IN THE COURT OF THE RAINMAKER: THE WILLING DEVIANT IN LONGANA, VANUATU

William L. Rodman
McMaster University

Margaret C. Rodman
York University

Abstract: In the district of Longana in Vanuatu the weather is not merely a physical but a social phenomenon. Rainmakers are responsible for gentle rains which benefit the crops and the community, but they can also cause continual downpours and floods. An examination of ethnographic literature from Oceania and elsewhere reveals relatively few cases where rainmakers are said to act in a deviant fashion. In one particular and unprecedented case which the authors examine, an individual confessed to small-scale acts of deviance in the past, when accused of responsibility for a protracted period of rain. The implications of that confession both for the individual and his community are examined, and some conclusions are drawn about differences between the ways Longanans and Westerners classify and treat deviant actions.

Résumé: Dans le district de Longana au Vanauatu le temps qu'il fait est non seulement un phénomène physique mais aussi social. Les personnes responsables pour déclencher les pluies peuvent le faire avec des pluies douces au profit des champs et de la population, mais ils peuvent aussi causer de grands orages et des inondations. Un examen de la littérature ethnographique provenant de l'Océanie et ailleurs révèle très peu d'instants d'activités soi-disant déviantes au passé. Les implications de cette confession pour l'individu et la communauté sont examinées, et quelques conclusions sont tirées démontrant la façon différente dont le peuple de Longana et les Occidentaux traitent des cas d'activités déviantes.

What is the most dangerous weather phenomenon? A Californian might answer "earthquakes"; other North Americans might respond "hurricanes,"

Anthropologica XXXIII (1991) 111-125

"tornadoes," or perhaps "lightning." On the South Pacific island where we conducted fieldwork, and in societies in many other parts of the world, the answer to such a question would be different: the most dangerous weather phenomenon, people would say, is weathermen. They would not mean weathermen as we know them, readers of meteorological signs, diviners of satellite maps, but rather men who make weather, especially too much weather: too much sun, too much rain. While we Westerners accept the weather as a physical system that is beyond our control, many peoples outside the West view it as a force with a *social* dynamic that a few individuals control for the good of society or for dark, devious ends.

In the first part of our paper, we briefly review the cross-cultural ethnographic literature on rainmaking and then we discuss what anthropologists have written about rainmakers in the South Pacific. We discuss three widespread patterns of weather control in Oceania. One pattern is of particular interest to us in this paper. In many places throughout the South Pacific, rainmakers are guardians of the social welfare whose skill ensures the frequent, gentle rains that bring an abundant harvest. In the societies we will consider, those who make mists and bring showers also possess the ability to raise storms, brew hurricanes and send unceasing rain for weeks, even months, on end. We are interested in rainmakers who come to be identified, and who identify themselves, as deviants.

We studied deviant rainmaking during four soggy months in the Republic of Vanuatu, from July through November 1982. By the time we arrived in Vanuatu, local people already had endured four months of virtual daily downpours spanning what was "normally" the dry season; after our arrival, we settled in the district of Longana on the northern island of Ambae, where the rain continued with only an occasional day of sunshine. To be precise, 83 percent of the days were rainy or overcast.[1] While the rain made many aspects of our fieldwork difficult, we were fortunate to be present as the process of identifying and dealing with the cause of the rain ran its course.

The identification of a deviant rainmaker is a social process consisting of a series of phases: discussion of possible rainmakers within the community, the narrowing of suspicion to likely malefactors, and then negotiations between authorities within the community and the individuals singled out as suspects. Most suspects reject the "rainmaker" label, and do their best to undermine the negotiation process with vehement denials, alibis, counter-accusations and arguments based on precedent or genealogy. Occasionally, however, the course of the negotiation takes a different turn: once in a long while, someone accepts the deviant label and confesses to possession of knowledge of how to make rain. Why a person might confess voluntarily to an act that people perceive as having disastrous ecological and social consequences is the focus of our study: we provide an illustrative case of the kind

of negotiation process that can result in willing acceptance of the label "deviant rainmaker."

