appreciate not only Chambri circumstance but Chambri power and agency as well.

NANCY MCDOWELL
Franklin & Marshall College

* * *


History and telling stories is for the Tolai, as it is for all human beings, a political act. In Not the Way It Really Was Klaus Neumann examines the way in which the Tolai and Western historians conceive of the past and how those conceptions are or are not woven into histories. Essentially, Neumann's main aim is to examine history as praxis. He does this by identifying significant themes and crafting an analysis in the form of montage, which invites audience participation through open-ended discovery. At times, Neumann compares his work to painting or a film rather than the more authoritarian genre of academic literature.

In an organizational style reminiscent of Greg Dening's Islands and Beaches, Neumann divides his chapters into two orders. The odd-numbered chapters contain Neumann's constructions on Tolai narratives of the past (the murder of Mrs Wolff, the exploits of ToMarnakat, the coming of Christianity, the personality of Abaram ToBobo, the actions of Enos Teve, the time before Christianity, the actions of Queen Emma), while the even-numbered chapters reflect on historical and anthropological theories and methodologies and their appropriateness in dealing with the past.

Although Neumann sets his analysis among the Tolai of the Gazelle Peninsula of Papua New Guinea, history itself is his main subject matter, not the Tolai. He explores the concepts of "truth" and "reality" in a circuituous manner by examining several incidents from the Tolai past. He carefully crafts his narratives and suggests that what is "true" to his narrators may not represent what "actually happened." He quickly asserts the, by now, well-traveled path of the relativity of the past and the inappropriateness of attempting to assess what "really happened"; but he also asks the essential question of whether the "truths" of his narrators in fact represent the important bits of history-making. Neumann relates the past to an emerging Tolai identity in the present. He also examines how the Tolai regenerate their society and the importance of kastom to that process.

Neumann's work well represents the current trend of blending historical and anthropological orientations when constructing a Pacific past. His "discovery" of the essential experience of immersion in the field in coming to grips with his own understanding and development is not a new approach for anthropologists or many Pacific historians; however the way he brings it into his published work, not as mere anecdote but as part of his analysis, is new for Pacific history.

I have a slight quibble with Neumann's conception of the relationship between anthropologists and their
informants. Neumann believes the word “informant” denotes “a one-way flow of information from the researched to the researcher.” He paraphrases Sartre about those individuals who would ingratiate themselves in order to extract information (75–76). Very few anthropologists would, I contend, adopt this definition or view of the fieldwork experience; rather “informant,” as I believe it is meant, acknowledges the source of the knowledge being shared. As Neumann so clearly demonstrates, it is in the sharing and exchanging that understanding takes place. I do not wish to romanticize the fieldwork experience, and I do believe that debate over power relationships and remuneration between academics (anthropological and otherwise) and informants is essential. However, it seems to me that Neumann is here concentrating on the term alone and not truly examining working relationships that have been established. Just because he calls those Tolai who spoke with him “my friends” rather than “informants” does not necessarily guarantee an equal power relationship. As many anthropologists know only too well, the power within a relationship with an informant does not always (or usually in the field) reside with the anthropologist; much of that influence is created by the scholar through publication. Similarly, Neumann would be better off analyzing in depth the relationships established between other scholars (most notably Errington and Sacks) and their Tolai informants, rather than simply assuming that the scholars were unaware of the significance of their presence in the field.

Neumann excels at presenting an image of a chaotic stream of past experiences from which historians (himself included) construct a cohesive vision of identity and interpretation. It is the authoritarian nature of the construction that concerns him, and rightly so. However, while Neumann realizes the overlapping nature of the pasts of colonizers and colonized and the uneven power relationship therein, he misses the nuances of many additional histories and the way in which they impinge on each other, overlapping distinct categories into the more blurred reflections of the past. For example, he mentions that Tongans and Fijians were the first Christian missionaries among the Tolai. Just as Fijians and Tongans have become part of the Tolai past, so, too, has the Gazelle Peninsula, and the Tolai are part (a footnote? a paragraph? a chapter?) of the Tongan and Fijian past. If one were to continue Neumann’s thread of many constructions of the Tolai past coexisting, the resulting montage could and should include these perceptions, as well as the many other colonizers (German, Japanese, and Australian) who have passed through the Gazelle Peninsula. Their depictions of Tolai may not represent “the way it really was,” but might further delineate the “truth” of the relationships, good or bad, established with the Tolai.

In Not the Way It Really Was Neumann poses weighty questions for which he does not attempt answers. For example, he correctly identifies western history’s preoccupation with chronology (110), but he does not address the issues of how to write a
history without one. His own perceptions of Tolai accounts of the past are posited within a clear chronology that he has obtained from, among other sources, published accounts of the Tolai past by other Europeans. Neumann must realize that he himself is bound by, or at least immersed in, the disciplinary constraints from which he wishes Pacific history to break free. This is not to belittle Neumann’s account; his book is well written and enjoyable to read. More important, his questions are well worth asking and well worth debating by those interested in the Pacific past.

**Phyllis S. Herda**

*Victoria University of Wellington*

---


Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa, associate professor at the Center for Hawaiian Studies, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, has written one of those rare and important works that, while not completely convincing in the argument she most ardently wishes to make, nevertheless succeeds in ways other scholars can only envy. With her interpretation of the *Māhele* from a Hawaiian cultural perspective, Kame'eleihiwa has succeeded in creating a book that is both challenging to the professional academic and, because of the simple elegance of her language, invaluable to the novice. It also succeeds as an inspiration to our people as we struggle to reclaim our nation in the late twentieth century.

Early in her introductory chapter, Kame'eleihiwa acknowledges the significant contributions of scholars Denning and Sahlins to the field of Pacific Islands history and to her own work and then proceeds to demonstrate why a history of native peoples can be neither complete nor completely legitimate without the contributions of native historians. Her argument is that if a people’s conception of the world is structured and described by certain metaphors that are understood within their culture, then a knowledge of the language that shapes and defines those metaphors is essential to the understanding of the metaphors.

Intimacy with the language is, indeed, one of the tools that Kame'eleihiwa brings to this study, interpreting various creation chants such as the *Kumulipo* and other *mo‘o kū‘auhau* ‘genealogies’ in order to construct a coherent and convincing metaphor of the relationships that existed between ‘aina ‘land’ and kanaka ‘human’ in prehaole Hawai‘i.

In her first three chapters Kame'eleihiwa describes that relationship as both familial and spiritual. People were servants of the ‘aina, and the ali‘i nui ‘ruling chiefs’ were the semidivine mediators of the spiritual power, or mana between the gods, the land, and the people. All of creation, including the Hawaiian people, were descendants of spiritual forms that mated and gave birth to land, kalo ‘taro’, and then to the ali‘i, in that