

# PACIFIC STUDIES

SPECIAL ISSUE  
GENEALOGIES: ARTICULATING INDIGENOUS ANTHROPOLOGY  
IN/OF OCEANIA

---

---

Vol. 33, Nos. 2/3

August/December 2010

---

---

## GENEALOGIES: ARTICULATING INDIGENOUS ANTHROPOLOGY IN/OF OCEANIA

Ty P. Kāwika Tengan  
*University of Hawai'i, Mānoa*

Tēvita O. Ka'ili  
*Brigham Young University Hawai'i*

Rochelle Tuitagava'a Fonoti  
*University of Washington, Seattle*

He miki oe Kane;	You are active, Kāne;
He miki oe Kanaloa.	You are active, Kanaloa.
O Kane hea oe?	Which Kāne are you?
O Kanaloa hea oe?	Which Kanaloa are you?
O Kane inu awa;	You are Kāne the 'awa drinker;
O Kanaloa inu awa.	You are Kanaloa the 'awa drinker.
Mai Kahiki ka awa,	From Kahiki came the 'awa,
Mai Upolu ka awa,	From 'Upolu came the 'awa,
Mai Wawau ka awa.	From Vava'u came the 'awa.
E hano awa hua,	Homage to the frothy 'awa,
E hano awa pauaka,	Homage to the well-strained 'awa,
Halapa i ke akua i laau wai la e!	May the essence reach unto the gods!
Amama, ua noa,	The tabu is lifted, removed,
Lele wale aku la ka pule e.	The prayer flies away.

*Pacific Studies*, Vol. 33, Nos. 2/3—Aug./Dec. 2010

THIS CHANT IS A KANAKA *‘ŌIWI MAOLI* (Indigenous Hawaiian) prayer used in an offering of *‘awa* or *kava* (Piper methysticum), an Oceanic plant whose root is pounded and brewed into a soporific drink for ceremonial and social purposes.<sup>1</sup> The prayer is also a genealogy of the *‘awa*, citing its origins in the ancestral homelands of Tahiti, Marquesas, Samoa (*‘Upolu*) and Tonga (*Vava‘u*), and referring to Kanaloa (*Tangaloa/Tagaloa/Tangaroa*), a common ancestor for people from Eastern Moana/Oceania. As with all genealogies, this one tells a story; or rather, it creates a context for the telling of stories. Also, genealogies create the conditions for debate, particularly when it comes to making claims on status, rank, authority, and *mana* (spiritual power, prestige), especially in matters of succession. We would like to suggest that articulating visions of anthropology’s future, at least from an Indigenous Oceanic perspective, can be done only through genealogical work—the search for, production, and transformation of connections across time and space.

In this introduction, we recount our journey through the four consecutive meetings (2005–2008) of the Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania (ASAO) where we *talanoa* (Halapua 2003), debated, and enacted our genealogies as Indigenous anthropologists. All of the contributors to this special issue but two (Anae and Barker) attended at least one meeting. At the last three ASAO meetings, Tengan recited the chant above as we conducted articulated *‘awa/‘ava/kava* ceremonies in San Diego, California, Charlottesville, Virginia, and Canberra, Australia. The nineteenth-century Hawaiian intellectual David Malo recorded this particular chant as a part of a ritual that dedicated and blessed a newly constructed *wa‘a* (canoe).<sup>2</sup> Born around 1793, Malo was trained as a traditional genealogist for the ruling chiefs and educated at the first American missionary seminary in the islands. Along with other Hawaiian scholars, he interviewed knowledgeable elders and collected traditions, histories, stories, chants, and genealogies that both Native Hawaiians and anthropologists (and Native Hawaiian anthropologists) draw upon today in their efforts to reconstruct ancient lifeways.

One might be tempted to call Malo and his cohort of oral historians the first Indigenous ethnographers of Hawai‘i, but they had their own name—the *‘Ahahui ‘Imi i nā Mo‘olelo Kahiko* (Association for the Seeking of Ancient Histories and Stories) (Arista 2007, x; Chun 2006, xiv–xv; Kamakau 1865). Contemporary Kanaka Maoli scholars are looking at the writings of their nineteenth-century forebears not only for their findings but also for their frameworks. Hawaiian historian Noelani Arista argues for *‘imi loa*—a term embedded in the older Indigenous association’s name—as a mode of Indigenous inquiry. The definition provided in the Hawaiian dictionary,

first-authored by the prolific twentieth-century Hawaiian ethnographer Mary Kawena Pukui,<sup>3</sup> reads: “to seek far, explore; distant traveler, explorer. *Fig.*, one with great knowledge or avaricious for knowledge” (Pukui and Elbert 1986, 100).

Indeed, genealogies lead us to seek far into our past for answers to modern-day questions of who we are, where we belong, and where we are going (Kame‘eleihiwa 1992, 19–23). Indigenous peoples of the great *Moana* (Pacific Ocean) today have returned to genealogies in their efforts to reconnect with ancestors, living relatives, and birth sands<sup>4</sup> in a multitude of cultural and political projects (Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua 2005). One of the watershed moments came with the construction and sailing of a Hawaiian–Polynesian double-hulled voyaging canoe called the *Hōkūle‘a*, which began initially as an effort by University of Hawai‘i anthropologist Ben Finney to put to rest any academic questions of Indigenous colonization of the Pacific two millennia prior (Finney 2003; Tengan 2008, 54–55). To do this, Finney worked with other Native Hawaiians and locals to form the Polynesian Voyaging Society and to build the canoe. They enlisted the help of master navigator Mau Piailug, from Satawal (in the Federated States of Micronesia), to help steer her on a voyage to Tahiti using only the stars, winds, currents, and natural elements. The 1976 voyage was a success, leading many Pacific Islanders to look anew at a genealogy of voyaging and exploration—one of *‘imi loa* (Finney 2003; Diaz 1997).

The *wa‘a*—hewn from upland forest trees, lashed together with interconnecting sennit fibers and propelled by wind-filled sails of woven pandanus—is perhaps the most potent of oceanic vessels for connection and linkage between people, place, and gods. A number of scholars have argued for the centrality of the canoe as metaphor for Pacific studies and identity formation because it focuses attention on cultural epistemologies and ontologies, our ways of knowing and being that highlight the rooted, routed, and collective nature of such undertakings (Diaz and Kauanui 2001, 322; Hau‘ofa 2008:81; Teaiwa 2005).

We approach anthropology similarly but with an emphasis on the place of genealogy. As such, we highlight the importance of *cordage*, the primary symbol and embodiment of genealogical lines of connection. The Hawaiian term *‘aha* refers to braided sennit cords, religious ceremonies, and chiefly assemblies. Traditional genealogists carried knotted *‘aha* as they recited genealogies such as the *Kumulipo*. As Māhina (this issue) relates, the Tongan art of lashing is a genealogy of intersecting lines and spaces. In *Moana* societies, braided cords *‘aha/‘afa/kafa* were the primary materials for *lalava*, the ancient art of lashing. The relations between *‘aha/‘afa/kafa*

and genealogy is metaphorically expressed in the Tongan saying, “*kafa taha*,” that signifies the Indigenous idea that people who are connected are bound together by a single cord. The ‘aha/‘afa/kafa also marks kinship rank. For instance, the Fijian kava bowl has a sennit cord with a cowrie shell that points toward the highest ranking chief in the circle. Finally, the ‘awa ceremony we conducted at the ASAO was an ‘aha; in the canoe ceremony, it is conducted after the lashing has been completed and the vessel is ready to be launched.

