

The Ancestors We Get to Choose White Influences I Won't Deny

The title of this chapter addresses concepts of both identity and intellectual genealogy in Pacific Studies, which is the field in which I work. As we describe it in our program publicity and literature at Te Whare Wānanga o Te Ūpoko o te Ika a Māui, Victoria University of Wellington, “Pacific Studies is an interdisciplinary programme of study that is international and cross-cultural in scope.”¹ Also known as Pacific Islands Studies at other institutions, this subfield of area studies can take as its broadest geopolitical boundary markers Timor Leste, West Papua, and the Philippines to the west; Aotearoa (New Zealand) to the south; Rapanui (Easter Island) to the east; and Hawai‘i to the north. However, the history of diasporic movements of Pacific peoples beyond the Pacific, which intensified in the twentieth century and continues in the twenty-first, has meant that Pacific Studies has to account for ever expanding cultural geographies. Pacific Studies needs to be understood as a project that is distinct from Native studies, because the former is about an inherently plural space—the region—whereas the latter is often focused on a single nation or ethnicity.² But as Vicente M. Diaz and J. Kēhaulani Kauanui argue, the existence of Pacific diasporas simultaneously requires and has been productive of an analytical approach that is attentive to what is both Native and Pacific about the new cultural and intellectual spaces in which diasporic Pacific people find themselves.³ This chapter may be read, therefore, as a reckoning with what is Native about Pacific Studies; it is also, inevitably, a subversion of it.

It has been routinely acknowledged in both anthropological scholarship on Pacific cultures and biographical and theoretical writing by Pacific Islands scholars that genealogy is central to the formation of Pacific subjectivity.⁴ In response to works by Pacific Islands scholars, there have also

emerged some clear expressions of suspicion and anxiety around the potentially fascist or ethno-nationalist turns in the use of genealogical (often conflated with genetic) discourse.⁵ Such anxieties, however, often fail to account for one of the foundational characteristics of kinship in the Pacific—the capacity (and, indeed, in some cases the preference) for assimilating Otherness through a variety of means that have genealogical implications: adoption, feeding, the exchange of land, titles, gifts, and names.⁶

So let me perform some moves to authenticate myself as a Native Indigenous person. In the culture of my father's people, te I-Banaba, from the central Pacific Islands of Kiribati, there is no such thing as being part Banaban. You either are or you aren't Banaban. Mixed blood does not lessen one's claim to being Banaban or one's authority as a Banaban. As a result, intermarriage is not threatening to Banaban people. But Banabans have never been satisfied with intermarriage as a way of strengthening their gene pool. A key feature of our social organization is adoption.⁷ But adoption in our culture is not just about adults adopting children. Among Banabans, it is common for adults to be adopted as children, and for adults to be adopted as siblings. What seals the deal in an adoption is the allocation of land to the adopted person. In our knowledge system, land is equivalent to blood. So when land is given to a newly adopted member of a family, it is for all intents and purposes a blood transfusion. The adopted family member now has the blood of the family.⁸

My second authenticating move is to invoke the words of someone with whom I am not related by blood (or land), but whom I consider an elder—a recently deceased elder from the Cook Islands, a group of Polynesian islands east of New Zealand and west of French Polynesia. Papa Tom Davis was of mixed European and Rarotongan heritage. His distinguished international career is marked by his becoming the first Cook Islander to graduate from a New Zealand medical school; his being a yachting enthusiast; his employment as a scientist at Harvard, as nutritionist for NASA, and as the second prime minister of the Cook Islands; and as a key figure in the revitalization of the Cook Islands heritage of oceangoing canoe building and navigation. It was in this last area of interest that Papa Tom was most irreverent and iconoclastic: when selecting a design for one of the first oceangoing canoes that he would lead Cook Islanders to build in the twentieth century, he did not choose an authentic Cook Island design; instead he chose to replicate a Fijian traditional vessel called a *drua*. After having difficulties with sourcing natural materials for and maintaining wooden canoes, he was recorded saying, "If my ancestors had fiberglass they would

have used it.”⁹ Papa Tom passed away in 2007, and he was mourned not only by his family and Cook Islanders but across the Pacific, and by Pacific peoples and others around the world. So in addition to invoking an elder, I have invoked someone who has joined the ancestors—a doubly authenticating move in many Indigenous worlds. But the elder and ancestor I have invoked was not someone who slavishly pursued Indigenous authenticity for its own sake.