The broader purpose of our paper is to explore the complementarity of deviance and power in a Melanesian context. In particular, we contrast deviance as a social category with deviance as a kind of behaviour in order to sketch the relationship between deviance and power. The case of the willing deviant, we conclude, demonstrates a process of transformation in which evil can be turned to good, and in which the rainmaker, rather than losing face, can gain a measure of authority.

This phenomenon is by no means unique to Longana. We suspect that it occurs in similar forms in other Melanesian societies, and, as sociologists recognize, it assumes a different but related form in Western societies. The idea that an individual may proudly wear the label of "deviant" is a well-established aspect of the sociological category known as secondary deviance. But the deviance we label as "willing" is primary rather than secondary in type; in other words, it refers to a "single or occasional involvement in a deviant activity" (Prus 1983:4) rather than to a "commitment to further deviant behaviour and increased levels of organization in 'deviant' personality" in response to the intervention of agents of social control (Harris and Hill 1982:163). The distinctive term we have chosen, "willing deviance," simply highlights this difference which we think is an important one for developing a cross-cultural and interdisciplinary perspective on deviance.

A Comparative Perspective on Rainmaking and Deviance

The cross-cultural ethnographic record suggests that there exist many societies in which rainmakers seldom, if ever, are perceived as deviant.[2] In parts of the world where drought can cause famine, rainmakers often are among the most valued and respected members of their societies. In the southwestern United States, for example, rainmaking is a core element in the religious ceremonies of most tribes; the rainmaking Kachina dancers of the Hopi and Zuni, far from being deviant, assume the identity of spiritual beings responsible for ensuring the harmonious continuation of life (Dozier 1970:1140-158). Whereas rainmaking is associated with spiritual power in many North American societies, rainmaking is linked to political power in many African societies. Among the Lovedu of the Transvaal, the queen is known as the "transformer of the clouds": "so bound up with nature is she that her very emotions affect the rain" (Krige and Krige 1970:63). Among the Alur (Cohen and Middleton 1970:16), the Nyole (Wagner 1967:224), the Plateau Tonga (Colson 1948) and many other traditional African societies, the power of leaders derives in large part from their abilities as rainmakers and from their role as guardians of important rain shrines.

In his overview of African religions and philosophy, J. Mbiti observes that "rainmakers are some of the most important individuals in almost all African societies" (Mbiti 1970:234). Were African rainmakers ever considered to be deviant? If so, under what circumstances was the "deviant" label applied? What sanctions did people use against deviant rainmakers? The answers to such questions are not at all clear in the literature on Africa. Part of the problem lies with the nature of the literature itself. Some information on rainmaking in Africa comes from colonial officials who regarded rainmaking as quaint, ineffective and essentially harmless, a set of attitudes well-represented in a government meteorologist's statement that he intended to give readers of his article on rainmaking in Tanganyika "a short resumé of the methods used by—if I may call them that—my witch-doctor predecessor" (McCallum 1959:53).

With the notable exceptions of Saul Bellow's *Henderson, the Rain King* (1959), and J.D. and E.J. Krige's *The Realm of a Rain-Queen* (1943), few books about Africa have had rainmaking as a central concern. Most scattered references to African rainmaking occur in books and articles that anthropologists published between 1940 and the early 1960s; the authors of such works tend to be scholars identified with the structural-functionalist school of anthropology (e.g., Gluckman 1963; Nadel 1955; Radcliffe-Brown 1952). Structural-functionalists tended not to be interested in the study of deviance, so deviant African rainmakers, if they existed, went unreported.

