program eliminated. Jonah and the Fobba-liscious crew sing “Ofaange ‘a e ‘Otua e” (the Tongan version of the hymn “God Be with You Till We Meet Again”) to Mr Joseph as a farewell. For a brief moment, it is a wonderful insight into one aspect of Tongan culture and the importance of arrivals and departures as part of relationships in Pacific society, and the boys’ voices are beautiful. Then Jonah hits Mr Joseph in the genitals.

There is much more here to generate fruitful discussion in the context of Pacific studies, and there is much here still to criticize. Far from perfect, Lilley could certainly have toned down his physical representation of Jonah, and the use of a tiki in the title credits as well to signify scene changes is not necessary to get his point across. But this is not D W Griffith’s Birth of a Nation; rather, if one takes a closer look, Jonah From Tonga, while flawed, is well worth the conversation about a multiplicity of issues Islanders encounter that Lilley is so obviously provoking. An argument might be made that Lilley is employing the Pacific custom of clowning and using unbearable examples of humor in order to force us to face the status quo and see it for all its absurdity. Let us hope that that is in fact the case.

David W Kupferman
University of Hawai‘i–West O‘ahu


For many years, disciplinary boundaries have hindered the production of major analytic works on Japan’s Pacific empire, particularly in Micronesia. As Robert Tierney notes in the introduction to Tropics of Savagery, postcolonial theory tends to be relentlessly focused on Europe and its colonies, and the tendency of many universities to relegate scholars of Japan to area studies programs only exacerbates the problem. Even within Japanese Empire studies, the politically anomalous position of Micronesia within a League of Nations Mandate and its relatively smaller population have caused it to be neglected in favor of other, more visible colonies. Micronesia scholars like Wakako Higuchi, Keith Camacho, and Greg Dvorak have made important contributions to the growing body of scholarship on the region’s Japanese occupation, but sustained engagement between Pacific studies and East Asian studies remains rare.

Tropics of Savagery and Nanyo-Orientalism are ambitious, theo-
etrically rich studies of the culture of Japan’s Pacific empire and welcome contributions to the field. Tierney, a scholar of Japanese literature, focuses primarily on the figure of the “savage” in colonial discourse during Japan’s occupations of Taiwan (1895–1945) and Micronesia (1914–1945). This trope of savagery, Tierney argues, is central to understanding the imagination of Japanese colonial writers and the imperial culture they helped to produce. Tierney is careful to note that the savage was “without a referent or indeed without any basis in reality” but that it nevertheless operated as a “polyvalent signifier” for a conflicted and evolving imperial culture (7). Imperial culture, both different from and mimetic of Western imperialism, embraced the image of the savage as a foil against which Japan could be made over into a modern, civilized nation. At the same time, the savage functioned within a “rhetoric of sameness” (21) through which Japanese authors claimed a closer kinship to the people they colonized than Western imperial rulers could.

While *Tropics of Savagery* mainly seeks to intervene in Japan studies and empire studies, Naoto Sudo’s *Nanyo-Orientalism* aims more directly at a Pacific studies audience. Sudo is primarily a scholar of postcolonial literature. Like Tierney, he is concerned with making sense of the triangular relationship among Japan, the Pacific, and the West that proved so powerful in defining Japan’s imperial culture. But *Nanyo-Orientalism* reaches farther in its temporal and geographic scope, engaging colonial and postcolonial Japanese discourses and English-language Pacific Islander responses in Hawai‘i and Guam. If there is a “polyvalent signifier” in Sudo’s work, it is the South Seas (Nanyo) itself. Sudo organizes his readings of the Nanyo as trope into two broad categories. On the one hand, what he calls “Nanyo-Orientalism” frames the Nanyo as a “primordial chaos to be reclaimed or liberated from Western rule by the Japanese” (5). This discourse originates in the prewar period but continues in modified form within contemporary Japanese culture. On the other hand, Sudo understands the Pacific as a “locale of diverse subjects striving together under imperialist regimes” and a site for the production of postcolonial and decolonizing literary work (19). Thus Sudo offers readings of Japanese and Islander-produced texts as “incomplete, unstable, and fluid—‘oceanic’—decolonizations produced from vantage points of the colonizer, colonized, diasporic returnees, emigrants, and hybrids” (20).

