The Journal of Pacific History

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cjph20

Remembrance of Pacific Pasts

Hilary Howes, Maile Arvin, Dario Di Rosa, Adrian Young & Robert Borofsky

To cite this article: Hilary Howes, Maile Arvin, Dario Di Rosa, Adrian Young & Robert Borofsky (2022) Remembrance of Pacific Pasts, The Journal of Pacific History, 57:1, 99-113, DOI: 10.1080/00223344.2021.2012108

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/00223344.2021.2012108

Published online: 07 Apr 2022.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 168

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=cjph20

The Journal of Pacific History, 2022
Vol. 57, No. 1, 99–113, https://doi.org/10.1080/00223344.2021.2012108

REVIEW FORUM

Remembrance of Pacific Pasts

Remembrance of Pacific Pasts: An Invitation to Remake History. Edited by Robert Borofsky. Honolulu, University of Hawai'i Press, 2020. New open access edition. Originally published 2000. xvi + 557 pp., bibliography, index. ISBN 978082482301690000 (e-book). Online open access at https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/65998/9780824888015.pdf

INTRODUCTION

Readers of *The Journal of Pacific History* (*JPH*) will be familiar with its aims and scope as 'a leading refereed journal dedicated to research concerning the Pacific Islands, their peoples and their pasts … from prehistory to the present'.[1] Underlying this seemingly straightforward description are many questions: how is this research to be conducted? By whom? For what purposes? Whose voices, whose stories, whose perspectives are to be prioritized? Contributors to *JPH* have grappled with these thorny issues since the journal's inception. Volume 1, published in 1966, commenced with contributions by distinguished Pacific historians J.W. Davidson and Greg Dening on the problems of Pacific history – including the limited utility of the 'imperial factor' as an explanatory concept and the need to devise 'methods for the study of multicultural situations' – and the value of ethnohistorical evidence for the study of Polynesian history respectively.[2] Contributions to subsequent issues addressed a wide variety of approaches and methodologies, facilitated from 1985 by the introduction of a 'Comment' section explicitly 'designed as a forum for debate about historical matters raised in this journal *or about wider issues of evidence, interpretation and historiography*'.[3] Most such contributions evaluated the benefits and challenges of particular kinds of evidence in researching and communicating Pacific history, primarily oral traditions, documentary sources, and the advantages and disadvantages of each.[4] A few contributions considered other kinds of historical

[1] The Journal of Pacific History, 'Aims and Scope', https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?show=aimsScope&journalCode=cjph20 (accessed 11 Oct. 2021).

[2] J.W. Davidson, 'Problems of Pacific History', *JPH* 1 (1966): 5–21; Gregory Dening, 'Ethnohistory in Polynesia: The Value of Ethnohistorical Evidence', *JPH* 1 (1966): 23–42.

[3] Peter G. Sack, 'A History of German New Guinea: A Debate about Evidence and Judgement', *JPH* 20, no. 2 (1985): 84. Emphasis mine.

[4] Sione Latukefu, 'Oral Traditions: An Appraisal of their Value in Historical Research in Tonga', *JPH* 3 (1968): 135–43; Roger Mitchell, 'Oral Tradition and Micronesian History: A Microcosmic Approach', *JPH* 5 (1970): 33–41; P.M. Mercer, 'Oral Tradition in the Pacific: Problems of Interpretation', *JPH* 14, no. 3 (1979): 130–53; Thomas Spear, 'Oral Traditions: Whose History?', *JPH* 16, no. 3 (1981): 133–48; Peter G. Sack, 'A History of German New Guinea: A Debate about Evidence and Judgement', *JPH* 20, no. 2 (1985): 84–94; Stewart Firth, 'German New Guinea: The Archival Perspective', *JPH* 20, no. 2 (1985): 94–103; John D. Waiko, 'Oral Traditions among the Binandere: Problems of Method in a Melanesian Society', *JPH* 21, no. 1 (1986): 21–38; E.L. Schieffelin and Hiroyuki Kurita, 'The Phantom Patrol: Reconciling Native Narratives and Colonial Documents in

evidence, including unconventional documentary sources, archaeological evidence, visual material such as photography and film, and the creative arts.[5] A handful of contributions followed Davidson and Dening in examining the problems of Pacific history more broadly, addressing topics such as the authorship and 'ownership' of Pacific history, as well as its geographical scale and chronological scope.[6] In addition, Paul D'Arcy's introduction to a *JPH*

Reconstructing the History of Exploration in Papua New Guinea', *JPH* 23, no. 1 (1988): 52–69; Klaus Neumann, 'Not the Way It Really Was: Writing a History of the Tolai (Papua New Guinea)', *JPH* 24, no. 2 (1989): 209–20; Nicholas Thomas, 'Partial Texts: Representation, Colonialism and Agency in Pacific History', *JPH* 25, no. 2 (1990): 139–58; Helga M. Griffin, 'Not the Way It Essentially Was', *JPH* 28, no. 1 (1993): 68–74; Niel Gunson, 'Understanding Polynesian Traditional History', *JPH* 28, no. 2 (1993): 139–58; Tuiatua Tupua Tamasese, 'The Riddle in Samoan History: The Relevance of Language, Names, Honorifics, Genealogy, Ritual and Chant to Historical Analysis', *JPH* 29, no. 1 (1994): 66–79; Klaus Neumann, 'A Comment on the Publication of "Not the Way It Essentially Was"', *JPH* 29, no. 1 (1994): 80; David V. Burley, 'Mata'uvave and 15th Century Ha'apai: Narrative Accounts and Historical Landscapes in the Interpretation of Classical Tongan History', *JPH* 30, no. 2 (1995): 154–72; Jean Guiart, 'A Drama of Ambiguity: Ouvéa 1988–89', *JPH* 32, no. 1 (1997): 85–102; Alban Bensa and Eric Wittersheim, 'Jean Guiart and New Caledonia: A Drama of Misrepresentation', *JPH* 33, no. 2 (1998): 221–4; Jean Guiart, 'A Reply to A. Bensa and E. Wittersheim, "Jean Guiart and New Caledonia: A Drama of Misrepresentation"', *JPH* 36, no. 2 (2001): 247–9; Ben Burt, 'The Story of Alfred Amasia: Whose History and Whose Epistemology?', *JPH* 37, no. 2 (2002): 187–204; Matthew Campbell, 'History in Prehistory: The Oral Traditions of the Rarotongan Land Court Records', *JPH* 37, no. 2 (2002): 221–38; Peter Sack, 'Who Wants to Know What "Really" Happened? "King" Gorai and the Population Decline in the Shortland Islands', *JPH* 40, no. 3 (2005): 339–51; Judith A. Bennett, 'Gorai and Population Decline in the Shortlands: A Reply to Peter Sack', *JPH* 41, no. 1 (2006): 97–102; Hugh Laracy, 'Who Wants to Know What "Really" Happened? Replies to Peter Sack', *JPH* 41, no. 1 (2006): 102–5.

