NAMING THE COOK ISLANDS: ARTICULATION THEORY AND ʻAKAPAPAʻANGA

Emma Ngakuraevaru Powell
Victoria University of Wellington

The Cook Islands has existed as a formal polity for roughly one hundred years. There is no antecedent Māori name for this nation. Referencing the explorer Captain James Cook, it has been the nation's primary identifier since the late nineteenth century despite the nation comprising fifteen islands and various and distinct cultural genealogies prior to European arrival. In this article, I ask how might we effectively describe the formation of the Cook Islands' national identity and understand its name given its underlying genealogical and cultural diversity. In asking this question, I consider the utility of cultural studies' articulation theory for contextualizing the development of the Cook Islands name and the culture it denotes. I then discuss how the Cook Islands (Māori) concepts of ʻakapapaʻanga (genealogy making) and the Māori practice of naming extend articulation theory's proposition that culture is a series of articulated parts.

Introduction

Ko ʻai toʻou ingoa: What Is Your Name?

My name is Emma Emily Ngakuraevaru Powell. I am a child of two Cook Islands Māori (Māori) parents who were both of Māori parents too. I was born in New Zealand and raised by my adoptive English grandfather and my Māori grandmother. I have spent my life in New Zealand. Apart from my multicultural family, I have spent very little time amongst the Cook Islands community

Pacific Studies, Vol. 43, No. 2—Dec. 2020

but have always felt deeply connected and proud of my cultural and ancestral connections. That distance from Māori people has meant I have had a limited fluency in the Māori language, cultural protocols, and (at least until my adult years) the history of my people. Reconciling my ignorance of essentialist cultural practices and the deep comfort and pride I feel toward my Māoriness has, in varying permutations, been a focus of my academic research about the Cook Islands nation and Māori people to date. The questions posed in this article are partly generated from that personal and academic experience.

They are also influenced by the ideologies of my discipline. As a Pacific studies doctoral student at Vaʻaomanū Pasifika, my research practice has been shaped by the theoretical underpinnings of the Pacific studies field at Victoria University and therefore the writings of the late associate professor Teresia Teaiwa and professor of Pacific Islands studies Terence Wesley-Smith (University of Hawaiʻi) (Teaiwa 2010; Wesley-Smith 1995, 2016). Teaiwa's tenets of interdisciplinarity, the need to engage with indigenous ways of knowing, and comparative practice have been grappled with by every student who has walked into our Pacific studies program since 2000. It is with her absence that our current cohort of postgraduate students feel keenly the need for her guidance and are questioning the intent and potential of her published contemplations, both implicit and explicit.

This article began as an exercise in applying theory within the broader spirit of the program's theoretical foundations. In the Pacific studies PASI401 course (Theories and Methods in Pacific Studies), students engage with theory and writings from across the Pacific, and in early weeks they learn about articulation theory. In our 2018 class, we focused on the theory's foundations in the British cultural studies school (Hall 1978, 1986) and followed part of its legacy to the History of Consciousness program at the University of California, Santa Cruz, through which Teaiwa and our 2018 course coordinator, April Henderson, had both obtained their doctorates. We learned that Teaiwa had used articulation theory extensively in her work, and for our course assessment, we were asked to write with the theory's conceptual language: "How would you describe and understand [your project or issue] as *a unity of disparate elements; an assemblage; a whole formed out of multiple parts; a fusing together in a particular place and time of things that have not always been and may not always remain fused*?"[1]

The theoretical contemplations in this article extend early writing done as part of this PASI401 assessment. My doctoral project explores genealogical practice—or ʻakapapaʻanga —in the Cook Islands context, so in this article, I had wanted to produce a more fulsome response to the exercise set for us in that course with a view to strengthening the theoretical framework of my thesis. I wanted to test my preliminary theorizations of ʻakapapaʻanga as a practical ontology for marginalizing colonial historical narratives of the Cook Islands. I

also wanted to test the extent to which ʻakapapaʻanga was able to foreground a Māori ontology. In that first draft, I had found that although articulation theory provided the means to deconstruct the cultural monolith of the Cook Islands, it had not been able to capture the layered multiplicity of relationality in the Māori worldview, the ways in which various cultural identities and elements could be called forth and peripheralized through Māori genealogical practices.

