IN THINKING OF SEAS AND OCEANS, Fernand Braudel famously illuminated his Mediterranean by imagining multiple civilizations joined by trade and cultural exchange; his *Annales* approach of a *longue durée* built upon archaeological and ecological evidence shaped a brilliant chronicle of kingdoms and powers. Yet as he noted of his subject itself, the Mediterranean was not even a single sea, but rather “a complex of seas, and the seas are broken up by islands, a tempest of peninsulas ringed by insistent coastlines.” To establish the project, he knew, “the question of boundaries is the first to be encountered.”

Defining the “Pacific” is an equally daunting challenge. As Robert Borofsky has posited, “We need to remember that the field’s self-defined area of study—the ‘Pacific’—is a constructed artifact of the discipline. Why, for example, should Pacific historians study large Pacific islands such as New Zealand and New Guinea but ignore the Philippines and Indonesia?” He also ponders the inclusion or exclusion of Australia in multiple accounts and points out the constructedness of Pacific designations: “For those living in Hawai‘i, the ‘Pacific’ refers to the islands lying within ‘Melanesia,’ ‘Polynesia,’ and ‘Micronesia’ (constructed categories themselves). For others on the West Coast of the United States, the ‘Pacific’ usually includes the Pacific rim—China, Japan, and Korea.”

Such multiplicities evoke the question, *What, where, and when* is “Pacific history”? How can a subject be constituted? The what of the “Pacific” can first be reckoned through its cultural imaginary, for which there are multiple claims made upon its unique attributions: tales of “cargo cults,” atoll-centered nuclear testing, hula, kava, taro; the Samoan tatau, the voyages of Cook and Bougainville, cannibals and natives, blue lagoons; trading and exchange networks: kula, sandalwood, copra, tea, *bêche-de-mer*, Toyotas; Japanese capital, California, Tahiti; the Maori haka; the Treaty of Waitangi; whaling and blackbirding; coral reefs. It is a multilocal space marked by nominatives of conflict: Guadalcanal, Iwo Jima, the Pali, Fatuaua, the mutiny on the *Bounty*, 1878 in New Caledonia, 1893 in Honolulu, nuclear testing in the Marshalls and Moruroa, Fiji coups, struggles in the Solomon Islands.
The where of these moments and lives in the Pacific is the enormous water world covering one-third of the Earth's surface, framed by continents, joined by islands. It is a geography distinguished by a famous fluid distinction between north and south. The south is the realm of Herman Melville's *Typee*, Paul Gauguin's paintings, Rodgers and Hammerstein’s *South Pacific*; of writers Albert Wendt and Patricia Grace and stories of cultural collision, nationalist revolution, and coups. The north is the theater of East Asia, of labor migrations and capital flows to and from Japan and China and Hawai‘i and the Philippines.4

To even begin to suggest history drawn from such a complex set of boundaries, nested temporalities, and geographies requires focus. The approach here is to underscore small islands, large seas, and multiple transits—not to concentrate on the continental and economic “Rim” powers of East and Southeast Asia and the Americas to define the Pacific, but to propose an oceanic history much more located in thinking outward from Islanders and local cultures. Such a “Pacific” has specific markers: it is heavily invested in anthropological methodologies and histories tightly linked to issues of political sovereignty and cultural preservation. Such histories explore “native knowledge,” and confront Euro-American narratives of discovery, adventure, and romance, while grappling with real implications of trade, migration, and empire. Much of the work is about constitutions of historical knowledge that are not academic (although they are increasingly becoming so) and about the highlighting of interdisciplinary categories—archaeological reconstructions, oral tales and dance, studies of epidemic disease, research on leisure and tourism, and ecological and oceanographic modeling.5

The Pacific is not lacking in grand conceptual vocabularies. As Braudel framed the Mediterranean as a complex of maritime civilizations and Paul Gilroy cogently articulated the diasporic logic of a Black Atlantic, so the “Pacific” has been historically reimagined many times: from an ancient Polynesian and early modern Magellanicspace of transit, to an Enlightenment theater of sensual paradise, to a strategic grid of labor movements and military “island-hopping,” to a capitalist basin, the key to
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a Pacific Century of emerging wealth and “globalization” at the end of the last millennium. Many of these grand narratives are framed by histories of Southeast Asia and peninsular peoples of Malaysia and Indonesia; more are anchored in Australia, New Zealand, and Papua New Guinea, connected by movements of peoples and goods from the coasts of North and South America.

Speaking in 1917 as the former president of the American Historical Association, Theodore Roosevelt asserted his faith in the Pacific as part of a new twentieth-century frontier, underscoring his role in securing the rights to the Panama Canal. Other academics declaimed upon the Philippines, China, Mexico, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand as part of a “Pacific Era,” enthusing, “the history of the Pacific Ocean is a chapter in the history of civilization,” while establishing that “it was reserved for European peoples to traverse those wastes of water and to establish regular communications.” The Pacific was the global future, although one to be instigated from Europe and America; Asia and Oceania were presumed to be trapped along distant shores and landfalls, limited and circumscribed by an expanse understandable only as barrier—those “wastes of water.”