[5] On unconventional documentary sources, see especially Dirk H.R. Spennemann, 'Interrogating Shipping Data to Illustrate Patterns of External Connectivity and the Rise of European Influence in the Tongan Archipelago (1770–1885)', *JPH* 56, no. 1 (2021): 50–79. On archaeological evidence, see Matthew Spriggs, 'Pacific Archaeologies: Contested Ground in the Construction of Pacific History', *JPH* 34, no. 1 (1999): 109–21; Hilary Howes and Matthew Spriggs, 'Writing the History of Archaeology in the Pacific: Voices and Perspectives', *JPH* 54, no. 3 (2019): 295–306. On visual material, see Max Quanchi, 'Visual Histories and Photographic Evidence', *JPH* 41, no. 2 (2006): 165–73; Jane Landman and Chris Ballard, 'An Ocean of Images: Film and History in the Pacific', *JPH* 45, no. 1 (2010): 1–20. On the creative arts, see Paul Sharrad, 'Albert Wendt and the Problem of History', *JPH* 37, no. 1 (2002): 109–16; Deborah Gare, Riley Buchanan, Elizabeth Burns-Dans and Toni Church, 'The Art of Contested Histories: *In Pursuit of Venus [Infected]* and the Pacific Legacy', *JPH* 55, no. 3 (2020): 321–39.

[6] For example, H.E. Maude, 'Pacific History – Past, Present and Future', *JPH* 6 (1971): 3–24; O.H.K. Spate, 'The History of a History: Reflections on the Ending of a Pacific Voyage', *JPH* 23, no. 1 (1988): 3–14; I.C. Campbell, 'European-Polynesian Encounters: A Critique of the Pearson Thesis', *JPH* 29, no. 2 (1994): 222–31; Doug Munro, 'Who "Owns" Pacific History? Reflections on the Insider/Outsider Dichotomy', *JPH* 29, no. 2 (1994): 232–7; Doug Munro, 'Revisionism and Its Enemies: Debating the Queensland Labour Trade [Review of *Cane and Labour: The Political Economy of the Queensland Sugar Industry, 1862–1906*, by A. Graves]', *JPH* 30, no. 2 (1995): 240–9; Alan Ward, 'Comfortable Voyagers? Some Reflections on the Pacific and Its Historians [Review of *Dangerous Liaisons. Essays in Honour of Greg*

forum on the teaching of Pacific history in Volume 46, No. 2 (2011) 'review[ed] the history and current state of Pacific History in Pacific Islands and Pacific Rim nations' and gave contributors the opportunity to consider how the 'objectives of Pacific History and Pacific Studies … should or can be realised in teaching'.[7]

This review forum is dedicated to a new open access edition of Robert Borofsky's 2000 edited volume *Remembrance of Pacific Pasts: An Invitation to Remake History*. Borofsky's introduction to this new edition explicitly seeks to encourage 'Pacific historians and islanders [to] address their differences and discuss the ways they "make" history' by 'draw[ing] people with diverse perspectives to engage with one another in ways that collectively encourage them to compose richer, more subtle, and fuller historical narratives of the Pacific' (p. 12). The volume itself brings together exactly such a range of diverse perspectives, in the form of 34 texts, commentaries and interviews by a total of 36 different authors.

Reviewers Maile Arvin, Dario Di Rosa and Adrian Young offer three critical appraisals of *Remembrance of Pacific Pasts*, each drawing on their areas of expertise and personal experience. Borofsky then responds to their reviews. I extend my thanks to all four for their thoughtful contributions to this forum and congratulate University of Hawai'i Press for making this volume available open access. Perhaps one of the few positive outcomes of the global COVID-19 pandemic is the new appreciation it has engendered for digital means of research and communication in a time of restricted physical mobility.

HILARY HOWES
The Australian National University
hilary.howes@anu.edu.au
© 2022 Hilary Howes

Dening; Pacific Islands History; Journeys and Transformations, by D. Merwick and B.V. Lal]', *JPH* 31, no. 2 (1996): 236–42; Donald Denoon, 'Pacific Island History at the Australian National University: The Place and the People', *JPH* 31, no. 2 (1996): 202–14; Donald Denoon, 'Black Mischief: The Trouble with African Analogies', *JPH* 34, no. 3 (1999): 281–9; Gavan Daws, 'Texts and Contexts: A First-Person Note', *JPH* 41, no. 2 (2006): 249–60; Judith A. Bennett, 'Meditations: New Directions in the Study of the Decolonisation of Melanesia', *JPH* 48, no. 3 (2013): 323–9; Bronwen Douglas, 'Pasts, Presents and Possibilities of Pacific History and Pacific Studies: As Seen by a Historian from Canberra', *JPH* 50, no. 2 (2015): 224–8; Dario Di Rosa, 'Microstoria, Pacific History, and the Question of Scale: Two or Three Things That We Should Know About Them', *JPH* 53, no. 1 (2018): 25–43; Annemarie McLaren and Alison Clark, 'Captain Cook upon Changing Seas: Indigenous Voices and Reimagining at the British Museum', *JPH* 55 no. 3 (2020): 418–31; Paul D'Arcy and Lewis Mayo, 'Fluid Frontiers: Oceania and Asia in Historical Perspective', *JPH* 56, no. 3 (2021): 217–35.

[7] Paul D'Arcy, 'The Teaching of Pacific History Introduction: Diverse Approaches for Diverse Audiences', *JPH* 46, no. 2 (2011): 197–206. The remaining seven contributions to this special issue were Stewart Firth, 'Culture and Context in the Teaching of Pacific History and Politics', *JPH* 46, no. 2 (2011): 207–13; Teresia Teaiwa, 'Preparation for Deep Learning: A Reflection on "Teaching" Pacific Studies in the Pacific', *JPH* 46, no. 2 (2011): 214–20; Anne Perez Hattori, 'Teaching History through Service Learning at the University of Guam', *JPH* 46, no. 2 (2011): 221–7; Anita Smith, 'Learning History through Heritage Place Management in the Pacific Islands', *JPH* 46, no. 2 (2011): 228–35; Greg Dvorak, 'Connecting the Dots: Teaching Pacific History in Japan from an Archipelagic Perspective', *JPH* 46, no. 2 (2011): 236–43; Jane Samson, 'Pacific History in Context', *JPH* 46, no. 2 (2011): 244–50; Max Quanchi, 'Pacific History – The Long View', *JPH* 46, no. 2 (2011): 251–6.

