ily’s evangelical enterprise was at an end, descendants of families that had been influenced by Kwato ideas of church and development have continued to play a significant part in the Massim region and in national life. David Wetherell is to be congratulated for a coherent reading of the Abel Papers and for breaking ground in the exploration of issues of missionary and colonial relations in Papua. No doubt he and other scholars will devote further attention to the nature and consequences of missionary and colonial assumptions in the Kwato era.

MARY N MACDONALD
Le Moyne College
Syracuse, NY


Losche and Thomas’s selected proceedings of a conference in honor of Bernard Smith is something of a curate’s egg. Good, as they say, in parts. The aim Double Vision sets for itself in the first lines of the preface, “a re-imagining of the art and culture of the Pacific,” is an ambitious and laudable one.

The volume adopts something of a cultural studies approach in its inclusion of the writing of scholars from history, literature, anthropology, art, and art history. With the exception of two of the book’s essays, one by Bronwen Douglas and the other by Dianne Losche, the methodology of each chapter remains firmly within the mainstream of its own discipline, and perhaps this is why the essays do not meld into a coherent whole. Smith’s European Vision and the South Pacific (1960), which the editors seek to emulate and even transcend, produced a remarkable summation of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century material on and about the Pacific—and some groundbreaking discussion of Australian colonial painting. But most of what is presented here is difficult to compare with Smith’s book in terms of either representing and reformulating the past or setting agendas and mapping a field for the future. This said, the best chapters of the book are very good indeed.

I have not read a more stimulating essay of its kind than Leonard Bell’s “Looking at Goldie: Face to Face with ‘All ’e Same t’e Pakeha’.” This engaging meditation on spectatorship and meaning in the New Zealand artist’s most famous painting plays with both the dynamics of looking and the riddles that nineteenth-century contact histories, such as that of Māori and Pakeha, produce. Bell suggests that the meaning of Goldie’s painting and the quotation in the title refer to a complex dialogue taking place off canvas between Māori and Pakeha. The nature of the dialogue, however, is the issue at stake in this deeply ambiguous picture. Bell’s contention is that “All e same Pakeha” can be read as a joke. This joke, like the best jokes, is many sided and can be read at a number of levels. Bell
teases out his discussion around the joke in a range of carefully nuanced arguments, whose complexity space prevents me from elaborating in full, and a summary would clearly spoil the pleasure of the intending reader. For example, while the subject of Goldie’s portrait, Te Aho o Te Rangi Wharepu, can be seen to be mimicking European modes of dress, the artist himself, in the marvelous attention to detail in his canvas, also takes on the role of mimic. At the same time, Te Aho’s imitation of European dress may be read as parodic in intention, following the arguments put forward by Michael Taussig on the politics of colonial dress, as a joke against Pakeha, as a sending up of the colonizers.

I cannot say how much I enjoyed Bell’s discussion and how greatly it has contributed to my own understanding of Goldie’s painting in particular and more generally the paintings, especially portraits, of academic artists working in a range of colonial-settler cultures in the Pacific. The existence of such a spectacular oeuvre as Goldie’s, in which Māori are represented dramatically, is a pointed reminder to art historians in Australia of the absence of anything approaching it in both quality and scope. Australian Aboriginal people were not painted in a sustained and serious way by artists working in colonial Australia after the departure of the first wave of academically trained artists such as Benjamin Duterrau, Robert Dowling, and Eugene Von Guerard. There is no equivalent in Australia of Goldie’s generation, artists like Louis Steele, Wilhelm Dittmer, and Gottfried Lindauer whose work Bell has illuminated elsewhere. There was no commensurate representation of Australian paintings in international exhibitions of the kind that took place with the New Zealand school either. The work of the much-heralded Heidelberg painters is sorely lacking in its representation of indigenous subjects and was not sought out, perhaps for this reason, for exhibition outside Australia during the period.

Jonathon Lamb’s essay on Juan Fernandez is also among the best writing of this anthology. His problematizing of the difference between the real and the imaginary voyage and his discussion of the commercial impulses that sometimes lay at the heart of the literature based on them have quite astounding possibilities for the way future scholars might come to regard them. Even the most resolutely factual accounts of voyages, he reminds the reader, have been disputed by others who were witness to them. Horace Walpole, as Lamb recounts, “was so contemptuous of the contradictions in the official account of Anson’s expedition, that he referred to the hero of this circumnavigation as ‘Admiral Almanzor’ and ‘Admiral Amadis’ and compared its episodes with Gulliver’s improbable achievements in Lilliput.”

Gordon Bennett’s discussion of his own methodology in producing his series of paintings, Notes on Perception (1988), is a useful and interesting account of how Bennett, as an artist, both constructs the imagery in his paintings and, in a way, how the state constructed him. His discussion around the seagoingness of the Australian Bicentenary and of how representations and images relating to the romance of ships held the celebrations together is witty and perceptive, fit-
ting in an odd fashion with Lamb’s chapter on voyage literature. I was sorry it was so short.

JEANETTE HOORN  
University of Melbourne

* * *


Nicklaus Schweizer felt a challenge stirring within. It welled up inside, urging him “to deal with” the topic of Hawaiian nationality in the context of local and outside forces of change and stasis. Unsure as he seemed at first, Schweizer did find a way to shed new light on a fairly well-covered topic. Among Schweizer’s credentials for doing this work are his residence of thirty years in the islands, the ability to translate and speak Hawaiian, and a background in European affairs, the origins of which go back to life in his native Switzerland. He also possesses a congenial personal demeanor that comes with a ready smile. To do the kind of work he did for this book demonstrates his aloha for these islands and their indigenous people.

It is clear the author felt this aloha, in the form of kuleana, his own province of responsibility, and proceeded “to approach the matter comprehensively and at the same time to adhere as much as possible to a local, home-grown point of view.” The local story focuses on how Hawai‘i has moved from an archipelago of separate chiefdoms to a unified nation-state under Kamehameha I, to a monarchy, republic, US territory, and eventually state. With each of these political designations came much tumult in the lives of the K na‘a Maoli, but since the end of the Hawaiian Kingdom, the upset has come in even more radical ways.

Schweizer traces the roots of change locally, but as he does he also places the Hawai‘i situation in a broader context. This macro-historical approach is effective and underlines just how certain powerful forces in world history, like imperialism, colonialism, Christian conversion, and capitalism, have affected indigenous peoples and changed conceptions of nationality.

In the course of his analysis, Schweizer also contributes to the historiographical record by commenting on and citing an array of scholars from Hawaiian nationalists Haunani-Kay Trask and Lilikalakame‘elehiwa to Ralph Kuykendall and Gavan Daws. The value of such an effort is to validate the native point of view while acknowledging earlier nonnative voices and the evidence put forward by such individuals in support of everything from legitimate claims to gross misstatements.

Schweizer is able to encourage an ebb and flow between local focus and global context throughout the book. K na‘a Maoli depopulation is discussed in the context of Tasmania and other lands where native peoples have been similarly affected. Cook is mentioned and his actions in Hawai‘i evaluated against a thorough treatment of Europe’s age of exploration, beginning with Columbus and Magellan. The sovereignty movement in Hawai‘i is discussed in light of similar developments in the Pacific Islands and elsewhere. The constant move-