There is significant overlap in terms of theoretical grounding, methodology, and source base between these two works. Postcolonial theory is a touchstone for both authors. Tierney uses Homi Bhabha’s notion of “colonial mimicry” as a jumping-off point for his analysis, adapting Bhabha’s work to account for the implicit presence of Western colonial regimes and cultural productions within Japan’s colonizer-colonized dynamic. Tierney’s work addresses other postcolonial scholars as well, such as Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak, and Nicholas Thomas. However, the book is understandably in closest conversation with scholarship on Japanese imperial culture like Faye Yuan Kleeman’s *Under an*

Sudo’s readings of Edward Said, Kang Sang-Jung, and Homi Bhabha bring him to a similar perspective on prewar Japanese discourse. Like Tierney, Sudo is concerned with issues of colonial mimicry, discursive ambivalence, and the relationship between Japanese and Western imperialisms. However, Nanyo-Orientalism’s theoretical grounding also relies on Epeli Hau’ofa’s work and what Sudo calls the “wa space.” As Sudo explains, “wa” signifies “harmony, unity, peace, mildness, Pacific, and Japanese[ness]” and, when read as “va” in Māori (and here Sudo quotes Albert Wendt), indicates “space that relates, that holds separate entities and things together in the Unity-that-is-All, the space that is context, giving meaning to all things” (22, 133). This is meant to be an expansion of Hau’ofa’s “sea of islands” to incorporate Japan. It also serves as the justification for Sudo’s inclusion of colonial, postcolonial, and indigenous authors under the rubric of the “oceanic decolonization” (21) that the wa space supposedly produces.

Tierney and Sudo adopt similar methodologies, offering historically and sociopolitically contextualized readings of both literary and nonliterary works. Tierney finds Japanese colonial discourse in works of literature, ethnography, anthropology, colonial policy studies, folklore, and eugenics. Sudo offers readings of literature, poetry, song, and film. Many of the same authors and texts appear in both works, particularly Nakajima Atsushi, Hijikata Hisakatsu, Akutagawa Ryūnosuke, and the comic book character Dankichi. Some of these works may be familiar to Pacific studies scholars, having appeared in Greg Dvorak’s 2007 dissertation “Seeds from Afar, Flowers from the Reef” and a few other works. Yet both Tierney and Sudo offer subtle and nuanced readings that make these texts well worth revisiting.

Tropics of Savagery is artfully structured as a series of four historically situated case studies. The first two chapters focus on Taiwan, while the next two focus on Micronesia. Chapters 1 and 3 offer extended analyses of two diametrically opposed tropes of savagery. In Japanese colonial writing on Taiwan, the figure of the savage appears as the “violent, irrational headhunter” (55). The trope of the savage as headhunter begins as a justification for Japan’s violent subjugation of Taiwan’s indigenous population. As Japanese domination of the island becomes more extensive, however, the headhunter figure is gradually transformed into a “domesticated foreigner” and an object of imperial nostalgia, signifying the “need to recover the purity and original nature of the Japanese people” (55).

In Micronesia, by contrast, the savage appears as a representational echo of the ogres of the classic Japanese folk tale Momotarō. The ogres embody an image of innocent, happy primitivism familiar from Western Orientalist visions of the Pacific. Imperial boosters like Nitobe Inazo repurposed the Momotarō story, in which a “peach boy” travels to a faraway island populated by ogres and brings home their treasure with the help of some newly made animal friends, as a tale of inspiration for
potential Japanese settlers. As Japanese rule in Micronesia progressed, however, Momotarō became a more problematic figure. Akutagawa Ryūnosuke, a critic of Japanese colonial policy, created a satire of the classic tale told from the point of view of the ogres. Akutagawa’s version highlighted Momotarō’s senseless and murderous takeover of the island and the utter failure of the civilizing project of Momotarō and his animal collaborators. Tierney’s fascinating readings of Momotarō’s evolution may prove especially useful to scholars of Micronesia, where the Momotarō story was commonly told and sung in schools before the war and where it is still remembered today.