Perhaps the most resonant challenge to such imperial tales of isolation, helplessness, and dependency has been the commentary surrounding Tongan writer and scholar Epeli Hau‘ofa’s “Our Sea of Islands,” which directly reversed the notion of “wastes” and emptiness of water and reimagined them as oceanic transits. Drawing on centuries of Pacific-wide navigation and settlement, Hau‘ofa was moved to confront notions that Pacific Islanders were fated by vast oceanic barriers to inhabit small, isolated, marginal countries. He began to imagine “isolation” not as geographic, but as historical—a narration imposed by continental and colonial assumptions. “Oceania,” on the contrary, was tied to ancestors, kin, and culture from Antarctica to the North Pacific, a realm of wide-ranging seafaring peoples intimately tied both to the sea and to each other. The “belittlement” of possible Pacific histories had created historiographical closure on lived pasts, such that “Oceania has no history before imperialism, only what is called ‘prehistory.’”

Against this notion, Hau‘ofa proposed a “Sea of Islands” and a resonant response to the “when” of Pacific histories: newly imagined chronicles rooted in ancient leg-

---


7 Douglas L. Oliver, Oceania: The Native Cultures of Australia and the Pacific Islands (Honolulu, 1989); Brij V. Lal and Kate Fortune, The Pacific Islands: An Encyclopedia (Honolulu, 2000).


acies tied to contemporary destinies, from Polynesian navigators piloting outrigger canoes by the stars, to Cook Islanders flying into Auckland, Samoans or Maori finding heritage in Los Angeles, New York, or London, or communities driven by global economics and cultural connections. The logic of thinking the Pacific as an ocean-based history engages such attempts to restore movements and autonomies—migrations and navigation of island peoples engaged in cross-cultural contacts, shifting social organizations, and ethnic diasporas. These, in turn, inform articulations of a “Pacific Way” and an “Oceanic” vision to match “Pacific Rim” and South Seas “paradise” narrations as historical possibilities.10

Academically, these projects are the domains of multiple specialties. Major journals divide the workload in Pacific studies—Oceania is largely concerned with anthropological theory and practice. Pacific Studies focuses significantly on culture, linguistics, and archaeology, an emphasis shared with The Journal of the Polynesian Society, whose title responds to the convention of culture zones. Pacific Affairs is an international journal of politics and economics, and greatly favors the “Rim” approach to the region, being principally concerned with the United States, China, Korea, Japan, and Southeast Asia. The New Zealand Journal of History, The Journal of Pacific History, and The Contemporary Pacific are historically and discursively rooted; focused on academic research, they are heavily invested in cultural criticism, ethnographic studies, and histories often concerned with “local” meanings, island events, topical political reviews, and issues-oriented forums. Many contributors are from the best-known scholarly research centers and universities in Australia, Aotearoa New Zealand, Fiji, and Hawai‘i.

An Oceanic approach to Pacific history suggests cross-talk between many of these constituencies: Pacific Islands historians and anthropologists who claim monographic expertise in specific island groups such as the Solomons, Fiji, Tonga, Tahiti, or Hawai‘i; “Rim” specialists who are dedicated to the study of policy issues and political-economic transfers of wealth and labor; Asian and American scholars whose concentration is the specificities of culture and politics in Japan, China, and Korea where mutual influences overlap in the Philippines, Indonesia, and Malaysia; and specialists in Southeast Asia doing sophisticated work on the “Sulu Zone,” the Celebes Sea, and the Malay Archipelago.11

Oceanic histories emphasize movements and interconnections rather than area-
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studies distinctions; waterways and transits take on an active character, although this should not suggest a wholly seaborne or maritime focus. Some scholars have argued that an ocean-based approach to the Pacific misreads the many land-bounded peoples of New Guinea, or the Kanak of New Caledonia, for whom terra is as defining as water, if not more so. Many questions of production, politics, and culture—as Donald Denoon, Brij V. Lal, and Lilikalā Kameʻeleihiwa have pointed out for territories as diverse as Papua New Guinea, Fiji, and Hawai‘i—are based upon communal land tenure, adaptations to plantation economies, and agricultural and private property questions. Pacific inhabitants in this instance are connected by overland trading networks and can be peoples who rarely see the open ocean. Such is the case when some Australian Aboriginal peoples—dryland “bush” cultures—are claimed as folk of tidal and fishing life in the Torres Straits between the Northern Territories and Indonesia. The logic of an “ocean-based” history is that of both land and sea—“saltwater people” working histories and traveling with “saltwater feet.” This reckons with a littoral approach, conceptualizing Pacific worlds through linkages of intermediate environments from beaches and coastlines to villages, ports, and harbors.

An Oceanic history of the Pacific is very much a zone where tidal and maritime metaphors are appropriate as great confluences and individual vessels meet. Histories from European worlds come in contact with those of Islanders, Asians, and peoples from the Americas. David Chappell’s studies of Oceanic voyagers on Euro-American ships neatly complicate the “Pacific” as simply—or principally—what Ferdinand de Magellan and Vasco Nuñez de Balboa claimed as the Great Southern and Pacific oceans. It was a place of origins and transit and a source of life; Arab traders, Indian Ocean merchants, and Portuguese caravels plied waters and crossed regions populated for millennia by peoples from Asia settling through Austronesia and outward. By emphasizing mixed crews of voyagers, such work resituates “discoveries” as already diverse encounters between allies, enemies, and Europeans, Asians, Africans, and Islanders.

