

Kanani, Henry, and their children are beautifully and sensitively rendered. Passages that stay with this reader include the young 'Analu's story of Grampa Wong and the lovebird, Mākena's account of the surf party in "The Runner-up," and the small-time criminal Sparkey Lopez's harrowing account of his betrayal by the gangster Harley Evans. Lopez's voice in "The Ultimate Salesman" recounts how his own high-school antics—his dumping fundraiser sweetbread and paper flowers at Bellows Beach—return in his adulthood in ironic ways, with his having to dispose of a dead body for Harley Evans. Like Mackie who dumps a corpse in the river, Sparkey dumps the body weighed down by a bag of cement in a pond near the Nu'uanu Pali. In these chapters Morales stuns the reader with his keen ear for pidgin, its inflections, rhythms, and variations across a range of ages and personalities. He convincingly conveys Mākena's earnest and perceptive observations of human nature, 'Analu's innocent knowing, and Sparkey's fearful hysteria, his degradation, and ironic humor.

Readers may find that Morales's depictions of women in the novel are perhaps less than ideal. For example, the strongest female character, Kanani, is rendered in less overtly political ways—as bearer of Keoni's child—and her significance diminishes as the novel progresses into the more contemporary moment of Henry's love affair, Mākena's car accident, and the resolution of the gangster narrative. Nevertheless, Kanani's voice and her stories of other women (such as her neighbor Beth, whose Waikīkī home is destroyed by arson) are

significant presences. Perhaps the overtly masculine nature of the topic (eg, Helm's disappearance, the syndicate, the world of surfing) makes for a rather masculine text, not to mention the highly gendered nature of detective fiction in general. As in *Speed*, the strength of this novel is its perspective on class politics, and it is Kanani, after all, who voices this significant critique (96). All in all, Morales's *When the Shark Bites* is definitely worth reading and reading again.

SUSAN Y NAJITA
*University of Michigan,
 Ann Arbor*

* * *

Handle With Care: Ownership and Control of Ethnographic Materials, edited by Sjoerd R Jaarsma. Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania Monograph Series. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2002. ISBN 0-8229-5777-9; x + 264 pages, tables, map, photographs, notes, bibliography, index. Paper, US\$16.95.

This is a valuable and fascinating collection of papers discussing the ownership and repatriation of field notes and field materials. It is the product of sessions run at Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania conferences and bears the imprint of these discussions in useful cross-referencing between chapters. The contributions are short and clear and include writings from ethnographers, archivists, and ethnomusicologists. The issues addressed are highly charged in terms of ethics, morality, and politics, and

the collection will be useful in teaching about these matters. The volume also offers some practical suggestions about how academic anthropology can be made more accessible to the people whose lives and stories are its focus, and also about what one might do with field materials, given the myriad potential sensitivities involved in their dissemination or revelation. Volume editor Sjoerd R. Jaarsma provides a thoughtful overview of the issues and the contributions in the introduction.

The first section, "Issues of Access," opens with a piece by David and Dorothy Counts, who advocate writing in ways that make anthropological knowledge accessible; they also discuss their West New Britain website. Alan Howard then describes constructing a web-based archive of field notes and other writings by himself and others about Rotuma. Like other contributors, Howard thinks that such efforts must be appropriate to particular ethnographic situations. Jaarsma argues that ethnographers must consider the complex potential impacts of repatriation, and Mary McCutcheon makes a plea for anthropologists to be clear and reasonable about how others are to regulate access to their materials.

The second section, "Managing the Collected Past," focuses on items already in archives. David Akin and Kathryn Creely's interesting discussion of Roger Keesing's Kwaio material points out that in the current academic climate, much more ethnographic detail exists in field notes than in published articles and books. A number of quandaries are involved in releasing all materials, however,

and Suzanne Falgout argues that, in the case she considers, old restrictions are necessary in order not to breach the trust between anthropologists and their informants. Some information (such as genealogies related to land-ownership) is important social knowledge and therefore, sensitivity to local contexts and the conditions of collection is vital (a theme echoed in the next section in the chapters by Chambers and Chambers, and by Oles). Karen Peacock discusses how preserving materials for general benefit in an archive may be interpreted by some as inappropriate metropolitan control over local cultural resources. Writing about knowledge of Hawaiian hula dance held in archives, Amy Stillman thinks that anthropologists themselves are in a position to serve as intermediaries, brokering the imperative to repatriate with a desire to "do no harm," either to communities or to materials themselves (147).

Part III, "Transformation, Interpretation, and Ownership," focuses on indigenous assessments of materials that have been returned. Keith and Anne Chambers discuss how their research materials have been taken and used by Nanumeans, changing their culture and the research context in the process. Bryan Oles's chapter addresses the whole basis of the moral instinct to repatriate. He emphasizes that anthropologists "must recognize that all repatriated data are subject to local agency and the demands of its epistemological foundation" (192). Nancy Guy concludes the chapters with a discussion of how aboriginal Taiwanese music was appropriated by the global music industry. She argues that anthropologists and ethnogra-

phers must be aware of copyright in order to protect the interests of their informants. The volume closes with a series of bulleted “thoughts,” which are distilled from recurrent themes in the chapters.

In his introduction, Jaarsma tells us that “researchers will inevitably have to yield some control over the research process” (11). I know of no recent ethnographers of Melanesia who have not been caught up in the agendas of the people they have worked with. This ability to be led by one’s “subjects” and learn from their (often unexpected) interests is the great strength of ethnographic research. Although, as the Chambers put it, “ethnography is a dangerous enterprise” (172), the value of ethnography as a practice of knowledge production lies in the meeting of perspectives it involves.

The issue of repatriation involves the question of ownership. Several contributors consider copyright to be an option for protecting the knowledge of indigenous people. Others caution against the imposition of intellectual property regimes. Ethnography as described in these chapters is a process in which information is elicited, and knowledge generated, in the context of *relationships*. The question of ownership complicates this process. As Jaarsma reminds ethnographers, “if we take this challenge [repatriation] seriously it will profoundly change the way we work” (12).

The Counts make a plea for accessible writing in order to fulfill anthropologists’ primary purpose: that of “fostering knowledge” (18). This is a

useful corrective, but it also must be said that not all understanding is easily won, nor is complexity in describing complex social and historical worlds always out of place. This raises another point: these debates tend to assume a timeless and universal value in the knowledge anthropology creates. Oles questions this, reminding readers that different kinds of knowledge are produced and valued in the context of particular cultural and historical projects. Howard speaks of his concern when he “discovered that few Rotumans expressed an interest in their history as a people” (28). Teaching people to have the sensibilities and values required by the nation-state, or interest in their social world as a “culture,” is surely not the project ethnographers are engaged in. It is the concept of culture itself that is at the root of this particular myopia. The “twofold imperative: to foster knowledge but . . . do no harm” is itself a particular social artifact (212), as is the idea of ownership of culture. Both need consideration as such. This volume points the way to such consideration, in the context of the relationships between researchers and those with whom they work in the Pacific.

JAMES LEACH

University of Cambridge, UK

* * *