.

Land tenure, land use and subsistence

Although game was formerly abundant in the study area, Koiarians were primarily dependent upon garden produce for their subsistence. Yam (Dioscorea alata) was the principal food staple during the 19th century, but recent surveys (Allen et al 1996) identify sweet potato as the dominant crop now, with banana and Chinese taro as the other staples in the Sogeri area, and yam and taro as the additional staples in upland areas towards Kokoda, along with a wide suite of fruits, nuts and other vegetables. Koiari people have long supplied coastal communities with game meat in return for fish and salt, and cash crops were promoted in the Sogeri area after World War II, but Koiari have not generally prospered from the opportunities of marketing fresh produce to Port Moresby.
A formerly communal system of land tenure in which decisions about land (not previously a scarce commodity) were taken by *uhea* groups, has been gradually replaced by individual or family control over land (with no small encouragement from Europeans seeking to acquire Koiari land). The acquisition of Koiari lands by outsiders – whether government or private – has been perhaps the dominant feature of post-war Koiari society, with large areas effectively alienated to plantations, the Laloki Hydroelectric Scheme and Sirinumu Dam, and the Variarata National Park. Koiari resentment over limited compensation for these land losses and the consequent diminishment of opportunities has a long history.

**Anthropology – summary**

1. There has been very little intensive ethnographic or anthropological fieldwork or documentation amongst either Koiari or Mountain Koiari communities. The most substantial document is still a brief 1932 paper by F.E. Williams.

2. Historical documents from mission, government and explorer sources provide the basis for some ethnohistorical reconstruction of changes in Koiari society since the 1870s.

3. Land acquisitions by outsiders remain an enduring source of contention, particularly in the Sogeri area.
CHAPTER 5
ARIOEHOLOGY

Author: Chris Ballard

Relation to the TOR: This chapter describes the history and current state of knowledge of the archaeology or prehistory of the AOI.

The purpose is to providing insights into the past human occupation of the AOI, fleshing out settlement patterns, demographic trends and population movements (Deliverables 1 and 3), given the thin ethnographic documentation available for the area.

It is also to show the significant pre-colonial cultural heritage in and around the AOI, notably that it is a region of the greatest density of known rock art sites in Papua New Guinea. The 26,000 year old site of Kosipe, it may be noted, lies 70 km northwest of Kokoda, in the Owen Stanley Range.

Archaeological research

210 Archaeological research within the study area has been sporadic and restricted almost entirely to surveys of rock art sites and occasional test excavations of rockshelters, with little result. However, more substantial excavations beyond the immediate boundaries of the study area provide some indication of the prehistory of the region.

211 The first concerted attempt to document archaeology in the study area was a series of reports by the Government Anthropologist, W. Mersh Strong (1923a, 1923b, 1924), who recorded four rock art sites during 1922: at Eriama, Ifa Kuruku, Isakerikeri and Wagava.

212 These finds inspired his successor, F.E. Williams (1931, n.d.), to conduct a more thorough survey of rock art in the Sogeri region, during which he located a further six sites: Yoiworo I, Yoiworo II, Rouna, Wureva Yani, Wakuia Wai and Yaritari (some of these sites are plotted in Map 15).

213 Williams documented oral traditions that related to the rock art, but noted that the present Koiari population of the area made no claims to be responsible for its production. An Australian army officer and amateur archaeologist, Maurice Leask (1943b), revisited a number of Williams’s rock art sites in 1943, and found two further sites.

214 With the advent of professional archaeology in PNG during the 1960s, first J. Peter White (in 1964) and then Susan Bulmer (in 1968-69) returned to the Sogeri sites, separately recording many of the known rock art sites and identifying a number of new sites. Amateur records of the Sogeri rock art sites continued to be made during the 1960s and 1970s (e.g. Kleckham 1966, Holdsworth 1976, 1981, 1986).
215 The most recent professional surveys, taking place during the 1980s, were led by Pamela Swadling, then Curator of Archaeology at the PNG Museum and National Gallery, and identified a further 19 new rock art sites in the Eriama area alone.

216 Archaeological excavations and surface surveys in the study area were also initiated by Williams in 1931, when he conducted test excavations at several of the Sogeri rockshelters, uncovering limited quantities of pottery and flaked stone material. Until the 1960s, the only other in situ archaeological finds came from Leask’s wartime investigations, which identified a hilltop midden site inland from Port Moresby (1943a).

217 White’s trial excavations at a number of the Sogeri rock shelter sites in 1964 followed the lead of Williams, but with little more by way of result. Much more substantial remains were uncovered through a series of excavations by Allen, Bulmer and Ron Lampert at the inland hill sites of Eriama and Nebira between 1968 and 1969. The Eriama and Nebira sites fall just outside the study area but, along with the excavations at the highland swamp site of Kosipe (approximately 70 km northwest of Kokoda Station), they offer the best available indication of the probable prehistoric sequence for the study area.


Archaeological sites within and beyond the Study Area

218 Precise details are not yet available for many of the sites of the study area (Appendix G), and will require a visit to the PNG National Museum to consult the National Site Register. The few archaeological sites known to lie within the study area are located on the Sogeri Plateau. Dense concentrations of open settlement and rock art sites are found just beyond
the southern boundaries of the study area, in the Laloki Valley, and further afield along the Port Moresby coastline and its offshore islands.

219 The regional prehistoric sequence, as inferred from sites outside the study area, extends back to at least ca. 26,000 years before the present (BP). This date is associated with the large stone tools, including waisted blades and axe blades, excavated at Kosipe, some 70 km northwest of Kokoda Station and just beyond the headwaters of the Vanapa River (White, Crook and Buxton 1970). The Kosipe site, situated at 2000 m, indicates intensive Late Pleistocene use of the Papuan Highlands, which can also be anticipated for the Kokoda area.

220 Adventitious finds of other large stone tools and artefacts, unearthed during early mining activity at the Yodda Valley Goldfield, to the north of Kokoda, are also suggestive of a rich prehistoric sequence in the upland areas on either side of the Owen Stanley Range. These finds include an elaborate and unique flaked obsidian axe blade, stone mortars and pestles, and a ‘dagger-shaped’ object produced in clay (Casey 1934, Chinnery 1919, Etheridge 1908, Seligman 1915, Seligman and Joyce 1907). No means of dating these finds is available, but the production of stone mortars and pestles is generally regarded as dating broadly to the mid-Holocene, from 8000 BP - 3000 BP (Swadling, Wiessner and Tumu 2008).

Map 16. Archaeological Sites of the Port Moresby Region (Swadling 1977).

221 From about 2000 BP, specific locations along the Papuan coastline around Port Moresby were settled by Austronesian speakers, the first producers of pottery in the region and well-connected to regional sources of goods such as obsidian from Fergusson Island. Pottery from this early phase was largely red-slipped, decorated with shell impressions and incisions, occasionally in-filled with lime. From about 1000 BP, pottery production
appears to have grown more localised and specialised, with several pottery-producing communities relocating to small offshore islands, such as Motupore Island in Bootless Inlet, southeast of Port Moresby (Map 16). Archaeologists interpret this shift as marking the beginning of the elaborate trade networks that linked the Port Moresby coast to the distant Papuan Gulf. The Port Moresby hinterland sites of Nebira and Eriama are regarded as inland adaptations by these Austronesian-speaking communities, which were evidently interacting and trading with non-Austronesian communities already resident in the region. Stone axe blades were traded from the Owen Stanley Range down to the coastal pottery-producers, and pottery, in turn, was traded inland at least as far as the Sogeri Plateau (Allen 1972; Bulmer 1968, 1975, 1978; Lampert 1969; Swadling 1977, 1978; White and O’Connell 1982, Worthing and White 1985).

No attempt has been made at formal analysis or direct or indirect dating of the rock art sites of Sogeri and the Laloki Valley. While some of the Laloki Valley sites may prove to be connected to Austronesian settlement and exploitation of the Port Moresby hinterland, the Sogeri sites were almost certainly produced by non-Austronesians. However it is also evident that extensive integration has taken place between the Austronesian and non-Austronesian communities of the region, such that the Koita are in many respects culturally closer to the Austronesian-speaking Motu than they are to the other members of the Koiarian Language Family. This observation is supported by the findings of an early genetic study of Motu and Koita (Groves et al 1957-58), which demonstrated that the two language communities had intermarried so extensively, at some period prior to European contact, that they could no longer be distinguished genetically from each other.

Archaeology – summary

1. Archaeological research within the study area has been sporadic and restricted almost entirely to surveys of rock art sites and occasional test excavations of rockshelters, with little result.

2. Substantial archaeological discoveries in areas immediately adjacent to the study area suggest that a rich record of human habitation and use is also likely to be found within the study area, including open settlement sites dating back to the Late Pleistocene, megafauna finds, and rich cave and rockshelter deposits.

3. The study area contains the greatest density of known rock art sites in Papua New Guinea, which warrants a comprehensive review and field survey. The detailed records available for some of these sites from the 1920s, 1930s and 1960s will enable a thorough program of conservation and monitoring of the art.

4. Consultation of the Site Survey Files on the National Site Register at the PNG National Museum and Art Gallery (not possible for this desktop study) will provide further details for known sites, and may reveal further archaeological or cultural heritage sites in or around the study area.
CHAPTER 6

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LANDOWNER ENGAGEMENT
STRATEGY AND SECOND PHASE OF SOCIAL MAPPING

Author: John Burton

Relation to the TOR: This chapter sets out the technical means of managing dealings with communities in the AOI.

Five goals are set out for consultation and decision-making: the purpose is to show what effective landowner engagement should look like.

A strategy for social mapping is set out: the purpose is to acquire the knowledge base to be able to achieve the five goals.

A strategy for landowner engagement is set out, comprising capacity building at the agency level and capacity building at the community level: the purpose is to implement procedures to achieve the five goals.

The general problem

223  ‘Landowner engagement’ embraces the processes of both consultation and decision-making. It includes ‘managing the expectations of landowners’.