Below, I propose the potential of understanding culture not only as a complex coalition of distinct parts but also as a dynamic, expansive, and animated organic body. I discuss this through the highly conceptual language of articulation theory and ʻakapapaʻanga and make my own contributions to the theoretical discourse with the concept of the "organic" as an extension of James Clifford's cyborg and Teaiwa's articulated limb (described later in this article).

This discussion is shaped by a central question in Māori practices of relation and ʻakapapaʻanga: *Ko ʻai toʻou ingoa*, or what is your name? As I pondered Teaiwa's prescription for indigeneity and comparativity in Pacific studies during my time in the PASI401 course, I consistently returned to considering my positionality as a Māori person and its relevance, status, and meaning to my project from within and without (see Case, this issue). When thinking through this personal and intellectual dialogue, I often use the metaphorical site of my name as a testing ground for theorizing indigenous and nonindigenous theories in my research practice. In my extended consideration of articulation theory and its relevance to ʻakapapaʻanga as a cultural practice within my work, Cook Islands naming traditions seemed fitting ground on which to test my theoretical workings. I focus in particular on my own name—"Emma Emily Ngakuraevaru Powell"—and the nation that is named "the Cook Islands" as a way of illustrating the limitations of articulation theory in the Cook Islands context. I then discuss the potential of ʻakapapaʻanga as a way of extending its underlying principal: that culture is a sociocultural ensemble of cultural elements, engaged in an ongoing process of articulation and disarticulation.

What's in a Name? The Cook Islands and Cook Islands Māori People

Te au ingoa: Naming Traditions

For Māori of the Cook Islands, the tradition of naming is a sacred and important custom. It is not peculiar to the Māori of the Cook Islands, but, as in other cultures of the Pacific region and the world, its role in Cook Islands society remains one that is intimately connected to one's relations, relationships and state of belonging. In his text *A Book of Cook Islands Māori Names*, Māori scholar Jon Jonassen wrote,

> Names play a major role in the traditional life of the Māori people of the Cook Islands. It has a dynamic, ever-present symbolism that constantly reminds those who are living of responsibilities to their ancestors and descendants. It has emotional, physical and spiritual connotations. . . . Names create a link to ancestors, friends, family members, titles and land. It enhances events and relationships between the past, present and future. . . . Traditionally, names change over the life of a person to commemorate particular events. There is a birth name . . . a new marital name . . . and a death name. . . . In general, names are dreamed during sleep or are simply created to describe an event, a relationship or a favourite aspect of nature. Often various parts of the child's whole name extracts from the genealogy of both parents. Additional names can also be added to the existing names of persons. These usually occur when traditional titles are bestowed: by families on a particular person. (Jonassen 2003: 7–8)

My big, long, complex name is a unity of many ancestral links, not all constituted through blood ties. The name "Ngakuraevaru" is the most recognizably Māori. It is the name of my great-great-grandmother. My surname is an inheritance from the English grandfather who adopted my mother. My second name—Emily—was the name of my English grandfather's mother. As a conglomeration and commemoration of Māori and non-Māori genealogies, one might ask, Where does this name come from, and what does it represent? What are the ways that such a name might be read, and how am I to carry them all at the same time?

I am always struck by the simultaneously meaningful and obfuscating aesthetic of my name. Inside its Māori paradigm, one would see my name as a complex and multilayered network of familial, social, and cultural connections. Each one represents a series of individuals and experiences. They have then been hung on a daughter and granddaughter to be carried forward for another generation and potentially handed on to another future descendant. But, as names are hooked on to new entities and then move through different cultural contexts, each new meaning simultaneously supersedes and extends, within some contexts its meaning may be reduced, and in others its complexity is liberated.