The two moves of authentication that I have used simultaneously function to destabilize certain notions of and about indigeneity. When education itself is often coded as a process of “whitening” for Indigenous communities, it sometimes seems that “we” should emphasize Indigenous influences over others in our lives.¹⁰ Without intending to marginalize my Indigenous intellectual ancestors, I direct my reflection here toward the implications of being influenced by white theorists, explicitly acknowledging that influence, and critically mobilizing that influence in my work as a teacher of undergraduate students in Pacific Studies.

In order to appreciate how I came to take the particular approach that I do as a teacher, however, some background on my own academic trajectory may help. I grew up in the early post-independence period in the Pacific Islands of Fiji, in a population where white people were a small minority whose social and political privileges were evident but not entirely enviable, perhaps because the Eurocentric effects of the formal education system that prevailed in the islands were ameliorated by a multicultural cadre of teachers, who had a sufficient degree of ambivalence about the ultimate costs of complete westernization. Fiji, I believe, gave me a combination of resilience and confidence as a person of color, so that when I arrived in the United States to undertake undergraduate studies, I was neither awed by nor resentful of banal assumptions of white supremacy. I should also add that I did not arrive in the United States with a sense of entitlement, and was keenly aware of the sacrifices that enabled me to bridge the world of my father in Fiji, and the one that my mother had come from in the United States.

I earned a BA in history, with a minor in Spanish and political science, from a women’s Catholic liberal arts college in Washington, DC. A political theory professor, someone with whom I had studied only in my last semester as an undergraduate, nominated me for election to Phi Beta Kappa just before I graduated. Although I did not feel as if I had been especially adept in her course, she seemed to like the way I engaged European political thought from Plato to Marx. I do not know if my professor realized it, but had it not been for Marx, I probably would not have become inter-

ested in political theory in the first place. And it was significant that I had been introduced to Marx, not through the pages of a university syllabus, but through friends I had made in the Socialist Worker Party when I had been on a study abroad program during my sophomore year. While I do not require my students in Pacific Studies to read Marx, my own reading of his theory has profoundly influenced the way I think and teach.

I went on to complete an MA in history at the University of Hawai‘i; my major field of study was Pacific history and my minor field of study was European intellectual history. A catalytic experience for me as part of the MA, however, was taking an elective course in the Hawaiian Studies Department—Haunani-Kay Trask’s first ever decolonization seminar. Trask assigned readings by revolutionary writers from outside the Pacific, such as Frantz Fanon and Malcolm X, and important activists and theorists of sovereignty and independence movements inside the Pacific, such as Donna Awatere from Aotearoa, New Zealand, and Susanna Ounei from Kanaky, New Caledonia. Among the compelling lineup of writers and activists of color that Trask required her students to read was the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci; and as I will discuss presently, I have endeavored to continue her tradition.

After Hawai‘i, my educational journey took me to the University of California, Santa Cruz, where I enrolled in a PhD in History of Consciousness. Those who know the reputation of that interdisciplinary program will understand how its students might appear to have overdosed on theory—I certainly found myself reeling often from the potent cocktails of cultural studies, discourse analysis, women-of-color feminism, and postcolonial theory I encountered there. As a result of this eclectic educational background, and in spite of falling victim to occasional bouts of nationalism and reverse racism (usually in reaction to the heightened oppositional identity politics of the US academy in the 1990s), my experience of theory has mostly been one of valuing ideas, and in particular valuing the ability to identify connections and resonances and distinguish gaps and contradictions between models and proposals. I do not like theory when it is used as a weapon. I especially dislike theory when it is used like a silencer on a gun. I prefer to see and use theory as a frame, a magnifying glass, a key, a plow, a sail, an oar. Theory is like fiberglass as well—I have found, like Papa Tom, that it can get you where you want to go, faster.