In recent literature on rainmakers in Africa, one finds more of a sense that people regard such men with a degree of ambivalence, as valuable members of society but also as self-interested and dangerous. Skinner, for example, reports that Mossi rainmakers are criticized for withholding rain and are believed to manipulate rain for highly personal reasons (Skinner 1974:301). It is clear from Skinner's account that Mossi believe that, at least occasionally, rainmakers contravene social norms and are deviant. What Skinner does not tell us is what happens when people decide that a particular rainmaker has raised one storm too many or has wielded his lightning a bit too freely.[3]

A survey of anthropological literature on Pacific island societies reveals three widespread sets of beliefs concerning the relationship between gods, men and control of the weather. In Samoa (Turner 1884), Tonga (Beaglehole and Beaglehole 1941) and a number of other societies, people believe that deities alone are responsible for natural events such as excessive rain or dryness; humans can petition the gods but cannot themselves control the weather. In such societies, rainmakers do not exist.[4]

In a second set of societies, of which the Trobriands (Malinowski 1922, 1935) and Yap (Hunt 1949; Lingenfelter 1972) are representative, chiefs or big men have exclusive control of the magic of rain and sunshine. Such

chiefs use their magic openly and officially, as a means of expressing their displeasure with their subjects and enforcing their will. As Malinowski notes, chiefs can use weather magic to "enhance their wholesale power, independently of any other mechanism which they might have used for forcing their will on private individuals or on whole communities" (Malinowski 1922:394). There is no evidence that rainmakers are regarded as deviant in the Trobriands or in similar societies in which only chiefs possess knowledge of rainmaking, and in which leaders use weather magic explicitly as an instrument of social control.

In most Pacific societies, rainmaking spells, chants and techniques are not the exclusive property of chiefs or big men. Williams states that among the Orokaiva of coastal New Guinea "there are many rain-makers and many methods of rain-making" (Williams 1928:113). Similarly, Codrington, writing of Vanuatu, implies that knowledge of weather control was widespread throughout the group: "There are everywhere . . . in these islands weather-doctors and weather-mongers who can control the aerial powers, and are willing to supply wind, calm, rain, sunshine, famine, and abundance at a price" (Codrington 1969:200). Most accounts of rainmaking in Oceania concern magicians who attempt to increase the fertility of the soil or end a drought. However, as Williams pointed out over half a century ago within the context of a discussion of rainmaking, "it might probably be said that to the benevolence of magic there is always a reverse or malevolent side—sorcery" (Williams 1928:64). From a Pacific islander's point of view, rainmakers become deviant when they use their ability to control the weather to achieve destructive ends. Use of such negative sanctions sometimes is made explicit in literature on the region. Godofroy, for example, discusses the case of a Vao magician who caused a cyclone that resulted in the loss of a whaler: "the owners held the magician responsible for the loss and forced him to refund the value of the boat by paying them ten pigs each worth twenty pounds" (Godofroy in Layard 1942:663).[5]

Ambae, the island where we conducted fieldwork, is one of the many Pacific islands where rainmaking can be either legitimate or deviant, depending upon the motivation of the rainmaker and the circumstances in which rain is made. Codrington was the first ethnographer to discuss rainmaking on Ambae; in *The Melanesians*, first published in 1891, he notes that the rainmaker's arts in northern Vanuatu were "once secret [but] are now pretty well known" (Codrington 1969:200). According to Codrington, an individual who seeks to make rain in northern Vanuatu needs a supply of kava (*Piper methysticum*) to drink, knowledge of a rain chant that invokes the aid of the creator god, Tagaro, and, finally, some special stones that have the power to make rain.

There appears to have been little change in techniques of rainmaking since Codrington's time. We obtained without difficulty several rain chants while we were in the field; the songs, while not common knowledge, are not secret. Kava is still used extensively for a variety of magical purposes. Rainstones still exist.

In theory, at least, rainmaking is not a difficult art. The ritual is never a public affair: the rainmaker works alone or with a client, or in the company of a small group of friends. The rainmaker sings his song softly and drinks kava, except for the last mouthful which is sprayed in the direction of the four cardinal points of the compass. The rainmaker then places rainstones in the water preserved in the base of an old, hollow tree. Nothing more needs to be done; rain should begin to fall within 24 to 48 hours. To stop the rain, a rainmaker simply retrieves his stones.