In the next section, we provide our own brief narratives of our individual journeys that brought us to anthropology (see Fig. 1). In our life stories, we point to the ways that our subjectivities (like those of our other contributors) are formed at the intersection of multiple lines of personal, familial, cultural, educational, and professional genealogy. In subsequent sections, we recite the genealogy of our ASAO sessions while also documenting those events ethnographically as sites of Indigenous anthropology. We examine the themes of indigeneity, articulation, and genealogy that served as frameworks for our conversations. Also, we draw upon the ideas presented in the contributions to this special issue, seeking to weave together various strands of knowledge and culture to form a *fala* (pandanus mat) upon which future Indigenous anthropologists and their supporters may gather together to sit and drink of the blood in the kava bowl as we search for “the cord brought by Tangaloa from above” (Hau‘ofa 2008, 180). It is with cordage that we stitch together the sails of matting to propel our canoe further into the ocean realm of Tangaloa. Bound by lineages of gods, land, and sea, we search for new ways to relate to community, academy, and each other.

### **Origin Stories: Our Genealogies**

*Tengan*: My father is a third-generation Okinawan American from O‘ahu and a retired Lieutenant Colonel in the U.S. Army. My mother is a retired prosecutor from Maui and is Hawaiian, Portuguese, and German. My routes go through army bases (in Germany, the United States, Hawai‘i), Catholic schools and churches, Kamehameha High School for Native Hawaiians, Ivy League Dartmouth College, and the verdant valley of Mānoa and its University of Hawai‘i (UH) campus. Elsewhere, I have spoken about my struggles reconciling my ‘Ōiwi and my anthropological identities (Tengan 2001, 2005, 2008, 25–29; White and Tengan 2001, 398–89). For genealogical purposes, I’d like to go back to a particularly meaningful point of departure.



In high school, I accompanied a performing arts group from Kamehameha Schools that was part of a delegation from Hawai'i in attendance at an important ceremony at the *marae* (temple site) of Taputapuātea on the island of Ra'iatea, Society Islands. The event marked the rebirth of Polynesian voyaging and navigation sparked by the *Hōkūle'a* and Mau Piailug (Finney 2003). I was sent not as a dancer, chanter, or musician but as one of three student government leaders whose job it was to obtain "Hawaiian leadership skills" by joining the Kamehameha performing arts group, taking part in their daily activities, and learning through doing. When I look back on it now, it was the first time I did Indigenous ethnography. It changed my life forever because I found a profound sense of (re)connection to the people, land, and spirits of Kahiki/Tahiti, from whence came my ancestors on their canoes, carrying communities, life, and 'awa. Although I did not know it at the time, two of my future mentors were also in attendance there: Ben Finney, UH professor of anthropology, and Sam Ka'ai, master craftsman, former crewmember, and 'awa ceremony conductor for the *Hōkūle'a*.

I went on to complete a Bachelor of Arts degree in anthropology and Native American studies at Dartmouth College, writing an honors thesis on Hawaiian voyaging canoes and cultural nationalism. Then I returned to Hawai'i for my graduate studies, where the collective background and knowledge of my committee members Geoffrey White, Ben Finney, Noenoe Silva, Christine Yano, and Vilsoni Hereniko represented an articulation of Indigenous and nonindigenous intellectual and political traditions rooted in/routed through Hawai'i and the Pacific. I met other 'Ōiwi graduate students, including Lynette Cruz, Kēhau Abad, Kekuewa Kikiloi, and Lahela Perry; together we imagined a more relevant, responsible and meaningful Hawaiian anthropology and archaeology. I took classes in Hawaiian language and Hawaiian studies from *kumu* (teachers) including Haunani-Kay Trask, Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa, Puakea Nogelmeier, Laiana Wong, and Kekeha Solis, and I visited *kūpuna* (elders) and *mānaleo* (native speakers) such as Harry Fuller, Lolena Nicholas, Eddie Kaanana, Tuti Kanahēle, Lydia Hale, and Kawika Kapahulehua (the first captain of the *Hōkūle'a*).

Perhaps the most important event for me was the "Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge" symposium convened by Vince Diaz and Kēhaulani Kauanui at Santa Cruz in 2000.<sup>5</sup> They offered the traditional Carolinian navigational concept of *etak* (triangulation) "as a native style of analysis and mode of politics" (2001, 316). They write, "As a technique for successful travel, whose urgent stakes are the peoples' survival and stewardship of place, triangulating among moving islands in a fluidic pathway involves a

clear and unambiguous sense of one's place at all times. . . . To lose one's place, to not know where one's island is, or to no longer be possessed by that island, is to be perilously lost at sea" (p. 317). I felt like I was on the canoe of Māui, the great navigator, chief, demigod, ancestor, and trickster of Polynesia known for "fishing new lands from the bottom of the sea" (Kame'elehiwa 2003, 15). The ancient Hawaiian cosmogonic genealogical chant Kumulipo, which tells of the creation of the world and the emergence of people, notes that Māui's task required not only the guidance of his ancestors (the stars), but also the procurement of the mystical cord and fishhook Mānaiakalani that would enable "*O ka lou [a]na o na moku I hui ka moana kahiko.*" Queen Lili'uokalani, the Hawaiian monarch illegally overthrown by the U.S. military and White businessmen in 1893, translated this line as, "When the hook catches land, twill bring the old seas together" (Lili'uokalani 1897 [1978], 77). This line is especially fruitful to think with as we consider the work of genealogy (the cord and the hook) in connecting people, gods, lands, and seas in an effort to reclaim knowledge and contest imperialism in the Pacific. It was there on the edge of Oceania that the descendants of the ancient Moana were brought together in a moment of cultural, intellectual, and political ferment. It is this mana and connection that I have sought to replicate as I have worked with Ka'ili, Fonoti, and all the other participants in our ASAO sessions and beyond. At home in Hawai'i, I have had the privilege of joining other 'Ōiwi archaeologists and anthropologists led by Sean Nāleimaile who have formed a group called Nāki'i Ke Aho, a name given to us by Aunty Ulu Garmon that translates as "The Cord is Tied" and reminds us that we are bound to our *kuleana* (responsibilities) to ensure the integrity of our sacred places.

*Ka'ili:* My genealogical pathways to Indigenous anthropology are riddled with detours. At the early age of five, I started my many years of transnational travel between Tonga and the United States. My parents, Tēvita and Lakalaka, lived in Kolofo'ou, Tongatapu, and my maternal grandparents, Tonga and 'Ana Mālohifo'ou, lived in Salt Lake City, Utah. I attended elementary, junior high, and high schools both in Tonga and in the United States. In the United States, my grandfather bequeathed to me knowledge of "traditional" Tongan culture. This "home school" was my introduction to "the study of culture." In college, I took a different route from the study of culture. I studied accounting and psychology as an undergraduate student. After my graduation from college, I worked as an accountant and, later, as an assistant to a clinical psychologist. Several years later, I returned to school and studied for a master's degree in social work. It was during my years as a social work graduate student that I stumbled upon anthropology. Up to this point, I had never taken a single anthropology class. As a social worker, I encountered many Tongans and Samoans. While working