The names "Cook Islands" and "Cook Islands Māori" are similarly complex. They are constituted from a specific ancestor—Captain James Cook—and the people and islands they have come to represent. The nation's name now suggests a homogeneous Māori culture and national identity, representative of all peoples with genealogical affiliations to one or more of its fifteen islands. It also belies the fact that the majority of the Cook Islands Māori global population

no longer live in the home islands. Māori academics Ani James, Jean Mitaera, and Apii Rongo-Raea propose that part of the name's power and meaning is produced from the binary generated by the nation's boundary:

> In the Cook Islands all things indigenous (both animate and inanimate) carry the name *Māori*. We call ourselves *Māori*, our language is *Māori* and our culture is *Māori*. In truth, *one is only a Cook Islander outside of the Cook Islands* [emphasis added]. (James, Mitaera, and Rongo-Raea 2012, 9)

As Cook had a salient influence on the drawing of that boundary, it seems appropriate that his name be used to contextualize the polity that it created. I suggest, then, that his name (and therefore Cook himself) is an important part of the contemporary cultural identity of Māori people, someone we might refer to as a key ancestor in our national genealogy. I am aware that claiming Cook as any kind of ancestor to Māori society has the potential for controversy given that his explorations of the Pacific are understood as the catalyst for the British colonial project and the dismantling and eventual disenfranchisement of indigenous people in many parts of the region. Nevertheless, he is the foreign explorer that the Cook Islands national identity and culture are named after. It is how we are known to those outside our boundaries, and many have accepted and invested meaning in the demonym as our national sovereignty has developed.

In my preliminary thinking for this article, I was reminded strongly of Teresia Teaiwa's sentiments in her article "The Ancestors We Get to Choose: White Influences I Won't Deny," where she explored the undeniable influence of non-Pacific thinkers in her intellectual genealogy and the intellectual genealogy of the Pacific region at large. In acknowledging those influences, Teaiwa wrote,

> It has been routinely acknowledged . . . that genealogy is central to the formation of Pacific subjectivities. 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. 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. (Teaiwa 2014: 43–44)

Teaiwa's words resonate strongly with my proposition that Cook's place in the cultural genealogy of Māori people is not only plausible but also undeniable. While his name may have been imposed on an arbitrary national boundary (something I explore later in this article), I am interested in how a Māori analytical lens might contextualize its longevity and its function for Māori people rather than the colonial cartographers. In 1994, a referendum was held in the Cook Islands asking whether Māori would consider changing the Cook Islands name to a Māori one and (among other things) if, in voting to change it, they would agree to the new name of "'Avaiki."[2] The majority voted to keep the Cook Islands name, and perhaps, in this way, Cook is indeed the ancestor Māori chose—or at least an ancestor they chose during a specific moment in 1994 (Crocombe and Crocombe 1995).[3] Shortly after I presented an early draft of this article at the annual meeting of the Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania (ASAO) in February 2019, New Zealand and Cook Islands media reported that one of the paramount ariki of Rarotonga and the Cook Islands, Pa Marie Ariki, had restarted conversations with the government and the House of Ariki[4] seeking a Māori name for the nation. Much of this coverage cited the irrelevance of Captain James Cook to Māori people and culture and the need to put the issue to the people via a referendum (Paranihi 2019; Roy 2019). This seemed to give some of my theoretical contemplations yet more relevance.

The Cook Islands Name

In the Cook Islands context, the nation's name will always carry negative and positive connotations. Non-Māori and Māori recognize that the Cook Islands is clearly not an ancestral name of the Māori people because, as we know, it is an English name, and it references Captain James Cook. Within the postcolonial paradigm, we might understand the connotations of Cook, the name, and the person as associated with colonialism, and our reading of the name might be neatly colonial and broadly bad. But, as I go on to discuss in the following sections of this article, it is important that in understanding the relevance of Cook and the Cook Islands name, we pay careful attention to cultural formation within a particularly Māori paradigm. Thus, as referred to by numerous native Pacific academics, we must be conscious of what Samoan-Tuvaluan-papa'a poet and scholar Selina Tusitala Marsh called a "genealogical aesthetic," constituted by the well-known Pacific adage of "facing the future with our backs" (Marsh 2004, 9). Within this context, a native Pacific and Cook Islands Māori view of temporality values not only understanding what came before (genealogies) but also the shifting meanings of those legacies, their recurrence and invocation, and their bearing on potential futures. Accordingly, understanding the connotations of the Cook Islands name begins with tracing its genealogy.

