

H-France Salon  
Volume 16, Issue 1, # 3

**Lands in Translation:  
Reconfiguring Space and Ownership on a Phosphate Plateau**

**William Matt Cavert  
University of Hawai'i West O'ahu**

In 1907, news spread through Pape'etē that a rich reserve of phosphates had been discovered on the island of Makatea and that the Goupil family was offering to lease land from anyone with a claim on the island's rocky plateau. For colonial administrators and investors, this was a potentially lucrative development in the *Etablissements français de l'Océanie*. The colonial economy was stagnant, having failed to realize the economic prosperity promised by the French-led Panama Canal project, the pearl shell diving industry, or plantation crops such as sugar, coffee, or cotton. Elsewhere in the Pacific, the phosphate industry was growing quickly, with British and German groups starting operations on Banaba, Nauru, and Ngeaur in the Western Pacific. Deposits on Makatea could revolutionize economic life in the French colony. Yet, there were considerable hurdles to overcome, namely the lack of any cadastral survey of the island and the French state's failure to implement its planned property regime.

Makatea was only lightly incorporated into the colonial structures of French administration before the discovery of phosphates. While, at roughly 237 kilometers, it is the closest island in the Tuamotu Archipelago to the French administrative center in Pape'etē, the island population rarely crested 200, and many of its residents spent long portions of the year elsewhere in the archipelago maintaining genealogical networks or performing seasonal labor in the pearl shell industry. The island was also difficult to visit. While much of the Tuamotu archipelago consists of low-lying atolls, Makatea towers above the ocean and lacks the rich reef environment found elsewhere in the archipelago. France's administrative presence was light across the region, and without significant resources or population, there was little reason to visit Makatea.

This article tracks the colonial project to render the island administratively visible and knowable, thereby governable, through land surveys and demarcated land claims. It begins with an overview of the island when phosphates were discovered before turning to contests over property and mining rights, which initially pit local elites, Indigenous elites, and foreign investors against one another. The final section addresses state decisions and investigations that attempted to bring order to the island and settle legal issues around mining. It positions this project as an act of translation in which traditional patterns of land use and conceptions of access rights were

refigured as private ownership to facilitate phosphate mining. Yet, varying types of overlapping legal pluralism operated across the colony and had to be revolved to guarantee the mining operation a firm legal foundation.

The pluralistic legal regimes governing the island resulted from the patchwork and incomplete imposition of French practices by colonial authorities in Pape'etē. The French Protectorate over Tahiti (1847–1884) imported French legal norms of private property when it enacted the Code Civil in Pape'etē on March 28, 1866. As enacted, the Civil Code recognized the right of all French citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Tahiti to private property with an additional provision respecting customary property rights. However, two years after the 1885 abdication of King Pomare V and the end of the Protectorate, French officials attempted to resolve uncertainties surrounding land ownership.

The administration set a deadline in the Decree of August 24, 1887 for all unregistered property to be officially registered. From an island's receipt of the *Journal Officiel*, with exceptions for more distant archipelagos, claimants had one year to register their property. At the end of the period, any unregistered lands became state property. However, since very little land beyond Tahiti and Moorea had been surveyed, the decree was sparsely enforced, and most land remained illegible in the state's eyes.

The discovery of phosphates on Makatea in 1907 proved an effective impetus to resolve uncertainties over property ownership on the island. John Arundel of the Pacific Phosphate Company (hereafter PPC) and the geologist Léonce Rozan officially discovered the phosphates in August of that year. During a private meeting with Governor Charlier, Arundel revealed that he had come to the colony at the behest of the *Société Française des Îles du Pacifique* (hereafter SFIP) to investigate potential phosphate or guano reserves on Makatea. Speculation that the island might contain rich reserves dated back to the 1880s and the island was morphologically similar to Nauru and Banaba, two other islands where the PPC mined phosphates. Entranced by the possibility for industrial development in the colony, the Governor approved a two-week visit to the island.<sup>1</sup>

On Makatea, Rozan and Arundel met with Albert Goupil, son of a prominent local lawyer, who had arrived a month earlier and negotiated leasing agreements with island residents for land on the upper plateau. Albert hoped that the sandy samples he showed Rozan were guano, but after a