No one is sure how many rainstones exist on the island. People strongly suspect that others possess rainstones but keep them secret. From the local point of view, there are good reasons why even an exemplary citizen might not want possession of rainstones to become common knowledge. First, the rainstones might be an "unwanted" gift, a part of an inheritance that one chooses not to use but that is too valuable to throw away. Secondly, the Anglican church, to which most people in the district of Longana where we lived belong, has an ambivalent attitude toward the stones. During the 1930s, Anglican priests and catechists collected and discarded many of the stones as part of a general campaign against sorcery. Today, local priests no longer are irrevocably opposed to such charms as rainstones. They feel that the stones can be a powerful instrument for good or a devastating tool for evil. Anyone who owns such stones has the potential to be a local-level saviour or a sinner of extraordinary proportions. A final reason why a law-abiding citizen might choose to deny having rainstones is that to do otherwise would be dangerous. To admit ownership of the stones might make others jealous; envy is a leading cause of poisoning and magical attack. Some are willing to take such a risk; others are not.

The people of Ambae draw a sharp distinction between "good" or legitimate rainmaking and "bad" or deviant rainmaking. Good rainmaking is:

1. *public, in the sense of "acknowledged."* Rainmakers must always be ready to assume responsibility for their actions.
2. *performed for a single motive: ecological need.* The only acceptable occasion for a rainmaker to perform is when drought threatens the livelihood and well-being of members of a community.
3. *beneficial in its effects.* Rainmakers must subordinate their private interests to the public will: their single duty is to correct an undesirable ecological situation and avert human hardship.

The indigenous conception of "good" rainmaking is a *model* for a social and ecological ideal. People know that the ideal has not been achieved because they must cope occasionally with the reality of hurricanes, bad storms and excessive rain. Such conditions give rise to a second conception, a *model* of deviance in the social and ecological domains. "Bad" rainmaking is:

1. *private, hidden, unacknowledged.* Deviant rainmakers work in secret and then maintain as a secret the fact that they have caused rain.
2. *performed for a variety of motives, all of which stem from self-interest* The most common motives for deviant rainmaking are sorrow, envy, blackmail or revenge.
3. *destructive in its effects.* The only person to gain, either emotionally or materially, from an act of deviant rainmaking is the rainmaker. The rainmaker's gain is at the expense of an enemy, a victim or a community.

Identifying a Deviant Rainmaker in Longana

Deviation must be the cause of trouble to be labelled as deviant behaviour. As Mendonsa observes in his analysis of deviance and divination in Ghana, the process of defining deviance "involves a representative of society selecting those misdeeds that are thought to be a threat to the group for which he is responsible" (Mendonsa 1982:155); this process, which can include both informal and formal labelling phases, is an interactive one involving influential persons in the community, gossip, the moral code and the alleged deviant (ibid.:155-157). Labelling a deviant rainmaker is problematic. The problem, we should stress, is quite the opposite of the conceptual confusion of the actor with the act, a difficulty whose resolution has led some sociologists to suggest that deviance is a quality conferred on an activity, and not a person. Longanans *assume* that this separation exists. The problem that they encounter arises from the fact that, because deviant rainmaking is assumed to be very secretive, the actor and the activity are so widely separated that it is hard to bring them together. Events that are completely external to the human agent, such as a thunderstorm, demonstrate the efficaciousness of the rainmaker's potentially beneficent or deviant activity.

In Longana, traditional big men often join with Protestant church leaders to identify the cause of trouble, when gardens are washed away and flash floods threaten the lives of people crossing the many ravines in the area. They begin to pay attention to rumours that someone must be making too much rain. Initially, investigators attempt informally to find the deviant, but the veracity of those who deny knowing how to make rain is never taken for granted. To ensure that people tell the truth, the Bible has become, in recent years, an integral part of the process of identifying such a deviant.