with them, I developed an interest in the intersection between culture and social work. It was during this time that I began to ask my grandfather serious questions about Tongan culture—that is, kinship, language, oratory, protocols, oral traditions, genealogies, etc. My interaction with my grandfather was my first “fieldwork” or “homework” (see also Teaiwa 2004). Also, I searched for writings on culture. This search led me to works by Frantz Fanon, Edward W. Gifford, Ngūgĩ Wa Thiong’o, Haunani-Kay Trask, Masiu Moala, Teresia K. Teaiwa, Bell Hooks, Helen Morton (1996), and Cathy Small. In addition, I read the writings of Indigenous Tongan scholars such as Futa Helu,<sup>6</sup> Epeli Hau’ofa, Sione Lātūkefu, ‘Ana Taufe’ulungaki, and ‘Okusitino Māhina. Also, I became involved with organizations such as the National Tongan American Society, Pacific American Foundation (PAF), the National Pacific American Leadership Institute (NAPALI), the Tonga Research Association (TRA),<sup>7</sup> and the Lo’au Research Society (LRS). Along the way, I began to envision myself as an anthropologist. My vision of anthropology was also influenced by the heroic legends of freedom fighter Māui and the social architect/seer Lo’au. I made up my mind to be an anthropologist after I read ‘Okusitino Māhina’s seminal Tongan article *Traditions and Conflicts: A Look at the Past from the Present* (1992b), Epeli Hau’ofa’s groundbreaking article *Our Sea of Islands* (1994), and Cathy Small’s well-known ethnography *Voyages: From a Tongan Village to American Suburbs* (1997). Even though I was very critical of the imperialism and colonialism of anthropological studies, I was determined to pursue a doctorate in anthropology. My decision to study anthropology was somehow a return to my roots—to the subject that was first introduced to me by my grandfather. In 2000, I began my doctoral studies in sociocultural anthropology at the University of Washington (UW) in Seattle. At UW, I studied under Miriam Kahn, who was mentored first by Margaret Mead and later by Jane Goodale (Kahn 1981). Miriam Kahn provides me with a direct genealogical links to Franz Boaz, the father of American anthropology. Kahn—my professor—was mentored by Margaret Mead, and Mead was mentored by Franz Boas. I am well aware of the controversial nature of Margaret Mead’s works in Oceania. However, I acknowledge her in my genealogy because she is one of my intellectual ancestors. Also at the University of Washington, I studied under Barbara McGrath, who did fieldwork among Tongans in both Tongatapu and Seattle. Also, I took courses from Rick Bonus, a Filipino-American Ethnic Studies professor who mentored Pacific Islander students at the University of Washington. Even though I had great mentors at the University of Washington, I must confess it was not always what I expected. After a year of taking graduate courses on the core theories of cultural anthropology, I was disheartened by the

lack of Indigenous theories and worldviews in my anthropology courses. I began to search for writings on Indigenous Moana concepts. I came across the works of Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa (1992), Vilsoni Hereniko (1994, 2000), Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), Kēhaulani Kauanui, Vicente M. Diaz, Melenaite Taumoefolau, Manulani Meyer, Sitiveni Halapua, David W. Gegeo, and Konai Helu Thaman. At UW, I selectively attended public lectures by Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Haunani Kay-Trask, Nainoa Thompson, Kauanoe Kamana, William "Pila" Wilson, and Eva Nani'ole. In addition, I read and debated articles on Native/Indigenous anthropology (Ohnuki-Tierney 1984; Narayan 1993). Up to this point, I had no idea of native/Indigenous anthropology. After reading the articles, I googled "Indigenous anthropology," and lo and behold, I came across Ty Kāwika Tengan's exciting and groundbreaking work on 'Ōiwi anthropology in Hawai'i (Tengan 2001; White and Tengan 2001). I was elated to find a fellow Oceanian who was working on Indigenous anthropology. I immediately emailed Ty. A few days later, Ty replied. For the next few years, Ty and I corresponded via email. In 2001, I attended the Tonga History Association (THA) Conference in Salt Lake City, Utah. The conference provided me with an opportunity to discuss my ideas with scholars of Tongan history and culture. During the conference, I met up with 'Okusitino Māhina, and we talked briefly about *tā* and *vā*—the Tongan sense of time and space. This conversation was not only my introduction to the ideas of *tā* and *vā*, but it sparked my interest in the Indigenous concepts of time and space ('Okusitino Māhina, pers. comm., April 3, 2001). Since 2001, the Indigenous concepts of *tā* and *vā* have become very influential in my development as a Moana anthropologist (Ka'ili 2008; Māhina this issue). Today, I am one of the leading proponents of the Indigenous-based *Tā-Vā* (Time-Space) Theory of Reality (Māhina this issue).

One of the pivotal moments in my journey toward Indigenous anthropology transpired in 2003. I had the opportunity to sail, as part of the NAPALI program, on the legendary *Hōkūle'a* from O'ahu to Molokā'i. Bruce Blankenfeld, one of the crew members of the 1978 *Hōkūle'a* voyage, was our captain (Finney 2003, 111). During the voyage, I was in awe of my ancestors' ability to persevere and navigate the open sea. In the closing ceremonial oration, after the voyage, I paid homage and expressed gratitude to our captain, Bruce, by addressing him as a "*toutai*"—a sea warrior. *Toutai* (or *Tautai*), a prestigious title, was used throughout the Moana societies. The title points to the genealogical linkages among Oceanians.

In 2004, I reconnected with Ty and encouraged him to organize a session on Indigenous anthropology in the 2005 ASAO Conference. He agreed only if I co-organized it with him. Thus, Ty and I co-organized our first

Indigenous anthropology session in the ASAO Conference in Līhu‘e, Kaua‘i.

*Fonoti:* Ironically enough, my formal “entry point” into the discipline of anthropology was at ASAO Kaua‘i in 2005, where I first met my advisor Miriam Kahn. At the time, I was based in the American Studies Department at the University of Hawai‘i in Mānoa and knew I wanted to pursue a doctorate but was uncertain of the discipline to which I wanted to commit. After hearing my paper/presentation, which was loosely based on my master’s thesis exploring the tradition of *ta tatau* within the Samoan diaspora, Kahn encouraged me to apply to the University of Washington’s anthropology program where Ka‘ili was also based. My initial reaction was one of shock; as a young Samoan woman, I was adamant about not wanting to study anthropology in the same way Margaret Mead had infamously produced *Coming of Age in Samoa* (Mead 1928). I was far too wary of the colonial and historical legacy through which *papalagi* anthropologists garnered and upheld reputations as communities within our beloved Oceania were plundered and violated. Furthermore, I detested the callous manner by which many *papalagi* anthropologists had extracted scientific and empirical data to produce disheartening case studies and doctoral dissertations for self-motive and gain (Wendt 1976; Hau‘ofa 2008). Perhaps out of an indignant sense of obligation to Oceanic communities who had been exploited by anthropologists, I was convinced that the trajectory of anthropology was at best demoralizing and counterproductive for Indigenous Pacific peoples. If the discipline had done more “harm” to our communities, how could I consider becoming an anthropologist in lieu of these contested histories? For many of us who claim Oceania as our “home,” the discipline of anthropology is synonymous with the colonial encounters and entanglements that have threatened our traditional epistemological ways of knowing.

As a diasporic Samoan, I spent an inordinate amount of time living between sites within our beloved Moana/Oceania; I was born in Auckland, New Zealand, raised in American Samoa and Samoa (formerly Western Samoa) and spent much of my adulthood on O‘ahu in Hawai‘i. My positionality as an Indigenous Samoan ethnographer committed to articulating and documenting the lived experiences of intergenerational families within diasporic Samoan communities such as west Seattle in Washington, where my dissertation research is currently based, is a conscientious attempt to understand how Samoan families, particularly youth, negotiate specific identity claims associated with *fa‘asamoa* as they make sense of places and spaces once they move away from the familiarity of the homeland.