CRAFTING INDIGENOUS PACIFIC HISTORIES BEYOND A 'MIDDLE GROUND'

Originally published in 2000, the hefty edited volume *Remembrance of Pacific Pasts* is dated in ways both good and bad. An impressive compilation of foundational scholarship in Pacific Studies, the book undeniably still holds much value especially as an introduction to the historiography of the region. The book laudably attempts to address inequities in how Pacific histories are valorized. While many of those inequities certainly remain, reading this book in 2021, I am struck by how far beyond the academic discourses of the 1970s, 80s, and 90s we have come. What a relief it is to have other frames of reference and more critical scholarship by Pacific Islander scholars ourselves.

This does not mean the book is without value for contemporary audiences. It does mean, thankfully, that some of the touchstone debates the book references are now practically irrelevant. This is due, in fact, partially to the work of the scholars in this volume, but also to the rise of the overlapping, interdisciplinary field of Indigenous Studies. The Sahlins–Obeyesekere debate over whether Native Hawaiians perceived James Cook as the *akua* Lono in 1778–79, for example, is mentioned in several essays and forms the subject of a full essay by Borofsky in this collection. Today, that debate reads as an overblown academic kerfuffle that completely ignores the knowledge and interests of contemporary Native Hawaiian people. It is also now happily overshadowed by a growing wealth of historical scholarship utilizing largely unexamined Hawaiian-language newspapers and other sources by Native Hawaiian scholars. David Chang's *The World and All the Things Upon It: Native Hawaiian Geographies of Exploration*, in particular, offers a powerful recontextualization of Cook by focusing instead on the active nature of Native Hawaiian encounters with the wider world. He argues: 'The hypothesis that Cook was an akua has received inordinate attention from Westerners because it has flattered Western sensibilities. In fact, it was one avenue of exploration among many'.[8] Chang's work resonates eloquently with Epeli Hauʻofa's conclusion in this volume that 'we lay to rest once and for all the ghost of Captain Cook' in order to bring to 'center stage, as main players, our own peoples and institutions' (p. 458).

While editor Robert Borofsky addresses newer scholarship by Indigenous authors to some extent in the introduction to the new, open access issue, somewhat disappointingly, he sticks fairly closely to the original framing of the collection. Broadly, the book attempts to assess and bridge how non-Indigenous historians of the Pacific and Pacific Islanders (both historians and non-historians) 'make history'. Borofsky presents this endeavour, in the new introduction, as one of 'finding middle ground' between the 'Western sense of the past' and 'Pacific Islanders' senses of the past' (p. 14). He posits that finding ways to critically address such differences in practices of history will hopefully lessen the hegemonic power often granted to Western historical narratives about the Pacific. This goal echoes the purpose of the volume that he states in the book's original introduction: 'Can *Remembrance of Pacific Pasts* do more than simply reproduce and reinforce the scholarly status quo?' (p. 27). Borofsky argues that searching for a 'middle ground' is needed because efforts to 'decolonize Pacific history' have often ended up 'supporting the existing colonial framework to a certain degree' (p. 15). While noting positive, long-standing trends towards 'island-centered' and 'indigenous-centered' histories, the central sticking point for Borofsky still seems to be that there remains a tension even in histories written by Indigenous Pacific Islanders between 'phrasing one's historical narratives in Western academic terms so as to foster publication and academic status, versus emphasizing more indigenous narrative styles and frames of reference' (p. 20).

I understand and, to an extent, appreciate the emphasis Borofsky places on needing to find ways to better value non-Western, Indigenous narratives of history. However, he seems

[8] David Chang, *The World and All the Things Upon It: Native Hawaiian Geographies of Exploration* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016), 30.

to suggest in multiple places that Indigenous scholars writing in Western academic terms have failed to decolonize history by conceding to Western formats. This implies that 'real' Indigenous history is in other 'traditional' forms like oral storytelling, dance, and song, and not in academic writing. This sense is amplified by the fact that while a number of Pacific Islander scholars have work included in this book, most of these contributions come in the form of poetry and fiction (by those including Grace Mera Molisa, Konai Helu Thaman, Teresia Teaiwa and Patricia Grace) in the last section of the volume, titled '"Postcolonial" Politics'. There are more scholarly essays in the original volume by Pacific Islanders including Epeli Hau'ofa, who wrote the epilogue, Vicente Diaz, August Kituai, Sam Highland, and Vilsoni Hereniko. However, these are outnumbered by essays and interviews with non-Indigenous scholars who are well-recognized as experts in the field of Pacific Studies, including James Clifford, Greg Dening, Marshall Sahlins, Nicholas Thomas and Bernard Smith, among others.

Of course, Indigenous Pacific Islanders do value those other forms of history and storytelling, and the Western-style scholarly accounts by Indigenous authors are not necessarily more or less treasured than those other forms. But as many of the essays in this collection attest, Indigenous Pacific Islanders always adapted, changed, appropriated, and in their own way 'possessed' (as Dening's essay in the collection would put it) Western symbols and genres. Academic genres of writing are now simply another tool used by Indigenous Pacific Islanders to tell critical histories, not only of our own peoples but also to rigorously study the historic actions of settlers and imperialists who have left lasting legacies in our islands. Though there is still much to change about academic institutions and history as a Western discipline, it matters profoundly that there are Indigenous Pacific Islanders teaching and writing about Pacific histories for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous audiences.