224  The general problem faced in the Kokoda Track area, as in any area hosting a development project, is that consultation and decision-making should satisfy the following five goals:

   Goal A  That consultations are undertaken at locations and with groups of people meaningful in terms of the rights and interests found in the project area;

   Goal B  That representatives emerging from such groups are properly authorised to make decisions on behalf of them;

   Goal C  That they enjoy the continuing endorsement of other members of their groups;

   Goal D  That the process is accepted by the representatives and members of like groups in the project area; and,

   Goal E  Taken as a whole, the decisions that emerge from the consultative / decision-making process result in measurable progress in fulfilling the objectives of the project.

225  If the first four above look like a prescription for a form of local or village government, this is deliberate. And indeed, local government has been present in the Koiari and Kokoda areas since the early 1960s, currently in the form of Local Level Governments. But if the LLG system satisfies goals A-D above yet, E, no measurable progress can be detected
using standard indicators – say those in the Millennium Development Goals – then the problem has not been solved.

*Why projects fail even with good consultation*

When development programmes do not have hoped-for outcomes, the cliché is to blame a lack of consultation – that is, too little time was allowed for consultation, or the wrong people were consulted – but this is not always the correct diagnosis.

In Papua New Guinea, consultation usually means ensuring the people with rights to project land are correctly identified and are able to express their views in an appropriate manner.

However, things are not so simple because of the many configurations of social systems and land ownership. Historical circumstances can lead many people to be dependent on a few for access to cultivable land; if so, general community meetings may appear to run smoothly, but if the people talking the most are not the principal land owners, it is unlikely that much will be decided. In other words, consultations can be ineffective if the rights and interests of the people being consulted fail to match the rights and interests that are actually needed to be in play.

Whether representatives who may emerge from community groups are *authorised* to make decisions is dependent of having arrived at meaningful groups in the first place. Mistakes can still be made; if a committee is formed, a particular balance of interests may be inflexibly entrenched, or spokesmen come to the fore who participate in making decisions over matters they do not have interests in.

For example, Ward members are elected to represent between two and five villages. As in all democratic systems, a mathematically fair system of representation can still produce decisions against the wishes of sections of the population – in the other villages – but this is a critical flaw if the opposers control the land required for project use.

(As we have already said, para 45 above, it is a quirk of the Kokoda Track Special Purpose Authority is that the presidents of the Koiai Rural and Kokoda Rural LLGs are automatic members, and this can result in presidents being elected from communities that are not in the KTA area.)

In the three tiers of government, representatives obviously endeavour to retain the *continuing endorsement* of their followers by contesting elections. As discussed earlier, however, the office bearers of landowner associations have a reputation for avoiding elections (para 30); when this occurs, the consultative process suffers accordingly.

Acceptance by like communities in the project area means that Goals A-C above may be faithfully achieved, but if other parties form a perception that their interests have been compromised, for whatever reason, the overall process can still fail.
These points have, it may be suspected, been leading up to a diagnosis having something to do with the difficulty of obtaining and sustaining a coalition of interests along a 96 km ribbon of country.

Certainly, if it possible from a distance to talk of a 'Kokoda Track syndrome', it is made up of collection of symptoms: spats over various issues and the periodic blockades of the Track that have high media visibility, but also in the less well known disputes between villages over the usage of camp sites and the hiring of porters.

All betray a failure in the process of decision-making on Track matters; indeed, we would not ourselves be writing this report if Track governance issues were of no consequence or had been solved. How can social mapping help fix this?

Social mapping as a means of improving the quality of landowner engagement

We will not repeat the conceptual background to mapping here. Suffice it to say that a central purpose of the field investigations for social mapping is to provide the knowledge that can help achieve Goals A-E above.

Social mapping typically begins, as has this project, with archival investigations, which are then followed by field investigations covering the whole project area. Field work, during which information is sought from individual families, comprises:

- physically going to and representing in map form the locations of all residential localities;
- genealogical census of the project area communities;
- the identification of social groups drawing on census results and genealogy;
- anthropological inquiries into the systems of social organisation and land ownership;
- anthropological inquiries into the form of leadership, and the duties and powers of leaders;
- inquiries about community organisations and the interests and people they represent;
- oral historical inquiries for principal social groups;
- inquiries into the physical landscape features that mark off the land holdings of social groups / extended families, if this is meaningful (but short of formal survey);
- the investigation of the background to significant disputes among social groups, with the consent of the parties (but not including mediation or intervention).

---

9 A lengthy explanation was given in the scoping study completed last year (Filer and Burton 2008: 4-15) and this should be referred to for further information.

10 This type of field work is not to be confused with Rapid Rural Appraisal, a method commonly encountered in development assessment, or forms of social survey in which a large area can be covered quickly using survey assistants. Social mapping should only be undertaken by persons with ethnographic training and adequate field experience.
The first objective of the field investigations is to yield information that can enable Goal A to be achieved (‘consultations … meaningful in terms of the rights and interests in the project area’).

During field work, anthropological inquiries invariably cast light on the make-up of social groups, the duties and powers of leaders,11 and what representatives are authorised to decide on behalf of others. All committees having only certain powers, better knowledge of the boundaries of these powers in custom gives guidance on when matters can safely be dealt with in committee meetings and when they must be deferred to community consultations.

This provides the knowledge to enable Goal B to be achieved (‘representatives … properly authorised’).

During field work, anthropological inquiries invariably cast light on what people think about their current system of representation, and whether they feel they are being kept in the dark, or that they can make their wishes felt in the places where decisions are made.

This provides the knowledge to enable Goal C to be achieved (‘continuing endorsement’).

During field work, inquiries among people in the project area, but not currently involved in project activities, invariably cast light on their perceptions of the management of the project and how others are benefitting. Ideally, the programme of activities for a run of years is properly understood across the project area; if it is not, and some without activities in a particular year are resentful, something has gone wrong and remedial action is needed.

This provides the knowledge to enable Goal D to be achieved (‘accepted by members of like groups’).

Finally, while project evaluation should always be done in its own right, social mapping field work gives the opportunity to find out how decisions made on a project sit with all project area communities, and thus whether they had the effect they were supposed to.

This provides the knowledge to enable Goal E to be achieved (‘measurable progress with project objectives’).

Our recommendations for a field phase of social mapping

We recommend that the fourteen wards of the Kokoda Track Local Level Government Special Purpose Authority should be the primary focus of a field phase of full scale social mapping.

11 If there are leaders. Not all Melanesian societies have leadership positions in the modern sense.
In respect of the Barai, we recommend only basic social mapping be done in the first instance.

**Social mapping coverage area**

The outcome of social mapping among the KTA wards should determine whether further communities should be considered – for example, Koiari settlements along Brown River or on the Sogeri Plateau, or further wards in the Kokoda area. In drawing up terms of reference for this work, a requirement for flexibility and an ability to re-deploy resources at later stages of the work in the light of the findings of earlier stage should be paramount.

If biodiversity values or REDD schemes become prominent in this project and a wider area of the Owen Stanley Range is required to be taken up by the AOI, we recommend that social mapping coverage, and the resources available, be expanded accordingly.

For example, if a larger area of rainforest needed to be included in the southeast of the AOI, and preliminary work among the Barai was not offputting, then we would recommend more social mapping resources be deployed to this area. However, in the first instance we assume that the fourteen wards of the Kokoda Track Local Level Government Special Purpose Authority are the priority for DEC and DEWHA.

**Social mapping tasks and field team**

Social mapping in the KTA wards should encompass the range of inquiries we set out above (para 238), structured around one central task, namely the conduct of a genealogical census based on the 1958 Tax-Census forms we were able to locate at the PNG National Archives (Appendix B).

Our best view of how social mapping should be organised for this area is that a small field team should be used – probably two persons plus village assistants, with the addition of social specialists for initial training, anthropological inquiries and periodic visits – and that a research plan should divide work by the field team into spells of a week to ten days around accessible locations.

Stays of longer than this in any one area should be avoided. Track villages already receive a great many visitors and the field strategy should be mindful of the fatigue and information overload that hosting yet another survey team may induce.

A research plan will need to balance the office time required for data entry and preparations for subsequent field spells. Our experience on long projects is that office time matches field time.12

---

12 A directly comparable project undertaken by ANUE over in 2006-2007 was social mapping for the purposes of resettlement planning at the Porgera gold mine. The population of the mine area communities
Special task – genealogical census in the project area

257 The purpose of conducting a genealogical census is to account for all the people in the project area who make up the communities with traditional rights to land. The starting point in any such exercise is variable, the ideal being some previous survey or census which shows the communities before significant disruptions have occurred, such as movements of people in or out of the area for work or voluntary resettlement. In the present instance we have established that the 1958 Tax-Census sheets form this base line – in fact, in an exceptionally complete form.

258 The Tax-Census sheets list a total of 1822 names for the Mt Koiari and Biage linguistic divisions in 1958, which equate approximately to the four contemporary Mountain Koiari wards, plus Wards 8 and 9 of the modern Kokoda Rural wards. At a growth rate of 2% p.a. for 50 years (this is not an excessive rate), 1958 population figures can be multiplied by approximately 2.7 to obtain an estimate of today’s population. For the villages represented in Appendix B, we think this amounts to approximately 4920 people.

259 Since the modern census units for the same area appear to have contained only a few more people in 2000 than in 1958 – about 2180 persons in the wards that cover the same area – as many as 2700 other people will need to be accounted for. It is very likely, from our preliminary inquiries, that most of these will be made up of people in branches of extended families that live outside the Track area, at Sogeri, in settlements along the Laloki River, further afield in the Kokoda area, in other places in Papua New Guinea such as Popondetta and Port Moresby, and places outside Papua New Guinea (e.g. Queanbeyan).

260 A key task, therefore, is to determine how the population of landowners is distributed among different places. We may anticipate that a weakening of physical links to place has occurred, in the sense of Koiari and Biage people do not now all have birthplaces in the Track area – but not a fundamental weakening of the assertion that their ‘home’ place is the Track area – and that the reckoning of traditional rights to land along the Track has the new complication that various forms of absentee-caretaker relationship may have evolved to mediate decision-making over land since the 1960s.