**Indigenous Anthropology: Lihu'e 2005**

In February 2005, Ka'ili and Tengan organized an informal session on "Indigenous Anthropology in/of Oceania" at the annual ASAO meeting on the island of Kaua'i in Hawai'i. The event attracted over forty participants, at least half of whom were Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders from all of the major (if still arbitrary) cultural areas of Polynesia, Micronesia, and Melanesia; admittedly though, it was very Poly-centric, with an unusually high number of Native Hawaiians in attendance because of the location. Representatives came from colleges and universities across Hawai'i, the United States, Canada, Aotearoa/New Zealand, Samoa, Japan, and Taiwan and one from the Papua New Guinea National Museum. Cultural anthropologists were joined by archaeologists, political scientists, cultural geographers, and Pacific Studies scholars. Also, there were at least two participants from Kaua'i. This international and interdisciplinary breadth points to the ways in which the project of Indigenous anthropology articulates with other forms of engaged scholarship, such as Native Pacific Cultural Studies (Diaz and Kauanui 2001).

We posed the following questions at the outset: What happens when the distinction between the "native" and the "anthropologist" is blurred when the "home" becomes the "field" or when none of these terms seem to apply at all? What do Indigenous perspectives and politics bring to anthropological practice, and what can anthropology offer Indigenous peoples? Indeed, is the concept of indigeneity even useful anymore? If so, how do Indigenous peoples construct and maintain identities and communities in Oceania specifically, and can or should anthropology be a part of those processes?

These queries sprang from a genealogy of feminist, minority, Native, and Indigenous critique within the discipline. Delmos Jones's call for a "native anthropology" that involved "a set of theories based on non-Western precepts and assumptions" (1970, 251) was followed by the reflections of Beatrice Medicine (Lakota) on "Learning to be an Anthropologist and Remaining 'Native'" (1978). On the international front, the 1978 Berg Wartenstein symposium on "Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Cultures" (Fahim 1982) brought together a number of Indigenous anthropologists, including Epele Hau'ofa of Oceania. Faye Harrison later argued that "an authentic anthropology" could only emerge with a reconciliation of "critical Western and Third and intellectual traditions," a transformation that would need to "come out of the experiences and struggles of Third World peoples in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, and 'the belly of the beast,' namely the 'internal colonies' within the so-called First World" (1997, 2). On the other hand, Kirin Narayan



rejected the fixed distinction between “native” and “nonnative” anthropologists and instead embraced multiplex identities and enactments of hybridity (1993, 94–95). In her 2002 review of the native anthropology literature, Lanita Jacobs-Huey argued that “foregrounding *native* in relation to anthropology, or oneself as a *native* anthropologist, can act as an empowering gesture and critique of the positioning of natives in the stagnant slot of the Other” (p. 800).

At the time of our first ASAO session, Indigenous anthropologists in Oceania had produced a small but important literature on the field. As Māhina (this issue) notes, debates ongoing in the broader discipline found regional articulations in Hau’ofa’s (2008, 3–10) critique of outsider anthropology in the Pacific and Professor Ron Crocombe’s (1975) reply problematizing insider–outsider boundaries. This exchange inspired Hau’ofa’s poem “Blood in the Kava Bowl” (2008, 180–181) that charged “the professor does not know./ He sees the line but not the cord/ for he drinks the kava not tasting its blood” (p. 180). As Selina Tusitala Marsh (1999, 166) points out, “The metaphorical umbilical cord connects all Pacific peoples genealogically to their spiritual parent, the Polynesian god Tangaloa. The familial



FIGURE 1. Ty Tengan, Tēvita O. Ka’ili, Rochelle Fonoti. 2008 ASAO Annual Meeting, Canberra, Australia.

relationship between those of common spiritual, mythological parentage means shared identities and knowledge of which the professor is ignorant.”

Commenting on the relationship between Pacific Islanders and the field of anthropology in 1975, Hau'ofa bemoaned that “after so many years of involvement, we have produced only one native anthropologist, the late Dr. Rusiata Nayacakalou,” with himself as a “poor second” (2008, 8).<sup>8</sup> Louise Morauta was more optimistic in her appraisal of Papua New Guinean anthropology, which she argued was being “decolonised in a more fundamental sense than has so far been described” (1979, 561), because Papua New Guineans were taking up anthropological research in their own ways and for their own purposes and with social and political action as an integral component (p. 566). Māhina later disputed “the insider–outsider distinction as having no intellectual worth, except in the political domain where it rightly belonged” (this issue). Katerina Teaiwa, whose personal and professional trajectories had been shaped by multiple displacements, suggested a focus on “homework, rather than fieldwork” and underwent a process of “unlearning anthropological *and* indigenous authority” (2004, 216).



FIGURE 2. Kava Ceremony. 2006 ASAO Annual Meeting, San Diego, California.



On Kauaʻi, we too were looking to displace some old anthropological and Indigenous “truths.” Our use of the term “Indigenous” (capitalized), as opposed to “native” (uncapitalized), stemmed from our desire to foreground the claims of Aboriginal Indigenous peoples (defined often in opposition to settler and post-settler nations). Partly this was in contrast to authors such as Narayan and Jacobs-Huey whose writings tended to conflate native with insider. We acknowledged that Indigenous was also often used too loosely and that Native (with a capital N) signified a political meaning of the term in line with our focus on indigeneity. As Diaz (2006, 577) has noted, “In Native Pacific studies, it has become almost customary to underscore the N of Native as a corrective against another historical and cultural effect of colonialism: the conflation between self-identified Native peoples and the nativism of ‘local’ discourses created by settler colonialism.”

Against such colonial impositions, Kanaka Maoli scholar J. Kēhaulani Kauanui (whose genealogy goes back to Kauaʻi) has argued that *moʻokūʻauhau* (genealogy) is the more appropriate anchor for claims to indigeneity. The term *moʻo* can mean “succession, series, lineage” while *kūʻauhau* refers to “genealogy, pedigree, old traditions, genealogist, to recite a genealogy.” (Pukui and Elbert 1986, 171, 253). Kauanui expounds on other meanings:

*Moʻo* is also the word for lizard and lizard-like supernatural beings. The imagery of the *moʻo* lizard with visible vertebrae and *kua moʻo* (vertebrae backbone, or to link something together) “is apt and obvious as a simile for sequence of descendants in contiguous unbroken articulation,” where one traces his or her genealogy in steps, just as one can follow the vertebrae of the spine (Handy and Pukui 1972, 197; Kaeppler 1982, 85). It is interesting to note that the word *ʻauhau* is used to mean an assessment, tribute, levy, or tax, which indicates the reciprocal relationship between the common people, the chiefs, and the land (Kauanui 2008, 37).

Indeed, some of the most ancient and prestigious chiefly lines (in particular, the Nanaulu) are traceable Kauaʻi, which is itself the geologically oldest of the major Hawaiian Islands. At Kēʻē, in the land division of Hāʻena on the northern tip of Kauaʻi, the *moʻo* woman Kiliʻoe stands in the form of a huge stone. Hawaiian studies professor and Kauaʻi Native Carlos Andrade writes, “At one time it was a *pōhaku piko* (umbilical cord stone), a place where people would hide the dried remnants of umbilical cords from their babies that fell off some days after their birth. One purpose of this ritual was to connect the child spiritually to the land of his or her birth”

(2008, 61) an instance of cords binding successive generations of people to place and deities.