Chapters 2 and 4 focus on the output of two individual authors. Chapter 2 explores the origins of Japanese anthropology, its matura-
tion as scholars scrutinized Taiwan’s indigenous communities, and its influence on colonial literature. The chapter features an extended analysis of author Satō Haruo’s story “Demon Bird,” which Tierney reads as a work of “humanistic liberalism,” a critique of imperial policy, and ultimately as a reinscription of imperial hierarchies (109). Chapter 4 focuses on the work of Nakajima Atsushi, a fiction writer who lived briefly in Palau. Nakajima’s unique ability to engage in a “sustained reflection on the lens or filter through which he, a Japanese subject, regarded the people Japan colonized” (149) affords Tierney the book’s best opportunity to explore the ambivalences and complexities of the Japanese imperial gaze. Tropics of Savagery ends with a conclusion that, like the book’s introduction, is a concise, clear statement of purpose for the text as a whole. Tierney closes by briefly noting the enduring power of tropes of savagery in Japan’s postwar era and by commending that topic to other scholars.

Other than its introduction, all of Nanyo-Orientalism’s chapters have previously appeared as stand-alone journal articles. Thus, while Sudo’s introduction provides a number of strong unifying themes, any of the chapters could operate independently of the book as a whole. Chapter 1 engages abstract representations of the Nanyo in the prewar era, dwelling particularly on the Momotarō-like comic book character Dankichi. Sudo highlights the links between Dankichi’s political adventure of conquest, the sexual adventures of popular South Seas love songs, and the framing of Japan’s colonial anxieties in relation to the West. Chapter 2 moves swiftly to the postwar era and to Godzilla and the Micronesia-focused novels of Ikezawa Natsuki. Sudo reads Godzilla as a flawed postcolonial critique of the West, and Ikezawa’s 1993 novel Macias Gilly’s Downfall as a key step toward addressing some of the limitations of that critique in its disruption of orientalist binaries. Chapter 3 juxtaposes the work of Nakajima Atsushi against that of Albert Wendt. Sudo reads both authors’ work as postcolonial, even if Nakajima was clearly a colonial author whose postcolonialism was “lukewarm, halfway, or inconsistent” (17). Nevertheless, Sudo believes, each author does adopt a postcolonial mode: Nakajima in “unshackling” Islanders from Japanization and Wendt in “Pacificizing” outsiders and
ultimately forging syncretic Japanese and Islander identities (133).

Chapters 4 and 5 turn to Hawai‘i and Guam, respectively. Sudo examines texts by “local” Japanese diasporic authors as well as indigenous authors such as Haunani-Kay Trask and Chris Perez Howard. These readings lead Sudo to the conclusion that, in contrast to Japanese postcolonial writing that tends to deal with Pacific Islander retaliations against Japan, Hawaiian writing is more closely focused on “the creation of new identities, which are provisional and local, based on self-criticism, and both challenging and reconciliatory” (169). Sudo’s reading of Howard’s 1982 novel Mariquita, however, leads him to the conclusion that postcolonial representations in Guam “remain to be decolonized” as Chamorro people “demystify” their island’s wartime domination and colonial rule (18). Unfortunately, the book has no conclusion to draw together these disparate lines of analysis.

Tropics of Savagery and Nanyo-Orientalism offer rare insight into the imperial culture so critical in shaping Japanese rule in the Pacific, and thus both books deserve a place on the shelf of scholars positioned across Pacific studies. Tierney’s work in particular is invaluable for its recovery and analysis of so many otherwise obscure and difficult-to-access texts, and his use of the trope of savagery to link Taiwan and Micronesia seems especially timely given the field’s increasing interest in pursuing links between Taiwan and the rest of Oceania. Sudo’s book, too, raises provocative questions for Pacific studies and Indigenous studies scholars. Perhaps chief among these is whether the “wa space” is a powerful enough concept to reframe colonial or diasporic writing as postcolonial, counter-hegemonic, or decolonizing, and whether the term’s resonances between Japan and other Oceanic contexts has utility outside Sudo’s project. Either way, both Tierney and Sudo have produced engaging, thoughtful books that mark a significant step forward in making sense of Japan’s presence in the Pacific.

JOSH LEVY
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign


Architecture in the South Pacific: The Ocean of Islands is a welcome effort to chart the development of architecture across the insular Pacific, a process deeply marked by the search for a regional identity, by the revaluation of vernacular elements, and by a critical sensitivity to social, political, and economic processes in each territory. The book bears a lusciously illustrated witness to the multiple phenomena that have shaped what we now recognize as an emerging architecture in the regional Pacific. The book opens with the challenge to make sense of the diverse and dynamic history of the region as a matter of its territories’ architectures, character-