---

was broadly similar at around 6,000 people. Two significant differences were (a) community members lived in a compact area a short distance by road or foot from the social mapping team’s project office and (b) it was not necessary to set aside time for background investigations as the anthropology of the project area was relatively well known prior to the start of the project.

The social mapping team comprised two data gatherers, a field supervisor responsible for logistics and liaison with community leaders and the client organisation, and one of us – Burton – as ANUE team director and social mapping specialist. The three in the field, recruited in Papua New Guinea, worked a roster of three weeks on with field breaks. After an initial period of training with the field team, Burton worked in Canberra and made field visits at 8 week intervals (in 2007). Field updating forms were exchanged by email and courier.
The four Mountain Koiari wards – Map 2

261 The wards have an average resident population of 350 people (Appendix A). A location in each, or very nearby in the case of Ward 5, can be accessed by air, from which other settlements can be reached by foot. Naoro village is rather more isolated that other places in this group, and in probably most easily reached by foot from Owers Corner.

262 We anticipate few difficulties in obtaining full coverage of these wards.

The two Koiari Rural LLG wards at Sogeri – Map 3

263 The wards have an average resident population of 485 people (Appendix A) and their settlements are easily accessible by road.

264 Boundary-setting will be somewhat more difficult in these wards because of (a) the number of settlers from other parts of Papua New Guinea who also live in the area, (b) the likely interaction between communities here and other Koiari communities in the Sirinumu area.

265 Further coverage of Tax-Census Sheets will be needed among villages in the Sirinumu area.

The eight wards in Kokoda Rural LLG – Map 4

266 The wards have an average resident population of 690 people (Appendix A) and their settlements may be accessed by air to Kokoda then by road; off-road settlements can be reached by foot.

267 Boundary-setting will be also be difficult in this area because of (a) the number of settlers from other parts of Papua New Guinea who also live here, (b) the likely interaction between communities here and Orokaiva communities in the other parts of the LLG, and (c) the likely interaction between communities here and communities downstream along the Mambare River.

268 Further coverage of Tax-Census Sheets will be needed among villages in the Kokoda Rural LLG.

Recommendations for landowner engagement strategy

269 In the above, we have focussed on the process of social mapping rather than discuss landowner engagement up front. This is deliberate. In our experience, social mapping creates a space in which people are able to air the issues closest to them – and the opportunity to represent their own interests in person – and many of the anxieties that are symptomatic of poor consultation dissolve.
However, among the substantive outputs of social mapping may be anticipated to be recommendations for improvements in the everyday dealings with communities. Some of these will be of a commonsense nature; others will be of a more technical nature.

The first commonsense observation is that ‘landowner engagement’ is not something done by agencies to communities. It is a two-way process of communication, with communities sending just as many – and sometimes more – messages to the agencies who they are supposed to be the clients of.

We distinguish between:

- improvements that can be made by agencies involved in Track matters, where budgets are approved, policies set, and messages about them created – and at the same where messages from communities are consumed, and responses to them made.
- improvements that can be made at the community level, where messages from agencies are consumed, and decisions made by, or on behalf of, community members – and at the same where messages emanating from communities are created.

**Landowner engagement – improvements at the agency level**

Among the many agencies currently involved in Track matters, it is obvious that a persistent handicap is the partial knowledge that each has of the overall situation such that different organisations are likely to be talking with different people or groups within communities.

In our conception of the process, a key purpose of social mapping is to assist with the improved targeting of communications by agencies, in line with Goals A-D above.

Accompanying this handicap is the lack of a consistent means of formulating messages and delivering them. The conventional means of doing this at resource industry projects is through a permanently staffed Community Relations (also Community Affairs or Village Liaison) Department tasked with doing just this. Indeed, operations that try to do their (industrial) work without such departments soon find themselves mired in landowner problems and cannot get anything done.

At the present we see an inter-agency Task Force, which is charged with the equivalent of a resource project’s work, but nothing exactly resembling a Community Relations Department to be the interface with project area communities.

It may be countered that the Kokoda Track Authority should perform this role, but the KTA has two other roles: to represent the Track communities politically and to collect and manage trekking fees. If it were to perform community relations functions effectively, it would have to shed these roles.
Similar arguments can be mounted against landowner representative committees of various kinds: if the emphasis is on *representation*, then they run the danger of duplicating political structures already in existence for this purpose. It may be that liaison functions can be performed by such committees under limited circumstances and perhaps in the context of project implementation, but (a) if things go wrong in any way (Goals A-D are not achieved), they cannot be performed and (b) this is not a prescription for liaison for multiple projects implemented by many agencies.

Without further investigation, we cannot make specific recommendations; our inclination, however, would be to separate community relations functions from other roles, and locate in a single agency. We cannot definitively say which of the agencies dealing with Track matters should be the host for community relations functions; prerequisites for success are:

- Normal office facilities in Port Moresby, with a suboffice in Kokoda;
- A reliable budget for travel and accommodation in the Track area, and an emphasis on handling important matters at meetings in villages;
- A premium placed on the avoidance of conflicts of interest – e.g. Village Liaison Assistants can be recruited from the Track area, but the Community Relations Manager’s position should be filled from among experienced CR managers, and senior deputies from social science graduates, who come from elsewhere in Papua New Guinea;
- A premium placed on keeping community relations functions at arms length from political representation and decision-making over trekking income and development projects.

*Landowner engagement – improvements at the community level*

Communities can be extremely active in formulating messages about what they have to say, packaging them in a manner they feel will be effective, and delivering them to who they think should receive them.

Unfortunately, some kinds of ‘messaging’ in use can be costly, puzzling, or directed at recipients not in a position to respond. The most familiar of these, the Track closure, bears a close resemblance to what happened on in the early 1980s during the construction of the Ok Tedi mine: constant road blocks. These became so frequent that a company manager observed:

> The road block syndrome has now become the accepted means of communicating with the Government and the Company. Established channels of communication are being ignored. Every time there is a road block we all come running and decisions are made—this trend must be stopped now and the people’s faith in acceptable avenues of communication restored.\(^\text{13}\)

\(^{13}\) Taken from an Ok Tedi Mining Ltd inter-office memo dating to December 1982.
282 In both case orthodox alternatives would be writing a letter, visiting a project office, or raising an agenda item at a meeting. But, as 25 years ago, it appears that Track closures catch everyone’s attention and are therefore felt to be effective.

283 In Ok Tedi, it was believed that ‘channels of communication‘ existed but were being ignored. The actions of landowners, however, made it clear that they thought such channels were ineffective and that no-one listened to them properly unless they erected road blocks.

284 Whether or not we ourselves believe that adequate ‘channels of communication’ exist today between Track villages and their representative bodies, trekking interests, the government, and donors, it is an inescapable conclusion that the people who announce Track closures do not believe that there are, or do not have confidence in them.

285 A similar logic applies to landowner associations that have become single issue pressure groups (para 27). It is likely they have done so because of the perception by those who have created them of a gap in how their interests are handled.

286 It is often overlooked that development projects of any kind place a considerable burden on communities in simply being able to keep abreast of their affairs and that, if there is a pool of well-educated, articulate community members, they are probably employed full time in town and are hard-pressed to devote the time to attending meetings.14

287 In our conception, digesting the very considerable amount of information on customary groups and community organisations that will be obtained from a field phase of social mapping is the first step needed to assist these groups and build their capacity to create plans and deal with outsiders.

288 Basic matters are as follows:

- Training in meeting procedures, the duties of office bearers (in the case of associations), and record-keeping;15
- Training in mediation and dispute resolution;16
- Logistical assistance with establishing meeting venues;
- Logistical assistance with planning and scheduling meetings, and notifying attendees in neighbouring villages (when appropriate) and town of meeting dates and venues;

14 We can add that this is a familiar situation in Indigenous communities in Australia.

15 In Australia, this kind of training is provided to Indigenous groups by the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations – e.g. ‘Introduction to Corporate Governance’ [www.orac.gov.au]. There are training providers in Papua New Guinea.

16 In Papua New Guinea, the Law and Justice Sector Secretariat [www.lawandjustice.gov.pg] is a likely place to start looking for training providers. At the Australian National University, State Society and Governance in Melanesia is also a provider, throughout the region, of workshops and short courses on building good governance.
Logistical assistance with office services, e.g. photocopying, typing.

Observing that the *Local-level Governments Administration Act* 1997 provides for Ward Development Committees to be established, these are a possible candidate for capacity building, but prior to having social mapping results and a clearer view of political conditions in the area, we cannot be certain whether a focus on them would be productive (refer para 22).
SOURCES CONSULTED

Index of sections

Preliminary consultations with stakeholders ................................................................. 68
History – pre-WWII ........................................................................................................ 68
History – WWII and the Track ..................................................................................... 70
Languages – Koia and Mountain Koiai ................................................................. 71
Languages – Barai ................................................................................................. 74
Languages – Managalasi ......................................................................................... 74
Languages – Ömie ............................................................................................... 75
Anthropology – early ethnographic descriptions .................................................. 75
Anthropology – Land tenure, land use and subsistence in the Sogeri area .......... 75
Anthropology – Traditional practices and material culture (Koiai and Mountain Koiai) ................................................................. 76
Anthropology – Barai and Ömie ........................................................................... 78
Archaeology ........................................................................................................ 79
Second phase of social mapping and recommendations ....................................... 81
Objectives .............................................................................................................. 111
Privacy and data protection provisions ................................................................. 111
Tasks .................................................................................................................. 112
Deliverables ....................................................................................................... 112

References prefixed with an asterisk (*) have not yet been sighted or consulted.

Preliminary consultations with stakeholders


History – pre-WWII

Administrative sources

*Anon 1905. Report of an Expedition inland from Port Moresby to Test the Feasibility of Establishing an Overland Mail Service to Kokoda. Canberra: National Archives of Australia A6661 barcode 422015

British Parliamentary Papers, Further Correspondence respecting New Guinea, 1883, reprints reports from Ingham and Hanran.