Various names were given to specific islands in the modern Cook Islands group by European explorers beginning in the late sixteenth century.[5] However, the Cook Islands name first appeared when hydrographer and cartographer Johann van Krusenstern sketched it onto a Russian naval map in 1835, honoring Captain Cook (Kloosterman 1976, 55). At this time, van Krusenstern's map only referenced the modern-day "southern group."[6] In 1888, the island group became a British protectorate, and in 1901, it became a New Zealand colony annexed under the "Cook Islands and other Islands Governments Act 1901." In New Zealand, the boundaries of the Cook Islands were gazetted as a proclamation from King George on June 13, 1901, and included the island of Niue. This was until the passage of the Cook Islands Amendment Act 1957, though it is clear from the resident agent reports and the published histories of the Cook Islands that they were administered separately well before then. In the Cook Islands Act 1915, the boundaries' coordinates and land area for the nation were defined and included the following islands (from south to north): Mangaia, Rarotonga, Maʻuke, Atiu, Takutea, Mitiaro, Manuae Aitutaki, Suwarrow, Nassau, Pukapuka, Manihiki, Rakahanga, and Penrhyn. The Cook Islands then became a self-governing nation in 1965.

Prior to this, during what is referred to as the colonial period (1888–1965), the respective islands, with the exception of the allied groupings of Ngaputoru (the southern islands of Atiu, Maʻuke, and Mitiaro) and the two northern atolls of Manihiki and Rakahanga, were considered to be relatively detached, possessing distinct genealogical legacies. These diverse traditions then set the tone for intraregional and eventually intranational relations well into the colonial period. I argue, as do others (Nicholas 2016; Sobel-Read 2012; Tagata Pasifika 2013), that these divergent genealogies have structured allegiances and relational proximities in a way that has made the collective development of the "Cook Islands Māori" nation and culture complex and at times difficult. In short, the priorities of different island and familial communities have often contrasted both in the Cook Islands and within the Cooks Islands diaspora, creating tensions. In the Tagata Pasifika story cited above, various interviewees in the report gestured to the subtle tensions between island community groups, and many anecdotal accounts echo these sentiments in home-island and diasporic contexts (S. Nicholas, pers. comm.).

While the formal creation of the nation was executed through political arrangements with colonial powers, collective subscription to the nationalist agenda of the new Cook Islands nation was slow and strategic, achieved through a combination of powerful chiefly titles, strategic rhetoric, and marital unions (Gilson 1980). Makea Takau—referred to as a past Queen of Rarotonga and holder of one of the most powerful ariki titles on that island (Makea Nui)—held significant political, cultural, and social power at the turn of the

nineteenth century. Influenced by the encroaching colonial presence of France in the islands farther to the east (Tahiti and eventually the entirety of modern-day French Polynesia), Takau sought protectorate status from the British in 1888 as a preemptive measure against potential French invasion. Rarotonga, as the largest island of the group, had already established itself as the headquarters for colonial and missionary institutions in the nearby region, and Takau's decision-making power was bolstered by her marriage to the paramount ariki of Ngāputoru, Ngamaruariki Rongotini. The alliance of these four islands was a strategic and powerful political move at a time when colonial competition for power in the region had begun to increase. The remaining islands of the southern group eventually bowed under the insistence of missionary and colonial actors, and the addition of the northern atolls—Pāmati, Manihiki, Rakahanga, Tongareva, Pukapuka, Nassau, and Suwarrow—occurred as Britain and New Zealand began tidying the cartographic record of their territories (Gilson 1980; Scott 1991).

