graph on contemporary Pacific media that treats the region as one large mediated space. While the gaps in the study are apparent, they also point toward numerous follow-up studies, including those that pay ethnographic attention to social practices around media production and reception. Seward provides productive schemas, such as his insistence on the importance of sound to Pacific communities. I can see other researchers picking up where Seward leaves off: to studies that address the intertextuality of radio news broadcasting and oral storytelling; the diverse social spaces where radio is consumed in urban and rural Pacific communities; or developing web technologies that are helping to connect Islanders and diasporic communities.

ADRIA L IMADA
New York University

* * *


The time frame of Rod Edmond’s book moves from Enlightenment-era contact in the South Pacific to the First World War and defeat of Germany; the spatial frame is the Polynesian triangle as affected by the colonial cultures of Britain, France, and the United States. In lesser hermeneutic hands, this book could easily have the feel and reach of a “round up the usual suspects” text, but it is much more important than that. Edmond pushes the white mythology of Euro-American representation to some end point of complexity and subtle self-undermining. At many points (especially in the introduction and epilogue), he acknowledges the limits of working inside this very “colonial discourse” frame as inadequate to represent or approach Native Pacific voices and views of Oceania.

For Edmond, however, there is no place to stand outside white mythology or to claim some interpretive immunity from the tropological sway of “the textuality of history” and staying power of canonical representations (51). Like the very writers he describes, Edmond is working “both within and against the dominant traditions of representing the Pacific” (262); this western negotiation with cultural otherness turns out to be a way of preserving their power of aesthetic and political complexity from charges of mere orientalism or colonial appropriation. He defends Pacific cultures from tropes of elegiac vanishment and orientalist typing. But in effect Edmond preserves western writers in various genres from their own displacement by more indigenous-centered voices and forms, showing that like Stevenson (and the late Pacific phase of Jack London) western writers can create a situated dialogue of European modes and Polynesian stories and forms.

Edmond claims we cannot suddenly or totally disengage prior classifications, mappings, tropes in some act of decolonization by fiat, and I would
agree. Discourse does not work like this; it goes too far down into recesses of subjectivity and into domains and genres of cultural dispersal. Hence we do need to understand the terms and frames of the past in some kind of discriminating and critical-empathetic way that is adequate to the encounters with globalizing powers and their technologies of representation.

If colonial discourse works via anti-conquest disavowals and the sublimation or repression of more overt forms of violence, Edmond admits that epistemic violence remains part of the systemic process of contact, containment, and settlement. Working in a postcolonial context of transformative hybridity and global-local negotiation, however, Edmond’s own text is relatively undisturbed by stronger calls for “decolonization” or nativist critiques of militourism then and now. Representation exists in a coherent archive of its own, transmitting the terms and tropes of narrative containment and complex settlement in the Pacific.

With thick-textual detail and chronological care, Edmond treats the death of Captain Cook and grand narratives of imperial encounter as deformed in our postcolonial era; beachcombing and jumping ship to go native in the *Bounty* episode and *Typee*; London Missionary Society missionary discourse and reports home of William Ellis and John Williams; Victorian texts of British boyhood inculcating adventure, heroic empire, and trade; Robert Louis Stevenson and his critique of colonialism and use of Polynesian mythologies; Jack London and the contradictory figure of leprosy; French Romanticism in the hands of Pierre Loti and others. An exemplary case is the complicated and tormented Gauguin, whom Edmond finds to be “self-conscious, conflictual and ironic” (20), as colonial discourse is shown to be self-divided, full of internal critique, hesitant about its own power, caught up in the ironies of guilt and exploitation, poetry and empire.

“Colonialism was never a unitary formation” (12), Edmond assumes, but it was self-divided, critiqued, differently elaborated in distinct contexts and eras. For Edmond, despite the pressure of the major white settler states of Australia and New Zealand, Britain maintains a “half-hearted colonial presence in the Pacific,” softened by distance, lack of interest, and liberal critique, more driven by missionary and commercial projects than imperial conquest of territory or state expansion. In the Victorian era, imperialist dream texts for boys came to fill the gap opened “by the lack of any sustained British colonial interest in the South Pacific” (145). The South Pacific increasingly became “a space of dreams” replacing the site of quasi-scientific investigation. Britain is said to have little interest in acquisition of land, little forcible dispossession of native peoples in the Pacific. Still, the missionary motive is said to have distinctive force in the Pacific, “with implications for European attitudes and policies as well as native life-ways” (13). Surely, not all contact is contaminating or anomic or one-way. But was the British imperial presence all that soft and ineffectual in the Pacific?

Edmond expounds on such myths and texts of white Pacific fantasy, rather than elaborating on the subjectivity and agency of the indigenous
peoples and their inside terms and frames and the pragmatics of encounters, negotiations, local struggles with the global forces of colonization. The time-honored tradition of using the South Pacific as staging ground for western fantasies is here countered by a thick-textual immersion in history, as in Edmond’s fine reading of Stevenson’s engagement in *Moana* and London’s unstable fantasy of contact as mutual biological damage and cultural war for supremacy.