So I now teach Pacific Studies at Victoria University of Wellington (also known as vuw or Victoria), in Aotearoa, New Zealand. Having outlined a bit of my own educational pedigree, the parts of the genealogy of Pacific

Studies that I want to share here are profoundly patriarchal, masculine, and significantly white. I admit this but make no apologies for it because I am now sharing the genealogy outside of the specific pedagogical and curricular context in which I introduce students to Pacific Studies. Suffice it to say that on average our students are exposed to more writings and works by Native and Indigenous Pacific scholars, writers, artists, and activists than others.

The thoughts I put forward in this chapter arise out of Pacific Studies—a field of academic practices that turns sixty-three years old in 2013. It is a comparatively young field in relation to the more established fields of science, mathematics, and classics in the Western academy. David Shorter described the 2007 and 2008 gatherings of a critical mass of scholars joined in critical reflection (Who are we? Where are we going?) as a point of maturation for a movement, which culminated in the formalization of the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association. In contrast, practitioners in the field of Pacific Studies have largely resisted engaging in such collective self-reflexivity; while we have enthusiastically embraced opportunities to share our research specializations in academic conferences, there have been few attempts to thoroughly interrogate the project of Pacific Studies itself.¹¹ In fact, what remains the most lucid intellectual stock-take of the field, in my opinion, is an article from 1995 by a white male practitioner in the field, Terence Wesley-Smith.

In his landmark work, “Rethinking Pacific Islands Studies,” Wesley-Smith charts the emergence of Pacific Studies in metropolitan universities (the University of Hawai‘i and the Australian National University) during the post–World War II period and describes three rationales for the establishment and development of these and subsequent programs. The first rationale for Pacific Studies is “pragmatic,” shaped by metropolitan-colonial and neocolonial interests and ostensibly aimed at getting to know “one’s friends as well as one’s enemies.” The pragmatic rationale generated research on behalf of the state, or in the national interest.¹² The second rationale for Pacific Studies that Wesley-Smith identifies is “laboratory,” and is predicated on what were presumed to be the ideal conditions for conducting scientific and social scientific research: mostly small and relatively isolated island societies. The laboratory rationale was attractive to and conducive for discipline-based studies.¹³ The third rationale is “empowerment.” Pacific Studies in this scenario can no longer primarily be about abstracted or objectified knowledge about the Pacific Islands or peoples; the academic field must instead contribute to advancing the best interests of the region.

The empowerment rationale for Pacific Studies involves research by and for Pacific peoples, and as a result, the very terms for academic research are also called into question. In a Pacific Studies project shaped by the empowerment rationale, the methods, standards, form, and content are no longer taken as given by the academy. Simple competence—or even excellence—in existing academic standards may be a source of empowerment for some Pacific Studies students and scholars; for others, what is desired is nothing less than a transformation of the field.¹⁴ Surprisingly, Wesley-Smith’s article has not been taken up very much by people who claim to be working in Pacific Studies. An issue of the journal *Contemporary Pacific* (a top-tier refereed journal in Pacific studies), published to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Center for Pacific Islands Studies at the University of Hawai‘i, contains few references to his article.¹⁵ Ironically, Wesley-Smith was coeditor of the volume—he is a modest man! He is a white man. Wesley-Smith is also a graduate of vuw.

When students enter our program and take the first-year introductory course “The Pacific Heritage,” I recount for them a genealogy of Pacific Studies at vuw. For me it is crucial that our students get a sense very early on that they become heirs to a specific academic tradition when they enroll. In the genealogical recitation that they are given, one of the early founding fathers is a man named J. C. Beaglehole. I tell my students how Beaglehole graduated from our university in 1924 before he went on to complete a PhD at the London School of Economics. After completing his PhD, Beaglehole returned to Victoria, where he taught until his retirement in 1966. He became world famous for editing, annotating, and publishing the journals of James Cook’s expeditions to the Pacific; it was a process that took him seventeen years to complete.¹⁶ These volumes have been the most reprinted and best-selling New Zealand texts of all time—essential references for Pacific historians and iconic texts in Pacific Studies. While I acknowledge the ambivalence, if not antipathy, with which many Native Hawaiian scholars and activists regard Cook, the truth is that it is precisely because of the work that Beaglehole did to bring Cook’s journals to new generations of readers that we are able to critically engage the age of European exploration in our region.¹⁷ In 1970 when Beaglehole was awarded the British Order of Merit, an honor accorded to only 24 living recipients, the university recognized his achievements by naming its library’s rare and special collections after him. However, Beaglehole’s academic career had not been without struggle: as an avid believer in academic freedom, and as someone who had criticized attempts to persecute communists in the academy, he had faced