In the volume's original introduction, Borofsky offers 'Islander' and 'Outlander' as 'loose terms' for respectively understanding the Indigenous peoples of the Pacific and 'those who settled in the region during the past three centuries' (p. 7). Borofsky is concerned about polarization between Islanders and Outlanders and seeks middle ground. This is another place where the volume appears quite outdated. Unintentionally or not, the vague notion of 'Outlander' appears designed to avoid a more direct positioning of historical actors in colonial power structures. While some debate remains, there is now wide acceptance of the use of the term 'settler' for white (and, in some contexts, Asian) people who directly participated in or benefited from the structures of settler colonialism and imperialism in the Pacific. There is no 'middle ground' to be had between the facts of historical dispossession of Indigenous Pacific peoples and those who did the dispossessing. Even more cringe-worthy in the original introduction is Borofsky's discussion of the Indigenous authors in the collection. He anticipates scrutiny of the percentage of Pacific Islander contributions to the volume, but hedges on this front by questioning how various authors should be classified. There is a long discussion of Vicente Diaz's parentage, Helen Morton's marriage and divorce to a Tongan man, and Brenda Lee's multiraciality (pp. 14–15). Borofsky concludes that 'ambiguities, subtleties, and complications abound … in trying to classify contributors in these stereotypical terms' (p. 15). While genealogies are undeniably important to Indigenous peoples, there is no question today that multiracial Indigenous people are Indigenous (and that white people married to Indigenous people are not). Indigenous communities are multiracial, multi-faceted, and complex. This fact is actually not that complicated. As Teresia Teaiwa's poem, 'Mixed Blood,' in the collection states, 'My identity / is not / a problem / a mystery / soluble / a contract / a neophyte / an interest rate' (p. 384).

As for the essays in the collection, many of those written by non-Indigenous scholars are centred around the same concerns and frameworks Borofsky uses in his introduction. Questions of objectivity, perspective, and 'both sides' predominate. On the more productive end of these is Greg Dening's 'Possessing Tahiti', a thoughtful consideration of 'who possessed who' regarding ceremonial practices of possession on the part of Europeans planting

flags and Tahitians weaving the British flag into a *maro ʻura*, or feathered girdle. Other essays by Indigenous authors anticipate more contemporary theories and frameworks used in Pacific, Indigenous and Ethnic Studies works today, including concerns of survival, struggle and cultural revitalization discussed in Vicente Diaz's 'Simply Chamorro', and theories of indigeneity and valuing circular, nonlinear forms of Indigenous history, as discussed in Epeli Hauʻofa's epilogue. Ultimately, too many of the essays in this collection tend to see the Pacific, as James Clifford puts it in his interview in the collection, as an exemplary 'laboratory' (p. 96). But as Hauʻofa puts it, Indigenous Pacific Islanders have a different, existential stake in Pacific history. 'The past is alive in us', he argues, 'so in more than a metaphorical sense the dead are alive – we are our history' (p. 506). I take heart in Hauʻofa's words, as well as in the fact that today Indigenous theories and frameworks like those shared by Hauʻofa are taken more seriously by many Indigenous and non-Indigenous historians of the Pacific.

MAILE ARVIN
University of Utah, USA
maile.arvin@utah.edu
© 2022 Maile Arvin

WHERE TO GO FROM HERE? TOWARD INDIGENOUS HISTORIES FROM BELOW

Remembrance of Pacific Pasts is a formidable collection of essays showcasing the richness of the practices of Pacific history. Most of the pieces included already appeared in other venues and are classics on their own, yet it is their arrangement and the theoretical framing Borofsky provides in his 'Invitation' that make this book useful to think with. When it came out in 2000, *Remembrance* was a limpid snapshot of what the 'crisis of representation' meant for Pacific scholars. While remaining a useful teaching tool, reading this book almost two decades after its appearance brought into sharper view some of its limitations to develop further a practice of Pacific history inclusive of, and enriched by, Indigenous histories.

Borofsky perceptively captures the contradiction underlying Pacific history since its inception:

> In turning away from European framings to regional concerns, it has been able to establish an identity of its own, apart from European history. But in embracing the local, it has often seemed constrained by local perspectives without ever being able to effectively include the perspectives of the real 'locals' – Pacific Islanders. (pp. 24–5)

This predicament has become more acute in the intervening years between *Remembrance*'s original publication and this new edition. Marginalized within the broader community of historians, Pacific historians recently rushed toward transnational and/or global perspectives in search of recognition.[9] On the other side, the middle ground that Dening proposed by arguing for a history *in* the Pacific has not emerged,[10] partially because the artificial Islander/Outlander divide has been co-opted into a novel division of academic labour, with Pacific Studies dominating the study of those multiform Indigenous ways to convey

[9] See David Hanlon, 'Losing Oceania to the Pacific and the World', *Contemporary Pacific* 29, no. 2 (2017): 286–318; Di Rosa, 'Microstoria, Pacific History, and the Question of Scale', *JPH* 53, no. 1 (2018): 25–43.
[10] Greg Dening, 'History "in" the Pacific', *Contemporary Pacific* 1, no. 1–2 (1989): 134–9.

their past (especially in Remote Oceania).[11] This is not an enviable position to find oneself in. The Islander/Outlander divide that *Remembrance* wished to overcome seems to me to have deepened with an increasingly sharper distinction between Pacific Studies and Pacific history.

The heart of the matter lies in that tension between those two terms – 'past' and 'history' – contained in the title. Not only are 'past' and 'history' two distinct, though entangled, objects, but we also need to be clear as to what we mean about 'history'. As Borofsky correctly argues, Pacific societies resort to a great variety of media to convey the past, and in this sense 'History telling … extends beyond professional historians' (p. 19).[12] The issue of the legitimacy of other ways to convey the past, to perform history, is hardly in question. Once we postulate that academic history is just *one* way among others to convey the past (a postulate very few professional historians, not just of the Pacific, would argue against), the issue of the multitude of *forms* in which the past is conveyed appears less salient when viewed in absolute terms. If forms are commensurable it is not the case for the social use of the past, which is conveyed for different purposes and deploying strategically different 'regimes of historicity'.[13] The example of the Pukapukans' criteria to pass judgement on different versions of the representation of the past, which so easily overlap with 'Western' ones (pp. 7–8), shows a high degree of commensurability between 'local' and 'Western' views of history.[14] Yet, I would argue that academic and local histories are not commensurable at the *social* level (though they feed each other). If history in its broad sense is performance, as Dening taught us, then the commensurability of the performances rests upon the commensurability of the contexts in which these take place rather than their content and form.[15] Academic histories are performances produced, circulated, and consumed largely within the context of their specific political economy, that of academia. The 'local' political field is something to be investigated (see below).