Cognizant of the need to recognize, honor, and seek permission from the Kanaka ‘Ōiwi Maoli of Kaua‘i, Tengan coordinated the opening ceremonies for the conference with his friend and colleague Kēhaulani Kekua, kumu of the traditional hula seminary Hālau Palaihiwa o Kaipuwai of Kaua‘i. Ka‘ili performed an oral Tongan *fakatapu*, in the opening oration of our session, to honor the *tapu*/sacredness of the *fonua* (land) and the *tangata‘ifonua* (Indigenous people) of Kaua‘i. He specifically acknowledged the sacredness of Olokele/Olotele—significant mounts in Kaua‘i, Tutuila, and Tongatapu.<sup>9</sup> The common name of these mounts clearly points to the genealogical linkages among Hawaiians, Samoans, and Tongans. Ka‘ili wanted to highlight the returning of Moana/Oceanians to Olokele in Kaua‘i, an ancestral land, to re-member and recite ancient genealogies. Ka‘ili concluded his *fakatapu* by paying homage to the senior Moana scholars at the conference: Vilsoni Hereniko, Albert Wendt, Loia Fiaui, Unasa L. F. Va‘a, and ‘Okusitino Māhina. Although this was a matter of following proper protocol for Tengan and Ka‘ili, for others in the association it was more about the performance (and fetishization) of culture and indigeneity.<sup>10</sup> Equally lost upon most ASAO members was the genealogy of land embedded in place names around them. Our meeting was held in the district traditionally known as Puna, which Andrade explains “is the namesake of an *ali‘i* [chief] whose daughters married Mō‘ikeha, a voyager celebrated in the orature of Hawai‘i who traversed the seaways connecting the southern islands known today as the Society Islands to Kaua‘i. Puna also references a connection to an older land, the Punaauia district in Tahiti” (Andrade 2008, 28–29). Though unbeknownst to most of our own Indigenous participants, the interweaving of our genealogies in that space and time reproduced ancient patterns of connection even as it created new ones.

Of course, many important divisions remained. This is to be expected in an area as large and diverse as the Pacific, which has experienced multiple and uneven waves of colonial and neocolonial presence. In our session, distinctions of race, class, gender, generation, genealogy, island origin, nationality, language, and tradition militated against a broadly accepted understanding of indigeneity. Recognizing this, as well as the real differences in political and economic struggles across Oceania, we chose to abandon any search for a final definition of who did or did not count as Indigenous. Instead, we chose to allow for a breadth of Indigenous expression and connection in line with Teaiwa’s (2004, 230–31) conceptualization of Pacific peoples and places “as specific, different, and connected individuals or groups . . . with respect to *each other* in past and present,” looking “beyond connections limited to the cultural areas problematically named

Micronesia, Melanesia, and Polynesia, for example to connections and differences (or the production of connections and differences) between and within these areas.” It is here that an expanded sense of “articulation” came to serve as an avenue for thinking about Indigenous anthropology.

### **Articulation: San Diego 2006 and Charlottesville 2007**

At our working session<sup>11</sup> in San Diego the following year, Rochelle Fonoti joined us as a co-organizer. We chose to focus on “articulation,” a term that indexed our interest in the processes by which the concepts of indigeneity and anthropology were “put together” in theory, practice, identity, politics, and cultural production. Here we use it in the sense that James Clifford, Stuart Hall, and Antonio Gramsci have invoked the concept as a way of thinking about tactical alliances made in the hooking and unhooking of elements that form a cultural ensemble (Clifford 2001, 477–78). Rather than focus on issues of authenticity, articulation looks at the ways that



**FIGURE 3. Rochelle Fonoti, Dionne Fonoti, Ping-Ann Addo, Katerina Teaiwa, Lisa Uperesa. Indigenous Anthropology Session, 2008 ASAO Annual Meeting, Canberra, Australia.**

“cultural forms will always be made, unmade, and remade” as communities draw “selectively on remembered pasts. The relevant question is whether, and how, they convince and coerce insiders and outsiders, often in power-charged, unequal situations, to accept the autonomy of a ‘we’” (Clifford 2001, 479). We do not claim to be the authentic voice of Indigenous Oceanic anthropology. We do claim to have a set of responsibilities and rights that need to be acknowledged, even as we are constantly remaking them.

We opened our session with an ‘awa/‘ava/kava ceremony that articulated the Hawaiian, Samoan, and Tongan traditions of kava drinking with which each of us was familiar (see Fig. 2). Tengan provided Hawaiian ‘awa and ‘*apu* (coconut shell cups) and offered the chant that this paper opens with, a canoe launching prayer that located Kahiki (Tahiti, or any far off lands), ‘Upolu (in Samoa and Tahiti Nui), and Vava‘u (in Tonga and Tahiti Nui) as the ancestral homes from which Hawaiian ‘awa and people came. Fonoti mixed the ‘ava in the Samoan *tanoa* (‘ava bowl) that she secured through her maternal ‘*aiga* (‘Aiga Sā Leniu) in Oceanside, California who also joined us at the meeting. Ka‘ili crossed the *fala* (pandanas leaf mats) on which we were sitting—his own woven in the Tongan style and the other a Samoan one from the Fonoti family. Also, he took the first cup outside and poured it onto the earth on which we were guests to honor the *tangata‘ifonua*. He returned and proceeded to serve a cup to each of the participants in our session—from oldest to youngest—and also those who joined us as audience members.

As scholars committed to Indigenous and alter/native research practices, we felt it was important to begin our session in a meaningful way and to welcome each other as friends and relations connected through familial, cultural, geographic, and academic lineages. As Unasa Va‘a notes (this issue), the kava ceremony becomes “an occasion for negotiating social space (*va*)” and “imbibing the spirit and mana of the ancestors.” In this vein, Melani Anae (this issue) stresses the importance of reciprocity and *teu le va* (tending to social and sacred space between) as cultural reference points in the native anthropological project (see also Ka‘ili 2005, 2008; Lilomaiva-Doktor 2009; Refiti 2009; Tuagalu 2008; Wendt 1999; Māhina and Va‘a this issue). She writes, “the centrality of reciprocal relationships and the saliency of mutual respect and understanding amongst all parties involved in all research relationships [are] sacrosanct.” Va‘a relates one origin story of kava (which is different than the one with which we opened in the chant), urging us to “look at such through the eyes of the people who own the myth in the first place.” Here a call to empathy is also marked

by a politics of authority and ownership, which is precisely the work of articulation.

Following the ceremony, Tēvita O. Kaʻili, Victor Narsimulu, Ping-Ann Addo, Rochelle Fonoti, Dionne Fonoti, and Che Wilson gave papers that spoke to a variety of themes including (though not limited to) Moana-based tā-vā (time-space) theory, Rotuman epistemology, nonindigenous yet “Native” positionality, Samoan representation through tatau and film, and the different houses of Maori learning. Mark Henare was present in the audience and provided insightful comments on discussions of *whakapapa* (genealogies) of genetically modified organisms (Roberts et al. 2004). We closed our session with another ʻawa/ava/kava circle. ʻOkusitino Māhina led our *talanoa* (discussion) with a critical reading of Epeli Hauʻofa’s 1975 poem “Blood in the Kava Bowl” (Hauʻofa 2008, 180–82), and he challenged each of us to not only look at the substance but also the form of Indigenous anthropology. Animated discussion followed, and all present felt that a number of extremely important ideas and positions had been articulated, if not yet fully resolved.



FIGURE 4. Ty Tengan, ʻOkusitino Māhina, Siosiu Lafitani-Tofua ʻipangai, Unasa Vaʻa, Tēvita O. Kaʻili. 2008 ASAO Annual Meeting, Canberra, Australia.

