Clearly *Dreadlocks: In Oceania* is meant to serve as a kind of corrective to the Faber book and undoubtedly it does function in this way. The other contribution by Mishra, a poem called “Alta, 1997,” is unambiguous in its projection of a certain kind of local reader:

He carries a sispaan across the field,  
A surf boiling in its prison, leaving  
Her by a diya that burns forever  
Under a tulsi, a world of herb-light  
Inviolate as her belief in today,  
The future. . . . (121)

The poem is not glossed and while someone who does not understand *sispaan, diya, tulsi,* and so on might be able to guess at some of the meanings, the overall effect of the poem is to make one hyperconscious of what one doesn’t know. This writer is not speaking to me, one thinks.

A handful of other pieces in this issue use similar tactics, though none to this degree. But it is pushing the bounds of credulity to suggest that the only or even the principal intended audience of this volume is a local one, never mind an audience of garment factory workers. Another group of pieces, including notably John O’Carroll’s “Multiple Cities: Suva and the (Post)colonial,” which “acknowledges the radical imbrication of polity and cultural specificity, of built formation and social practice,” and to a lesser extent Arlene Griffen’s study of Bakhtinian “carnivalization” in Hau'ofa’s *Kisses in the Nederends,* are plainly pitched at people with recent higher degrees in the humanities and would be incomprehensible to anyone else.

I know it is hard for journal editors to be clear about their aims. Often with a journal one wants to do contradictory things—to speak to both specialists and general readers, or to make a contribution to scholarship and at the same time to entertain. In the case of *Dreadlocks: In Oceania* it is doubly difficult because there are so few alternative publication venues in the region. It is obviously tempting to try to do everything with this one book: to provide a forum for local students; to engage in international debate; to feature the work of well-known writers, and so on. My own feeling is that it is uneven, both in the quality of the writing and in the expectations it sets up. That said, it is also just a journal and journals are, as every editor knows, at least two parts ephemera for every part enduring stuff.

**CHRISTINA THOMPSON**  
*Lincoln, Massachusetts*

---


While researching Pacific artifacts at the Chicago Field Museum of Natural History, Nick Stanley stumbled on a performance by Asmat and Dani tribespeople who were participating in a Festival of Indonesia. Watching them, Stanley starts to ask what distinguishes their mode of ethnographic performance from earlier ones held in the 1893 Columbian Exposition. Stanley contends that while the actual perfor-
mance itself may not have changed much, the self-consciousness of the performers is what has emerged explicitly. The Asmat and Dani—like the Solomon Islanders, Welsh miners, Kwakiutl, and other groups covered in this study—are applying the tropes of salvage ethnography to their own cultural representations.

In this compact and energetic volume, Stanley probes at the meanings and visual strategies of a variety of contemporary ethnographic displays. The study covers an impressive geographic and analytic terrain: both large and small performance sites in locales as far flung as the western Pacific, south Wales, the Pacific Northwest, and Taiwan. While World's Fair modes of racialized visual display declined with imperial powers, Disneyland, Stanley asserts, continued the tradition with newer technology, as in “It’s a Small World.” With its hyperreal, spectacle-driven approach, Disneyland updated ethnographic display for the post–World War II period. The performers in this study—most of whom are indigenous people or relics of Fordist economies—are producing their own brand of spectacular culture à la Disney through ethnographic theme parks, indigenous cultural centers, and post-modern ethnographic performances.

In contrast to other tourism studies that Stanley feels are devoted to the tourist’s experience, he embarks on his journey with the intention of explicating the role of the performer. He operates according to the proposition of “the performer as volunteer”: all performers, he maintains, participate in cultural demonstrations “willingly and usually with some pride.” This wholesale claim, however, is not always an accurate or substantiated one; for example, performers from communities with sparse economic opportunities may find themselves with little choice but to grudgingly submit to the tourist marketplace. He also may be missing more informal economies of exchange at work in between the market and pure “volunteerism.”

In the first part of his globetrotting, Stanley tackles large-scale ethnographic theme parks in Hawai‘i, Indonesia, mainland China, and Taiwan. The Polynesian Cultural Center in Lā`ie, O`ahu, remains the most influential and successful example of large-scale cultural tourism to which the other parks aspire. Affiliated with the Church of Latter-day Saints, the Polynesian Cultural Center practices cultural preservation according to a “living museum” model, consolidating the Pacific Islands (at least a smattering of them) into one site. While similarly geared toward the visually spectacular, the Indonesian and Chinese parks pose different challenges for their architects. Taman Mini (Beautiful Indonesia in Miniature Park) and the “Chinese-style” tourist parks (eg, China Folk Culture Villages, Taiwan Aboriginal Culture Park) are national projects that aim to produce “unity in diversity” through multicultural displays. By integrating ethnic minorities into a coherent visual narrative, these cultural parks promote a sense of nationalism and modernity.

The book turns to case studies of “indigenous curation” in the Western Pacific as alternatives to government-sponsored or tourist-focused enter-
prises. Spearheaded by indigenous communities and often geared toward local consumption, museums and cultural centers in Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands accommodate visions of both the past and the future. While by no means unproblematic, indigenous museums are upheld as a viable way for local communities in a post-colonial Pacific to juggle cultural recovery and the tourist marketplace.

Stanley continues to explore other alternative displays, namely heritage centers in Ireland and south Wales where salvage ethnography is sup- planted somewhat by the presence and discourse of live interpreters. He also deliberates on the possible “future of ethnographic display” via more postmodern displays of cultural survival like Kwakiutl electronic installations at Knott’s Berry Farm.

While engaging, Stanley’s analysis often disregards the “backstage” of the performances and would benefit from a finer and deeper engagement with the institutional politics that produce what audiences see. Who creates and controls these institutions: government agencies, local communities, a mixture? There are crucial differences between the Mormon Church and a struggling postcolonial government, for instance, that shape how cultural policies are developed and implemented.

Furthermore, he often divides entrepreneurial “architects” and “natives” into separate categories; the former as profiteers and the latter as mere tools of management. In this highly structuralist reading, performers have little agency when they are in the employ of large ethnographic theme parks. Yet, when indigenous people are relatively autonomous from the marketplace and the state, they suddenly are endowed with agency and the power to “revolt” against hegemonic representations. Don’t “natives” also act as savvy profiteers, even within the confines of a large institution like the Polynesian Cultural Center? There are also more ephemeral but equally important means of displaying culture beyond theme parks and local cultural centers. Were Stanley to look beyond the staged performances to the performers’ lived experiences, he might discover that they participate in a multiplicity of cultural “performances,” such as native cultural activism that skillfully uses the “culture concept” to support claims to land and political sovereignty. On the basis of culture a disenfranchised group can assert its human rights and enter local, national, and international politics.

* * *

**Being Ourselves for You** provides a dazzling overview of ethnographic display strategies, but readers may be disappointed by the lack of ethnographic detail of the performances themselves. Quite often the basic visual content—descriptions as basic as costumes and staging devices—is difficult to discern. Relying heavily on secondary sources, the study often stops at the level of assertion, rather than providing careful evidence and analysis. This ambitious project might have been better served by limiting itself to fewer strategic sites. The careless editing of the volume also distracts from the stimulating content.
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