Kokoda Annual Report 1906. G91 416A

**Films**


**Other**


Mackay, Kenneth 1909. *Across Papua, being an account of a voyage round, and a march across, the Territory of Papua, with the Royal Commission*. London: Witherby


Pearl, Cyril 1967. *Morrison of Peking*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson


**History – WWII and the Track**


Bowd, Rueben 2005. *A Basis for Victory: The Allied Geographical Section 1942-1946*. Canberra: Australian National University, Strategic and Defence Studies Centre


James, Bill 2007. *Field guide to the Kokoda Track: An historical guide to the Lost Battlefields*. Sydney: Kokoda Press


Kienzle, Bert n.d. „Report on Kokoda L. of C. Native Carriers …‘ AWM54 577/6/8

McCarthy, Dudley 1959. *South-West Pacific Area – First Year: Kokoda to Wau*. Canberra: Australian War Memorial


Vernon, Dr Geoffrey Hampden 1942-1943. „Diary of Field services in the Owen Stanley-Buna Campaign 1942.‘ AWM52 1/10/1, Item ID PR00787

Languages – Koiari and Mountain Koiari


*Dutton, Tom E. In press. _The dialects of Koiari revisited._ In Ken McElhannon (ed.) Festschrift for Karl J. Franklin. SIL.


*Fison, Lorimer n.d. Lorimer Fison Papers. NLA/MS 7080. Papers include un-attributed Koiari word list and comparative vocabulary.


James, Bill 2008. Field guide to the Kokoda Track: An historical guide to the Lost Battlefields. Sydney: Kokoda Press

Lane, Chris 1976. A Comparative Study of the Koiarian Language Family. Unpublished ms, University of Auckland. [Copy held in Dutton Papers]


**Languages – Barai**

Dutton, T.E. n.d. South Barai Phonology. Held in Dutton papers, ANU.


**Languages – Managalasi**


*Parlier, James 1964. „Managalasi verb inflection.“ *Te Reo* 7: 28-35.


Languages – Ömie


Anthropology – early ethnographic descriptions


Anthropology – Land tenure, land use and subsistence in the Sogeri area


**Anthropology – Traditional practices and material culture (Koiari and Mountain Koiari)**


The Papuan Villager 1931b. “Koiari villages.” *The Papuan Villager* 3(12): 92 [photograph], 94 [Haveri Village]


Quanchi, Max 2007. Photographing Papua: representation, colonial encounters and imaging in the public domain. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. [Chapter 4 – extensive discussion and illustration of Koiari treehouses as iconic images of early colonial Papua]


**Anthropology – Barai and Ömie**


*Rohatynskyj, Marta 1975. „Survey of the Mawoma Valley Ömie.‘ Report to the Canada Council.*


**Archaeology**


Haddon, Alfred Cort 1900b. _A classification of the stone clubs of British New Guinea._ *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 30: 221-250.


Seligman, C.G. 1915. „Notes on an obsidian axe or adze blade from Papua.“ Man 15(91): 161-162.


Strong, W. Mersh 1923b. „Rock paintings from the Central District, Papua (British New Guinea).“ Man 23: 185-186.


Williams, F.E. n.d. Papers. ML. Copies held at PNG National Archives.


Second phase of social mapping and recommendations


APPENDIX A

WARDS AND VILLAGES OF THE KOKODA TRACK LOCAL LEVEL GOVERNMENT SPECIAL PURPOSE AUTHORITY
AT THE 2000 NATIONAL CENSUS

List of Wards follows KTA proclamation.

List of villages in the Wards follows 2000 National Population Census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Koilari Rural Wards in the SPA (Sogeri)</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05 Depo (Mageri)</td>
<td>010 Ianabewai</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Depo (Mageri)</td>
<td>012 Kalakadabu</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Depo (Mageri)</td>
<td>013 Manurinumu</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Depo (Mageri)</td>
<td>026 Bisitabu</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Depo (Mageri)</td>
<td>415 Anglican</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Depo (Mageri)</td>
<td>424 Variarata National Park</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Depo (Mageri)</td>
<td>507 Hombroom Bluff</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Depo (Mageri)</td>
<td>513 Kokoda Trial Motel</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Depo (Mageri)</td>
<td>522 Roua No. 2</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Depo (Mageri)</td>
<td>530 Bahai Centre</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Depo (Mageri)</td>
<td>542 Maketawai</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Vesilogo</td>
<td>020 Vesilogo</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Vesilogo</td>
<td>021 Eru-Dabuna</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Vesilogo</td>
<td>408 Girinumu</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Vesilogo</td>
<td>501 Bisianumu DPI</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Vesilogo</td>
<td>510 Iilo Estate</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Vesilogo</td>
<td>520 Red Shield Farm</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>970</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Koilari Rural Wards in the SPA (Track)</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Boridi</td>
<td>002 Bodinumu</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Boridi</td>
<td>003 Boridi17</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Boridi</td>
<td>004 Dubi</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Boridi</td>
<td>012 Manumu</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Kagi</td>
<td>009 Kagi</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Kagi</td>
<td>013 Nadunumu</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Efogi</td>
<td>005 Efogi No. 1</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Efogi</td>
<td>006 Enivilio</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Efogi</td>
<td>008 Hailogo</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Efogi</td>
<td>019 Efogi No. 2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Manari</td>
<td>001 Manari</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 Incorrectly named as ‘Bodiri’ in the proclamation of the Kokoda Track Local Level Government Special Purpose Authority. Bodiri is correct.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 Manari</td>
<td>010 Madilogo</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Manari</td>
<td>014 Naoro</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Manari</td>
<td>017 Ebologo</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Manari</td>
<td>020 Loni</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1415</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kokoda Rural Wards in the SPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 Asimba</td>
<td>001 Asimba</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 Asimba</td>
<td>002 Kanga</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 Asimba</td>
<td>003 Karukaru</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 Asimba</td>
<td>004 Korogo</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 Asimba</td>
<td>005 Sungeina</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Kovelo</td>
<td>006 Kovelo</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Kovelo</td>
<td>007 Koiasi</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Kovelo</td>
<td>008 Ebea</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Kovelo</td>
<td>030 Savaia</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Kovelo</td>
<td>031 Kovelo Z</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Kovelo</td>
<td>032 Savaia Settlement</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Kovelo</td>
<td>033 Yoda</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Kovelo</td>
<td>034 Koma</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Kovelo</td>
<td>035 Mudiui</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Kovelo</td>
<td>036 Soa</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Kovelo</td>
<td>037 Foka</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Saga</td>
<td>001 Amada</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Saga</td>
<td>003 Fala</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Saga</td>
<td>006 Botue</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Saga</td>
<td>028 Saga</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Saga</td>
<td>036 Manua</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Saga</td>
<td>037 Kokoda Village</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Saga</td>
<td>038 Botue Settlement</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Kokoda Urban</td>
<td>001 Kokoda Station</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Kokoda Urban</td>
<td>002 Kokoda Station</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Kokoda Urban</td>
<td>003 Kokoda Station</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Kokoda Urban</td>
<td>600 CRC/SDA Area</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Kokoda Urban</td>
<td>601 Gollala Compound</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 Kebara</td>
<td>018 Kamondo</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 Kebara</td>
<td>019 Kanandara</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 Kebara</td>
<td>020 Kepara</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 Kebara</td>
<td>026 Perive</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 Kebara</td>
<td>031 Sengi</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 Kebara</td>
<td>032 Manekari</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 Kebara</td>
<td>033 Kaumo</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 Abuari</td>
<td>001 Abuari</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 Abuari</td>
<td>003 Hagutava</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 Abuari</td>
<td>005 Kyle</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 Abuari</td>
<td>007 Palai</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 Alola</td>
<td>002 Alola</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 Alola</td>
<td>004 Isurava</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Waju</td>
<td>014 Havaki</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Waju</td>
<td>033 Sisireta</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Waju</td>
<td>035 Waju</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Waju</td>
<td>037 Hovea</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Waju</td>
<td>038 Gorari</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Waju</td>
<td>039 Wasara</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Waju</td>
<td>040 Housea</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5538</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL** | **7923**
We obtained photocopies of the Tax-Census Sheets for 23 villages in the first instance. In the course of a field project, the Sheets for further places should be acquired as a matter of priority, depending on the areas selected for fieldwork.

Figure 3. Cover sheet for ‘Village or Group: Samoli’, 1958. Samoli (or Samori) is one of two customary groups found at Kagi village.
Figure 4. First page of names at ‘Samoli’, 1958, commencing with the family of the Luluai / Village Constable Selu Kekeve. Selu Kekeve’s son, the late James Vovove Selu (no. 4 on this page), was President of the Koiari Local Government Council in the 1990s.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Division</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Enivilogo</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Emoia (Manari)</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Eguru</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Elologo</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Dubi</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Boridi</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Bodinumu</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Bisiatana</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Baginumu</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Launumu (Efogi)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Hailogo</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Madilogo</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Manumu</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Nadunumu</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Naoro</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Uberi</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Vadulogo (Manari)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Auwalabai'wa</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Koiari</td>
<td>Samoli (Kagi)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1608</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Biage               | Hagutawa                     | 37    |
| Biage               | Abuari                       | 67    |
| Biage               | Alola                        | 60    |
| Biage               | Isurava                      | 50    |
| **Total**           |                              | **214** |

**GRAND TOTAL** | **1822**

Table 5. Number of names shown on Tax-Census sheets for Mt Koiari and Biage linguistic divisions, 1958.
APPENDIX C SOGERI

PATROL REPORTS

Deveni Temu

**Sogeri, 1956 - 1957.**
Patrol officers: Redwood, A. L.; Linsley, G.
138 leaves. 7 patrol reports.
Areas patrolled: Sogeri Valley/ Koiari/ Mt. Brown/ Vanapa River/ Sogeri.

**Sogeri, 1957 - 1957.**
Patrol officers: Linsley, G.
25 leaves. 2 patrol reports.
Areas patrolled: Sogeri Valley/ Koiari/ Sogeri.

**Sogeri, 1958 - 1959.**
Patrol officers: McGrath, W. A.; Byrnes, B. C.; Connolly, K. W.; Gauci, J. A.; Claridge, R.M.
41 leaves. 4 patrol reports.
Areas patrolled: Vanapa River/ Sogeri Valley/ Sogeri.