For example, in 1977, two priests began an informal search for an unidentified rainmaker. They carried a Bible with them, as they walked barefoot through the mud from hamlet to hamlet, asking residents if they were responsible for the rain. At each settlement, people responded by kissing the Bible to affirm their innocence. About 40 local men joined forces with the priests along the route. Finally, the party entered the hamlet of a man we shall call Henderson who, it was rumoured, knew how to make rain. "Do you know how to make rain?" one of the priests asked. Henderson was silent for a moment and then, without a word, he turned and ducked into his house. After a few minutes, he reappeared with a tusked boar's skull, a traditional valuable used for paying compensation. He faced the priests and, beyond them, the crowd and spoke in a very soft voice. "Look," he said, "I don't know how to make rain. In the past, people knew how to make rain. Perhaps my father knew. But I am not the one who is making this rain. I give you this pig's skull to show you that I am telling the truth."[6] No one mentioned kissing the Bible, and the priests and their followers returned to their homes.

As this example of the informal process of identifying a deviant illustrates, a person can deny being the maker of destructive weather—indeed, one can deny knowing how to make any rain at all—and yet through actions such as the magnanimous gift of a tusked pig's skull one can almost simultaneously be labelled and "de-labelled" as a deviant. In Mendonsa's words, "the deviant is 'hooked' and then let off the hook in a ritual drama" that certainly has value for socializing children and that may communicate contradictions in the social system (Mendonsa 1982:189).

One contradiction that the example we have just cited communicates is this: Longanan priests and many other residents accept, most of the time, the belief that only God makes rain; yet many people, including some priests, also believe that individuals sometimes can make rain. The fact that both informal and formal processes of labelling a deviant rainmaker tend to end in ambiguity, with neither confession nor denial, highlights this contradiction. When leaders and the community consider an informal investigation of bad weather to have been ineffective, a more formal meeting, or court, usually is held to pursue the trouble to its source. In a public forum people are believed to be more likely to tell the truth. Yet, as one leader remarked, "Every meeting has been the same—the accused people always deny that they are guilty, but nobody ever believes they are telling the truth."

In 1982, a rain court was convened to establish the long-sought identity of the person who had made, by that time, about five months of rain. Although people had been asked in the privacy of their homes to verify their innocence by kissing the Bible, this court marked the first time that the

Bible was used in public to entrap a rainmaker. Leaders were reluctant to require accused persons to swear publicly on the Bible, because they feared this would shame people beyond acceptable limits. But they agreed that the Bible offered a foolproof method for identifying the guilty rainmaker. Even if all suspects denied culpability, "the error of the liar's ways would be revealed. God would point out who had lied."

Two traditional leaders and a priest accused seven men and three women of making rain. For example, a man who celebrated his wife's major funerary feast on the one sunny day in a month of rain was suspected of starting, and stopping, the deluge out of grief. He denied this and suggested that the court investigate his wife's matrilineal relatives, adding, "It wasn't me. I practically had to swim when I was preparing for her feast. I chopped firewood in the rain. I cooked food in the rain." The court dismissed the widower and summoned one of his dead wife's female, matrilineal relatives to testify. Although women are accused of rainmaking, a lack of confessions makes it possible for women to deny knowledge of rainmaking on the basis of gender. The accused responded, "What are you asking me for? I am just a woman. *Men* make rain. Men have made rain lots of times. But not me; I am just a woman."

The process of establishing innocence was painstaking and slow. Night fell, the court was adjourned, a second long day of court was held, and, after the ninth person swore an oath of innocence, people began to drift away from the meeting house. Only one suspect remained, a respected man of moderate influence in the community. This man was Henderson, the person who, five years earlier, had ended the search in another case of deviant rainmaking by giving the informal investigators a fine pair of pig's tusks while denying his guilt. He sat quietly and, instead of rising to take the oath, he pulled a stone from his pocket. "It's true," he said, "I have rainstones. You people think I know how to make rain. Well, you're right! I have the stones; I know the chants. *But* I didn't make this particular rain." Then he swore on the Bible.