---

<sup>1</sup> Joseph François, Gouverneur des Établissements français de l'Océanie à Monsieur le Ministre des Colonies, Pape'etē, Note sur la situation litigieuse des deux Compagnies actuellement en présence à Makatea pour l'exploitation des gisements de phosphates dans cette île, inclosed in Letter 27 sept. 1909, FR ANOM 3800 COL 123.

careful examination, the PPC representatives concluded it was the same type of rocky phosphate found on Nauru and Banaba. Rozan found the island difficult to traverse and a challenging environment to establish a mining operation, but reckoned there were over 8 million tons of phosphate rock on the plateau. Suddenly, anyone with a land claim in the zones Rozan identified might expect to secure a modest fortune leasing their land and deposits to a mining interest.<sup>2</sup>

French administrative views of Makatea shifted dramatically with the discovery of phosphates. It was no longer a distant, rarely visited geological curiosity, a lived-in place for a small population; it was a reservoir of potential wealth—a buried treasure. However, the island presented a significant challenge to any legal mining operation as very little land had ever been officially registered, and those plots that had been were mainly in the coastal villages of Temao and Moumu rather than on the phosphate-rich plateau. Determining who, in the eyes of the administrative state, legitimately owned or held a claim on tracts of land was a challenge that extended far beyond Makatea.

According to Nixon, the translation, or transformation, of land from a vernacular lived-in landscape to an official bureaucratically delimited one was a fundamental act of slow violence. His articulation of slow violence as violence unfolding slowly and out of sight so that it was rarely considered violence, offers a compelling way to understand colonial projects to reorder land on paper before physically transforming them.<sup>3</sup> Tuan describes this reimagining of the landscape as a struggle between insider and outsider. For the insider, the island is a “home-place,” a lived-in landscape defined by traditions and experience; for the outsider, the landscape is a resource, a wild empty space available for reimagining.<sup>4</sup>

The transformation of Makatea into a governable, or legible, space only began once colonial state became aware that valuable resources were present. For mining interests, French administrators, absentee land-claim holders, and dissenting officials, this reconfiguration transformed the island into a commodity that could be bought and sold.<sup>5</sup> This process was part of a broad colonial project to extract resources, and the administrative state required “the strengthening of European-style property rights on land and the removal of any constraints in the ocean” to do so.<sup>6</sup> Banivanua-Mar and Banner observe this process as central to empire in the Pacific as colonial states rewrote Indigenous spaces as “land” that could be partitioned and brought to market for plantation agriculture, cattle, settlement, or mining. Much as Nixon

---

<sup>2</sup> Léonce Rozan, *Rapport de Mission. Gisement de Phosphates de l'Archipel des Paumotu, Possessions Françaises de l'Océanie, Plymouth à bord de l'Océanie*, 18 mar. 1908, FR ANOM 91 COL 328.

<sup>3</sup> Nixon, *Slow Violence*, 17–18.

<sup>4</sup> Tuan, “Language,” 686.

<sup>5</sup> Scott, *Seeing*, 39, 44.

<sup>6</sup> Jones, “The Environment,” 130.

articulates, land surveys and legal deeds were forms of violence critical for making land an alienable commodity and transforming nature into natural resources.<sup>7</sup>

Colonial officials struggled to impose what they viewed as normative practices, from private property to civil registers, across the archipelagos. French administrative culture was not easily transposed across a vast seascape and on cultures dissimilar to France. The assumption that individuals belonged to a single island, akin to belonging to a single village or commune, was ill-suited to the reality of a world in motion in which genealogical and kin connections tied individuals to multiple places at once. The apparent fluidity with which individuals moved through their networks, maintained rights or privileges in various locales, adopted children of friends or relatives, and changed names over the course of a lifetime frustrated French administrators. There was no simple way to resolve a tolerated legal pluralism in which traditional conventions and French legal norms coexisted, allowing individuals to move between them, conforming to French practices when required or beneficial, but otherwise maintaining traditional authorities and practices.<sup>8</sup>

This legal pluralism also extended to land claims, and the lack of any tradition of private property was a significant weakness for colonial land registration schemes. The custom of familial or communal land management made the translation process exceedingly onerous since other claimants often contested individual land registrations. For most of the colonial population, even if they were aware of government decrees requiring individuated land registration, it was simply more practical to maintain existing property practices and ignore the government decree. Land surveys were expensive and court proceedings often required multi-day travel to Pape'etē.