The issue of the social (and political) commensurability of academic and non-academic histories, in my view, becomes crucial when it comes to understanding inequalities in light of hegemonic 'Western senses of the past' (n.p., under 'Finding Middle Ground').[16] Do these, Borofsky asks, 'dominate because they are more accurate, more effective at

[11] In his assessment of Pacific Studies Terence Wesley-Smith correctly notes that in settler societies like Hawai'i and Aotearoa New Zealand Pacific Studies is connected to a cultural renaissance while in (formally) independent Island nations the main concern is with development issues. This, to me, means that the two paths are indissolubly tied to particular colonial histories, the legacy of which put different countries in different politico-economic relations vis-à-vis the contemporary capitalist configuration, thus begging for a historicization of the category of 'Indigeneity' and the need to de-homogenize it. See 'Rethinking Pacific Studies Twenty Years On', *Contemporary Pacific* 28, no. 1 (2016): 153–4. See also the perceptive take on Pacific Studies in Malama Meleisea and Penelope Schoeffel, 'Forty-Five Years of Pacific Island Studies: Some Reflections', *Oceania* 87, no. 3 (2017): 337–43.

[12] I prefer to use the expression 'conveying the past' rather than 'history telling' because the latter overemphasizes the aural dimension, downplaying the other senses which are equally capable of triggering memories and acquiring knowledge.

[13] François Hartog, *Regimes of Historicity: Presentism and Experiences of Time* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015).

[14] See also Robert Borofsky, *Making History: Pukapukan and Anthropological Constructions of Knowledge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

[15] Greg Dening, 'Performing on the Beaches of the Mind: An Essay', *History and Theory* 41, no. 1 (2002): 1–24.

[16] I do not see any reason to pluralize 'sense' when in this case Borofsky clearly refers to an academic positivist ideal-type (or straw man) of 'history'. Needless to say, 'Western' senses of the past are not at all homogeneous. See Byron Ellsworth Hamann, 'How to Chronologize with a

recounting the past? Or is this dominance mostly a matter of continued Western power in another form?' (n.p., under 'Finding Middle Ground'). Of course academic histories are as partial as local ones, and both have blind spots of their own. What I find problematic is a simplistic nexus between cultural forms and politico-economic and social inequalities. In Borofsky's rendering, the very profession of academic historians 'reflects the hegemonic control Western powers have today in the region' (n.p.):

> In acknowledging the limits of the development paradigm, we are led to an important question: What forms of cultural, historical, and/or intellectual independence might be effectively asserted by Third (and Fourth) World countries today? (p. 13).

Does intellectual independence consequently bring decolonization? As Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang write in their truly challenging piece, decolonization is not a metaphor, and especially so in settler societies.[17] Recognition is not sufficient.[18] Sovereignty on Indigenous lands, according to Tuck and Yang, remains the key issue, hence reminding us that 'hegemony' is not only 'cultural' but has social, political, and economic components. Indeed, for Gramsci, hegemony serves the interests of a certain class in relation to other ones, but specific configurations must be read in their particular social and historical contexts.[19] Under this light it is quite striking that China's increasing presence in the Pacific receives only a passing mention in the new introduction, as did the absence of a deeper engagement with Christianity in the book's original edition. The scenario Borofsky sketches prompts many questions: What role do Indigenous elites play? Which historically determined political, economic, and social forces enable or limit their capacity of action and their interests? How do these affect various groups of 'common' people? What function does academia serve in these larger processes? Does a quest for decolonizing the institution equal a quest for self-determination? These are all questions that cannot be asked in abstract but must be addressed within specific political fields.[20]

What is to be done? While I do not pretend to give any prescriptive orientation, I find it particularly productive to engage with Hempenstall's chapter and especially his statement that 'if older fashioned colonial history marched with the European proconsuls and missionaries, the newer anticolonial history simply reversed the polarities and raised up Islander chiefs and Big Men as the new, empowered agents of history' (p. 46). The challenge is to find ways to craft an Indigenous history from below. Although reading documents against the grain permits us to find what Douglas calls 'Indigenous countersigns',[21] as Hempenstall alerts us, 'Historians and storytellers are drawn to giant actors, easily identifiable personalities, those

Hammer, Or, The Myth of Homogeneous, Empty Time', *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 6, no. 1 (2016): 261–2.

[17] Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, 'Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor', *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): 1–40.

[18] See Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014).

[19] At the time of writing I had no access to the English translation of the *Prison Notebooks* and hence I decided not to give specific quotes, though I have consulted Antonio Gramsci, *Quaderni dal carcere*, 4 vols (Turin: Einaudi, 2014).

[20] Scholars are often in the awkward position of not being citizens of the country where they work and live, and this condition does limit their possibility for action.

[21] Bronwen Douglas, 'In the Event: Indigenous Countersigns and the Ethnohistory of Voyaging', in *Oceanic Encounters: Exchange, Desire, Violence*, ed. Margaret Jolly, Serge Tcherkézoff, and Darrell Tryon (Canberra: ANU E Press, 2009), 175–98.

highly individualized figures policed in community memory and in the records' (p. 53), thus posing the same problems for local accounts.

During my own fieldwork with Kerewo people (Papua New Guinea) the stories of 'giant actors' who were canonized in local narratives had the lion's share; slightly different versions were given by descendants of other contemporary historical characters, throwing these narratives into the arena of historical claims that my presence in the field doubtless ignited. I regrettably was only partially able to write a history from below,[22] but historians (and anthropologists) have to make do with what material is available and what people are willing to share, weaving those limits into the narrative.[23] The stories of Kerewo 'giant actors', though, were for me a window into the role that historical claims play within the moral and political economy of recognition in neo-colonial Papua New Guinea. Methodologically, then, an ethnography of the social and political structures which give meaning, at different scales, to those narratives becomes crucial for researching the past of Indigenous groups, and should be paired with the sociology of knowledge already called for by Keesing.[24]

Does history need to be remade? Perhaps. But we must be clear about what we mean by this term. In its academic sense I see no other way to remake it than to sharpen and repurpose the two complementary toolboxes Pacific historians have largely used: fieldwork and archival work. When Borofsky cites Joyce Carol Oates – 'Writing is an art, and art means artifice, the artificial' (p. 16) – against positivists' views of history, what remains adumbrated is that academic history often rests on the other end of the artisanal spectrum; it is a *craft*.[25] As it happened in anthropology with the appearance of *Writing Culture*,[26] the attention has largely focused on the final (broadly conceived) 'text' – the monograph for anthropologists and historians, and the creative piece for Pacific Studies – but the very process by which those final products come into being remains hidden. To make visible the very process of production of academic histories by contextualizing our various sources of knowledge, while it might not be a panacea for all the problems raised in *Remembrance*, it is *a* way to address some of them. Another refreshing exercise is to pay critical and reflective attention to other areas of the world, as testified by the interviews with Clifford, White, Prakash and Said, which remain an invaluable treasure trove of stimuli. My own critical take on *Remembrance* bears testimony to its continuous relevance and challenge.