The imaginative of a “Pacific” rooted in the notion of a “distant” ocean is logically Atlantic in inspiration, and has much to do with what Euro-American histories have
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supposed as the ocean’s vast navigational challenges. It would be incorrect to suggest that this resulted from any “lateness” in navigational mastery over the Pacific relative to other great maritime realms. That mastery simply came from Asian seafarers, and especially Polynesian navigators, whose talents for open-ocean travel predated European transits. The power of naming the “Pacific” has been that of creating intellectual cohesion by imposing an encompassing European vision of water on Palauan atolls, the Japanese Nan’yo (South Seas), or the moana and marae of the Maori and the Hawaiians. About hundreds of Oceanic voyaging generations, Deryck Scarr has suggested, “If anything like a general name for the ocean ever, improbably, existed among them, it has not survived, and perhaps would not be recoverable.” Yet “the Pacific” was not a notion lacking in islander thinking; it simply had other names and supposed other destinies—not of discovery, but of return.

Much of the scholarly work in this area has been done by ethnobotanists, historical linguists, and marine archaeologists, tracing Lapita pottery and seed crops to join the common cultural ancestries of the Maori in Aotearoa New Zealand with an ancestral homeland of “Hawaiki.” In reverse, the search by other Polynesians for Aotearoa—the land of the long white cloud—suggests an extraordinarily large “Pacific” diaspora stretching from the northern tropics of Hawai’i to the Maori edge of Antarctica. The “Pacific” was a territory of distance, but not of outward adventure, discovery, or mystery in the sense of European exploration narratives. It was more a path of currents to return to an ancestral place. In this regard, an Oceanic Pacific is a vast notion, one for which the world was huge, incorporating originary connections to both the heavens and the underworld.

These are narrations relatively little known against a Pacific constituted in Euro-American scholarship by the Columbian and post-Columbian voyages of adventure and empire undertaken by the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spanish, Portuguese, and Dutch whose legacies shaped Indonesia, the Philippines, and Malaysia, and the subsequent charting and mapping of the South Seas during brilliant scientific missions by James Cook, Georges Vancouver, and others in the European Age of Enlightenment. The eighteenth-century moment of scientific transit, royal prestige, and encounters with “unexpected” places overlay the earlier mercantile empires seeking the wealth and civilizations of the Orient, and later provided much of the cultural “Romance of the South Seas.”

This romance became the nostalgic counterpoint to merely commercial histories or tales of the barbarous Antipodes where English and French prisoners were sent to Australia and New Caledonia. As a result of the nineteenth-century coming of the French, British, and German empires, joined by the Japanese and Americans, Asian maritime voyages and the extensive migration and trading networks around the entire region of today’s Micronesia, Melanesia, and Polynesia were gradually closed out
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and cut off through the imposition of colonial territories, exclusive zones, and strategic transits. These narrative elements of empire were emplotted in “lost world” literary and artistic romances issuing from Bougainville in the thrall of Rousseau, given substance by tales of paradise and possibilities by histories such as that of the *Bounty*, reinvented as vanishing cultures with Melville and Stevenson and Pierre Loti, and immortalized as sensual melancholy for much of the world by Paul Gauguin in Tahiti and the Marquesas.\(^{18}\)

Yet Pacific histories, under different names, were maintained and transmitted through ritual, image, dance, and oral tradition. Many of these have been studied in detail: the Trobriands kula and the “gift”; the Kanak-engraved bamboo in New Caledonia; the royal ali‘i genealogies in Hawai‘i; Pukapukan tales; Marshallese and Palauan canoe culture.\(^ {19}\) Such subjects, of “anthropological” interest, have only fitfully become categorical forms of *historical* knowledge production. Initially taken as closed systems of signification reinforcing “timelessness” and “isolation”—thus stasis and impoverishment—they were not recognized for the qualities of narrative continuity and temporal transformation that historians underscore. As Jocelyn Linnekin put it, “A striking feature of Western scholarship in the Pacific Islands is the dominance of Anthropology since the late nineteenth century,” a discipline that “emphasized the structured, routine aspects of events such as market transactions and ritual performances. They discovered history as a theoretical problem in the 1980s—when historians were extending their own gaze beyond particular sequences of events.”\(^{20}\) The confluence of temporal and cultural analysis has been critical for Pacific histories; neither is resonant without the other. For academics, “historical” engagement with the Pacific broke from the colonial narrative by drawing on historicized anthropological models and collaboration with many of the humanities and human sciences, including archaeology, linguistics, literature, and performance studies.

The “formal” institutional historiography of Pacific history is conventionally traced to the inauguration of the first chair in “Pacific History” at the Australian National University by James Davidson in 1954.\(^ {21}\) This self-declared new history, famously “centered not in Downing Street but in the islands,” was a project shaped by “the general postwar spirit of decolonization” and organized around an attempt to combat a literature dating from the nineteenth century that was familiar to stu-


tendants of “native” populations the world over: resigned and irresponsible tales of extinction of local peoples, inexorable loss and corruption of innocence and culture in an evolutionary and nostalgic model, and a focus on the fraught perils of “civilization.”

This internal reimagining of Pacific histories developed in parallel with early works on subaltern or Orientalist critical frameworks investigating what would become “tensions of empire.” In promoting “island-centered histories,” Davidson read the European presence in Oceania as superficial—hegemonic, perhaps, in political and economic systems, but never truly altering (here we see the anthropological imperative) indigenous bases of custom, practice, and local knowledge. Pacific histories have since marked numerous domains as the field was transformed. Many scholars have maintained advocacy of agency and autonomy interests in examining cultural and national contexts. Martyn Lyons, Stewart Firth, Margaret Jolly, Stephen Henningham, Bronwen Douglas, Brij V. Lal, and others have fashioned strong traditions of political and cultural histories by examining national struggles divided by ethnicity, class, and gender in New Caledonia, French Polynesia, Fiji, Vanuatu, and the Solomons.