**Sogeri, 1960 - 1960.**
Patrol officers: Walsh, J. P.; O'Donnell, T.
16 leaves. 1 patrol report.
Areas patrolled: Koiari/ Sogeri.

**Sogeri, 1960 - 1961.**
Patrol officers: O'Donnell, T.; Walsh, J. P.; Lewis, P. E.; Anthony, Q. P.; Brown, M.
87 leaves. 10 patrol reports.
Areas patrolled: Koiari/ Sogeri Valley/ Vanapa/ Sogeri.

**Sogeri, 1963 - 1964.**
Patrol officers: Morris, H. W.
60 leaves. 2 patrol reports.
Areas patrolled: Vanapa River/ Sogeri Valley/ Sogeri.

A list of the Kokoda and Port Moresby patrols is also available but is too extensive to be included here.
APPENDIX D

LIST OF PACIFIC MANUSCRIPT BUREAU MICROFILMS RELATING TO THE KOKODA DISTRICT OF PNG

Prepared by Ewan Maidment and Kylie Moloney
Pacific Manuscripts Bureau
Room 4201, Coombs Building
Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies
The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 0200 Australia
http://rspas.anu.edu.au/pambu

PMB 1162 BROWN, Gerald F. X. , (1909-1968) Patrol Officer/Native Labour Inspector
Title: War diary, patrol reports and personal papers, Papua New Guinea
Dates: 1936-1965
Reels & Format: 2 reels, 35mm microfilm
Holding: Mrs Helen Tracy, Beehive Park, Sodwalls NSW 2790
Available for reference


PMB 1181 MELROSE, Robert (1890-1952)
Title: Diary of an escape from Salamaua, Territory of New Guinea
Dates: 22 Jan-19 Feb 1942
Reels & Format: 1 reel , 35mm microfilm
Holding: Mr Geoff Melrose, Beechwood, NSW, Australia.
Available for reference

Robert Melrose was born in Hay, NSW, on 5 April 1890. He served as a Telegraphist in the Royal Australian Navy on HMAS Yarra in New Guinea waters. He joined the civil administration of the Mandated territory of New Guinea as a Patrol Officer on 9 May 1921. He served initially as an Assistant District Officer to Colonel John Walstab in Kavieng, New Ireland, 1921-1924, than became District Officer at Manus 1924-1926, Aitape 1926-1931, Kavieng 1931-1933, Rabaul and Salamaua until 1936/37, and then at Rabaul till late 1941, when the Department of District Services...
and Native Affairs was transferred to Lae with the Administrator. At that time Robert Melrose was Assistant Director, then Director, of the Department.

Robert Melrose returned to the Territory after the War as Government Secretary based in Port Moresby. He suffered a heart attack and returned to Australia in April 1949. During his retirement, Melrose served on a Committee interviewing applicants for government posts in PNG and also served as Honorary Secretary/Treasurer of the newly formed Retired Officers Association of PNG till his death in September 1959.

(Note by Geoff Melrose.)

In January 1942 two parties evacuated Lae and Salamaua in front of the approaching Japanese forces. One group of young fit people, led by Nick Penglase, went via Wau, Waria valley to Buna and Kokoda. The remaining group of 34, led by Robert Melrose, travelled by pinnace and canoe to Morobe and Buna and then overland to Kokoda.

Diary of escape from Salamaua, Territory of New Guinea. Ms (faint pencil and pen), 22 Jan-19 Feb 1942


Notebook and letterbook (letters-out), Apr-Jul 1941, Feb 1942

Notebook: list of personnel, stores, provisions and expenditure, n.d.

**PMB 1260 Nancy Helen WHITE (1908- )**


Dates: 1931-1994

Reels & Format: 4 reels, 35mm microfilm

Holding: Professor John Waiko, Port Moresby

Available for reference.

NW/12-17 Sr White's correspondence, 1948-1978;

**PMB 1276 WOLFERS, Edward P.**

Title: Letters from Papua New Guinea to the Institute of Current World Affairs, New York

Dates: 1967-1971

Reels & Format: 1 reel, 35mm microfilm

Holding: Pacific Manuscripts Bureau

Available for reference

Edward P. Wolfers taught politics at the University of Papua New Guinea. He later became an advisor to the government of Papua New Guinea on Bougainville and constitutional affairs and Professor of Politics at Wollongong University, NSW.

Letter No.9. Return to Kokoda.
PMB 1314 MIDDLETON, Stanley Guise (1902-1991)
Title: Taubada: an autobiography, Papuan Experiences, 1925-1947.
Dates: 1925-1947
Reels & Format: 1 reel, 35mm microfilm
Holding: Trevor Middleton, Mandura, Western Australia.
Available for reference

Chapter IX: 5 The Loloipa Patrol, n.d. (3pp.)
Chapter IX: 6 The Aiwarra Patrol, n.d. (4pp.)
Chapter IX: 7 The Karuama Patrol, n.d. (5pp.)
Chapter IX: 8 The Mount Victoria — Port Moresby Patrol, n.d. (6pp.)
Chapter X: 3 Kokoda to Port Moresby, 1939-1940 (4pp.)

PMB 1052 JOHNSTON, Edgar Lisle (Ted) & Johnston, Andrew Lisle
Title: Sogeri Rubber Plantations Ltd: Minutes, Directors' Reports, Annual Reports, Balance Sheets and Correspondence
Dates: 1944 - 1983
Reels & Format: 1 reel, 35mm microfilm
Holding: Mr E.L. Johnston
Available for reference

These papers comprise the Papuan company records of Andrew Lisle Johnston (1912-1990) and his son Edgar Lisle Johnston (b.1940), managers and directors of Sogeri Rubber Plantations Ltd from 1936 to 1983 when it was sold.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE MATERIAL ON THIS REEL APPEARS IN THE FOLLOWING ORDER:
Item 1. Minute Book of Sogeri Rubber Plantations Ltd, 1944-65 (frames 1-256)
Item 5. Minutes of Meetings, Annual Reports, Balance Sheets and Correspondence of Sogeri Rubber Plantations Ltd, 1983-81, pages 135-1
Item 4. Minutes of Meetings, Annual Reports, Balance Sheets and Correspondence of Sogeri Rubber Plantations Ltd, 1980-76, pages 189-1
Item 3. Minutes of Meetings, Annual Reports, Balance Sheets and Correspondence of Sogeri Rubber Plantations Ltd, 1975-70, pages 112-1
Item 2. Minutes of Meetings, Directors' Reports, Balance Sheets and Correspondence of Sogeri Rubber Plantations Ltd, 1969-61; 1959-57; 1946s; pages 86-1

PMB 1053 PU YU, Mrs Anna (nee Monina)
Title: Letters to Mrs E.M. Johnston
Dates: March 1974 - September 1992
Reels & Format: 1 reel, 35mm microfilm
Holding: Mr E.L. Johnston
This material is restricted. It is not available for release until 2022 - Copyright Mrs Anna Pu Yu. Anyone requiring information on this material should contact Mr Johnston via P.J. Schultz or
Anna Monina (b.1956) is the daughter of the former hausboi on Sogeri Estate. Mrs Johnston has taken particular care of Anna throughout her life.

There are 73 letters (320 pages) from Anna to Mrs Johnston. Anna did very well at school and left Sogeri to study at Gaulim Teachers' College at Rabaul and it is at this time that she started the correspondence. The letters deal very frankly and vividly with her married life, the happenings in her extended family and her teaching experiences in schools in the Gulf and Southern Highlands Provinces.

PMB 1054 JOHNSTON FAMILY PAPERS
Title: Correspondence, Autobiographical Memos, Family Certificates, Miscellaneous Papers and Sogerinumu magazine of Sogeri High School, Maps and Photographs
Dates: 1934 - 1990
Reels & Format: 1 reel, 35mm microfilm
Holding: Mr E.L. Johnston, PO Box 618, ARMIDALE NSW 2350
Available for access

These papers comprise the family records of Andrew Lisle Johnston (1912-1990), Mrs E.M. Johnston and their son Edgar Lisle Johnston (b.1940). The collection includes: letters from native employees, various family papers, and a large collection of photographs including many of plantation life and work from 1935 to 1977

The contents are:
1. 65 letters from native employees to A.L., E.L. or E.M. Johnston (81pp). The letters cover the period 1962 to 1977 and generally refer to employment on Sogeri Estate or to problems which needed the assistance of the Johnston family. Many are in Pidgin and some in Motu. All have been individually annotated by E.L. Johnston with explanations and, where possible, identify the writer and circumstances.
3. Johnston Family Certificates (44pp) Birth, Marriage, Death, Medical, Medical Aid and Military Certificates; Commissioner for Declarations Certificates and associates Ordinance; A.L. Johnston's 1945 Demobilization Procedure Book and 1975 passport; E.M. Johnston's 1946 Civilian Identity Card
e: Anniversary Race Meeting Programme, 4 June 1956, Boroko
f: Letter from Papua Turf Club to E.L. Johnston to appoint him Clerk of Scales, 7 October 1970
g: Airline Ticket Folder, 'Air Pacific', containing E.L. Johnston's ticket for his last flight to PNG
5. Sogerinumu: the magazine of the Sogeri High School - 1966 and 1967
6. Johnston Family Photographs and Map of the Environs of Sogeri
   Map of Crown Lands and of the Occupation in the Environs of Sogeri by T. Jackson Townsend of
   the Survey Office, Port Moresby, 12 July 1934. The map extends from Rouna Township to the
   headwaters of Eworogo Creek, and shows the boundaries and ownership of the rubber plantations
   7. 480 photographs dating from 1935 to 1990 including many of work and life at Sogeri (128 of
   them are pre-1941, and some show Port Moresby).

PMB 1060 GOODGER, D. R., 1929-1988
Title: Papua New Guinea Patrol Reports and Related Correspondence
Dates: 1954-1963
Reels & Format: 1 reel, 35 mm microfilm
Holding: Mrs Margaret Goodger (widow), P.O. Box 8 Maleny, QLD, 4552
Available for reference

D.R. Goodger held various positions in the Australian public service in Papua New Guinea
between 1953 and 1975. He spent his first ten years in Papua New Guinea working as a District
Officer, initially in the Central District of Papua and later in New Britain.