several disheartening professional obstacles.¹⁸ Beaglehole was a hardworking man. He was a white man.

Chronologically, the next most significant figure in our genealogy of Pacific Studies is another white man, J. W. Davidson. Davidson graduated from Victoria in 1938. He went on to a doctoral program at Cambridge, which he completed in 1942, and a few years later he was offered the first-ever professorial chair in Pacific history at the newly established Australian National University. As chair in Pacific history, Davidson also became the first director of the Research School in Pacific Studies, and he gathered around him an energetic cohort of graduate students whom he promptly dispatched to go off to research and write up historical investigations of the Pacific. Much like their mentor, many of these students (mostly white) were on fire with a fervent post-World War II belief in rights to self-determination. Davidson's magnum opus was provocatively titled *Samoa mo Samoa* (Samoa for Samoans).¹⁹ He advocated centering the islands in historical research and writing about the Pacific; this went against the grain of imperialist and Euro-centered work that Beaglehole and previous generations of historians had produced. On account of the generosity and sincerity that Davidson displayed in both his written work and his relationships with Samoans, he was invited to help author the constitution of the independent nation-state of Western Samoa.²⁰ In fact, Davidson was such a widely trusted man across the Pacific that when Papua New Guinea—another nation of fiercely proud and astute people—was approaching its own independence, Davidson was invited to participate in its constitutional convention as well. Sadly, he died in a car crash while in Papua New Guinea for that purpose in 1973.²¹ Davidson was a man whom Pacific Islanders trusted. He was a white man.

One of Davidson's many Australian National University students was another graduate of Victoria, a man widely known as Papa Ron Crocombe. Crocombe graduated from Victoria with an MA in 1957, and early in the 1960s he went over to Canberra to study with Davidson. Crocombe's PhD research was on land tenure in the Cook Islands, and the monograph he developed from that stands as the most authoritative work on the subject to this day.²² Surpassing Davidson in his dedication to "island-centered" approaches to the Pacific, Crocombe became a zealous advocate for the publication of Pacific voices and analyses. When he became the first director of the Institute for Pacific Studies established at the University of the South Pacific in 1976, that was his mandate. He was almost rabid in his pursuit of Pacific authors to publish. He did not care if they were formally edu-

cated or not—his mission was to record, disseminate, and validate Pacific knowledge and perspectives. Tributes on his sudden passing at the age of seventy-nine in 2009 noted that under his watchful eye, the Institute of Pacific Studies had published more than 1,700 Pacific Islanders.²³ Crocombe believed in an *islander*-centered Pacific Studies. Yet he was a white man.

The first brown man to appear in the genealogy of Pacific Studies that I present to my first-year students is the Samoan novelist and professor of English Albert Wendt, who graduated from Victoria with both his BA and MA in history in the 1960s. Wendt is profoundly influential on the field and on my own thought and teaching.²⁴ And of course, the majority of students are able to identify with him to a certain extent because he is brown. (The average class size for this first-year course is sixty-five, of which about 60 percent are of Pacific Island heritage, about 10 percent are Maori, and about 5 percent are Asian, and at least 25 percent are white.) In spite of these demographics, I resist the urge to locate Wendt at the beginning of the genealogy of Pacific Studies. For me, it is important that my students are able to see through both this recitation and their own reading of Wesley-Smith's article that the origins of the field that we inherit at university are unavoidably white and colonial. There is nothing wrong with admitting that. To deny it and try to locate the origins of Pacific Studies in some pure Indigenous intellectual activity that predates universities would be disingenuous.