The local richness and broad implications of the studies remind general audiences that “the Pacific” is not simply a subset of East Asian and Southeast and South Asian histories. Rather, Pacific Islands work reinforces tensions and conjunctures—for example, Sandra Tarte’s examination of disputed Japanese economic aid to Pacific islands in exchange for fishing rights—and continuing struggles, at times emphasizing violence. Such studies cross over national sovereignties, mineral resources, and the dilemmas of identity politics, as in the case of political clashes between Melanesian and Indian populations in Fiji or men and women and spousal battering in Vanuatu. Because the Pacific is an area invested with highly visible female au-


authority—from the revered monarchs Pomare Vahine and Liliuʻokalani in Tahiti and Hawaiʻi, to the controversial Margaret Mead, to contemporary activists, scholars, and poets such as Grace Molisa in Vanuatu and Miliani Trask and Haunani-Kay Trask in Hawaiʻi—students of the area have produced an extraordinarily sophisticated literature on gender questions. These range across representations of exotic fantasy to analyses of “custom” and feminist politics, with many of the categories and genres in constant tension.27

Other scholars have developed works with significant “crossover” impact in general academe with tales that incorporate symbolic and representational analyses into their visions. Greg Dening’s works have investigated re-creating the life-world of Marquesan Enata, Tahitian royalty, English sailors, and mutineers with an ethnographic, almost quotidian richness. In close readings, Dening sees histories as performances, suggesting not only source bases for “mentalités,” but also a notion of “histories” that deals with transformations of language, ritual, foodways, botany, and marine ecology as they become represented and reappropriated in commemorative and historiographical discourses. Nicholas Thomas’s works have articulated in rich detail subjects ranging from Oceanic arts to the unstable subjectivity of diaries to material culture and exchange within colonial trading networks.28

In one of the most highly visible academic controversies of the last generation, Marshall Sahins imagined the death of Captain Cook within a structural universe of Hawaiians through a question of European visitors as symbolic “gods.” His sub-


sequent challenge from Gananath Obeyesekere (each wrote a book in response to the other) and Hawaiian Island nationalists played out in international journals to much fanfare. Whether or not the research demonstrated or claimed that islanders thought that Europeans were “gods,” the exchanges underscored the centrality of anthropologists to Pacific history, and highlighted forms of narrative analysis that attempted to take seriously the possible examination of islander consciousness as formative in the playing out, indeed the creation, of “historical events.”

Such works, whose questions and controversies have deeply inflected other studies, suggest how Pacific history has uniquely developed, in that it is a subject dominated not by mainstream academic historians, but rather by anthropologists, ethnohistorians, and often fiction writers, political activists, and artists. Its subjects have been much written about and expanded by talents who are deliberately and forthrightly reflexive about the production of their work, which draws on multiple genres: academic interdisciplinarity as read through critical essays, poetry, dramas, films, songs, and dance. These are in part histories as performances, invested in critical vocabularies, gender and women’s studies, and artistic expressions. As David Hanlon has said about the “decentered” materials and practices of Pacific narrations, “One begins to realize . . . that the practice of history in Oceania is something quite distinct from what is commonly understood to be the practice of history in the Euro-American world.”

“History” is partly an academic enterprise, but also self-consciously a wrestling with forms and practices of histories: sources visual and artistic, forms poetic and epic, actions and projects materially realized. These include Oceanic festivals of cultural appreciation and renaissance, such as that developed as Melanésie 2000 by the New Caledonian Kanak leader Jean-Marie Tjibaou; the creation of the 1970s Hokule’a canoes, which demonstrated the possibilities of sailing without instruments, navigating only by the stars, from Hawai‘i to Tahiti; or the advocacy of “Oceanic” arts and musical forms at the University of the South Pacific at Suva, Fiji.

Autobiographical modes and dance performances are not simply, or even largely, points of self-expression, but rather experiments with “Pacific” ways of communicating knowledge, drawing on epistemologies of oral and movement traditions, and fabulist tales and humor as forms of cultural and historical knowledge. Such approaches are constitutive of the sort of creative and often locale-specific studies that


have had resonance in other narratives: detailed microhistories excavated for their connections to global historical transformations, tilted always at the edge of postcolonial and neocolonial debates—what Tarcisius Kabutaulaka called “the bigness of our smallness.”

With respect to long-standing historical and anthropological interests in ritual, kinship, and imperial policy, Pacific scholars have increasingly highlighted concerns with contemporary legacies of colonialism and indigeneity, and have used academic positions, journals, and conferences as active forums for self-reflexive “native voices” to present, advocate, and criticize their own intellectual authority and subject positions as scholars. Scholars such as Malama Meleisea, David W. Gegeo, and Caroline Sinavaiana-Gabbard have addressed such challenges by widely interrogating and employing postcolonial critiques and methodologies. Vilsoni Hereniko, Teresa Teaiwa, and J. Kehaulani Kauanui have likewise not only actively pursued intellectual and institutional critiques, but also championed the logic of a “new” historiography of practice shaped around the integration of personal narrative, performance, and activism within an academic apparatus. A 1978 essay by Meleisea used such self-identification to comment, “I know of a number of foreign scholars in Samoa, for example, who have been given valuable historical and genealogical information which would be denied me on the grounds of my status as an untitled man and because it would be suspected that I might use it to further any political ambitions I might have.”