The resolution of this case contrasts sharply with the episode in 1977 when Henderson gave away valuable tusks but did not kiss the Bible. His gift of tusks suggested that he was guilty; at the same time, he verbally denied his guilt while sidestepping the issue of kissing the Bible. But once the Bible became a tool in the public, formal divination of the deviant, Henderson found himself cornered, and, in the end, he confessed his guilt. He had been secretive, he had lied about his skill, he had made rain for a series of individuals whose names he recited.

Discussion

Henderson was not a marginal man. He was a respected member of society who was suspected of disreputable, antisocial activity. Why, aside from fear of God's reprisals for lying under oath, would he admit his knowledge of rainmaking especially since he did not feel responsible for the particular rain in question? In puzzling over this case, we have concluded that Henderson willingly accepted a fleeting label of "deviant" as part of a process in which he quickly transformed the suspicion of others into increased respect for his socially desirable power.[7] By volunteering that he had acted as a deviant, but small-scale, rainmaker in the past, Henderson emphasized what sociologists would call the primary, rather than the secondary, nature of his deviant activity. In other words, the admission that in the past he had pursued a deviant activity, but one with little social impact in the present, effectively quelled suspicion that he was responsible for the current state of affairs in which prolonged heavy rain was causing serious problems for the community.

Henderson's admission was unprecedented as the first public confession to rainmaking after many years in which those whom rumour held to be deviant rainmakers always denied their guilt yet continued to be suspected. His confession was crucial to the definition of his behaviour as deviant, for it was only through his willingness to publicly acknowledge secret behaviour that social control could be exercised. By revealing his secret activities, Henderson voluntarily subjected his own deviance to negative sanctions. Yet, by confessing to minor incidents of rainmaking, he was able to establish his credibility while limiting the extent to which negative sanctions actually would be imposed.

As is common in Melanesian courts, bringing such a matter out into the open is a considered desirable; public confession usually initiates a process Longanans call *haranago* "wiping away guilt," which reincorporates the offender into his or her proper place in society.[8] Thus, Henderson allowed Longanan leaders and members of the community to begin interacting with him, thereby continuing the process of transforming secret into public and evil into good that his confession had initiated.

In the small, multiplex, insular societies of Melanesia, agents of social control tend *not* to exclude, reject or regard as disreputable those people who are identified with deviant activity. Instead, the labelling process and, especially public confession to having performed a deviant act, is oriented toward the reintegration of the offender into the mainstream of society. It is evident that conceptual separation of actor and activity is at times difficult for us Westerners to keep in mind; even sociologists tend to lapse into regarding the labelling process as one in which persons, not activities, are

designated as deviant. But Longanans and other Melanesians have a fundamental acceptance that people are distinct from what they do. For them, the performance of a deviant activity clearly does not make one a deviant person. Therefore, they reintegrate and render harmless the person who has given offense rather than nurture a reactive secondary deviation in which control emphasizes the presence of the offender *within* the society. In contrast to our own way of life, there is physically and culturally no place for a deviant individual in a community such as Longana; hence, every effort is made to treat people as respected members of society while dealing with their occasionally deviant actions as socially intolerable.

In a cross-cultural investigation of deviance, we must go farther than distinguishing between actors and actions. Analysts must also recognize that primary deviation such as we have described is situational or circumstantial. Often, as is the case with rainmaking in Melanesia, deviant behaviour is simply a transformation of a socially beneficial activity. Context assumes crucial importance, for it is not even the act itself but the circumstances in which the activity is performed that render such behaviour deviant or desirable. Consequently, the imposition of social control can effect a relatively simple transposition of evil into good. For example, although some people favoured destroying Henderson's rainstones, they did not prevail. Instead, a priest took custody of the stones, allowing Henderson access to his rainmaking tools so long as he promised to use them only for the well-being of the community. In times of drought, Henderson's skills could be tapped and rainmaking would be publicly performed; but he was forbidden to make rain in secret or for individual clients.

