manu be taken as a sign of her personal bias?

Indeed, it is her genealogical claim, far more than her expertise in language, that separates Kameʻeleihiwa from Dening and Sahlins and separates her work from theirs. For the culture, according to Kameʻeleihiwa, is not simply language, it is genealogy. Just as ka poʻe kahiko ‘ancient people’ could not express their history except through the moʻo kūʻauhau, neither can anyone claim a Hawaiian identity unless they are linked to the lāhui by birth.

It is a typically uncompromising claim for this incredibly gifted scholar, and it strongly implies that there are limitations to a non-Hawaiian’s understanding of our culture. This is a claim that she might have made even stronger except that she digresses into an unnecessarily contentious argument that haole should not try to be Hawaiians and that their genealogy forever bars them. It is not their genealogy, I think, but the ideologies that are nested in their culture that limit the haole understanding and acceptance of many things that Hawaiians take for granted. I wonder, for instance, how many foreigners, especially Americans, could identify with a Hawaiian’s continued fondness for the memory of a landed and privileged aristocracy?

Kameʻeleihiwa’s argument is not a racist one. She says on page 326, “Foreigners should remember who they are and should be unashamed of their race.” I agree.

I also know that reading her book made me proud of the ancestry we share. If pride in one’s heritage is one of the more important gifts that a historian can bestow, as I believe it is, He makana māoli i ka poʻe Hawaiʻi kēia moʻolelo a Kameʻeleihiwa. She has given to scholars a brilliantly exciting and thoroughly researched history that will spur debate and rekindle outsiders’ interest in the Pacific Islands. Equally important to me, she has written a history that teaches and touches the young and older students who have little or no knowledge of their own history. She has lightened the burden of teaching and not many scholarly works can make that claim.

Jonathan Kamakawiwoʻole Osorio
Kapi‘olani Community College


Many if not most Westerners conceive of Pacific Islanders either as fun-loving, oversexed Sybarites or backward, head-hunting cannibals. Anthropologists commonly decry what Angela Gilliam calls “sex, savages, and spears” stereotypes (270) and blame the popular press for their perpetuation. But most contributors to this volume—a mix of ten Pacific Islander and American academics, former political leaders, and self-proclaimed “activists”—point the finger back again, claiming, as do the editors, that the “widespread nature of such images owes much to the continuing legacy of Margaret Mead and later anthropologists” (xix).
This legacy is built on “the abstraction of supposedly timeless Pacific cultures from a real context of massive rapid social change” (Peter Worsley, xii–xiii), which has produced “images that could too easily be incorporated into ideologies used by the West to rationalize the claim to world hegemony” (Eleanor Leacock, 11). Through distorted portrayals of Pacific peoples, uncritical acquiescence in the face of western colonial exploitation (or even direct participation, as Glenn Alcalay interprets the activities of field-workers who were part of the postwar Coordinated Investigation of Micronesian Anthropology), and paternalistic presumption of the right to represent those it studies, Pacific anthropology has been “a largely complicit enterprise for the stratagems of aggrandizing nations against the indigenous peoples of the Third World” (Alcalay, 174). Not only are Islanders victimized at the individual level when they “are perceived as nothing more than these [anthropologists’] creations when they travel to Western societies” (Warilea lamo, 77), but their collective efforts toward political independence (as with the Kanaks of New Caledonia) or a nuclear-free Pacific are frustrated when “their views about the future are dismissed as irrelevant, unimportant, and unsophisticated. They are the stuff of National Geographic magazine covers—quaint, timeless, and incapable of modern political discourse” (Gilliam, 273).

According to the dust jacket, this collection is destined “to be highly controversial.” Certainly the overall tone is angry and accusatory, and one should expect defensive reactions to the repeated charges of career-serving distortion, complicity in both past and current exploitation of Pacific peoples and devastation of their environments, and outright “cultural theft”—not only have countless artifacts been appropriated for European museums, but even “the nonmaterial culture has been taken away from the people” by anthropologists who do not publish their work in vernacular languages, such that it would be open to criticism “by those best equipped to judge it” (John Waiko, 251, 254).

Margaret Mead, in particular, is excoriated by most of the authors for her alleged romanticization, sensationalism, erroneous ethnography, and a “Freudian” (read “biological”) orientation, as well as for her “class bias,” racial insensitivity, “pro-nuclear” stances, and her “deep commitment to Westernization and laissez-faire capitalism” (Gilliam and Foerstel, 145). But it is clear that Mead serves most contributors as a convenient, high-profile target for charges that are intended to apply to almost everyone other than the authors of these chapters, and that her work, especially her early popular books, is considered representative of all that has been done since her first research in Samoa and Manus. Indeed, according to Gilliam, “Pacific scholarship has by and large remained unchanged and explicit in the past 60 years of research, incorporating the descriptions of Pacific peoples as ‘primitives’ ” (268).

To assert, or even to demonstrate systematically, that few if any anthropologists in the past two decades (at least) have characterized Pacific peoples as “primitive” or “savages” would be, one suspects, an insufficient re-
would be a pity if the cogent and constructive aspects of this wide-ranging critique became unnecessarily mired in legitimate current debates over an independent Kanaky or Belau's constitution.

TERENCE E. HAYS
Rhode Island College


Thanks to the timely publication of Gananath Obeyesekere's The Apotheosis of Captain Cook, Pacific anthropologists can at last turn away from the deluge of revisionist theories about the conspiracy or assassination of John F. Kennedy to engage the debate over our own mythic-historical moment, the "apotheosis" and ritual murder of Captain James Cook at Kealakekua Bay, Hawai'i, on 14 February 1779. Obeyesekere, a distinguished South Asianist and authority on psychological anthropology, bursts onto the Polynesian scene as a "stranger king," confidently and masterfully striding over the turf of areal specialists. This incursion deserves our enthusiastic welcome and careful examination, for it raises issues of critical importance for the historical anthropology of the interface of Europeans and Pacific Islanders: not only is it imperative to uncover local categories of meaningfulness, but it is equally