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 Ke‘hoe Bay,” linking the H‘k‘ele‘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

* * *


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

...
with the traditional division of Oceania into culture areas. Anticipating criticism for this arrangement, Craig attempts an apology for it. But there was no need, for there was no better way of arranging the book. Part 1 is devoted to Polynesia, except for one paper on Micronesia. Part 2 addresses Australia, and Part 3 is concerned with Melanesia. Part 4 deals with issues of contemporary art and performance in Oceania.

The Micronesia and Polynesia papers are concerned with identity, sociocultural change, and sociopolitical order. Identity surfaces in all of the papers in this section, particularly those by Karen Stevenson, Bernie Ker-not, and Regina Meredith. Concern with identity relates to how outsiders perceived Pacific Islanders in the past, how they perceive them at present, and how they should relate to them in the future. This is clearly Kernot’s interest in “Imaging the Nation: The New Zealand International Exhibition 1906–07 and the Model Maori Pa.” At the same time, there is also interest in how Pacific Islanders perceive themselves, as raised in Meredith’s paper on art education and Samoan identity and Stevenson’s on Tahiti and the sixth Pacific Arts Festival.

Vilsoni Herenioko’s and Kenishi’s discussions are part of the sociocultural change issue, but they concentrate more on the sociopolitical order. Not only do they tell us about some of the traditional mechanisms of maintaining social or political order, but they also tell us that some of these mechanisms are at work in maintaining the status quo in present sociopolitical systems. Whether it is the symbolism of dance in Yap or the role of clowns in Polynesia, these mechanisms still have a place in the sociopolitical culture of the Oceania region.

The six papers in Part 2 concern the role of museums, exhibits, and indigenous artists in a changing society. These particular issues are local to Australia, but also have universal implications.

Vincent and Ruth Megaw initiated an artists-in-residence program at Flinders University, Adelaide, in 1978. Their paper reviews the program, highlighting its successes, difficulties, and accomplishments. They proudly report that the program has created very strong links between the university, Aboriginal communities, and the artists. Brenda Croft’s “Speaking as the ‘Other’” is concerned with the marginalization of some indigenous art as non-Aboriginal and its classification as “second rate ‘white’ art.” Living and working as an artist in Sydney, she argues that Aborigines and Aboriginal art do not have to come from the deserts of Central Australia. Juno Gemes shows the importance of photography for Aboriginal people. She urges indigenous people to see the value of establishing photographic collections, which may be very useful to them.

The important issue of the impact of museums on their audiences’ thinking or worldviews, is addressed by Deane Fergie in her paper “Racism and the State: Critical Reflections on the Organisation of Heritage Institutions in South Australia.” While many of us are often not aware of it, how museum displays and exhibitions are organized greatly determines the ways we perceive cultures and peoples. She clearly shows this by comparing the displays of the History Trust of South Australia and the South Australia
Museum. The former, by displaying photographs of historically important persons, portrays humanities. The latter, on the other hand, displays artifacts and even some natural objects, formulating a closeness of non-European cultures to nature.

Chris Anderson’s paper, “Old Galleries, New People,” addresses the need for museums and galleries to adapt to modern circumstances and describes his attempt to involve indigenous artists in displays and exhibitions. This has been successful, for both the museums and the artists, but there have been some strong criticisms of this approach.

The ten papers of Part 3 focus on “the social and cultural context of artwork, taxonomies and technical aspects of ritual objects, the individual artist past and present, and museum collections and documentation.” While this section is devoted to Melanesia, nine of the papers are on Papua New Guinea, and only one on Fiji.

Dirk Smidt and Soroi Eoe’s detailed description of the “maskers” of the lower Ramu area of Madang Province provides some degree of understanding of the culture of this area. In the process of presenting the maskers and their ritual and artwork contexts, they also present some insights into social and cultural contexts. Not much has been written on this aspect of Madang cultures, and this is an important contribution. The second paper, by Barry Craig and Chris Issac, on mask performances in Sulka, focuses on the beauty and performance of the hemlaut mask. At the same time they show that the exchange of masks and food is important in maintaining relationships between social groups.

Noah Lurang, from the Tabar Islands in New Ireland Province, adds to the existing information about malagan culture. Tabar Island is one of the main centers of malagan culture and a place where this aspect of New Ireland culture is still vibrant. Lurang’s presentation of the taxonomy of the mask and its ritual performance processes is important to the understanding of malagan. Michael Gunn’s paper on the taxonomy and ownership of malagan complements Lurang’s. He states that in these two areas the meaning of malagan can be discovered. Malagan owners told him that meaning derived from designs or artistic tradition is a western preoccupation. According to Gunn, “Ownership of malagan rights is at the nucleus of malagan” (154).

The only paper in this section not on Papua New Guinea is by Rod Ewin. His paper on the acoustic properties of Fijian slit gongs shows the high level of skill and craftsmanship involved in making these very sophisticated musical instruments.

The two papers on artists are by Harry Bevan and Wendi Choulai and Jacquelyn Lewis-Harris. Bevan traces the work of Mutuaga, a nineteenth-century master craftsman who lived in the Massim area of Milne Bay Province. Though Mutuaga has been long dead, Bevan demonstrates that by using the methodology of art history it is possible to identify an artist’s work. Choulai and Lewis-Harris discuss Choulai’s position as a contemporary Papua New Guinea female artist working in an international setting in Australia. Choulai draws inspiration from her personal experiences and cultural background. While she
readily incorporates her personal experiences into her work, she cannot do the same with cultural themes, mainly because she is female, but also because of copyright considerations.

The Koari tree-house as a symbol representing the “primitiveness” of Papuans and Papua New Guinea in general is the subject of a paper by Max Quanchi, who shows how a simple photograph, perhaps taken innocently, can be used to portray the image of “primitiveness” for decades.

The last two papers in this section deal with Melanesian collections (mostly Papua New Guinean) in European museums—the ways they were collected, by whom, contexts of collection, accompanying and lack of accompanying information. Hélén Regius’s paper “Our Ethnographical Troops in the Field,” concerns the mid 1800s. Aside from presenting the unfair circumstances in which objects were obtained, more importantly she argues that there is a need for further research to be undertaken to “recontextualize” these objects, as most of them were acquired with very little, wrong, or no information at all. Gabor Vargya’s paper deals with objects and information on art styles of the Astrolabe Bay area. In his research of museum and ethnographic material, he finds areas of inconsistency and disagreement and a paucity of information. He advocates combining research on old museum collections and historical documentation with thematically directed long-term field research.

The book concludes with papers by Susan Cochrane and Phillip Dark that raise questions about the future of cultural institutions and art in the Pacific. Cochrane discusses the growth of cultural institutions (mainly museums and cultural centers) and the difficulties they face, such as in funding and lack of government support. Also of concern to many Pacific Islanders is the role of museums and cultural centers in the Pacific and their future status.

Dark’s paper is concerned with three categories of Pacific art: traditional, traditional adapted for tourism and other markets, and innovative art. Dark points out that most Pacific Island societies claim ownership to some forms of “traditional” art. Some of these forms have remained very much unchanged, while others have changed a great deal. Most of the faces of change are from the outside, such as tourism and the cash economy, with the result that Pacific art is being tailored to meet outside tastes. This raises the question of the quality of such art works—real or spurious. Dark says, “The model certainly seems to have been muddled, but then the purpose for which it is intended is now quite different. Under these conditions, how far does the quality of the style persist?”

JACOB L SIMET
National Cultural Commission,
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