Notably, the imposition of social control in Henderson's case involved no punishment. In fact, punishment was avoided. People were concerned not to alienate Henderson because of his presumed ability to control the weather. Longanans treated this category of deviance as the potent antithesis of socially beneficial power.[9] As we have suggested in our review of cross-cultural literature on rainmaking and in our analysis of Henderson's case, evil and good are not opposite ends of a continuum in Melanesia, but transformations of each other. Those who heal are those who can cause sickness, those with the power to make peace are those with potent charms for success in warfare, and those who bring a destructive deluge can end a drought with a gentle shower.

The complementarity of deviance and power became particularly evident in the days after the rain court. Although the rain continued, Longanans were satisfied at last that the culprit was not a local person. Henderson resumed his ordinary position in community life, but, under the surface, people did not forget his potentially powerful skill. A few months after the rain court, a very influential leader suggested that Henderson should pay a

steep fine for having made rain in the past. Others objected quickly and vehemently: paying a fine might make Henderson extremely angry, and if Henderson was angry, who knew what the consequences might be? Perhaps he would vent his temper in a tempest.

Would Henderson make rain if people made him angry? No one was sure; but local objection to imposing a fine on the reformed rainmaker suggests a measure of authority comparable to that which Ridgeway (1981) reports may accrue to Western non-conformists under certain circumstances. Rather than reducing his influence, Henderson's willing deviance had become a personal asset grounded in people's cognizance of his potential, but largely unrealized, power for evil in the past and for good in the present.

Not only in Melanesia but everywhere, "deviance is a socially created fact" (Mendonsa 1982:210). The leap from rainmakers to rapists or other deviant behaviour of the more conventionally sociological variety is not, we suggest, a great distance. The study of rainmakers simply highlights assumptions about the nature of deviance that are taken too much for granted by those of us who think we want to know "what" rather than "who" is responsible for mild winters and spring snow.

Notes

1. The Longana environment is discussed in detail in Rodman (1981).
2. We wish to thank Jonathan Mark for his assistance in researching Pacific materials discussed in this section.
3. Historical accounts indicate that deviant rainmakers were enough of a problem in Europe for laws to be established against them. Russell notes that "Visigothic laws of the sixth century prescribed whipping as punishment for self-advertised 'storm makers' who made farmers pay them to spare their fields" (1980:46).
4. In a few societies, there are no rainmakers but there are rainstoppers. Hogbin (1970:191) reports that in Wogeo there is not much call for rainmaking magic but a reputation for the ability to stop rain confers high status. Kapauku Papuans believe that only spirits can cause rain; men, however, can end rain by simple processes of imitative magic (Pospisil 1958:27).
5. Williams (1928:177), Hunt (1949:203) and Malinowski (1935:104) cite other examples of attempts on the part of members of a community to curb the activities of a rainmaker.
6. All attributed quotations are translations of tape-recorded statements that Longanans made to us during 11 months of fieldwork in 1978-79 or during our 1982 field research.
7. We doubt that Henderson did this in a calculating manner. His motivation seemed to arise directly from anxiety about the Bible's ability to detect a lie. Nevertheless, a consequence of confession was the enhancement of his reputation.
8. A more complete discussion of court procedure and litigation can be found in Rodman (1977, 1983).
9. Ambae has close cultural ties with nearby Raga (North Pentecost). Robert Lane, writing of Raga, observes that "power is the result of interaction between the environment and man . . . human beings through their actions, are an important part of the interacting forces that, when joined, produce power" (Lane 1977:365). By implication, rainmaking, which clearly results from interaction between man and the environment, produces

power. One reason why deviant rainmakers are feared is because they are engaged in activities productive of illegitimate power that can be used for antisocial ends.

References Cited

Beaglehole, E., and P. Beaglehole
1941 Pangai, Village in Tonga. Wellington, New Zealand: The Polynesian Society.

Bellow, Saul
1959 Henderson, The Rain King. New York: Viking Press.

Codrington, R.H.
1969 The Melanesians: Studies in Their Anthropology and Folklore [1891]. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.

Cohen, R., and J. Middleton
1970 Introduction. *In* From Tribe to Nation in Africa: Studies in Incorporation Process, edited by Ronald Cohen and John Middleton, pp. 1-34. Scranton, Pennsylvania: Chandler.