We followed the 2006 ASAO working session with another in Charlottesville, Virginia, in February 2007. We again opened and closed with the sharing of kava, and in addition to the returning contributions of D. Fonoti, Narsimulu, and Wilson, new papers from Andrew Moutu, Patricia Fifita, and Esther Tinirau raised issues of ontology and ritual in Papua New Guinea, Tongan medicine and modernity, and Maori attachments of people to the land. We were joined in the audience by Lisa Uperesa, whose input as someone dealing with her own “halfie-status” and as living in the “long shadow” cast by Margaret Mead gave us new ways to complicate our genealogies (see her essay, this issue). In our closing talanoa, Māhina performed and analyzed songs of the *fangufangu* (nose flute), the melodies of which reminded us of other ways of knowing and being.

Our day-long discussions and our late night kava drinking in the Omni Charlottesville Hotel lobby (where we rearranged the couches into a kava circle) led us to arrive at the theme of genealogies as a productive place for thought and practice. We felt that it was not only useful to trace our respective intellectual genealogies but also to articulate the interconnectedness that inevitably positions advocates, anthropologists, and cultural practitioners within actual communities.

### **Genealogies: Canberra 2008**

For many Indigenous anthropologists who claim Oceania/Moana as their home, the practice or tradition of citing one’s genealogy is critical in gauging what one’s identity is in relation to *vā*. Therefore, genealogy as an index of articulation for Indigenous anthropology within Oceania allows us to further assess the various ways the Native/Indigenous anthropologist is bound to her particular field site or community. Genealogy is also inextricably bound with sense of place; the *vā* or space/place inherently determines or shapes what then becomes manifested in one’s fieldwork and ethnographic data. Through tracing our intellectual development as Indigenous anthropologists to Euro-American anthropologists (such as Boas, Mead, Benedict, Bateson, etc.), we are inadvertently connected to each other within the discipline. By acknowledging these connections or ties, how does this inevitably affect our respective work as Kanaka Maoli/Moana/Pacific Islanders/Oceanians?

Even though genealogy was relatively dormant in our previous sessions, it erupted with intensity as the central concept of our 2008 meeting in Canberra, Australia (see Figs. 3 through 5). There new papers given by Katerina Teaiwa, Lisa Uperesa, and Micah Van der Ryn joined those of D.



Fonoti, Addo, and Māhina. Lily George contributed significantly as an audience member who arrived at ASAO unaware of our session but already foregrounding whakapapa in her own paper for another session on Indigenous struggles (see George in this issue). In addition, Samoan anthropologist Unasa L. F. Va'a and Tongan doctoral student Siosuia F. P. Lafitani Tofua'ipangai made several insightful contributions to our discussions.

In keeping with the tradition of our past meetings, our session was organized around an 'awa circle. Ritual items for our kava circle were made possible by our Moana/Oceanian connections in Canberra. Tofua'ipangai provided us with a tāno'a (kava bowl). Katerina Teaiwa, the Pacific Studies convener at the Australian National University and one of the original participants in the Kaua'i session, lent us one of her mats. Tofua'ipangai and members of his kava club performed beautiful Tongan traditional songs during our session. Also, we were generously hosted by Teaiwa at the Pacific studies facility. The following day after our session, Tofua'ipangai, Luseane Tuita, and the Phoenix Performing Arts of the Pacific, staged a special performance for members of our session at the Holo Boomerang—one of the Tongan community centers in Canberra. After the performance, Ka'ili gave a Tongan oration (*lea fakamālō*) to pay homage and respect to the Indigenous people of Canberra and to express our group's heartfelt appreciation to the performers and their hospitality.

The process of "rearticulating" the various interactions we experienced during our session in Canberra also prompts us to consider the significance of place when certain locales or sites in/of the Pacific are designated as possible venues for academic conferences and forums. This concern inevitably raises the question of the extent Indigenous communities are involved and included with such meetings or conferences. After heavy snow storms delayed ASAO Conference Proceedings in 2010 in Washington, DC, a number of people questioned the feasibility of continuing the rotation of venues for future meetings. If ASAO continues to rotate meetings between the Pacific, West Coast, and East Coast, how accessible or relevant will these meetings be for Indigenous Pacific Islander scholars? Also, what does it mean to host a meeting in Pacific sites such as Canberra or Kaua'i? One of ASAO's objectives in choosing venues in the Pacific is to allow for the organization to interact or engage with Indigenous communities, but to what extent is this actually achieved?

For us, sites such as Canberra and Lihū'e have prompted us to draw upon existing social networks to facilitate critical elements of our sessions. For instance, securing a tāno'a for our session was achieved by using our

Moana connections. In 1999, Ka'ili (who was living in Utah as the time) first met Tofua'ipangai online via the planet-tonga.com—one of the largest Tongan online communities at the time. Ka'ili and Tofua'ipangai were part of a group of diasporic Tongans who actively participated in the debates on Tongan cultural issues (i.e., language revitalization). In addition, they were members of the Lo'au Research Society (LRS)—a transnational Tongan research group. In terms of fonua (land/people) genealogy, Ka'ili and Tofua'ipangai are both descendants of people from the island of Hā'ano in Ha'apai, Tonga. Several weeks before the 2008 meeting in Canberra, Ka'ili e-mailed Tofua'ipangai in Canberra and asked him for a kava bowl for our session. This connection gave us the opportunity to obtain the tāno'a and include members of the Canberra Tongan community in our session.

Genealogical ties also provided us with the foundation for an Indigenous anthropological framework for engaging Moana people—whether in Kaua'i, San Diego, Charlottesville, or Canberra. Moana people are Indigenous to Oceania highlights one of the major claims made by Hau'ofa—the sea is a common heritage for all of us (Hau'ofa 2008).

Genealogy gave us a framework for acknowledging other Indigenous people, at least to the extent that we could. It was quite depressing for our group to see the relative absence of Indigenous people, such as Native Americans and Aboriginal Australians, in our ASAO meetings in San Diego, Charlottesville, and Canberra. In the ASAO conference in Canberra, only one Aboriginal woman, Ms. Matilda House, was officially involved in the scheduled program. Ms. Matilda House, an Indigenous Ngambri woman, was only involved in the opening event, and (to our knowledge) she did not participate in any of the other conference activities. In addition, no other Native people participated in the other conference meetings. This marginalization of Indigenous peoples was quite disappointing for many of us. Ironically, the ASAO conference in Canberra occurred on the same week that the Australian Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd, gave a formal apology to the Aboriginal people for the Australian government's abduction of an entire "stolen generation" of children from their families. Although several of the ASAO participants attended the formal apology event in Canberra, ASAO failed to create a culturally meaningful space within the conference for Aboriginal voices. In each of our sessions, we made a conscious effort to acknowledge the Indigenous people of the conference places—Līhu'e, San Diego, Charlottesville, Canberra—by paying homage and respect to them in the opening portion of our 'awa ceremony (see above).

In all of our Moana cultures (Hawaiian, Tongan, Samoan), the act of acknowledging and expressing respect to the Indigenous people of the land



and the place is crucial for opening events (meetings, gatherings, performances). This form of opening ceremony is best done by people who have knowledge of the genealogy of the people of the land and of the place.

Genealogy is concerned with the intersection, interweaving, and interconnection of people, titles, and lands, as well as ideas and academic disciplines (see Māhina, George). Genealogy is socially arranged in different ways in different cultures (see Māhina). In our sessions, Māhina and George explained some of the numerous notions of genealogy in Oceania, such as *hohoko* and *whakapapa*. In addition to the concepts mentioned by Māhina and George, there are other concepts of genealogy in Oceania, such as *mo'okū'auhau* (genealogy) in Hawaiian, *gafa* (genealogy) in Samoan, and *uhinga* (genealogical ties of people, land, sea, animals, plants, etc.) in Tongan (Taumoefolau 2010). These multifaceted concepts of genealogy, both Moana and non-Moana, provided the foundation as well as the springboard for conceptualizing and practicing Indigenous anthropology.



