

Book and Media Reviews

The Contemporary Pacific, Volume 26, Number 1, 231-258
© 2014 by University of Hawai'i Press

future students of media and communications in Papua New Guinea and beyond.

JAMES SLOTTA
Franklin & Marshall College

* * *

Canning Paradise. Documentary, DVD, 90 minutes, color, 2012. Written, directed, and produced by Olivier Pollet. Distributed by Ronin Films. Available for purchase from www.canningparadise.com. Institutions, A\$75.00; individuals, A\$34.95.

One would like to view *Canning Paradise* as a dialogical movie: dialogical in the Bakhtinian sense of featuring independent, unmerged voices engaging each other in unfinalized, open-ended exchange that is subordinate to no last word (see Mikhail Bakhtin's *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 1984). But perhaps I am being naive.

The movie tells a story of the expansion of neoliberal capitalism into a postcolonial outpost in the global south. It is specifically about the Philippine tuna industry that established itself in a town in Papua New Guinea during the first decade of the current century. There are fishing and boating scenes in *Canning Paradise*. There are scenes of village meetings and urban scenes of heated, defiant demonstrations. For the most part, however, the movie focuses on talking heads. We see faces and hear the voices of every one of the main stakeholders in this story—European Union officials, local political elites, nongovernmental organization (NGO) leaders, villagers, men and women, young and old. We hear, that is, from everybody—everybody but representatives of the tuna indus-

try who of course declined to participate. No matter. The absent voice of the latter inheres in their raw action, here seen in overfishing, polluting, abusing labor, and manipulating local elites, all with the goal of building a *maquiladora*, a free-trade zone for its profit and purposes in Madang town. *Canning Paradise* is made up of a great many voices, but to what extent is this dialogue open-ended? To what extent is it unfinalized?

The catastrophe of depleted near-shore fish stocks, the pollution of the urban bay, the threat of forced relocation of a small island community that willy-nilly finds itself located smack in the middle of the free-trade zone, and the exploitation of labor are all portrayed poignantly and staggeringly without mawkish romanticism. What stand out are the local people resisting the tuna industry and its *maquiladora*. They lodge angry protests against land alienation in the interest of the new free-trade zone and speak unequivocally of their multivalent commitments to the resources on which their livelihoods depend, the land and the sea. But all they have are their voices. They certainly lack official legal and political support, as well as support from international civil society. A pair of expatriate activists, a lawyer and an applied anthropologist, do appear repeatedly in the movie, as do another pair of NGO spokespersons. They speak on behalf and in defense of customary landowners and fishermen. And they speak on behalf of environmental regulation. But their voices are overwhelmed by the distanced officials in business suits advocating the local and foreign value of tuna exports in such august venues as the Council of the European Union.

The movie ends with the 2012 change of government in Papua New Guinea and with the suggestion that the pro-industry bias will begin to shift in favor of landowners and balance the playing field, to some extent at least. It also ends with a threat of violence akin to the resistance that took place over environmental impacts of a huge copper mine in Bougainville (1988–1997). The movie thus ends with the suggestion that in the dialogue between global capitalism and local-level resource owners, at least for the moment in this one setting, the forces of global capital will not simply be free to have the last word. As I said at the outset, one would like to hope that this absorbing documentary portrays a dialogical relationship in this Bakhtinian sense between local community members, distant markets, transnational capital, and national and international political regimes. But somehow one does not feel too confident that this open-ended, egalitarian kind of dialogue can or will be sustained in the long run.

Canning Paradise is a tremendous achievement for which I congratulate its producer/director/writer, Olivier Pollet. The only problem I have with it lies in its ninety-minute length, which makes the movie a difficult fit for classroom use. Were it edited into an hour-long version, it would make an excellent addition to college-level courses on culture and global capitalism as well to as any other, free-standing context in which debates go on about this ubiquitous tragedy.

DAVID LIPSET
University of Minnesota

* * *

The Land of Eb. Feature film, DVD, 88 minutes, color, 2012. Languages: Marshallese and English with English subtitles. Written by John Hill and Andrew Williamson; directed by Andrew Williamson; produced by Andrew Williamson, John Hill, and Jonithen Jackson. A Kona Film Group production. Not yet available for purchase. See film website for more information: <http://thelandofeb.com/>

The Land of Eb, a feature film in documentary style, is a memorable exploration into legacy and the struggles of Hawai'i's newest immigrants. Focusing on a family from the Marshall Islands, and the Marshallese community in Kona, Hawai'i, where approximately 3,000 Marshallese reside, it places these struggles in the broader context of the complex relationship between the United States and the Marshall Islands. Under the direction of Andrew Williamson, the film brings into crisp focus issues of access to the United States through a Compact of Free Association, as well as the legacy of the prior US administration of the islands during the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (1947–1990), which allowed for US testing of nuclear weapons there in the 1940s and 1950s.

The film's opening demands the audience take note of these facts in white text on a black screen: "Starting in 1946, the US tested nearly 70 thermonuclear weapons in the Marshall Islands. Many islanders were forced to leave their home for good. However, most were unable to escape the widespread radioactivity caused by over a decade of nuclear tests." These lines not only contextualize the migration of Marshallese in the commu-