French officials interpreted this reluctance as opposition to French civilization and progress. In 1910, Governor Adrian Bonhoure, writing about the difficulty of expanding property registration, explained to the Colonial Minister that “the indigènes through the preservation of customs, morals, and habits against all progress, have had the intention of opposing the penetration of our civilization in their islands with an impassible barrier.” He claimed that the habit of moving and using names different from birth certificates or the civil register hindered the cultivation of settled private property regimes on the islands.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Banivanua Mar, ““Boyd’s Blacks,”” 57–73. Banner, *Possessing the Pacific*, 2–3, 316–318.

<sup>8</sup> For more on the extension of identity registers and the fixing of names in France and the French Empire, see: Caplan, ““This or That Particular Person,”” 57–59.

<sup>9</sup> Adrien Bonhoure, Gouverneur des Établissements français de l’Océanie à Monsieur le Ministre des Colonies, Pape'etē, Rapport au sujet de la transformation du régime des phosphates de Makatea et de Niau à Monsieur le Ministre des Colonies, Pape'etē, Lettre 29 sept. 1910, FR ANOM 3800 COL 122.

The push to delineate and determine land ownership, to transform the island into something legible from the perspective of French property ownership, came from several directions. On the one hand, state and company administrators wanted to rationalize landownership so that mining took place on a firm legal footing—while companies were willing to sign competing leases over the same parcels of land, or overlapping leases, there was little question that ownership would eventually be determined in the courts. On the other hand, Charles-Adolphe Macardé, Administrator of the Tuamotu (1904–1914), and Maurice Viollette, a Socialist member of the French Chamber of Deputies, promoted the transformation of the island from a vernacular lived-in landscape to an official bureaucratically delimited one to protect Indigenous land rights and claims and ensure that the benefits and profits of mining were shared with the island community. Macardé and Viollette’s actions reveal how they understood their role as administrators or elected officials to include particular forms of advocacy. They believed that translating what they understood to be traditional familial rights to one in which property ownership rested with individuals was critical to ensuring that the interests of the local inhabitants were protected.<sup>10</sup>

In actuality, across the *Etablissement Français de l’Océanie*, terrestrial and oceanic resources were managed through *rahui*, the right or privilege to mediate access and exclusions over particular resources or places for a period of time rather than private or even familial ownership. This authority could be exercised to various degrees or extents and diffused in an overlapping manner between individuals.<sup>11</sup> Though it was not a form of ownership, French authorities interpreted it as such. The colonial administration leveraged the ability of islanders to identify which trees or plots of land over which they held some claim or privilege to determine the extent of land claims without performing an expensive cadastral survey. As a result of the uneven translation, Viollette described property claims as “more tangled than a tropical forest” after his fact-finding visit in 1912.<sup>12</sup>

The murky status of land claims on Makatea in 1907 enabled a group of well-connected local elites to take decisive action. The fact that the group primarily included members of the extended Goupil family, including those who worked or had recently worked for the colonial government, inspired Viollette to claim that Tahiti had become “a familiar fief in the medieval sense of the word.”<sup>13</sup> At the head of the group was famed local attorney August Goupil, his son and newspaper publisher Albert, and son-in-law Etienne Touze, a young engineer and former director

---

<sup>10</sup> Procès-verbal de la Commission nommé par décision de M. le Gouverneur en date du 8 juin 1910, Séance du 20 juillet 1910, FR ANOM 3800 COL 122.

<sup>11</sup> Bambridge, “Introduction: *The Rahui*,” 2–5.

<sup>12</sup> Réponse du Gouverneur Bonhoure au Rapport fait au nom de la Commission du budget par Maurice Viollette, député, FR ANOM 3800 COL 124.