Equally challenging, the reconstruction of organizing narratives regularly draws on ethnographic evidence, often transmitted through tales. Such tales, recounting deeds of deities or ancestors, are studied and maintained by scholars not merely as folkloric preludes or “prehistoric” mythologies, but as sources of cultural continuity and evidence of active and formative political action. Hawaiian scholar and activist Haunani-Kay Trask famously prefaced a collection of essays, “Despite American political and territorial control of Hawai‘i since 1898, Hawaiians are not Americans.”
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Nor are we Europeans or Asians. We are not from the Pacific Rim, nor are we immigrants to the Pacific, we are the children of Papa, earth mother, and Wakea, sky father, who created the sacred lands of Hawai’i nei.” Ancient tales inform a comprehensive historical cosmology of settlement patterns, social structure, agriculture, sustenance, and trade. The employment of such genealogies and inherited practice has come under scholarly fire as “invented tradition,” underscoring the high stakes and active challenges yet involved in the forging of “authentic” Pacific histories from multiple nonstandard sources.38

It is little wonder that one of the most salient narratives concerning the early historical Pacific developed around debates leading to the Hokule’a voyages of the 1970s. The challenge of retracing the fabled routes of ancestors in outrigger sailing canoes was and is emblematic of both Pacific and “Oceanic” histories. Beginning with scholarly division about the possibilities of intentional sailing across the open ocean before the European age, the re-creation and sailing of vessels according to “traditional” methods defied archive-dominant historical knowledge. The deliberately performative engagement of history—part scientific mission, part drama—not only served to satisfy scholars and journalists, but also gave visibility to an acted ancient-contemporary continuity, sparking Pacific-wide celebrations of cultural pride and claims for historical integrity. The crews, in cooperation and conflict, also were emblematic—haole (white or foreign) academics from the American mainland, the Hawaiian navigator Nainoa Thompson, and the revered teacher Mau Piailug, who helped link Polynesia to its past by drawing on his own heritage from the Marshalls in Micronesia.39

The storytelling aspects of these “new histories” have been controversial at times, yet they in no way suggest an abandonment of historical narration. The Pacific is simply a “civilization without a center,” an Oceanic space of movement, transit, and migration in a longue durée of local peoples and broad interactions, what Rob Wilson and Arif Dirlik call “heteroglossic spatiality.”40 Major academic surveys of the field—textbooks—engage this principle, declining strictly territorial or national-specific approaches in favor of thematic chronicles. Douglas Oliver’s “standard” Pacific Islands survey ranges around an insular Pacific connected by migrations, a scope that Kerry Howe’s Where the Waves Fall deepens with emphases on Islander-actors
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shaping temporalities from archaeological pasts and nineteenth-century trading networks, migrations, and imperial administrations. This design is also favored by I. C. Campbell’s *A History of the Pacific Islands*, which emphasizes the mutual appropriations and exploitations of cultures in contact. A volume on the twentieth century edited by Robert Kiste with K. R. Howe and Brij V. Lal ranges across areas and specialties from colonialism to religion, trade, and warfare along the currents of a “tides of history” metaphor. Donald Denoon’s edited *Cambridge History of the Pacific Islanders* offers up multiple essays and island contexts both ethnographic and institutional with scholarly authority. Robert Borofsky’s *Remembrance of Pacific Pasts* adopts a postcolonial strategy of multiple textual interrogations and narrative irresolution in an invitation to “remake history,” framed by Vilsoni Hereniko’s challenge to “indigenous knowledge and academic imperialism.” In a singular voice, Deryck Scarr offers *A History of the Pacific Islands: Passages through Tropical Time* (partly written while he was shipboard) as history deeply invested in nautical sensibilities—thematic discussions encompassing centuries shaped around organizing metaphors of seaways, oceangoing canoes, ports, schooners, trade vessels, and warships.41

All of these are projects in repudiation of the “isolation” and limited possibilities of a distant or empty Pacific. The narratives, written to provincialize European tales of “discovery,” “paradise,” and “development,” capture the living nature of Oceanic histories and support newly mobile readings of “custom” and “tradition,” revived from artifactual stillness in cabinets of curiosities. The Oceanic approach studies islands as sites of robust and dynamic exchange networks rather than small, isolated points. Even economies, rather than being “underdeveloped,” are motivated by sophisticated gifting and kinship creation. As Nicholas Thomas and Marilyn Strathern have suggested, these are societies deeply implicated in—rather than innocent of—regional, global, and colonial exchanges in objects, arms, and peoples.42

The interrelational narratives of Oceanic histories are particularly rich and contested where Islander stories are matched against other global histories of seaborne empires emanating from European states and kingdoms, creating theaters of encounter and contact, instigating tales of conquest, mission faiths, and commodity commerce. With the coming of Europeans, especially in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, early contact narratives develop into new categorical analyses of hybrid societies and communities with seafarers, beachcombers, traders, and castaways, each weighing benefits and dangers. As I. C. Campbell has suggested, the meanings of first meetings are encoded by sharing and misunderstanding, from cannibalism to religion and trade with cultures and practices taken from and “introduced” from Asia.43

Greg Dening has articulated many of the key questions by reading contact as a
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moment that has been lost by the dominance of colonial historiography, trying to reconstruct initial encounters—extending over decades in most cases—as not reflexively shaped by the organized and unequal power relations of guns, germs, and steel. Although this was clearly true for long-term devastating effects, early meetings have been reimagined as situations of appropriation, indeed collaboration and mutual engagement.44