By the time New Zealand annexed the Cook Islands in 1901, the colonial geography of the group had become reasonably stable. However, despite this and the well-traveled routes of missionaries and twentieth-century colonial officials, the islands remained to some extent separate from one another with scant transport opportunities and little effort from colonial and Māori leaders to push a strong nationalist agenda beyond Rarotonga. Indeed, for much of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the northern atolls had little to do with the administration in Rarotonga. It was not until independence that a concerted effort to build national identity got under way, driven by the first government of the Cook Islands and its premier, the late Sir Albert Henry.

In his 1999 book *Nation and Destination: Creating Cook Islands Identity*, anthropologist Jeffrey Sissons discussed how national unity and identity was built under the leadership of the first four Cook Islands governments, beginning with Henry's inaugural government in 1966 (Sissons 1999). Sissons observed that Henry and his government had initially focused on fostering unity amongst the islands. Sissons called this Henry's "first phase of ethnicisation," involving a political emphasis on funding and support for cultural institutions that would begin building a national brand for much-needed economic development and the collective enterprise required for the nation-building project. Those institutions included the Cook Islands Ministry of Cultural Development (Tauranga Vānanga) and the Cook Islands National Arts Theatre (CINAT). The former had broad oversight of cultural institutions like CINAT, the national archives, and fostering a national research culture. The latter was focused primarily on the performing arts culture that worked to define an internationally recognized Cook Islands tourist brand (Pigman 2012).

Henry's rationalization for the focus on building national and cultural unity was conveyed by his colleague Percy Henderson. Sissons quoted Henderson, who said,

> I was here in the colonial days when each individual island was an island. They had their Resident Agents and not very much contact [with Rarotonga]. I remember sitting with him [Albert Henry] right at the beginning when he became Prime Minister and he said "my first task is to make fifteen islands one country. . . at the moment we're fifteen different islands, we've got to make these the Cook Islands, unless we get everybody together we've got nothing." (Sissons 1999, 37)

Henderson and the legacy of Henry's governments from 1965 to 1978 suggest that right up to independence fifty-three years ago, the people of the Cook Islands nation were engaged in the process of articulating a new national identity or at least contending with multiple identities of which the Cook Islands national identity was but one.

The formulation and durability of this "ethnicization" process built a strong nationalist sentiment amongst an emergent, contemporary Cook Islands society. Kevin Sobel-Read (2012), a lawyer and anthropologist, discussed the formulation of national identity and sovereignty within the context of globalization in his doctoral thesis, using the Cook Islands as his primary case study. He argued that national identity in the Cook Islands had been generated from a mix of functional and formal political mechanisms and the emotional investment of Māori writ large. He described "emotional sovereignty" as "the cultural magic that makes sovereignty *collective*, that renders the whole larger than the sum of its individual parts, the fusion whereby human allegiance and affection form a sacred bond superior to Western forms of logic" (84), and gave examples of that "magic," including national sport and performing arts, as the glue constituting and holding national identity and culture together. Sobel-Read had quite accurately described Henry's ethnicization agenda.

Sobel-Read had not, however, accounted for the diverse cultural genealogies that had existed prior to independence or how those genealogies had been either amalgamated, developed, or discarded as part of Henry's pursuit of "togetherness" (Sissons 1999). While the first governments of the self-governing Cook Islands nation focused on building togetherness as a solid foundation on which nationalism could grow, the genealogical legacies—the island-specific legacies to which Māori belong—have continued to subtly influence and at times vex the rules of social engagement for Māori people. Cook Islands land tenure, as a brief example, is a cultural institution that Māori have not (as yet) shifted entirely to a Western economic and legal model of private property

rights. Under this system, all Māori, in principle, have rights to communal landownership and potential occupation and lease of specific land title, determined through one's genealogical ties to specific land or what is considered natal soil and the wider permission of family, tribe, and chiefly system. This land system, though problematic, is relatively rare for indigenous peoples with a legacy of colonization and is held to by Māori society because it is still widely considered an appalling and egregious notion to permanently separate a Māori person from the islands and lands of their ancestors (Sobel-Read 2012, 130). So, on the one hand, how do we understand a cultural and national whole while at the same time reconciling our genealogical traditions and the large majority of Māori who are no longer located on the islands of their ancestors? How might we recognize and account for these multilayered papa'anga (genealogy) in the name of our nation?