<sup>13</sup> Viollette, “Une Colonie de Famille.”

of the colonial *Travaux Publics*. The group also benefited from August's good relationship with his brother-in-law, Émile Vermeersch, who served as Registrar of Land in the colony.

Undoubtedly, the group had some foreknowledge that phosphates were present on the island. In anticipation that Arundel and Rozan would confirm their presence, Albert sailed to the island in July 1907 to negotiate leases with anyone with a potential claim on the phosphate-rich plateau. He returned several times to renegotiate based on the findings of Rozan and sign a lease for district lands with Council President Turi a Aro.<sup>14</sup> As Albert negotiated on Makatea, Auguste and Touze sought out any landholders who might be in Pape'etē. They believed that the potential phosphate reserves were so valuable that it was worth signing overlapping land claims and sorting through the knotted mess at a later date.

The rush to sign contracts, especially over district land without the required approval of the region's administrator, who was conveniently absent, or the governor, raised questions in the office of the Registrar of Lands. Émile Vermeersch hesitated to sign off on the lease agreements Albert delivered until his brother-in-law, August Goupil, impressed upon him that registration was only an administrative process and not a final ruling on the legality of the claims. August was one of the most well-respected legal minds in the colony, and his brother-in-law eventually relented, though not without sending word to the Governor and Marcadé, Administrator of the Tuamotu, when he registered the agreements.<sup>15</sup>

The extended Goupil family was not alone in quickly taking action to secure their position. Dame Marau Taaroa Salmon, the last queen of Tahiti, may have also had foreknowledge that Makatea potentially contained substantial phosphate reserves. She moved in the same elite circles as August, and it seems likely her son Tati, working for the SFIP at the time, tipped her off when the company began signing leases on the island so that she could seek out claimants in Pape'etē or across the Tuamotu archipelago. Dame Salmon's status as a royal and ranking member of the Teva clan put her at the head of a customary network and a position of privilege within the French state. For Tahitians and French officials, she was a powerful intermediary between cultures. When her status as a popular figure and beloved former queen did not win over signatories, she offered better terms, 2.25 francs per ton of phosphate. Three days after August submitted his contracts, Dame Salmon submitted her own. August implored her to sell her

---

<sup>14</sup> Note: Les Phosphate de l'Océanie, 30 oct. 1911, FR ANOM 91 COL 328. Fillon, l'Inspecteur de 1ere classe des Colonies, Chef de mission, à Monsieur le Ministre des Colonies, Confidentiel Report N° 46: Ventes illégales des phosphates domaniaux de Makatea et de Niau. Inaction de l'autorité locale., Paris, 21 juillet 1909, FR ANOM 3800 COL 124.

<sup>15</sup> Fillon, l'Inspecteur de 1ere classe des Colonies, Chef de mission, à Monsieur le Ministre des Colonies, Confidentiel Report N° 46: Ventes illégales des phosphates domaniaux de Makatea et de Niau. Inaction de l'autorité locale., Paris, 21 juillet 1909, FR ANOM 3800 COL 124.

contracts to him, but she resisted, only relenting the following February when John Arundel visited the island again and met with her. She received 75,000 francs from the SFIP and an offer of 35 centimes per ton of phosphate so long as she signed no further contracts and gave the SFIP preference for any phosphate contracts she signed on other islands.<sup>16</sup>

Once the position of the SFIP seemed secure, Touze left the colony for Paris to raise more capital, eventually securing a 51% stake from the PPC, itself largely owned by Sir William Lever's Unilever company. While French law limited the amount of financial control the PPC could maintain in the new company, the *Compagnie Française des Phosphates de l'Océanie* (hereafter CFPO) quickly hired several key executives and agents from PPC and signed an agreement allowing the PPC to handle phosphate sales in a variety of overseas markets, thereby ensuring the company maintained its near monopoly on the Pacific market.<sup>17</sup>

On July 13, 1908, a rival group of phosphate investors represented by Albert Bonnel de Mézières and Jean Delpit arrived in the colony. The group had reached out to the metropolitan government for a mining concession and been informed that as there was no mining legislation in the colony, they should negotiate with individual landholders. On August 1, Delpit and Mézières set out for Makatea where they secured 46 contracts, some overlapping with CFPO claims. They offered better terms and an upfront payment for title to the property rather than just a lease to extract phosphates, which won over some community members disaffected by Albert's attempts to renegotiate lower rates with property owners.<sup>18</sup>