Multiple scholars have searched for what Richard White has called “the middle ground,” underscoring the development of performative and hybrid cultures, at times seeing postmodernist bricolage notions of identity fashioning by reading the ways in which European sailors took Islander things and acquired them, while Islanders took on European artifacts, as well as practices and armaments. These appropriations and employments could be rich and polyglot, as languages and religion, or ferocious—the Pomares in Tahiti or Kamehameha in Hawai‘i adopted military technologies and tactics to wage war to attain political supremacy in their islands in the early nineteenth century. Oceanic narratives increasingly underscore these interrelational exchanges, adoptions, and transformations. Some intersect multiple categories, such as Damon Salesa’s readings of overlapping “racial” typologies, colonial institutions, and military histories.45

This complexity has helped to problematize concurrent major narratives, such as those of “fatal impact” and paradisiacal exoticism. Built into Pacific diasporic and encounter stories are the demographic fates of peoples and lands marked by theories of inevitable decline, cultural fragmentation, and degeneration. Some of these tales have been rendered since the nineteenth century as grim chronicles of disease and “ecological imperialism.” These spoliations were first rendered, generations previously, as indicators of moral decline, as Diderot suggested: “before the corruption of manners which unhappily characterizes civilized regions, may reach that innocent race of men, who live here fortunate in their ignorance and simplicity.”46 Melville propagated this tendency; civilization was a poison, leading to ultimate extinction for which the Pacific could be a momentary remedy, a place to regenerate—or to die. Catastrophic epidemics reinforced these narratives with deadly effectiveness.

“Fatal impact” challenges have broached both epidemiological and cultural lines
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of argument. David E. Stannard’s *Before the Horror* and multiple studies of disease and politics have created controversy, and also fields of study that trace the devastation of local populations without recourse to the elegiac narrative of extinction. Such histories crosscut and separate formerly inextricable teleologies, pointing up the appalling legacies of biological and ecological depredation while counterpointing continuities and survivals of local cultures.

As the literary allusions above suggest, legacies from this era outside the immediate domain of Pacific specialists are found largely in the analyses of enduring tropes springing from Pacific and European histories: the foundational confirmation and inevitable loss of Noble Savages deriving from the heyday of the age of European exploration. These involve rereadings of Magellan, Cook, La Perouse, and Bougainville, their legacies and reports, and the shaping of the Pacific in early modern Europe. This is the specific historical moment that has most shaped visions of the Pacific as a space of paradisiacal idylls, of exoticism, sexuality, and savagery, of escape, or of transit to better things—the fabulous mysteries and wealth of Asia and India. Such stories created the *European* Pacific of the Enlightenment that became the distant penal colonies and melancholy “paradise lost” of colonialism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

This Pacific was initially generated from multiple sources and institutions of purported change, enlightenment, and civilization, such as the Christian religious legacies of missionization that spread from continental emplacements in East and Southeast Asia and South America into the mid-Pacific at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Historiographically, this is a significant age of disputed legacies: of power and ideology contested through religion, soon entangled with science and epistemology. Both archival and ethnographic studies continue to grapple with the meanings of “conversion,” the logic of salvation for missionaries and Pacific peoples—the two would eventually become one and the same—and the alliances between faith, politics, and competitions for legitimation between outlander and Islander authorities. Much of the scholarly work deals with male and female engagements with faith, intersections with local politics, and appropriations and adaptations of multiple sources of belief and practice.
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The Pacific is one of the great areas of study for such intersections of religion, science, and cultural politics. Darwin’s famous voyage and observations in the Galapagos Islands are the foundation of the natural history that developed as evolutionary theory, while the human sciences are controversially indebted to models developed to “explain” social and cultural behaviors by using Pacific “laboratories” in the early twentieth century.

Such culture and “acculturation” models moved away from simple analyses of primitivism, and focused on the discursive constitution of scholarly narratives themselves. The intellectual history of the Pacific for academics has particularly been borne by two anthropologists who became icons in the West: Margaret Mead and Bronislaw Malinowski. Since the elemental simplicities and cyclical verities popularized by Mead’s *Coming of Age in Samoa* and the ritual and customary details of Malinowski’s *The Sexual Life of Savages* (Trobriand Islands), the model of historian as anthropologist—studying the other up close—has been powerful and also invested in self-critique, with the investigator recognized as inseparable partner and nemesis in narrations of ethnographic reality. Although Mead popularized new anthropological possibilities focused on female subjects and women’s practices, and Malinowski set a standard for rigorous fieldwork and detailed observational studies, both have proven controversial for the ways in which their personal lives intersected their scientific personas. This legacy is important. Works that transgress the boundaries of the scientific and self-reflexive, and are ultimately as much about the researcher’s critique of self or discipline, are familiar in Pacific studies. They are particularly noteworthy where they study the very academic assumptions that constitute objects of study, and question the authority of the observer.