Colson, E.
1948 Rain Shrines of the Plateau Tonga of Northern Rhodesia. Africa 18:272-283.

Dozier, E.
1970 The Pueblo Indians of North America. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Gluckman, M.
1963 Custom and Conflict in Africa. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.

Harris, A., and G. Hill
1982 The Social Psychology of Deviance: Toward a Reconciliation with Social Structure. Annual Review of Sociology 8:161-186.

Hogbin, H.I.
1970 The Island of Menstruating Men. Scranton, Pennsylvania: Chandler.

Hunt, H., ed.
1949 The Micronesians of Yap and Their Repopulation. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Krige, J.D., and E.J. Krige
1943 The Realm of a Rain Queen: A Study of the Pattern of Lovedu Society. London: Oxford University Press.
1970 The Lovedu of the Transvaal. *In* African Worlds [1954], edited by D. Forde, pp. 55-82. London: Oxford University Press.

Lane, R.
1977 Power Concepts in Melanesia and Northwestern North America. *In* The Anthropology of Power: Ethnographic Studies from Asia, Oceania, and the New World, edited by R. Fogelson and R. Adams, pp. 365-374. New York: Academic Press.

Layard, J.
1942 Stone Men of Malekula. London: Chatto and Windus.

Lingenfelter, S.
1972 Political Leadership and Culture Change in Yap. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.

Malinowski, B.
1922 Argonauts of the Western Pacific. London: George Routledge and Sons.
1935 Coral Gardens and Their Magic. London: G. Allen and Unwin.

Mbiti, J.
1970 African Religion and Philosophy. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday.

McCallum. D.
1959 Rain-making in Tanganyika. Tanganyika Notes and Records 52:53-56.

Mendonsa, E.
1982 The Politics of Divination: A Processual View of Reactions to Illness and Deviance among the Sisala of Northern Ghana. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nadel, S.F.
1955 Two Nuba Religions: An Essay in Comparison. American Anthropologist 57:661-679.

Pospisil, L.
1958 Kapauku Papuans and Their Law. New Haven: Yale University Publications in Anthropology.

Prus, R.
1983 Deviance as Community Activity: Putting "Labeling Theory" in Perspective. Paper presented in a symposium on Cross-Cultural Deviance, Canadian Ethnology Society Annual Meeting, McMaster University.

Radcliffe-Brown, A.R.
1952 Structure and Function in Primitive Society. Glencoe, New York: Free Press.

Ridgeway, C.
1981 Nonconformity, Competence, and Influence in Groups: A Test of Two Theories. American Sociological Review 46:333-347.

Rodman, Margaret C.
1981 Customary Illusions: Land and Copra in Longana, Vanuatu. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, McMaster University.

Rodman, W.L.
1977 Big Men and Middlemen: The Politics of Law in Longana. American Ethnologist 4:525-537.
1983 Gaps, Bridges, and Levels of Law: Middlemen as Mediators in a Vanuatu Society. *In* Middlemen and Brokers in Oceania, edited by W. Rodman and D. Counts, pp. 69-95. ASAO Monograph No. 9, Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.

Russell, J.
1980 A History of Witchcraft: Sorcerers, Pagans and Heretics. London: Thames and Hudson.

Skinner, E.
1974 African Beliefs in the Psychic Manipulation of Material Phenomena: The Tengsoba in Mossi Society. *In* Parapsychology and Anthropology, edited by Allan Angoff and Diana Barth, pp. 294-306. New York: Parapsychology Foundation, Inc.

Turner, G.
1884 Samoa: A Hundred Years Ago. London: Macmillan.

Wagner, G.
1967 The Political Organization of the Bantu of Kavirondo [1940]. *In* African Political Systems, edited by M. Fortes and E.E. Evans-Pritchard, pp. 197-236. London: Oxford University Press.

Williams, F.E.
1928 Orokaiva Magic. London: Oxford University Press.