The legal battle over the competing contracts was expensive and Mézières returned to Europe, where he raised capital from the *Hanseatisches Südsee-Syndikat* and the German National Bank, who dispatched German engineers to verify the phosphate deposits. The presence of the German engineers kicked off a series of daily confrontations on the plateau, and a justice of the peace had to be dispatched to defuse the situation. The group led by Mézières remained in a difficult situation: the Goupil family painted them as a foreign attempt to steal French resources, the company never constructed any infrastructure on the island, and it faced a significant setback in 1909 when the court annulled a number of its contracts. A year later, the group sold its claims to

---

<sup>16</sup> Note: Les Phosphate de l'Océanie, 30 Oct. 1911, FR ANOM 91 COL 328; Administration de l'enregistrement et des domaines 1909, Transfer of Contracts from Marautaroa Salmon to the Société Française des Îles du Pacifique, FR ANOM 3800 COL 122; Joseph François, Gouverneur des Établissements français de l'Océanie à Monsieur le Ministre des Colonies, Pape'etē, Note sur la situation litigieuse des deux Compagnie actuellement en présence à Makatea pour l'exploitation des gisements de phosphates dans cette île, inclosed in Letter 27 sept. 1909, FR ANOM 3800 COL 123; Newbury, "Makatea Phosphate Concession," 172.

<sup>17</sup> Williams and MacDonald, *Phosphateers*, 80, 157.

<sup>18</sup> Fillon, l'Inspecteur de 1ere classe des Colonies, Chef de mission, à Monsieur le Ministre des Colonies, Confidentiel Report N° 46: Ventes illégales des phosphates domaniaux de Makatea et de Niau. Inaction de l'autorité locale., Paris, 21 juillet 1909, FR ANOM 3800 COL 124

the CFPO in exchange for company shares, effectively merging their claims and leaving the CFPO as the sole mining interest and majority landholder on the island. This was the most desirable conclusion to the affair for the governor and most French colonial officials—a single mining company with strong French and local ties having a secure hold on the island and its resources.<sup>19</sup>

The CFPO may have found itself on a more secure footing in 1910, but challenges to its unresolved land claims continued. There was little doubt that mining would take place, and none of the dissenting voices in the French government objected in principle to the mining effort. They were critical of how the landscape was reordered and the terms on which mining began. Three investigations occurred in the first five years of mining, all focused on the issue of irregular land registrations—Inspector Fillon in 1909, Deputy Viollette in 1912, and Inspector Revel in 1914.

Their reports were highly critical of the colonial state. Fillon concluded that it had skipped numerous steps, critically a cadastral survey followed by land registration, to ensure that mining began as soon as possible. As a result, the warren of double registrations and competition claims allowed the Goupil family to evade oversight and secure rights over a wide swath of the island, including government land. Viollette raised similar issues three years later and noted that the colonial state continued to abrogate its authority to the company and that the collection of taxes and royalties rested on its good faith without any apparent oversight.<sup>20</sup>

Inspector Revel arrived in 1914, tasked to determine whether the local administration had adequately addressed these issues. His answer was no, and he described the CFPO as the “absolute master in its domain” with only a temporary and infrequent government presence. While Fillon and Viollette viewed private property as a means to protect islander interests, Revel supported the reclassification of phosphates as a mined substance instead of a quarried one and, therefore, not the property of landholders at all but of the state. Under this classification, he argued, the state could permit mining even over landowner objections and offer the company

---

<sup>19</sup> Fillon, l'Inspecteur de 1ere classe des Colonies, Chef de mission, à Monsieur le Ministre des Colonies, Confidentiel Report N° 46: Ventes illégales des phosphates domaniaux de Makatea et de Niau. Inaction de l'autorité locale., Paris, 21 juillet 1909, FR ANOM 3800 COL 124; Joseph François, Gouverneur des Établissements français de l'Océanie à Monsieur le Ministre des Colonies, Pape'etē, Note sur la situation litigieuse des deux Compagnie actuellement en présence à Makatea pour l'exploitation des gisements de phosphates dans cette île, inclosed in Letter 27 sept. 1909, FR ANOM 3800 COL 123; Note: Les Phosphate de l'Océanie, 30 oct. 1911, FR ANOM 91 COL 328; Newbury, “Makatea Phosphate Concession,” 174–175.