DARIO DI ROSA
Independent scholar
dariodirosa385@gmail.com
© 2022 Dario Di Rosa

INVITATIONS STILL OPEN

How should we remember *Remembrance of Pacific Pasts*, reissued now in open-access format 20 years after it was originally published? The collection is itself already full of ruminative meditations on the ways scholars wrote the history and anthropology of the Pacific, an example of the

[22] Dario Di Rosa, 'Frustrated Modernity: Kerewo Histories and Historical Consciousness, Gulf Province, Papua New Guinea' (PhD diss., The Australian National University, 2018).

[23] Carlo Ginzburg, *The Night Battles: Witchcraft & Agrarian Cults in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983).

[24] Roger M. Keesing, 'Anthropology as Interpretive Quest [and Comments and Reply]', *Current Anthropology* 28, no. 2 (1987): 161–76.

[25] Marc Bloch, *The Historian's Craft* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992).

[26] James Clifford and George E. Marcus, eds., *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986).

disciplinary metacriticism that thrived at the end of the last century. The perspectives on offer in this Review Forum, then, are in a sense histories of histories of histories, critiques of critiques of critiques. The recursions threaten to loop inward on themselves indefinitely, perhaps at risk of growing smaller and less significant each time. And yet, perhaps infinite recursion is not only unavoidable but desirable. 'Every generation rewrites its history', Epeli Hau'ofa reminds us in the volume's epilogue (p. 456), and what we have in this reissue is an exceptional archive of the ways one generation wrote and rewrote Pacific history. The question is what the current generation should do with it – and I submit that *Remembrance* remains valuable not only for understanding where Pacific history was at the turn of the last century, but as a useful vantage point for ruminating on where it has gone since.

Edited volumes so often feel chummy – the products of symposia or preexisting networks of likeminded scholars. It is the chief accomplishment of *Remembrance* that its essays and poems are decidedly *un*collegial, at least when read together. The book's 'invitation to remake history' is an earnest one, and readers are met by a multitude of often contradictory perspectives on how that invitation should be taken up. Many of those arguments still feel vital. For one thing, *Remembrance* is deeply invested in the question not only of who should author Pacific history, but what constitutes authority in the first place. As Vilsoni Hereniko bluntly asks in a powerful chapter: 'Do outsiders have the right to speak for and about Pacific Islanders? Westerners seem to think … they have the right to speak about anything and everything' (p. 86). What is at stake is not just who writes history, but what institutional structures allow certain writers to produce knowledge claims and make them believable. Here, Borofsky's chapter forensically analysing the Sahlins–Obeyesekere debate is revealing, showing 'how academic scholarship often depends on appearance and trust', particularly given that we so rarely actually read each other's archival material and treat footnotes mostly as affirmations of disciplinary good faith (p. 433). If the mechanics of empirical scholarship are merely ornaments signifying membership in an exclusive academic community, he suggests, then empiricist critiques of non-western historical modalities lose much of their force.

Of course, we should notice that so much writing about the Pacific is authored, then as now, by people from elsewhere. Both Sahlins and Obeskeyere were 'outsiders', after all. To redress that imbalance, *Remembrance* offers us multivocality – we have selections by authors from within and without the Pacific. The resulting visions are uneven by design. Some chapters, like the excerpt by Sam Highland on World War II in Kiribati, offer problematic colonialist visions, particularly of the postwar US presence. Others, like Hempenstall's excellent chapter, call for the 'creation of spaces in our histories where other voices can be heard' (p. 60). However, there are limits on the volume's success in creating space. As Borofsky admits, Pacific authors appear more often through their poetry, and 'outsiders' disproportionately through academic prose. The result is not only that outsiders are granted more 'space', but that each genre's truth-telling conventions are bluntly juxtaposed. Poetic verse and academic jargon are uneasy companions on the page, and the inevitable comparison between the two raises certain questions. Why should we treat professional history writing as the most important or prestigious genre for understanding the past, when it is often outshone by a few stanzas of verse? And why is it academe's prerogative to grant space in the first place, as though its authority to represent anything and everyone were not a holdover of enlightenment imperiousness – and as though academic publishing was not in perpetual decline, read by smaller and more insular audiences every year?

'Outsiders' is in any event a complicated category, reliant on certain essentialisms, as Borofsky and others point out. And yet, *Remembrance* also does quite a lot with outsideness as a useful perspective. A number of eminent scholars of other regions appear as interview subjects, forming a sort of Greek chorus to comment on the proceedings. What do we learn from Gyan Prakash, Richard White, and Edward Said? For one, we are reminded that reading Pacific history with and against broader global history of colonialism was and remains fruitful. As White says: 'much of the peculiarity of American history claimed by historians as unique seems far less so in light of the Pacific' (p. 71). But beyond affirmations that the Pacific

matters, we also get a sense that the postcolonial theory these scholars and their contemporaries developed provided a powerful set of tools for answering the questions raised here, including those about who can author a region's histories. On essentialisms such as 'insider' and 'outsider', for instance, Prakash usefully reminds us that we should spend less time pondering their realness, and more time understanding the 'nature and effects of the complicity between essentialism and domination' (p. 298). Of course 'insider' and 'outsider' are constructed categories, but they are the products of real histories of power, and those remain worth disentangling.

It is in narrating the history of colonial power that one finds real strengths but also disconcerting questions in *Remembrance*. The book is broken down into four sections: 'Frames of Reference', 'The Dynamics of Contact', 'Colonial Engagements', and 'Postcolonial Politics'. But, as some contributions within the book ask, why and to what degree should colonialism continue to provide the temporal armature around which all our histories of the Pacific are built? For all the sound and fury over alternative historical modalities, *Remembrance* offers little trace of Pacific pasts beyond colonialism and its legacies. History begins with contact, and there is no 'pre-history' on offer here. That is not to say its history of colonialism is not rendered well. Its selections are a reminder of how ably the field rewrote the history of colonialism at the end of the last century. Patricia Grimshaw and Helen Morton show the deep ambiguities and countersigns manifested in colonialism. James Belich shows us the ways Māori resistance and ingenuity suffered historical erasure through Britain's 'myth of conquest'. Nicholas Thomas shows the variegated forms of colonialism's cultural productions. And Greg Dening reminds us of the need for anthropologies of both sides of colonial encounter. But what histories and narratives are left out by framing everything around colonialism? What would happen if, per Hau'ofa's suggestion, we 'send Captain Cook to the wings to await summons when necessary to call in the Plague', and perhaps 'recall him at the end to take a bow' (p. 458)?