PMB 6 FASTRE Father Paul
Title: Notes sur les Moeurs et Coutumes des Fujuges, specialement des Tribus d'Alo et Sivu
Dates: Notes completed in 1937
Reels & Format: 1 reel, 35mm microfilm
Holding: Bishop's House, Kairuku, Papua
Available for reference

Father P. Fastre, M.S.C. (born 1880), was a member of the Roman Catholic Mission in Western
Papua, whose headquarters are at Yule Island. His notes were completed in 1937.

Notes on the customs of the Fujuges (English Fuyuges) people of the Mt. Scratchley-Chirima River
area of the Central and Northern Districts of Papua. Principally:

. Ceremonies, dances and songs, including the major ceremony, Le Gabe.
. Warfare
. Chiefs (Utumi).
. Engagement and marriage.
. Conception and childbirth.
. Naming.
. Nose-piercing.
During the 1950s and 1960s the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) was investigating resources in Papua New Guinea on a broad scale using both air photography and checking “ground truth”. As a Botanist with the CSIRO Division of Land Research and Regional Survey, carrying out scientific and terrain exploration in many areas PNG, Mr Pullen wrote regular letters to his wife which are detailed, observant and witty. Mr Pullen’s letters clearly conveys his impressions of the country and the people as well as giving a clear account of his botanical survey practices.

Mr Pullen’s letters document the following expeditions:
1956 Eastern Highlands – Western Highlands
1957 Western Highlands
1958 Ramu – Atitau
1959 Wewak – Lower Sepik
1961 Southern Highlands (Wabag–Tari)
1962 Port Moresby – Kairuku
1963 Kubor Range
1964 Managalase; Finisterre Range (with British Museum)
1966 Gulf District
1967 Port Moresby
1967 Fly River, Western Province
1969 Popondetta - Mt Lamington
1970 Port Moresby, ANZAAS Conference and excursions only
1972 Mt Suckling
APPENDIX E

NAMES OF GROUPS AND PLACES IN THE HISTORICAL RECORD

Hank Nelson

Because of the length of contact there has been considerable change in administrative boundaries and in the names of places and geographical features.

**Brown River** has two main tributaries that join west of the Track and west of the village of Hailogo. On some maps the southern tributary is marked as the Brown River and it was sometimes called the Brown in 1942. On other maps it is the Naoro River. James (2008: 206) states that the Naoro River is a tributary of the Brown, but in the main map that comes with the *Guide* the same river is called the Brown. The Naoro River crosses the Track downstream from the village of war-time village of Nauro. Nauro was also known as Naoro. The war-time village has been abandoned and new village of Naoro/Nauro is on the Track and to the southwest.

The **Mambare River** is sometimes called the ‗Mamba‘, a term often favoured by the Anglican Mission. ‗Mamba‘ is also retained in ‗Mamba‘ the name of the Kienzle property on the Mambare downstream from Kokoda.

The upper Mambare flowing parallel to the Owen Stanley Range from Kokoda to the junction of the Mambare with the Chirima was called the ‗Yodda‘. And when the goldfield was declared on the upper Mambare in 1900 it was officially and commonly known as the Yodda Goldfield.

In the early records there are references to Mt Owen Stanley, the highest peak in the central range and visible from ships passing along the south coast. After William MacGregor climbed this peak in 1889 he named it Mt Victoria. Owen Stanley then became the name of the range rather than the dominant peak.

**Track/Trail** The question of whether the ‗correct‘ name is Kokoda Track or Trail is fiercely contested. Most of the assertions that are given with great confidence are wrong. For example, the term ‗Trail‘ was never heard before World War II or by those Australians who served in the Kokoda campaign in 1942. In fact ‗trail‘ was used infrequently before the war and it occurs in diaries during the war.

‗Trail‘ is said to have been an invention of the Americans. But Australian correspondents in Papua, not in contact with the American servicemen or the American HQ used ‗Trail‘ as early as September 1942.

Geoff Reading, an Australian correspondent has several times claimed that he was the first to use ‗Trail‘, but Trail was in the Australian newspapers before he claimed to have first used it.
_Kokoda Trail_ was officially gazetted as the name in Papua New Guinea and it is recognized in Australian battle honours. The Australian Official Histories use both Track and Trail, but favour Trail.

Many ex-servicemen are fierce advocates of _Track_ rather than _Trail_ and currently in Australia _Track_ is winning more acceptance. Nelson (2003: 126-127) has a note on the controversy. Hawthorne (2003: 233-240) has an extensive discussion of Trail/Track.

**Neneba** In early reports by government officers and miners, there are references to the Neneba (sometimes Bida or Beda) people, who were always characterised as friendly and honest and in spite of being under attack from more war-like peoples were often lightly armed and ready to provide assistance to strangers. In the early reports they were said to occupy villages from just north of the Gap to the Chirima River. By 1914 they were restricted to the northwest in the Chirima area. When Assistant Resident Magistrate (ARM) Jackson visited them in 1914 he called them the _Karukaru tribe_. He said that they had come from _Biagi_ and that the _present generation spoke both Fuyuge and Biagi languages with almost equal facility_. These people as a distinct group over time disappeared from the records. It seems that the Neneba lost territory and then their culture.

**Biage** Note also the uncertainty of the classification of the Biagi / Biage. Stuart-Russell in 1899 wrote of the _Koriri_ or _Biagi_. Jackson in his 1914 patrol report claimed that the distinction between _Biagi_ and _Isurava_, often made in the records, was unnecessary as these were one people. He preferred to call them all the _Isuvara_ tribe. Jackson also said that _Biagi_ was a term imposed in the early years of administration and was adapted from the villagers’ salutation and request for friendship. The 1960 Village Directory has a separate Biage Census Division of 7 villages and 608 people within the Kokoda Subdistrict. In the 1969 Village Directory the Biage villages are within the Kokoda census division of 17 villages and 2,018 people. Dutton in his classification of the languages in 1969 placed the _Biagi_ villages within the larger Northern Dialect group.

There are many variations in spellings, particularly of village names, but as these are similar to what has become the standard spelling: Alola/Alolo, Chirima/Sirima, Manari/Menari, Naduri/Naduli, but these should not normally lead to confusion.

**Owers’ Corner.** Noel Owers was a surveyor. It is correct to refer to _Owers‘ Corner_, but not to _Ower’s Corner_ as it often appears in print. _Owers Corner_ is also common usage, and it is certainly preferable to _Ower’s_ which is simply a mistake.

**Changing Village Sites** Since World War II Uberi, Ioribaiwa, Nauro, Efogi, Kagi, Eora Creek, Alola, Asurava, Deniki have all changed location or been abandoned. Such changes are not limited to those along the Track. The patrol reports report villages shifting and retaining the old name or taking on a new name, or dividing and a new village being established while the old continues.
APPENDIX F

DUTTON PAPERS: MATERIALS ON KOIARI, MOUNTAIN KOIARI, ÖMIE, BARAI AND MANAGALASI

Extracted from a shelf list compiled by Karina Taylor, Pacific Research Archive, The Australian National University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box No.</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item Title/Description</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Koiari</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Copy of A.C.Capell’s notes on Koiari (Sogeri) and Ewowo Wovanga (n.d. but pre-1960).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, R.E. Sex affiliation and its implications, JRAI, LXII: 51-81. P/copy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Koiari elementary readers Books 1 - 15 [Koiari vote Buka 1-15]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Koiari Tene edit by Dumo Tom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Koiari conversations- first field trip 1966. Ts</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Toli’ texts from Koiarian languages, Ts</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre fieldwork notes on languages of Central Papua. Ts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Koiari text input to computer for concordance. Ts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Koiari – 1966 Texts revised. Ts</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Koiari text input to computer for concordance. Ts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Koiari: computer concordance and output [Conversations etc.]. Printout, Folio 2, 1968</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Koiari origin and other stories. Ts</td>
<td>ca. 1960s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aboriginal vocabularies of Koiari Goto and Koita Ga , 1899-90</td>
<td>1899-1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Koiari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Iesu Keliso hotoe tumu [The New Testament in the Mount Koiali language]. South Holland, Ill USA, World Home Bible League.</td>
<td>ca. 1960s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Dutton, T.E., 2006 South Barai phonology, grammar sketch and vocabulary. Ts.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Notebooks - Kokoda – Sairope, Kanga, Gen. Info. about SDA areas, Karukaru, Siorata, Namanadza (or Vora), Emo, Awoma, Pop. Figures for Kokoda sub-district), Book 1 (or 3). Managalasi (Aormie), Book 2 (of 3). Kokoda – Afore (Managalasi), Book 3 (of 3).</td>
<td>ca. 1980s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Managalasi 1, 3, 4, 5 [Primers 1, 3, 4, 5], SIL, Ukarumpa. Maka [The gospel of Mark in Managalasi], SIL, Ukarumpa. Dara’e senti [Dollars and cents in Managalasi], SIL, Ukarumpa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>The lexical dialects of Koiari: maps showing lexical isoglosses. MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ca. 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSR Site Code</td>
<td>Site Name, Location (Duplicate Codes)</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF</td>
<td>Rockshelter, Port Moresby region (AYB, AEC)</td>
<td>Bulmer (1978: 381).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACJ</td>
<td>Nebira 2</td>
<td>Bulmer (1975).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>Nebira 4</td>
<td>Allen (1972).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACR</td>
<td>Boulder, Eriama area</td>
<td>Bulmer (1978: 201-206, 382, fig. 7.2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Cliff, Eriama area</td>
<td>Bulmer (1978: 201-206, 382, fig. 7.2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU</td>
<td>Eriama Rockshelter, Bomana</td>
<td>Strong (1923a), (1923b), F.E. Williams (1931: 122-123), Pretty (1966: 2), Bulmer (1978: 201-206, 382, fig. 7.2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACV</td>
<td>Eriama 1 shelter</td>
<td>Bulmer (1978: 201-206, 382, fig. 7.2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACW</td>
<td>Cliff, Eriama area</td>
<td>Bulmer (1978: 201-206, 382, fig. 7.2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACX</td>
<td>Eriama area shelter / midden</td>
<td>Bulmer (1978: 201-206, 382, fig. 7.2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>Isakerikeri, Nahatana Village</td>
<td>Strong (1924: ‘Station II’), F.E. Williams (1931: 123, 125, 127), Pretty (1966: 3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADW</td>
<td>Rouna / Oma Yaniwa (ADX, ALa)</td>
<td>F.E. Williams (1931: 123, 126), Leask (1943: 116-117), Pretty (1966: 7), White (1967a, ii: Map 3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AED</td>
<td>Ramodordo / Ramadoido Yani (ALK)</td>
<td>White and White (1964: 775, fig. 2), White (1967a, ii: i-ii), Pretty (1966: 10).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEE</td>
<td>Upper Rapids 2</td>
<td>Leask (1943: 120), Pretty (1966: 12).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEF</td>
<td>Upper Rapids 1</td>
<td>Leask (1943: 120), Pretty (1966: 11).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEH</td>
<td>Wakuia Wai</td>
<td>F.E. Williams (1931: 123, 126-127), White (1967a, ii: v-vi, pls. 2-1, 2-2, Map 3), Pretty (1966: 14).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEN</td>
<td>Moka/Mokayani, Laloki (ALJ)</td>
<td>White and White (1964), White (1967a, II: iii).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>Sapphire Creek burial shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>Eriama (57) shelter</td>
<td>Bulmer (1978: 201-206, 382, fig. 7.2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALE</td>
<td>Subitana burial shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALI</td>
<td>Hombrom Bluff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWK</td>
<td>Hombrom Bluff east side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXN</td>
<td>Little Mount Lawes, Brown River</td>
<td>PNG National Museum Site Survey Files (SSF), P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYB</td>
<td>Eriama area</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYC</td>
<td>Eriama area</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYD</td>
<td>Eriama area</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYE</td>
<td>Eriama area</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYF</td>
<td>Eriama area</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYG</td>
<td>Eriama area</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYH</td>
<td>Eriama area</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYI</td>
<td>Eriama area</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYJ</td>
<td>Eriama area</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYL</td>
<td>Eriama area</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYO</td>
<td>Eriama area</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYP</td>
<td>Eriama area</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYQ</td>
<td>Eriama area</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYV</td>
<td>Eriama area</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYW</td>
<td>Eriama area</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYX</td>
<td>Eriama area</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYY</td>
<td>Eriama area, (= ADT?)</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYZ</td>
<td>Eriama area</td>
<td>SSF, P. Swadling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Engraved stone at Nahatana, Sogeri</td>
<td>Strong (1924)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>12 Mile red ochre quarry</td>
<td>Leask (1943)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