To deny the white origins of the field would also be to deny the extraordinary political, intellectual, and academic activism of the white men and later the native Pacific Islander academics and intellectuals who have helped shape the field. For me, acknowledging the significance of all their work is critical to helping my students understand and deconstruct whiteness. By introducing my students to white men who advocated for self-rule and the independence of Pacific Islands states, and by introducing my students to white men such as Crocombe, who could be as ornery as he was helpful to the Pacific Islander students and academics who reached out to him, they start to understand that whiteness is not monolithic. It is not just the brown students who need to understand this either; the white students need models for both performing and deconstructing their own whiteness. More than anything, however, the reason that I present students with this genealogy in this order is so they can see themselves in relation to the *students* who have gone before them. What is most powerful about this genealogy is that it is a genealogy of thinkers who started out as students—just like our students. We are incredibly endowed at vuw with this rich intellectual history; more than any other university in New Zealand, it has been

our VUW ancestors who have made some of the most significant impacts on the field of Pacific Studies, from Beaglehole to Davidson to Crocombe, Wendt, and Wesley-Smith.

In case the androcentrism of this genealogy causes the reader to worry, please be assured that it is balanced and disrupted by my stacking of strong women-centered and Indigenous texts and conscientiously critical pedagogies throughout this course and the others that make up the Pacific Studies major at Victoria. Furthermore, and as testament to the students' discernment and construction of a broader genealogy of thought for themselves, when given an opportunity to write an essay for their major assignment in "The Pacific Heritage," describing any one of the thinkers or writers they have come across in the course as the students' closest intellectual kin in Pacific Studies, the most popular choices in the last five years have been a Native Hawaiian woman (Haunani-Kay Trask), a Samoan woman (Lonise Tanielu), and a man of Tongan descent (Epeli Hau'ofa), none of whom studied at Victoria. The ethos of adoption is strong in our Pacific Studies students.

What is interesting to me is that my students rarely question why a white man is in my genealogy of Pacific Studies, or why a white person's work is assigned as a course text, as long as the white man or white woman is writing about the Pacific. Even if they might disagree with a white author, even if they might prefer to read the Indigenous writers I also assign, my students, brown and white, can see the logic of having white people's work in our syllabus if the white people are working on the Pacific. But what happens when I ask them to read Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Thomas Hobbes, Antonio Gramsci, or John Berger? In "Framing the Pacific: Theorizing Culture and Society," we take our final-year students through an extended exercise in framing and theorizing the work of artists and activists in the Pacific. Whenever I have taught the course, I assign excerpts from Rousseau, Hobbes, Gramsci, and occasionally Berger. They are not writing about the Pacific—Rousseau might mention the "savages" of America, Gramsci might refer to Asiatic peoples, but by and large, these theorists are writing in the realm of abstraction and generalization. And although Gramsci's Italian heritage could locate him in a liminal space of whiteness, as far as students of Pacific heritage in New Zealand are concerned, at least initially, he and the other European theorists they are encountering are *palagi* (white).²⁵

In "Framing the Pacific," I ask the students if they recognize anything from what Gramsci describes in his chapter "The Intellectuals" in their

own communities.²⁶ Usually the students respond by saying, “You must be kidding—this thing was impossible to read!” But then I explain to them that in spite of a family background of poverty and struggle and being the fourth of seven children, Gramsci took every opportunity for education offered to him; that he loved writing theater reviews, he was arrested not long after becoming a member of the legislature, and he was imprisoned for ten years, during which he wrote *The Prison Notebooks* and had to do so in a code so that the prison guards would not easily understand. In response the students make all sorts of noises in sympathy and return to the next class flushed and invigorated from having had a thorough workout on Gramsci. “Gramsci had it hard when he was young—just like us!” “He was a white man, but man, he was cool!” The students come back being able to identify the church ministers in their communities as “traditional intellectuals”; they come back asking whether I would consider *tufuga tatatau* (tattoo artists) to be “traditional” or “organic” intellectuals; they reckon that hip-hop artists are “organic” intellectuals, for sure.