The real question, however, is whether Borofsky's invitation to remake history has been met today. Certainly new cohorts are authoring (and authorizing) Pacific history. A comparison between the endorsements for the old and new editions is telling. Then, we had praise from luminaries beyond Pacific history: Benedict Anderson, Robert Darnton, Natalie Zemon Davis, and so on – emphasizing that *Remembrance* was part of a critical turn that transcended Pacific Studies. Today's endorsements are very different indeed, featuring Damon Salesa, Anne Perez Hattori, Matt Matsuda, and so on, as if now, decades on, the open-access version is meant for the Pacific and Pacific historians. But one can get caught up too much in the moral economy of the book blurb. At a deeper, structural level, one wonders what a sequel to *Remembrance* would look like. If the list of endorsements were instead a table of contents, that would be a very powerful book indeed.

Would the questions asked and answered by a sequel look different? For one thing, the boundaries of the Pacific it remembers might be larger. Stewart Firth writes that 'we are caught in a rhetoric of region that brings the South Pacific to an abrupt end along the Papua New Guinea–Indonesian Border' (p. 319). But Pacific history has become much bigger than that in the last decades, with collections and surveys regularly weaving Asia and the Americas into their narratives.[27] For another, we have a more robust language for dealing with Oceanic historicities and temporal modalities.[28] And yet, 'progress seems to merge into stasis at times', not least because we academics tend to be better at posing critical questions than answering them (p. 27). That might not be a bad thing. *Remembrance* famously offered questions and not

[27] See, for example, Matt K. Matsuda, *Pacific Worlds: A History of Seas, Peoples, and Cultures* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); David Armitage and Alison Bashford, eds, *Pacific Histories: Ocean, Land, People* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

[28] Chris Ballard, 'Oceanic Historicities', *Contemporary Pacific* 26, no. 1 (2014): 96–124; Warwick Anderson, Miranda Johnson, and Barbara Brookes, eds., *Pacific Futures: Past and Present* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2018).

solutions. Its success came from pulling together a number of voices who saw reflexive, post-colonial critique as necessary, and even some who ignored it. That was all to the good. As Vaine Rasmussen declares, 'There is not one Pacific / There are many' (p. 399). One wishes we had more volumes like *Remembrance*, that embraced multivocality and uncertainty, that eschewed definitive answers, and that invited us to keep asking the right questions.

ADRIAN YOUNG
Denison University, OH, USA
younga@denison.edu
© 2022 Adrian Young

MIGHT I ASK SOME QUESTIONS?

Let me begin with a story. It is about the book's origin and why it was republished 20 years later. I wanted to build on a theme by Greg Dening: 'we are concerned to write the anthropology and the history of those moments when native and intruding cultures are conjoined. Neither can be known independently of that moment'.[29] This relational perspective resonates with works by Claude Lévi-Strauss, Martin Buber, and Carlo Rovelli.[30] (Given the data available, that is the reason I focused on the contact era onward.)

Having had little training in Pacific history, I asked a Pacific historian to co-edit the book with me. We worked on the project for over two years. But at a critical meeting to select specific readings, he suddenly announced he was quitting the project and walked out. He has never explained why.

I was apprehensive. Could I frame the dynamics of Pacific history in a professional way, never having had a course in it? I felt my way through a host of issues as best I could. When I collected blurbs from prominent scholars, I was 'blown away'. I knew Claude Lévi-Strauss a bit, but certainly not well. He wrote:

> History is always interpretation. The French Revolution as told by an aristocrat and by a sansculotte are not the same. The problem is how to bring these different views together in a way that makes sense of the whole. Rob Borofsky wonderfully succeeds at this difficult task. He turns widely different points of view into an asset. The narrative ceases being linear. We have instead a multidimensional history that the reader must approach from several angles and the meaning of which, like that of a musical piece, is apprehended globally. *Remembrance of Pacific Pasts* is a very impressive and important work (p. 11).

The same occurred with Natalie Zemon-Davis, whom, at that time, I did not know at all. She wrote:

> *Remembrance of Pacific Pasts* is brimming over with new ideas about how history can be found, rethought, understood, and told … . Whether set in Samoa, Fiji, Hawaii, Papua New Guinea or elsewhere, each fascinating essay has resonance for questions being asked by scholars everywhere.

[29] Greg Dening, *Islands and Beaches: Discourse on a Silent Land, Marquesas, 1774–1880* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1980), 43.

[30] Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology* (New York: Basic Books, 1974); Martin Buber, *I and Thou* (New York: Scribner, 1984); Carlo Rovelli, *Helgoland: Making Sense of the Quantum Revolution* (New York: Riverhead Books, 2021).

> Rob Borofsky's edited volume is multicentered, dialogic history at its best (p. 10).

I was taken aback. Here were two of the world's most prominent scholars giving expression to what I was trying to do, phrasing it better than I could myself. Wow.

I presumed such praise would foster thoughtful discussions in various publications about the writing of Pacific history and how we needed a conversation among multiple perspectives to give voice to our multiple understandings of the Pacific past. I was wrong. *The Contemporary Pacific* published a positive review by three USP students.[31] But that was all. Apparently, I had stepped on some scholars' silences (see pp. 15–18). With time, despite the complimentary blurbs and review, I came to view the book as a failed attempt at an inspiring goal. The book's central message seemed to have had little impact on the field. I left Pacific history and turned back to anthropology.

19 years later, at an East-West Center conference, Alex Mawyer introduced himself to me and told me how impressed he was with *Remembrance of Pacific Pasts*. I did not know whether to laugh or cry – seriously. Having just published an open access book (*An Anthropology of Anthropology*), Alex's comment set me thinking: why not try again, but, this time, as an open access book? I was able to negotiate republishing the book with UH Press. But there were clear terms: I could not change any of the old text. I could only add a new introduction and new blurbs. So, voila.