THE SEVENTH DAY ADVENTIST MISSION AMONG THE KOIARI, FROM 1913 ACCORDING TO THE AUSTRALASIAN RECORD

Inland New Guinea

Sunday, June 22, saw a string of carriers, men and women, leaving Bisibisita, followed by Brother Lawson and myself. The ten swags contained our bedding, tents, kangs, kerosene, medicines, salt and beads with which to pay carriers and purchase food, and sufficient European tinned food to last a month, when used sparingly with the native vegetables and fruits. We were bound for inland New Guinea to visit the tribes already previously reached and to come in touch with others.

For the first week it rained each afternoon, but the rest of the journey was agreeably fine. The travelling was all on foot along native tracks and was mostly strenuous, with but few miles of level country. Each day, on an average, we climbed four thousand feet, and the descent was sometimes more difficult than the ascent.

Altogether fourteen tribes were visited, seven of them for the first time by any missionary. The Owen Stanley Range was crossed, and Kokoda, the government station 110 miles from Port Moresby, was reached. Breakfast at seven thousand feet, the highest point reached, was enjoyed one morning round a good fire, the wind being cold.

Two of the mission boys, themselves inland lads, accompanied us the whole trip, acting as interpreters, and they were certainly benefited by the experience. At the same time we were able to compile a rough dictionary of several hundred words of their language, which we found different from the one spoken near Bisibisita, and yet more dissimilar to the Port MORESBY language.

The tribes were generally about a day's journey apart, and carriers would take us to the next tribe only, for which each received two strings of beads valued at six pence, and a dessertspoonful of salt. Papuans can eat salt like European children eat sugar. On the home journey carriers who had gone with us for one day, found the next tribe absent from the village, so promptly left the swags and deserted us. Having four boys with us on the way to Bisibisita, we were able to carry the things most needed, leaving the rest to follow a week or two later.

Christ and His crucifixion and the necessity of preparing to meet a soon coming Saviour were the themes mostly dwelt upon at every village. Services were held at the roadside, by the mountain torrent, in the garden, or wherever hearers could be found; and the old, old story became sweeter to the narrators each time it was repeated.

Good attention on the whole was paid to the message delivered, although at first some of the women ran into the bush. One old man especially encouraged us. He was one of the Boura tribe whose village had recently been burnt, and pigs shot by the police because of a case of sorcery resulting in the death of a man. During the first service he called out, "By and by we will know about Jesus and His ways." At the next meeting he exclaimed, "We will soon know about Jesus and His ways," but next morning at worship he said, "Now we know Jesus and His ways."

It was also encouraging to find that some of the intrepid boys, who had previously been at Bisibisita working for a year, were exerting a good influence over their fellows, and we found quite a number of the Efogi and Kagi tribes who were keeping the Sabbath as far as they knew how, which of course was far from perfect, yet a good advance step.

Our return to Bisibisita, where all were found well, was accomplished without mishap. Ps. 121: 8 thus proving once again true.

S. W. Carr.

Figure 5. First visit of Lawson and Carr to Mountain Koiari villages Australasian Record 17(37) p. 2, 1913.
Benisimani „Benny” Tavodi, Fijian mission teacher, arrived in Papua in 1908 with S.W. Carr to found the Seventh Day Adventist station at Bisiatabu. He died in October 1918 of snake bite at Bisiatabu (Australasian Record 26(22) p. 9). In 2008 members of the SDA congregation gathered to apologise for the sorcery of their forebears:

Descendants of the Taburi clan in the Koiari district who first received the Adventist gospel in 1908, yesterday expressed remorse over the killing of one of the pioneer missionaries by reconciling with his descendant. It is believed that Fijian missionary Peni Tavodi [sic] was killed by sorcerers of the Taburi clan whilst on his knees praying one Sabbath morning. A re-enactment of the arrival of the missionaries was carried out by the local Koiari villagers in traditional wear before the reconciliation took place. Taburi tribe chief Gideon Jack presented to Tavodi’s great nephew Pastor Mitieli Nakasamai and his Fijian counterparts, a pig tooth and bilums. My true, true brother, you are great in my heart, and I am so sorry for what we did on that Sabbath morning,’ Mr Jack said (‘SDA pioneer missionaries reconcile after 100 years’ The National 16 June 2008).
New Mission Home, Efogi, New Guinea


Appendix I

GEOLOGICAL MAP OF THE KAGI-MT OBREE AREA, 1923


Map 18. ‘Geological investigation of mountain country between Kagi and Mt Obree’, 1923 – enlargement showing the Kagi area.
APPENDIX J

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ARISING IN CONSULTATIONS WITH DEWHA AND DEC

We were asked to make recommendations ‘in consultation with DEWHA and DEC for the design and implementation of a second phase of social mapping’. While we have built the outcomes of longer standing discussions with DEWHA and DEC staff into the body of the report, we received subsequent written commentary and questions after providing a draft of this report. We provide responses as follows.

Q. (Deliverable 3) Is comparison of information in Appendices A and B useful for determining village population changes eg A: Enivilogo population listed as 52 and B: Enivilogo names on tax census sheets listed as 64?

A. This is not possible from a desk study or as a short piece of extra work. In our proposals for a field phase of social mapping, we say a special task is to conduct genealogical census in the project area, for which the Tax-Census sheets form an exceptional baseline (para 257 et seq.). We should also say that the information in them – not seen for 50 years – will catch the interest of people in the AOI and will help generate enthusiasm for the field study.

An ultimate goal of doing this is indeed to enable comparison of the composition of villages today with the ones enumerated in the Tax-Census sheets, and we would expect to find branches of the families shown 50 years ago to be distributed in a complex manner among (a) the modern villages, (b) settlement blocks at Sogeri and the Laloki Valley, and (c) in suburbs of Port Moresby and other places in PNG.

This task has objectives in its own right, as we explain (e.g. para 260), but bringing the information back to the communities has great importance in helping to build capacity for development planning. This is because LLG Wards are conceived of as self-contained units of people, when in fact they are the rural representation of communities that have undergone half a century of rural-urban migration. This situation is common in Pacific communities, indeed is mirrored in Indigenous communities in Australia that have experienced high out-migration since the 1950s (e.g. Torres Strait).

Q. (Deliverable 6) Is it possible to include a map of proposed AOI based on AOI boundary revision recommendations?

A. No. For each major section of the AOI boundary, we have said there is a need for investigation on the ground (paras 54, 57, 59, 61, 64, 68). In some cases, improved imagery may help (para 68), but it would be invidious to draw up a revised AOI map without consulting people in the communities who would be affected by any proposed change.
We are also asked to provide guidance on managing expectations of communities (below). A significant part of this is to achieve a ‘smart boundary’, i.e. to make sure that those people are inside it who should be inside it, and that it does not unnecessarily or accidentally include people who should not be in it. At present this is highly likely in all six major sections of the boundary and cannot be resolved from a distance.

Q. (Deliverable 7) It would be useful if ANUE can provide some guidance on managing expectations of communities in undertaking a field phase of social mapping and risks to be managed.

A. We have attempted to set this out in Chapter 6. In blunt terms, there is a ‘standard model’ of landowner engagement in Papua New Guinea. The internal aim is to deal with people in the community who fairly represent it (and we break this down into components) and it is done in two parts: with a Community Relations section – neither a person in a staffing structure nor a negotiating committee – at arm’s length from decision-making, and through capacity building at the community level.