<sup>20</sup> FR ANOM 3800 COL 124; Fillon, l'Inspecteur de 1ere classe des Colonies, Chef de mission, à Monsieur le Ministre des Colonies, Rapport Paris, 31 août 1909, FR ANOM 3800 COL 122. Réponse du Gouverneur Bonhoure au Rapport fait au nom de la Commission du budget par Maurice Viollette, député, FR ANOM 3800 COL 124.



greater security.<sup>21</sup> Though it took several more years, this is precisely the tactic employed by the state with the decrees of October 17, 1917 and June 1, 1918. The messy translation of property rights was simply avoided altogether by changing the legal classification of phosphates. State officials justified this action, which critics described as expropriation, as necessary to ensure a legal foundation for mining and tax collection.<sup>22</sup>

From the discovery of phosphates in 1907 to their classification as a mined substance, the mining operation on the island slowly grew as hundreds of workers arrived from Tahiti to build a port, barracks, narrow-gauge railway, drying and processing sheds, and storage facilities. The island was transformed from a remote backwater to a site of industry and economic dynamism just as the landscape was rewritten from a lived-in to an official, bureaucratic, governable space. Though this translation of vernacular rights and privileges to private property was messy and often incomplete, local colonial officials defended their approach on two main grounds: that the mining was supported by and beneficial to the island community and that the state was the ultimate possessor of all territory and the final arbiter in any disputes.

There was never any doubt that mining would take place. French governors used several legal levers to intervene in the landscape transformation, from freezing land claims and leasing all unclaimed district land to mining interests, awarding non-phosphate district land to companies for infrastructure building, or writing mining legislation that considered phosphates to be a state good that the state could simply lease over the objections of landholders. Governor François (1908–1910) imagined mining was welcomed by island residents—whom he described as much an integral part of France as the island itself. Governor François visited the island in 1909 and described to the Colonial Ministry the attachment he imagined the islanders felt to France and the warm welcome they gave him. Mining, he believed, promised to change everything, bring economic development to the colony, turn a rocky island into a vault of wealth, and enrich islanders and colonial coffers at the same time. The Governor celebrated the phosphate mine, which he cast as mutually beneficial work emblematic of the shared affection between France and subject populations.<sup>23</sup>

This paper has laid out the initial years of the phosphate industry on Makatea, during which the colonial state appropriated and translated the island's physical landscape into property and natural resources. Colonial officials defended mining as a slow and gradual process that did not

---

<sup>21</sup> Revel, L'Inspector de 1er Classe des Colonies, Chef de la Mission d'Inspection des Établissements français de l'Océanie, à Monsieur le Ministre des Colonies, Lettre, Pape'etē, 30 mai 1915, FR ANOM 3800 COL 122.

<sup>22</sup> Danton, "Makatea," 15, 44–45.

<sup>23</sup> Joseph François, Gouverneur des Établissements français de l'Océanie à Monsieur le Ministre des Colonies, Pape'etē, Rapport de tournée à Makatea (24–28 août 1909) inclosed in Letter 27 sept. 1909, FR ANOM 3800 COL 123; Newbury, "Makatea Phosphate Concession," 169; Matsuda, *Empire of Love*, 13–15.

all at once deny or disrupt islander access to land. However, that distinction between slow and fast violence hardly seemed to have mattered when they largely concurred with Governor Bonhoure that mining would be a net positive for the island population due to mining royalties.<sup>24</sup> While administrators across the empire often framed their *mettre en valeur* of the colonies as furthering imperial and Indigenous interests, it is clear that many expected that the interests of the empire were the interests of its subjects. Colonial environmental narratives framed development as a rescue from waste or misuse. While the French State insisted that Indigenous interests were protected and guaranteed on Makatea, the primary beneficiary of the narrative that Makatea was a fabulous source of wealth and fertility was the CFPO and the colonial budget.<sup>25</sup>