One such area of contest is the iconic phenomenon called “cargo cult,” the supposed millennial worship of material fetishes (the ubiquitous refrigerator) and legendary saviors (John Frum) by Solomon Islanders in the later twentieth century. Reading these practices in terms of American consumerism and situating them in post–Pacific War national liberation histories, scholars such as Lamont Lindstrom have suggested that “cargo cult” is actually a double narrative: a compulsive tale about primitive reverence for magical goods (actually an expression of Westerners’ own obsession with consumerism and “progress”), and an Islander’s very different adherence to locally generated practices tied to political and spiritual organization and anticolonialism. The interrelational approach marks the characteristic disputed
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The legacies of Pacific histories and ties them to global Oceanic contests over cultural and political autonomy.51

The contested give-and-take of many of these histories has its roots in the distorted relations of power, hegemony, and accommodation of the nineteenth-century colonial age in the Pacific. General narratives chronicle British settler colonies and strategic interventions, the French presence in Tahiti and New Caledonia, struggles with missions, gunboat diplomacy, and the encoding of narrations that are peculiar to the Pacific, such as “the Romance of the South Seas.”52 Margaret Jolly and other Pacific scholars have engaged such typologies both by playing out their literary and visual representations following art historical and “Orientalist” critiques of Pacific imagery, and by building sovereignty politics and direct colonial critique into gendered postcolonial examinations of corporeal, sexual, racialized, and familial instantiations of authority and imperial possession.53

For scholarship both north and south of the equator, the nineteenth century is a period that concomitantly sees the formal articulation of Islander, Asian, American, and European interactions and dependencies on a global geopolitical stage, shaping categories that define the Pacific to this day. Reinscribed trading and, now, colonial outposts institutionally locate the political and imperial boundaries of what Braudel referenced analogically as the “multiple” Mediterraneans and Atlantics. Here, Polynesian commercial routes and Melanesian trade become parts of a system of hemispheric commercial exchange, as new market commodities tied to treaties and profits in Asia—notably Japan after the Perry missions and the Canton Chinese trading ports—propelled the growth of the “Pacific Rim” in the nineteenth century.

Exploitation of the sandalwood trade, bêche-de-mer (sea cucumber), and copra, and the land clearings of cotton and sugar plantations ignited the creation of a “people trade.” Scholars have focused on the practices of blackbirders, recruiters, and slavers, tracing movements and circulation of both voluntary and forced labor.54
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Where coercion and opportunity were ambiguously in tension, these researches famously include studies by Dorothy Shineberg, tracing Hebridean peoples and groups from the Solomons who were taken to the Northern Territories plantations of Australia, and especially to New Caledonia. Such movements also included Javanese, Japanese, and Vietnamese migrating into New Caledonia, and at the other extremity of the Pacific, the infamous “Slavers in Paradise” kidnapping of populations to excavate guano in Peru. Most famous, perhaps, are the contract and indentured laborers from India who were imported into Fiji to develop plantations for the British crown. These immigrants established themselves and became a demographic majority in the twentieth century, creating a multiethnic society troubled by legacies of empire, immigration, and nativist struggles between Fijians and Indians over political representation, land rights, and economic interests.55

In the north, histories that began with ancient migrations from Asia and South-east Asia millennia ago reconnect by drawing Asia and North America dramatically back to the center of Pacific narrations. These look to whalers and traders, and especially to 1898 and the end-marking of the old Spanish Empire in the Pacific with American domination in Guam, the Philippines, and the kingdom of Hawai‘i. In Hawai‘i, the turn of the century was the culmination of decades of political and economic struggle and accommodation between island peoples and mainland planter aristocracies, royal juggling of interests in land ownership and political influence, trials over access to trading and naval ports, and, finally, armed overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy. The U.S. government officially apologized for the seizure in 1993, setting the stage for reparations debates over Islander sovereignty, land, education, and financial resources.56

These histories underscore again our resonant question: Who is part of the Pacific? Asian American scholars such as Gary Okihiro, Ronald Takaki, Evelyn Hu-Dehart, Lisa Lowe, Sucheng Chan, and Jonathan Okamura have famously narrated the trans-Pacific experiences of Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos, and other Asians in American territories (both north and south) and plantation economies, giving ethnographic richness to prosaic tales of hardship by reconstructing working and family lives.57 Here, the histories of the Asias, the Americas, and Oceania interact—at times within narratives of a “multicultural” society, at times within grim tales of racial violence, plantation labor, and class exploitation.58 The social histories of Chinese,
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Korean, Filipino, and Japanese immigrants have shaped the Northern Pacific narrations of everyday life for planters, laborers, prisoners, writers, teachers, and priests whose presence and actions are otherwise marked in the context of American exclusion acts and “yellow peril” rhetoric. Critically, this literature continues to seek forms for interrogating a hybrid culture of Asian and Pacific influences bounded within labor-market capitalism and the cultural preservation ethics of the later twentieth century.

These histories of struggle and claims for inclusion while maintaining distinction are not strictly American. Inflected by national and regional differences, they are played out across the Pacific among Vietnamese, Malaysians, and Chinese in Australia and New Caledonia, Cook Islanders in New Zealand, and any number of peoples in Fiji, Indonesia, and French Polynesia. Indeed, one of the most resonant and studied chapters of Oceanic history has been that which questions economic development and dependency, and the access of Pacific peoples to labor and resources. Regular debates focus on labor out-migration from Pacific territories—tying back into diasporic conceptions of Oceanic peoples, yet also framed within “remittance economy” questions and reassessments of “limited” local economies.59

The “Who is part of the Pacific?” question also falls across Pacific histories dedicated to worldwide conflict. “Pacific War” chronicles pay close attention to the motives and actions of European, American, and Asian national belligerents, yet surprisingly little to Pacific peoples. World War I in Europe redistributed German colonial authority in Papua New Guinea, in Samoa, and around the Marshall Islands, with concessions made as mandates to Japan in Micronesia. The turbulent seas of the 1930s and 1940s have been framed by the diplomatic-political maneuvering of the Pacific War itself—Japanese invasions of China, American responses, and colonial empires under pressure in Indochina, the Dutch East Indies, and the Philippines. Yet narratives of Pearl Harbor, Midway, Guadalcanal, “island-hopping,” and Iwo Jima are largely stories of American and Japanese imperial collision, heroism, villainy, and sacrifice, with little account of Pacific Island peoples.