Articulation Theory

Articulation theory is a cultural studies theory that aims to account for "the ideas, principles, and beliefs that make up ideologies. It provides an insightful means by which to account for the ways in which discourse and discursive formations are able to bind people and their sense of identity together in concrete ways" (Jackson and Hogg 2010, 36). It is a critical turn away from Hobsbawm and Ranger's (1992) "invention of tradition." Rather than focusing on the binary of tradition versus modernity, articulation theory assumes a series of cultural developments comprised of multiple parts and joined together through complex political, social, and cultural processes. Stuart Hall, who was influential in developing articulation theory for the British cultural studies school, was interviewed in 1986 by Lawrence Grossberg, who asked him to describe the ideology underpinning articulation theory. Hall responded with the analogy of the articulated lorry. The lorry (or truck), made of two distinct parts—the cab and the trailer—was representative of cultural formation. He declared that rather than thinking of culture as a single, whole, and static body of ideas and norms, it would be better to consider culture as a highly flexible and dynamic assembly of different cultural elements. He detailed the inherent ability of these elements to be connected, disconnected, and reconnected under specific conditions, saying, "An articulation is thus the form of the connection that *can* make a unity of two different elements . . . it is a linkage which is not necessary, determined, absolute and essential for all time. You have to ask, under what circumstances *can* a connection be forged or made?" (Grossberg 1986, 53). The articulated lorry (transposed by some American scholars as a metaphorical train with carriages [Teaiwa 2017, 5]) suggested that culture was not only an assembly but also a cultural whole with the perpetual potential to change or be disarticulated temporarily or permanently.

Other interlocutors of cultural studies, including James Clifford (2001, 2003), Clifford and George Marcus (1986), and Jennifer Slack (1996), and Pacific studies' uptake of cultural studies, including Teresia Teaiwa (2001, 2005, 2017), Vince Diaz and Kēhaulani Kauanui (2001), and Ty Tengan, Tēvita Kāʻili, and Rochelle Fonoti (2010), advanced the theory further, extending the metaphorical lorry/truck by developing more corporeal analogies. In the introduction to their collection of papers from the 2000 conference "Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge," Diaz and Kauanui (2001) noted the potential of articulation theory to permit appreciation of "longer, deeper histories of indigenous articulations such as 'landedness' [and] diaspora and exile" (331) while also acknowledging that cultural studies (the field from which articulation theory had come) "had been remarkably distant, if not hostile, to indigeneity" (324). The previously mentioned authors and scholars suggest that in wielding articulation theory in Pacific contexts, indigenous (Pacific) modes are also necessary.

In a 2003 interview with Manuela Ribeiro Sanches, Clifford reflected on how his critical understanding of invented or reinvented cultures had become more fluid, referencing the ability of articulation theory to avoid an "all-or-nothing, zero-sum game" approach to understandings of cultural development and authenticity (Clifford 2003, 46). He contemplated the tension between the constructivist agenda inherent in articulation theory and the organic connotations of the word *culture*, arguing that while the word *culture* referenced the organic, theoretically it worked better as a mechanized, deliberately constructed body:

> When I think of a cultural body as an articulated body, it doesn't look like an organic body. It looks more like a monster, sometimes, or perhaps a cyborg . . . a coalition in which certain elements of a population have connected with other elements, but with the possibility—which is always there in articulation—of disarticulation. (Clifford 2003: 46–47)

Clifford's imagining of the cultural model advanced the serial mode of the articulated lorry proposed by Hall and others. Clifford's conceptualization also followed that culture was neither static nor predetermined, and, accordingly, he had declined to use the archetypal organic body of a human. He reasoned that to change—to articulate and disarticulate—the human body would be to equate cultural transformation with the death of the body/culture (Clifford 2003: 47–48).