FIGURE 5. Rochelle Fonoti, Ping-Ann Addo, Lily George. Holo Boomerang, Canberra, Australia, 2008.

Māhina employs his new general Tā-Vā (Time-Space) Theory of Reality to critically examine the concept and practice of genealogy. One of the claims of the Tā-Vā Theory is that time and space, or form and substance, always intersect in reality. It is within this claim that Māhina views genealogy as an intersecting temporal-spatial, formal-substantial, human phenomenon across nature, mind, and society. This intersection in genealogy “is connected with human procreation, where the two opposite sexes, i.e., men and women, are physically intersected in the process, with their combined genes transmitted through generations” (see Māhina). Genealogy, according to Māhina, also reflects the Moana arrangement of time and space in plural, cultural, collectivistic, holistic, and circular modes (see Māhina). This is evident in how Moana genealogy emphasizes collective (i.e., kinship relations) and holistic (i.e., human-land connections) modes.

George explores similar aspects of whakapapa—the Maori concept of genealogy. She maintains that whakapapa grounds and connects her to other Maori, to all the lands and people of Aotearoa and (through shared history) to other Indigenous people of the world (see George). George argues that whakapapa are “epistemological frameworks” for establishing connections, relations, and contexts. Whakapapa is methodology, history, and stories of the *tupuna* (ancestors). It is also “the inalienable link that binds us to the land and sea, to people and places, to time and space, even when we are not aware of it.” Whakapapa provides a solid foundation or a “standing place” for researchers whether or not Indigenous, who go into the field carrying their genealogies and histories.

Our contributors examine not only ancestral genealogy, but also intellectual genealogy. Within the context of the Tā-Vā Theory, Māhina views intellectual genealogy as the cross-fertilization (intersection) of ideas between teachers and students, citing his own experiences with his teachers. Barker and Fonoti (this issue) write from the vantage point of instructors who have co-taught courses at the University of Washington in order to provide students with both “insider” and “outsider” perspectives and build capacity among Indigenous diasporic Islanders. They write, “Through collaborative teaching we not only assist with the goal of training future Indigenous researchers, but we also build the capacity of everyone to recognize and appreciate the strengths of combining different positionalities and expertise.” On the other hand, George provides an example of intellectual genealogy by reciting the whakapapa of anthropology in Aotearoa. In a similar fashion, Uperesa considers the “weight of biographical and intellectual genealogies” in her work, particularly as she and her interlocutors (many of whom are family) are constantly reevaluating each other based on an evolving knowledge of anthropology and its past.

Addo critically examines the concept of genealogy, especially its use to forge idiomatic kinship between herself and her Tongan “informants.” Addo, a Caribbean woman of Chinese and west African descent, illustrates how Tongans accepted her Caribbean/west African (misperceived as “Black American”) genealogy, but rejected her Chinese genealogy in order to selectively forge “fictive kinship” relations with her. This stems from the anti-Chinese sentiments among Tongans that are based on their experiences of neocolonial economic domination by the Chinese in Tonga. As a member of her informants’ “kin,” Addo directly challenged their rejections of her Chinese genealogy. Addo shows that, as an “ethnographer of color” (and not as an “Indigenous ethnographer”), she became conscious of the shifting forms of idiomatic kinship.

### Conclusion

We recite the above names because they have begun to create a new genealogy for Indigenous anthropology in/of Oceania. The most important goal of our sessions and this collection has been the making and maintaining of relationships that create the context for sharing *aloha* (affection and empathy) and producing mana, a spiritual power and potency that has marked our interactions.

We do not want to romanticize this endeavor either. Much was said about the need for us to attend to the ways that our genealogies have divided as much as they have unified us. The Indigenous is by no means a homogenous category, and its efficacy as a unifying identity is dependent upon the context. We hope that this special issue creates a genealogy for the next generation of Indigenous Moana/Oceanian anthropologists and also provides them with a point of reference, a connection, and a set of relations to enter into the messy work of Indigenous anthropology.

### NOTES

1. See Finney (2003, 71–72) for a discussion of the revival and rearticulation of Hawaiian ‘awa ceremonies in the context of modern day Polynesian voyaging.
2. The original text from which this chant is drawn is found in Malo (1951: 129–30). This chant has been slightly modified in its present-day usage by members of the Hale Mua, the Hawaiian men’s organization from which Tengan learned this (see Tengan 2008).
3. For more on Pukui see White and Tengan (2001, 390–91) and Losch (2003).
4. The Hawaiian term “one hānau” or “birth sands” metaphorically refers to one’s homeland or birthplace. It is a particularly apt metaphor when thinking of beaches as places for

first crossings of peoples from their canoes or ships, a la Dening (1980, 2004) and the final resting place of the sacred burials found in sand dunes.

5. Articles from the symposium were published in a special issue of *The Contemporary Pacific* (Vol. 13, No. 2). The introduction by Diaz and Kauanui (2001) includes a schedule of the symposium events, art installations, and participant names.

6. See Māhina (this issue) to read about the intellectual genealogical ties between Māhina and Professor Futa Helu.

7. Formerly known as the Tonga History Association (THA).

8. For a recent examination of the life and work of Nayacakalou as an Indigenous anthropologist, see Tomlinson (2006).

9. In Tonga, Olotele is the name of the Tu'i Tonga's (King of Tonga's) residence in Lapaha, Tongatapu (Māhina 1992a:163).

10. One colleague (White American male) came up to Tengan afterward with a big smile and said, "I didn't know you could chant like that! That was great!" Although this was certainly meant to be a compliment, it also suggested that the most relevant aspect for some was the "show."

11. The ASAO structure encourages sessions to go through three stages of "informal session," "working session," and "symposium," with the intent of presenting refined and publishable papers in the third year.

## REFERENCES

Andrade, Carlos

2008 *Hā'ena: through the eyes of the ancestors*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Arista, Noelani

2007 Foreword. In *Kepelino's traditions of Hawaii*. Rev. ed., ed. and trans. Martha Warren Beckwith, with notes by Mary Kawena Pukui. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 95: iv–xiv. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum Press.

Chun, Malcolm Naea

2006 Davida Malo. In *Ka Mo'olelo Hawai'i: Hawaiian traditions*, ed. D. Malo, trans. M. N. Chun, i–xxiv. Honolulu: First People's Productions.

Clifford, James

2001 Indigenous articulation. *The Contemporary Pacific* 13:468–90.

Crocombe, Ron

1975 Anthropology, anthropologists and Pacific Islanders: A reply to Dr. Hau'ofa. Discussion Paper 11. Port Moresby: Institute of Papua New Guinea Studies.