I would like to thank Maile Arvin, Dario Di Rosa, and Adrian Young as well as the forum's editor, Hilary Howes, for their comments and questions. Let me deal with three broad subjects raised by them.

First is the question of how much progress Pacific historians have made since the book was originally published in 2000. I believe Young is correct in suggesting our view of the Pacific has widened – with a better sense of the exchanges across it. And I believe that Tracey Banivanua Mar was correct in calling both 'colonization and decolonization … imperial projects'.[32] In seeking innovative ways to study these dynamics, might I suggest the overlapping perspectives enunciated in the chapters by W.S. Merwin, Peter Hempenstall, and Patricia Grace?

Presumably, we all agree that there has been a plethora of publications produced since 2000. As Arvin affirms, a considerable number of these have been by Pacific scholars themselves. This is important. But I am not sure if the appearance of more publications means 'progress' in a less quantitative sense. As Di Rosa suggests, this has not produced an overlapping set of perspectives. Rather, it has produced 'a novel division of academic labour, with Pacific Studies dominating the study of those multiform Indigenous ways to convey their past … . The Islander/Outlander divide that *Remembrance* wished to overcome seems to me to have deepened with an increasingly sharper distinction between Pacific Studies and Pacific history'. Just because earlier Pacific historians obscured Pacific Islanders' views in their accounts – as I stressed in the book's new introduction – does not mean Indigenous inclined scholars need do the same in reverse. Quoting Dening, 'for strangers of Pacific outlands and natives of Pacific islands to have a bound-together present means that we shared a … past'.[33]

Second, I feel uneasy with Arvin's tendency to 'speak for' 'Indigenous Pacific scholars' and 'contemporary Native Hawaiian people'. In Vaine Rasmussen's words, 'there is not one Pacific, there are many' (p. 399). As I explain in *Making History*,[34] interviewing 230

[31] Gina Balawanilotu, Anurag Subramani, and Robert Nicole, 'Remembrance of Pacific Pasts', *Contemporary Pacific* 15, no. 1 (2003): 198–203.

[32] Tracey Banivanua Mar, 'Author's Response: Transcendent Mobilities', in 'Review Forum: Decolonisation and the Pacific', *JPH* 51, no. 4 (2016): 461.

[33] Greg Dening, 'History "in" the Pacific', *Contemporary Pacific* 1, no. 1/2 (1989): 139.

Pukapukans (in a population of roughly 785, including more than half of those over 60, a group deemed most knowledgeable about traditional matters), it was clear Pukapukans rarely spoke with one voice about traditional matters. Many purposely disagreed with their peers as an act of bravado. I appreciate Arvin acknowledging that I included a number of scholarly essays by 'Indigenous Pacific Islanders'. She might have added that I included a powerful poem by Merwin, who was one of North America's more recognized poets. I intended no easy divide in styles of presentation. I perceive a fluidity to cultural labels and styles, as Teresia Teaiwa suggests. I presume Arvin knows, from her work with Hawaiians, that they do not speak with one voice today and, more than likely, did not in times past. I concur with Di Rosa that context is critical to understanding content. I wish him well with his 'history from below'.

I would stress that Marshall Sahlins was concerned with considerably more than Cook's reputation. Quoting him: 'The great challenge to an historical anthropology is not merely to know how events are ordered by culture, but how, in that process, the culture is reordered. How does the reproduction of a structure become its transformation?'[35] He used the Hawaiian–British interactions during the Makahiki festival to explore Hawaiian ritual structures and, in seeing their transformation through time, come to better understand them vis-à-vis Cook's visit – a theme touched on earlier by Daws.[36] As far as Cook's identification with the *akua* Lono, we might rely on two of Lono's priests (i.e. Kanekoa, Kuakahela, Ka'ō'ō, Keli'ikea, and Omeah) who, following Cook's death, asked the astonished British, 'When the Orono would come again? And what he would do to them on his return'.[37]

There is an under-recognized politics in many cultural identifications, one tied to the rise of European nationalism in the 19th century. Might I suggest that 'cultures' often tend to be imaginary communities in Anderson's terms?[38] There is more diversity within them than many affirm.[39] As Arvin illustrates, cultural labels are frequently used in oppositional scenarios.

Third, I much appreciate Young's question 'whether Borofsky's invitation to remake history has been met today'. While we might all concur on the general progress made in the field, I still concur with the quote he cites for me: 'progress seems to merge into stasis at times'.

Though I have some ideas, I would appreciate hearing others' views on why the book's vision has flown under most Pacific scholars' radar. The list of professional historians with their commentaries and blurbs did not seem to move many. Perhaps the new set of commentaries will not as well. Still, I suggest an engagement with diverse perspectives and presentational styles can lead to a better understanding of the region's past and present. History-telling, I note, 'is an active, participatory process' (pp. 28–9). This approach would help address problems the field has been facing for some time – its low readership, its marginal meaning for many within the Pacific, and its inability to demonstrate its relevance to historians

[34] Robert Borofsky, *Making History: Pukapukan and Anthropological Constructions of Knowledge* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), xix–xx.

[35] Marshall Sahlins, *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities: Structure in the Early History of the Sandwich Island Kingdom* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1981), 8.

[36] Gavan Daws, 'Kealakekua Bay Revisited: A Note on the Death of Captain Cook', *JPH* 3 (1968): 21–3.

[37] James Cook and James King, *A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean […] on His Majesty's Ships Resolution and Discovery*, 3 vols (London: W. and A. Strahan, 1784), vol. 3, 69; cf. Jillian Robertson, *The Captain Cook Myth* (Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1981).

[38] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 2nd ed. (New York: Verso, 1991).

[39] See, for example, Borofsky, *Making History*; Robert Borofsky, *Revitalizing Anthropology … With Your Help*, unpublished manuscript.

in other regions (relevance that Richard White and various blurbers stress). We have a treasure trove of historical records dating from the Enlightenment, a plethora of differences across the region, and a range of engagements that help us step outside our own self-conceptions to better understand ourselves vis-à-vis others through time. As stressed, *neither side can be known without the other*. The problem, perhaps, is that many scholars remain within their intellectual comfort zones and training. To address the difficulty, might I suggest the multicentred, dialogic histories that Zemon-Davis supports? Or, following Lévi-Strauss, that we apprehend our pasts in a more multidimensional global manner that conveys a sense of music to our readers?

ROBERT BOROFSKY
Center for a Public Anthropology, Hawai'i Pacific University
borofsky@publicanthropology.org
© 2022 Robert Borofsky