Mining and miming the canon, Edmond finds some hope in the “possibility of a hybrid culture of the kind Stevenson was to glimpse” (97), and even more so in the postcolonial visions of Pacific writers like Hau’ofa and Wendt, creating postcolonial “polyglot island worlds” (266). There is hope in cultural creolization and cross-cultural mixture and mutual transformation. Even Jack London moves toward a redemptive vision of mongrel hybridity in the Pacific, but more often offers visions of broken wholeness, maimed bodies, dismemberment, both naturalized and read as an effect of western imperialism. Gauguin is shown to be “more nuanced and contradictory” than Pierre Loti in his transformation of French orientalism and primitivism transported to Tahiti (254).

Does Edmond repeat the “vacancy of [Pacific] otherness” (Nicholas Thomas) earlier generations of western representations were guilty of? He warily risks replicating the epistemic violence of western discourses in constituting otherness from within colonial vocabularies. His claim that “ pidgins evolved in colonial settings to meet the basic needs of the colonizer” (175) seems way off the mark in terms of how functional pidgin English has become for postcolonial Pacific writers, from Albert Wendt and Russell Soaba to Kathy Dee Banggo and Joseph Balaz. This Pacific-based English literature needs to be engaged with, not just sidelined to the epilogue anymore. There are other ways of tapping into and respecting some kind of ancestral cultural archive of Pacific belonging. Still, in its own archival terms, this is an important and challenging study.

Edmond’s book is a historicizing study of European schema, then, written within and against the terms of colonial discourse studies, which maps the language of representation and power of textuality as a colonizing force, and at best grants reactive agency to colonized peoples who can mimic and deform the western frames. “The inside perspective [on the Pacific] must always have been different” (1), Edmond admits, connecting land to sea in concentric circles of expansive interconnection rather than grid-like squares of mapped and settled land called New Ireland, New Britain, New Hebrides, and so on. For Edmond, “Indigenous points of view are not forgotten but they are often out of reach” (20). But can we claim this anymore, assume some “shortage of sources” and just work in the western archive and track the traces of irony, self-division, self-reconstitution and critique, without in some ways listening to counter views of native Pacific cultural frames, then and now? Fearing such native silencing and the repetition of colonial violence in a secondary belated mode, Edmond confesses, “no doubt if this book was written in Hawaii it would have been rather different” (20).
Relying on a bevy of western anthropological, historical, folklore, and archaeological sources as well as Hawaiian language resources and texts, Dennis Kawaharada tracks a very different way of doing such work even as a nonnative scholar of the Pacific. If the west imposes a telos of history on the spatial complexity of cultures in the Pacific, the culture of Hawaiian indigenous settlement survives via a complex process of embedded naming and oral transmission achieved through poetic traditions archiving history, legend, pragmatic knowledge, and spirituality into the names of places.

As a resident scholar and local-born writer in Hawai‘i, Kawaharada feels an ethical and political imperative to research, respect, and keep alive the aboriginal heritage of pragmatic ecological knowledge and respect for the community, land, and ocean. As he remarks in a splendid chapter on the “Voyaging Chiefs of Kāne‘ohe Bay,” linking the Hākūle‘a voyages of 1975 onward to the diasporic quests for mana of the Hawaiian-Tahitian trans-Pacific flow, chants can have pragmatic and spiritual functions that link the past to the present and transmit useful knowledge of place and community. “The chant,” Kawaharada writes, “seemingly a mere listing of stops in a journey of the spirit home, is a verbal map that may have also served as a device for remembering narratives explaining the significance of each of these places in the life of Laka” (34). By knowing the story of Laka—if only in transcultural translation—we can still have access to a complex Hawaiian knowledge of ocean, wind, cloud, reef, and place-based decorums of behavior.

While at times we might want Kawaharada to question his sources (he draws on modern anthropology and folklore studies as a virtually uncontaminated transmission of native knowledge) or to self-situate and critique his own nonnative status (is it Jack London alone who runs the danger of “epitomiz[ing] the strategy of colonization through the usurping of the native voice in storytelling” [96]?), *Storied Landscapes* opens up a cross-cultural space of ancestral listening in modern contexts of ecology, sovereignty struggle, and political-spiritual coalition. Rather than look back to a white Pacific with all its elegiac flaws, traumatized sublimity, and self-undermining tropes, Kawaharada enacts a way forward that is respectful of the Native Pacific and open to the claims of ancestral possession in a pragmatic and literary way that proves original, succinct, and useful.

**ROB WILSON**

*University of California, Santa Cruz*
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At the end of the introduction of *Art and Performance in Oceania*, Barry Craig, as coeditor, advises that the book has been divided into four parts. This division was made “according to the editing task,” but it falls in line