- Dening, Greg  
1980 *Islands and beaches: Discourse on a silent land, Marquesas, 1774–1880*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.  
2004 *Beach crossings: Voyaging across times, cultures and self*. Carlton, Victoria, Australia: The Miegunyah Press.
- Diaz, Vicente M.  
2006 Creolization and indigeneity. *American Ethnologist* 33 (4): 576–78.
- Diaz, Vicente M., Director/Writer/Coproducer  
1997 *Sacred vessels: Navigating tradition and identity in Micronesia*. Video. Written, directed, and coproduced by Vicente M. Diaz. GMF, Guam: Moving Island Productions.
- Diaz, Vincente M., and J. Kēhaulani Kauanui  
2001 Native Pacific cultural studies on the edge. *The Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2): 315–42.
- Fahim, Hussein  
1982 *Indigenous anthropology in non-Western countries: Proceedings of a Burg Wartenstein symposium*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Finney, Ben  
2003 *Sailing in the wake of the ancestors: Reviving Polynesian voyaging*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, Jennifer Noelani  
2005 *Kū i ka Māna: Building community and nation through contemporary Hawaiian schooling*. PhD diss., Santa Cruz: Univ. of California.
- Halapua, Sitiveni  
2003 Walking the knife-edge pathways. Archived on Pacific Islands Report [Internet]. Available from <http://166.122.164.43/archive/2003/July/07-08-halapua.htm> (19 May 2003).
- Handy, E. S. Craighill and Mary Kawena Pukui  
1972 *The Polynesian family system in Ka'ū, Hawai'i*. Rutland, Vermont: C. E. Tuttle.
- Harrison, Faye V.  
1997 Anthropology as an agent of transformation: introductory comments and queries. In *Decolonizing anthropology: Moving further toward an anthropology for liberation*. 2nd ed., ed. F. V. Harrison, 1–15. Arlington, VA: Association of Black Anthropologists.
- Hau'ofa, Epeli  
1975 Anthropology and Pacific Islanders. *Oceania* 45:283–89.

- 1994 Our sea of islands. *The Contemporary Pacific* 6:147–61.  
2008 *We are the ocean: Selected works*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Hereniko, Vilsoni

- 1994 Representations of cultural identities. In *Inside out: Literature, cultural politics, and identity in the new Pacific*, ed. V. H. R. Wilson, 137–66. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.  
2000 Indigenous knowledge and academic imperialism. In *Remembrance of Pacific pasts: An invitation to remake history*, ed. R. Borofsky, 78–91. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Jacobs-Huey, Lanita

- 2002 The natives are gazing and talking back: Reviewing the problematics of positionality, voice, and accountability among “native” anthropologists. *American Anthropologist* 104 (3): 791–804.

Jones, Delmos J.

- 1970 Towards a Native anthropology. *Human Organization* 29 (4): 251–59.

Kaeppler, Adrienne L.

- 1982 Genealogy and disrespect: A study of symbolism in Hawaiian images. *Res* 3:82–107.

Kahn, M.

- 1981 Always in hunger: Food as metaphor for social identity in Wamira, Papua New Guinea. PhD diss., Philadelphia: Bryn Mawr College.

Ka'ili, Tēvita O.

- 2005 Tauhi va: Nurturing Tongan sociospatial ties in Maui and beyond. *The Contemporary Pacific* 17 (1): 83–114.  
2008 Tauhi vā: Creating beauty through the art of sociospatial relations anthropology. PhD diss., Seattle: Univ. of Washington.

Kamakau, S. M.

- 1865 Ahahui imi i na mea kahiko o Hawai'i nei. *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, September 9, 1865, p.1.

Kame'eiehiwa, Lilikalā

- 1992 *Native land and foreign desires: How shall we live in harmony?* [Ko Hawai'i aina a me na koi puumake a ka poe haole: Pehea la e pono ai?] Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.  
2003 “Kumulipo,” unpublished article, 16.

Liliuokalani

- 1897 *The Kumulipo: An Hawaiian creation myth*. Repr., Kentfield, CA: Pueo Press, 1978.

- Lilomaiaava-Doktor, S.  
 2009 Beyond "migration": Samoan population movement (Malaga) and the geography of social space (vā). *The Contemporary Pacific* 21 (1): 1–32.
- Losch, Naomi Noelanioko'olau Clark  
 2003 Mary Kawena Pukui, Ka Wahine o La'i Aloha. 'O*iw*i. *A Native Hawaiian Journal* 3:102–05.
- Māhina, O.  
 1992a The Tongan traditional history tala-e-fonua: A vernacular ecology-centered historico-cultural concept. PhD diss., Canberra: Australian National Univ.  
 1992b Ko e Tukufakaholo mo e Fepakipaki: Ko ha Sio ki Ono'aho mei Onopo. *Konivēsio ki he Konisitūtone mo e Temokalati (Convention on Tongan Constitution and Democracy)*, Pasilika 'o Sangato 'Antonio Patua.
- Malo, David  
 1951 *Hawaiian antiquities (moolelo Hawai'i)*. 2nd ed. Trans. Nathaniel B. Emerson. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Marsh, Selina Tusitala  
 1999 Here our words. In *The Pacific Islands: Environment and society*, ed. Moshe Rapaport, 166–79. Honolulu: Bess Press.
- Mead, M.  
 1928 *Coming of age in Samoa*. New York: Morrow.
- Medicine, Beatrice  
 1978 Learning to be an anthropologist and remaining "Native." In *Applied anthropology in America: Past contributions and future directions*, ed. Elizabeth Eddy and William Partridge, 182–96. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- Morauta, Louise  
 1979 Indigenous anthropology in Papua New Guinea. *Current Anthropology* 20:561–76.
- Morton, H.  
 1996 *Becoming Tongan: An ethnography of childhood*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.
- Narayan, Kirin  
 1993 How native is a "Native" anthropologist? *American Anthropologist* 95:671–85.
- Ohnuki-Tierney, Emiko  
 1984 "Native" anthropologists. *American Ethnologist* 11:584–86.
- Pukui, M. K., and S. H. Elbert  
 1986 *Hawaiian dictionary*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Refiti, A. L.

- 2009 Whiteness, smoothing and the origin of Samoan architecture. *Interstices: A Journal of Architecture and Related Arts* 10:9–19.

Roberts, Mere, Brad Haami, Richard Benton, et al.

- 2004 Whakapapa as a Māori mental construct: Some implications for the debate over genetic modification of organisms. *The Contemporary Pacific* 16(1):1–28.

Small, Cathy A.

- 1997 *Voyages: From Tongan villages to American suburbs*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai

- 1999 *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.

Taumoefolau, M.

- 2010 The 'UHINGA (meaning) of 'UHINGA (identity). In *Thirteenth Tonga Research Association conference. Siu'alaimoana: Voyaging through the oceans of Tongan theories and practices*. Berkeley: Univ. of California.

Teaiwa, Katerina M.

- 2004 Multi-sited methodologies: Homework between Fiji, Australia and Kiribati. In *Anthropologists in the field*, ed. Lynn Hume and Jane Mulcock. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.

Teaiwa, Teresia K.

- 2005 The classroom as a metaphorical canoe: Co-operative learning in Pacific studies. *World Indigenous Nations Higher Education Consortium Journal* 2005:38–48.

Tengan, Ty P. Kāwika

- 2001 Reclaiming space for an Indigenous anthropology: Some notes from Social Sciences Building 345. *Public Anthropology: The Graduate Journal*. Available from <http://www.publicanthropology.org/Journals/Grad-j/Hawaii/TenganSept21.htm> (accessed June 1, 2010).
- 2005 Unsettling ethnography: Tales of an 'Ōiwi in the anthropological slot. *Anthropological Forum* 15(3):247–56.
- 2008 *Native men remade: Gender and nation in contemporary Hawai'i*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press.

Tomlinson, Matt

- 2006 Reflexivity, tradition and power: The work of R. R. Nayacakalou. *Ethos* 71 (4): 489–506.



Tuagalu, I.

- 2008 Heuristic of the *vā*. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous People*.  
Special Issue: 109–26.

Wendt, Albert

- 1976 Towards a new Oceania. *Mana Review* 1:49–60.  
1999 Afterword: Tatauing the postcolonial body. In *Inside out, literature, cultural politics and identity in the new Pacific*, ed. V. H. R. Wilson, pp. 399–412.  
Lanham, MD: Rowman.

White, Geoffrey, and Ty Kāwika Tengan

- 2001 Disappearing worlds: Anthropology and cultural studies in Hawai'i and the Pacific. *The Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2): 381–416.