Gramsci has been integral to our teaching program for our final-year students. Gramsci helps us to see how other theories with white origins might be shaping or manipulating us into consent. Gramsci helps us to think about culture in very politicized ways. Gramsci opens the door for my students—not just to theory (as something to learn or apply) but to theorizing (as something to do for themselves). For me, his particular chapter on the intellectuals is a provocation to my students and me to think about what our endeavors at the university are about. Am I here to produce students who become traditional intellectuals (technicians, bureaucrats, agents of the status quo)? Am I here to produce organic intellectuals (individuals who can serve as the mouthpieces and public-relations agents of change for the specific communities with whom they identify and by whom they are claimed)? Whom do my students think they will become? One thing is for sure: I need to equip them for either or both possibilities. I must give them the skills to be competent in the status quo, and I need to give them the tools to work for change—to do only one or the other would be criminal by my own moral and ethical code. No matter what, Gramsci has become one of those ancestors we in Pacific Studies get to choose. We get to adopt him. We get to make him ours. If we want. My students get to take him or leave him behind when they graduate. And if they choose to leave him behind, they can always come back to get him later. That is sovereignty.

Engaging broadly with theory and theorists of all kinds is part of exer-

cising intellectual agency and is a necessary foundation for achieving fuller self-determination for Native and Indigenous and Pacific peoples in the academy. Sovereign intellectuals have nothing to lose by admitting that some white men, white women, and white people are part of our genealogies of thinking whether we like it or not. Some white men, white women, white people, are the ancestors we get to choose.

Notes

1. "Study and Careers," Va'aomanū Pasifika, Victoria University of Wellington, accessed October 7, 2013, <http://www.victoria.ac.nz/pasifika/study>.
2. Teresia K. Teaiwa, "Lo(o)sing the Edge," *The Contemporary Pacific: A Journal of Island Affairs* 13, no. 2 (2001): 343–57; and Teresia K. Teaiwa, "Specifying Pacific Studies: For or Before an Asia-Pacific Studies Agenda," in *Remaking Area Studies: Teaching and Learning Across Asia and the Pacific*, ed. Terence Wesley-Smith and Jon Goss (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2010), 110–124.
3. Vicente M. Diaz and J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, "Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge," *The Contemporary Pacific: A Journal of Island Affairs* 13, no. 2 (2001): 315–342.
4. For anthropological scholarship, see, e.g., Raymond Firth, *We, the Tikopia: A Sociological Study of Kinship in Primitive Polynesia* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1936); Per Hage and Frank Harary, *Island Networks: Communication, Kinship, and Classification of Structures in Oceania* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Antony Hooper, *Why Tikopia Has Four Clans* (London: Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, 1981); and Margaret Mead, *Kinship in the Admiralty Islands, with a New Introduction by Jeanne Guillemin* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2002). For biographical and theoretical writing by Pacific Islands scholars, see, e.g., Wilsoni Hereniko, "Representations of Cultural Identities," in *Tides of History: The Pacific Islands in the Twentieth Century*, ed. K. Howe, R. Kiste, and B. Lal (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1994), 406–34; Ty P. Kawika Tengan, Tevita O. Ka'iili, and Rochelle Fonoti, "Genealogies: Articulating Indigenous Anthropology in/of Oceania," *Pacific Studies* 33, nos. 2–3 (2010): 139–67; and Haunani-Kay Trask, "From a Native Daughter," in *The American Indian and the Problem of History*, ed. Calvin Martin (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 171–79.
5. Roger M. Keesing, "Reply to Trask," *The Contemporary Pacific* 3, no. 1 (1991): 168–171; Jocelyn Linnekin, "Text Bites and the RWord: The Politics of Representing Scholarship," *The Contemporary Pacific* 3, no. 1 (1991): 172–177; and Doug Munro, "Who Owns Pacific History? Reflections on the Insider/Outsider Dichotomy," *The Journal of Pacific History* 29, no.2 (1994): 232–37.
6. J. C. Beaglehole, ed., *The Journals of Captain James Cook on His Voyages of Discovery Volumes 1–4* (Cambridge, UK: Hakluyt Society at the University