Focus of current dealings by TF, KDP

Relationships to be ascertained by field phase of social mapping

Focus of social mapping and community engagement

Figure 7. Kokoda Development Program inter-agency linkages and focus of social mapping and community engagement.
The _standard model_ is intended to achieve a number of things, and one of them is indeed to manage landowner expectations.

We did not look at Kokoda Development Program issues (para 11), but after completing the draft of our report received an organisation chart showing inter-agency linkages for the Kokoda Development Program (Figure 7). This shows three secretariats dealing with a Landowner Negotiation Committee:

- PNG Kokoda Taskforce: Secretariat DEC (DEWHA Support)
- Australian Kokoda TF: Secretariat DEWHA
- Kokoda Development Program Coordination Committee: AusAID – Secretariat

The chart enables us to highlight points we made in Chapter 6, namely that bodies such as the Task Force (para 276) and Kokoda Track Authority (para 277) have specific roles in co-ordination, management and political representation that are different from, and usually bypass, what community relations deal with.

Indeed, the word _negotiation_ in Landowner Negotiation Committee highlights the nature of the relationship between the secretariats above and people in the communities. Managing expectations of communities is not done at this point, but through a lower level focus on the communities themselves; the relationships between people in communities and those who negotiate is not a given, but is yet to be ascertained (Figure 7).

Q. (Deliverable 7) It would be useful if ANUE can provide some guidance on privacy issues associated with field phase of social mapping and risks to be managed.

A. We previously gave guidance in Annex 4 of our original proposal, _Application of the National Privacy Principles to a Social Mapping Project_.

This may need to be modified to reflect the _Information Privacy Principles_ if the information that may be collected in a field phase of social mapping will be handled exclusively by public sector organisations.

The Information Privacy Principles / National Privacy Principles will apply to any social mapping outputs that identify people.

We previously discussed National Privacy Principle 3 _Data Quality_, which stipulates that data collected on individuals must be _accurate, complete and up-to-date_.

Information Privacy Principle 8 is the equivalent:

A record-keeper who has possession or control of a record that contains personal information shall not use that information without taking such steps (if any) as are, in the circumstances, reasonable to ensure that, having regard to the purpose for which the information is proposed to be used, the information is accurate, up to date and complete.

As with NPP3, this points to the need to acquire fresh data in as thorough a manner as possible.
Since the identification of people is an important component of full scale social mapping, IPP2 ‘Solicitation of personal information from individual[s] concerned’ comes into play. This is to do with consent to collect information and informing people about who the information will be passed to:

… the collector shall take such steps (if any) as are, in the circumstances, reasonable to ensure that, before the information is collected … the individual concerned is generally aware of … the purpose for which the information is being collected … and … any person to whom, or any body or agency to which, it is the collector's usual practice to disclose personal information of the kind so collected, and (if known by the collector) any person to whom, or any body or agency to which, it is the usual practice of that first mentioned person, body or agency to pass on that information.

The question of obtaining FPIC (Free, prior and informed consent) in social mapping has been the subject of commentary by one of the team (Burton 2007) because of the rather different nature of information collected from a whole community, as opposed to information collected from individuals separately.

In general, a clear explanation must be in community meetings prior to information being collected, setting out the purpose of the exercise, what uses the information will be put to, and how the information will be looked after in the long term.

The procedures for doing the first two parts are well-established in dealing with Indigenous communities in Australia, and do not differ substantively. The third part is more problematic (as it is in Australia). In our earlier advice we proposed that only working materials be released routinely – i.e. materials needed for specific project implementation purposes – and that original data from be subject to six controls:

1. Safe haven. A safe haven for permanent storage of the materials is to be agreed upon.

2. Unbroken oversight. When the materials are not in the safe haven, a person with oversight responsibility must be designated. Work may be delegated to subordinates who are supervised, meet minimum standards of training and experience, and who have no conflict of interest, but the whereabouts of all materials must be known at all times. If the person with oversight responsibility is absent, transferred to other duties or ceases employment, a handover of responsibility should be undertaken to another person able to satisfy the six criteria or the shutdown mechanism invoked.

3. Data security. A secure IT environment must exist, such that portions of local or network drives holding the materials are encrypted, protected by password access, and information on a portable device, such as a laptop computers or memory stick, cannot be accessed if the device is mislaid or stolen.

4. Conflict of interest. Employees or contractors' employees or assistants recruited from within the social mapping project area, or with any perceptible interest in it, may not handle the materials. Particular care should be taken with perceptions of bias in the case of community liaison assistants being preset during interviews and surveys – however, common sense should prevail.
5. Data quarantine. Work practices must ensure that the handling of the materials is separated from normal office operations. For example, secretaries may not be given data sheets to type up or photocopy, paperwork may not be left on desks in an open office environment, workstations where material area being worked on may not be left unattended etc.

6. Shutdown mechanism. If work ceases on the materials, the person with oversight responsibility can no longer perform the task, or the organisation ceases operations or hands control to a successor organisation, unnecessary materials must be destroyed and the remainder returned to the safe haven prior to the cessation of work or oversight.

We have not discussed the returning of information, for example in the form of charts of genealogy, to communities, but we would expect there to be a considerable demand for this. Indeed, returning information in this way would certainly be in the terms we would expect community member to impose on a social mapping field team and that would form part of the process of fulfilling FPIC obligations.

Legal advice is required on compliance requirements for transborder data flows – which may occur, for example, if a social mapping team creates a database in Australia and is required to send data collected on individuals to Papua New Guinea.

Q. Is there a rationale for focusing on the Barai in the first instance? If yes, please indicate this.

A. No, we do not propose a particular focus on the Barai. We suggest basic social mapping only in their area (para 249), in order to determine how many of them should be included in the AOI (para 52 et seq.). Further direction is also needed on how important REDD schemes are to the AOI because the Barai-speakers would appear to be the owners of large tracts of rainforest in its current southeastern corner.
APPENDIX K

DELIBERABLE 8 – RECOMMENDATIONS AND TERMS OF REFERENCE DEVELOPED IN CONSULTATION WITH DEWHA AND DEC FOR THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A SECOND PHASE OF SOCIAL MAPPING BY MEANS OF FIELDWORK IN THE AOI

These are draft TOR, for development in consultation with DEWHA and DEC, as our original terms of reference have asked us to supply.

We have not included introductory / background sections.

Objectives

The objectives of [social mapping fieldwork] are to obtain information in the Area of Interest on:

- the identity of landowners;
- land tenure;
- customary social and political organisation;
- formal organisations;
- oral history and cultural heritage.

The purpose of collecting the information is to:

- understand the nature of customary rights and interests in the project area;
- provide a resource for community planning and the appropriate targeting of social development programmes;
- assist with the management of biodiversity conservation;
- assist with cultural heritage management;
- assist with the implementation of REDD schemes;
- assist with other matters consistent with the aims of the Joint Understanding.

Privacy and data protection provisions

The place of permanent storage for data collected on individuals – a 'safe haven' – must meet data safeguard protocols consistent with the Information Privacy Principles [copy in protocols proposed in Appendix K].
Tasks

1. Undertake a field programme of social mapping within the AOI as currently indicated, consistent with the recommendations of the report entitled *Kokoda Track-Brown River Catchment Region: Preliminary Social Mapping Study*, and following the *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research* (Australian Government 2007).

2. Investigate the oral history of communities in the AOI relevant to settlement formation and community identity.

3. Investigate the customary social and political organisation of communities in the AOI.

4. Follow accepted consultative approaches to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent for the conduct of any part of the work which will involve the collection of personal data on individuals, and determine usage rules for this data.

5. Create a ‘safe haven’ for the genealogical database following the protocols given above.

6. Investigate the composition of landowner communities in the AOI by means of genealogical census where FPIC has been obtained to allow this, and return the resulting charts of genealogy to community members.

7. Represent in an appropriate form the boundaries of customarily-owned tracts of land, where it is determined that a consensus of local opinion exists on where they are.

8. Take note of any historical or continuing land disputes in the AOI, without undertaking any mediation of such disputes, and document such facts of the cases as community members give their consent to be recorded.

9. In the course of field work and in consultation with DEWHA and DEC, investigate and hold relevant consultations with local communities to arrive at a better definition of the AOI with regard (a) to its fit with existing community and LLG boundaries, (b) the need for cadastral precision, and (c) the objectives of the Joint Understanding.

10. At arm’s length to the research team, obtain a peer review of the project report and other outputs, and respond to the peer reviewer’s comments.

Deliverables

1. A textual report describing the conduct and outcomes of the social mapping project, and the oral history, customary social and political organisation, and demographic composition of communities in the AOI.
2. Outputs from a database of genealogy, consistent with the usage rules determined at Task 4, comprising (a) a breakdown of settlement locations and the number of residents and absentees at each, (b) tables of primary data and other analyses from which social development indicators can be calculated, (c) sample genealogies, where permission has been given for reproduction, and (d) tables of customary groups in the AOI and their membership.

3. A specification of the ‘safe haven’ arrangements and description how the data safeguard protocols have been implemented in a manner compliant with the Information Privacy Principles.

4. One or more maps in the GIS format used by DEC showing (a) the boundaries of customarily-owned tracts of land, where it is determined that a consensus of local opinion exists on where they are; (b) the local names of human settlements and sites of significance in the AOI; (c) the names of creeks, rivers, mountains and other significant geographical features; and (d) the boundaries of LLG Wards, where these can be agreed upon.

5. A review of the existence and functioning of Ward Development Committees in the AOI, and recommendations for the capacity building of Ward Development Committees.

6. A review of the existence and functioning of other formal organisations, such as youth groups, women’s groups, church groups, landowner companies, incorporated land groups, business groups, apart from Ward Development Committees, that have been formed in the AOI, with recommendations for capacity building if any are of relevance to fulfilling the objectives of the Joint Understanding.

7. Recommendations for PNG national government strategies to engage with local landowners and other stakeholders in the negotiation of development plans for the AOI.

8. A boundary description of the revised AOI, with textual commentary on the reasons for the particular course of the boundary along each section.