Chronicles, often in Bislama and local languages of the “Big Death,” have transformed this tumultuous period with oral narrations of shifting, often treacherous alliances and loyalties, volunteerism, and cooperation from scouts, conscripts, and “coastwatchers.” Island veterans’ groups have extolled new heroes such as Jacob Vouza and the Tahitian battalions sent by the French to fight in Europe, and they have praised and condemned both Japanese forces and American landing and bombing operations from local viewpoints. Most of all, such oral and commemorative
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reconstructions move beyond “loyal native” and “fuzzy-wuzzy angel” characterizations to form the basis for histories that capture the Pacific at a moment not only of external violence, but of resulting internal weakness—the delegitimation and fracturing of colonial institutions and imperial authority.60 Continuing disputes over colonial legacies are present in the island trust territories that were taken as mandates and strategic bases during the Cold War. Such implantations reorganized the map of the Pacific into bases of American power in the Philippines, Hawai‘i, Guam, and Micronesia by linking their economies and statuses to military and political contests in China, Taiwan, Korea, and Vietnam.61

The critical mass of this era is felt with perhaps the greatest global impact at the intersection of technology, coral atolls, and ecological spoliation: the atomic and later nuclear testing that began at Bikini in the late 1940s and was continued by the Americans, British, and French into the 1960s and 1990s as a prerogative of national power and colonial domination. The “resettlement” theme in Pacific history is given one of its cruelest twists by the forced evacuation of Bikini Islanders in the name of American authority and science, and their reclassification as “nomadic” peoples presumably capable of reestablishing themselves on any number of Micronesian islands. The ecological threats and reef destruction of testing resulted in a multination ban on nuclear material in the Pacific, and the criminal sinking of the Greenpeace ship Rainbow Warrior by agents of the French government in Auckland Harbor also sharpened resistance to the neocolonial political effrontery of continental powers.62 Numerous studies have subsequently examined the peculiarities of French territorial rule in terms that unite Gauguin-type artistic legacies with statist imperial power.63

The contests are long. In some Pacific worlds, struggles and legacies concerning
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colonialism are both past and present. Nationalist movements, at times accompanied by armed violence, mark histories since the 1980s from the Solomons and New Caledonia to Fiji and Tahiti, many of them inscribed with unresolved questions of race and male and female roles and representations. Contention also continues in Australia, a regional superpower with economic weight through its agricultural production and manufacturing, and political and military capabilities for intervention (especially 1999–2003) in East Timor and in the Solomons. The government at Canberra reckons with anxieties over an increasing Asian population from China, Singapore, and Malaysia, and a grim history of encounters with Aboriginal peoples, whose culture it struggles to recognize officially at sites such as its National Museum. Aotearoa New Zealand equally reckons with Maori claims by adjudicating land settlements, and through artistic projects, museum exhibitions, and heritage and tourist promotion in Rotorua.
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Indeed, “tourism” is a category with particularly wide resonance in the Pacific. Debates focus on whether the increasing impact of leisure and entertainment economies is transforming the Pacific into a theme park, whether through the enforced folklorism of the Polynesian Cultural Center in Hawai‘i, activist attacks on Japanese and American capital in Waikiki and “corporate prostitution,” or the great impact on local economies of cruise ship charters to Tahiti and “cannibal tours” in Melanesia. The play between history and culture is a large question, and critics of tourism, while not opposing visitors, fear and loathe mass commodification of “tradition.”

Scholar-activists propose “culture” as a messy historical process, drawing out the problematic simplifications and appropriations of tradition and “kastom” in the Pacific as a means to shape a genuine sense of a local culture and “Pacific Way,” deeply tied to family and clan and recognition of the earth and sea. Some of these attempts have struggled to integrate different forms of law and customary practice; others have been employed to sharply critique strong differences that remain between regional ethnic groups, and male and female access to political and economic rights behind consumer-friendly representations.

Pacific histories remain narrations formed at the confluence of different tides from academic scholarship, political activism, and creative arts and literature. The Oceanic vision is composed by document and fiction, archives, film, poetry, chants, dances, novels, and writing by island researchers, writers, and scholars. It is a field awash with predicaments and tensions in examining pop culture and representation—tourism, film, writing, and music drawn from inherited tales and practices, linked to enduring questions of identities and sovereignties. These surface in vi-
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sions of navigation and Chamorro tastes from Vince Diaz and others, to ritual heiau ceremonies, to postcolonial literature from Albert Wendt, Keri Hulme, and Sia Figiel, to tales of community experience and individual vision from Alan Duff to Grace Molisa to Lois-Ann Yamanaka, writing in mixed idioms of Hawaiian, Maohi, Maori, Fijian, Samoan, or pidgin languages.70

All of these create shifting realms of surfaces and depths. Many questions remain. To what degree do Pacific Island histories and histories of East and Southeast Asia remain distinct disciplines, and how should these be understood? Is the Pacific a colonial or postcolonial realm? What methodologies will best suit research where academic scholarship has been only one approach to fashioning histories? The approach here has been to map some of the confluent narratives: ancient navigations, colonial labor markets and migrations, strategic policy, and culture networks. Re-fashioning these narratives will be the work that runs below and through islands and continents connected by water, spaces, times, and places that in their multiple conjunctures define the histories of an Oceanic Pacific.
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