**William “Matt” Cavert** received his Ph.D from the University of Hawai’i Mānoa in the spring of 2022. His doctoral research focused on the intersection of environment, culture, and colonial development programs in the French colonial Pacific from 1842 to 1931. He has published articles on the Third Plague Pandemic and Spanish Influenza in the colonial ports of Nouméa and Pape’etē, respectively. He currently teaches courses on the history of disease, environment, and empire at the University of Hawai’i West O’ahu.

---

<sup>24</sup> Adrien Bonhoure, *Gouverneur des Établissements français de l’Océanie à Monsieur le Ministre des Colonies, Pape’etē, Rapport au sujet de la transformation du régime des phosphates de Makatea et de Niau à Monsieur le Ministre des Colonies, Pape’etē, Lettre 29 sept. 1910, FR ANOM 3800 COL 122.*

<sup>25</sup> The phosphate mine on Makatea closed in 1966 as the colonial economy reoriented with the arrival of nuclear testing and international tourism. For more on the legacy of phosphate mining see: Nicholas Hoare, “Re-Mining Makatea: People, Politics, and Phosphate Rock,” PhD diss., Australian National University, 2020.

## Works Cited

### Primary Sources

Archives Nationale d'Outre-Mer (Aix-en-Provence, France)

FR ANOM 91 COL 328

FR ANOM 3800 COL 122

FR ANOM 3800 COL 123

FR ANOM 3800 COL 124

Viollete, Maurice. 19 August 1916. "Une Colonie de Famille." *Les Annales Coloniales* (Paris).

### Secondary Sources

Bambridge, Tamatoa. 2016. "Introduction: *The Rahui*: A tool for environmental protection or for political assertion?" In *The Rahui; Legal pluralism in Polynesian traditional management of resources and territories*, edited by Tamatoa Bambridge, 1–14. Canberra: Australia National University Press.

Banner, Stuart. 2007. *Possessing the Pacific; Land, Settlers, and Indigenous People from Australia to Alaska*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Caplan, Jane. 2001. "'This or That Particular Person': Protocols of Identification in Nineteenth-Century Europe." In *Documenting Individual Identity; The Development of State Practices in the Modern World*, edited by Jane Caplan and John Torpey, 1–12. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Danton, Hervé. (1992–93). "Makatea." *Bulletin de la Société des Etudes océaniques*, no. 258–59: 153–184.

Jones, Ryan Tucker. 2014. "The Environment." In *Pacific Histories; Ocean, Land, People*. Edited by David Armitage and Alison Bashford. New York: Palgrave MacMillan: 121–142.

Hoare, Nicholas. 2020. "Re-Mining Makatea: People, Politics, and Phosphate Rock." PhD diss., Australian National University.

Mar, Tracy Banivanua. 2019. "'Boyd's Blacks': Labour and the Making of Settler Lands in Australia and the Pacific." In *Labour Lines and Colonial Power; Indigenous and Pacific Islander Mobility in Australia*, edited by Victoria Stead and Jon Altman, 57–73. ANU Press.

- Matsuda, Matt. 2005. *Empire of Love; Histories of France and the Pacific*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Newbury, Colin. 1972. "Makatea Phosphate Concession." In *Man in the Pacific: Essays on Geographical Change in the Pacific Islands* edited by R.G. Ward. Oxford: Clarendon Press: 167–188.
- Nixon, Rob. 2011. *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Scott, James C. 1998. *Seeing Like a State; How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu. 1991. "Language and the Making of Place: A Narrative-Descriptive Approach." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 81, no. 4: 684–696.
- Williams, Maslyn and Barrie MacDonald. 1985. *The Phosphateers; A History of the British Phosphate Commissioners and the Christmas Island Phosphate Commission*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

William Matt Cavert  
University of Hawai'i West O'ahu

*H-France Salon*

ISSN 2150-4873

Copyright © 2024 by the H-France, all rights reserved.