- Press, 1955–74); Firth, *We, the Tikopia* and Branislaw Malinowski, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea* (London: Dutton, 1961).
7. Raobeia Ken Sigrah and Stacy King, *Te Rii ni Banaba* (Suva, Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies, the University of the South Pacific, 2001), 61.
 8. Martin G. Silverman, “Banaban Adoption,” In *Adoption in Eastern Oceania*, ed. Vern Carroll (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1970).
 9. See, e.g., Sean Mallon, *Samoa Art and Artists: O Measina a Samoa* (Nelson, New Zealand: Craig Potton, 2002), 10.
 10. James T. Carroll, “The Smell of the White Man Is Killing Us: Education and Assimilation among Indigenous Peoples,” *US Catholic Historian* 27, no. 1 (2009): 21–48; and Karen Lupe, “An Ocean with Many Shores: Indigenous Consciousness and the Thinking Heart,” in *Penina Uliuli: Contemporary Challenges in Mental Health for Pacific Peoples*, ed. Philip Culbertson, Margaret Nelson Agee, and Cabrini Ofa Makasiale (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2007), 124.
 11. Teaiwa, “Lo(o)sing the Edge”; and Teaiwa, “Specifying Pacific Studies.”
 12. Terence Wesley-Smith, “Rethinking Pacific Islands Studies,” *Pacific Studies* 18, no. 2 (1995): 117–21.
 13. Wesley-Smith, “Rethinking Pacific Islands Studies,” 121–24.
 14. Wesley-Smith, “Rethinking Pacific Islands Studies,” 124–26.
 15. Vilsoni Hereniko and Terence Wesley-Smith, eds., “Back to the Future: Decolonizing Pacific Studies,” special issue, *The Contemporary Pacific* 15, no. 1 (2003).
 16. J. C. Beaglehole, ed., *The Journals of Captain James Cook on His Voyages of Discovery*, Volumes 1–4.
 17. See Pauline Nawahineokala‘i King, “Some Thoughts on Native Hawaiian Attitudes towards Captain Cook,” in *Captain Cook: Explorations and Re-assessments*, ed. Glyndwr Williams (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2004), 94–109.
 18. Rachel Barrowman, *Victoria University of Wellington 1899–1999: A History* (Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press, 1999), 53–53; Timothy Beaglehole, *A Life of JC Beaglehole: New Zealand Scholar* (Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press, 2006).
 19. James Wightman Davidson, *Samoa Mo Samoa: The Emergence of the Independent State of Western Samoa* (London: Oxford University Press, 1967).
 20. Doug Munro, “J.W. Davidson and Western Samoa: University Politics and the Travails of a Constitutional Advisor,” *The Journal of Pacific History* 35, no. 2 (2000): 195–211.
 21. O. H. K. Spate, “And Now There Will Be a Void: A Tribute to J.W. Davidson,” *Journal of Pacific Studies* 20 (1996): 21–22.
 22. R. G. Crocombe, *Land Tenure in the Cook Islands* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971).

23. See, for example, “Ron Crocombe, a Great Friend of Pacific Peoples,” Cooks Library and Museum Society, February 27, 2010, accessed October 7, 2013, <http://cookislandslibraryandmuseum.blogspot.co.nz/2010/02/ron-crocombe-great-friend-of-pacific.html>.
24. *The New Oceania: Albert Wendt, Writer*, dir. Shirley Horrocks (Auckland: Point of View Productions, 2006), videodisc; and Teresia Teaiwa and Selina Tusitala Marsh, “Albert Wendt’s Critical and Creative Legacy in Oceania: An Introduction,” *The Contemporary Pacific: A Journal of Island Affairs* 22, no. 2 (2010): 233–48.
25. Gaia Giuliani, “Whose Whiteness? Cultural Dis-locations between Italy and Australia,” in *Transmediterranean: Diaspora, Histories, Geopolitical Spaces*, ed. Joseph Pugliese (Brussels: P.I.E. Peter Lang, 2010), 125–38.
26. Antonio Gramsci, “The Intellectuals,” in *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, ed. and trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (New York: International Publishers, 1971, 1st edition), 3–23.