Teresia Teaiwa took the idea of the articulated body further in her article "The Articulated Limb." She proposed that, at least for her case studies of the military-industrial complex (MIC) in the Guam and Fiji contexts, the metaphorical articulated limb of the human body offered

> a more appropriate illustration and analogy of articulation's engineering, the difficulty and trauma of disarticulation and the literal possibilities of rearticulation. For while the basic ball and socket of a hip or shoulder joint, the hinge of a knee . . . may share the fundamental mechanics of that joint between a lorry/truck and trailer . . . the ligaments, tendons, nerves and blood vessels that grow around an articulated limb make the possibility of disarticulation inevitably violent and traumatizing. (Teaiwa 2017, 66)

In contrast to Clifford, Teaiwa argued that rather than the death-inducing disarticulation of key body parts, the articulation of bodily limbs at the joint by way of complex muscle, tendon, and ligature represented a more accurate analogy for cohering some of the political, social, and cultural formations in particular temporal contexts. Like Clifford, she then invoked prostheses as a way of metaphorically representing the adaptive resilience of those wanting to detach themselves from the military complex. Teaiwa's usually deft poetics become confusing in her article, however. Followed through to an anticipated conclusion of liberation and resilience, the logics set out in her article render the articulated "limbs" of Fiji and Guam discarded and the MIC maintained as those cultural elements/limbs are eventually replaced with Teaiwa's much-discussed prostheses.

In spite of this, I take two useful points from Teaiwa's work. The first is the attention she brings to the complexity of cultural disarticulation. I am struck by the idea that "trauma" and "violence" are being generated from the act and are thus marking the genealogical aesthetic I cited from Marsh earlier in this article. The second and related point is the attention that Teaiwa brings to the relevance of organic metaphors in the Pacific context, something that both Clifford and Hall did not account for in Pacific modes of understanding growth—of very literal things, including people and *thus* culture.

As a national institution, the Cook Islands national identity has been an articulation project of epic proportions. With Clifford's and especially Teaiwa's discussions in mind, it is possible to read the national institution as a metaphorical cultural body. The antecedent genealogical legacies of each island community might then be considered the limbs protruding from that torso. This cultural body was born from 150 years of shifting political and strategic colonial contexts, providing new conditions for cultural articulation. Although missionization may not be linked directly with the nation-building project in contemporary discourse, its articulation to Cook Islands cultural identity in parallel with the major narratives of the nation's formation cannot be ignored. The political, religious, and diplomatic milieu would have included the growing presence of various colonial powers in the nearby region and the pursuits of

their respective interests as well as the church's growing power within Māori society. Over time, the national identity and culture of the Cook Islands has experienced the tightening of metaphorical ligature and muscle as nationalist initiatives have been driven by neoliberal, Christian, and globalization ideologies (Sobel-Read 2016). As part of the global community, the Cook Islands have collectively established formal political and public institutions on which to stand, negotiate, and strategize in the modern global context. The joints of the metaphorical cultural body have become strengthened through a mixture of policy levers and political machinery (public institutions driven by political objectives) and nationalist sentiment built through Sobel-Read's "emotional sovereignty."

Like Diaz and Kauanui's suspicion of cultural studies, I find myself perplexed by Clifford's dismissal of the organic as an appropriate analogy or principle for cultural growth. Teaiwa herself belabored the significance of human bodies in the Pacific context, highlighting the history of abuse, oppression, and colonial inscription on individual and collective, metaphorical, and literal Pacific bodies (Teaiwa 2017, 14). Even though both authors utilized the (human) bodily form to facilitate their theoretical discussions, I cannot help but think of the generative and expansive ways that Māori understand bodies outside of and in relation to the human body.

In Cook Islands scholarship, this oft-quoted passage from Puati Mataʻiapo (a tribal leader from the island of Rarotonga) gestures to more expansive ways that bodies are conceived within Māori ontology:

> Takaʻi koe ki te papa enua
> ʻAkamou i te pito enua
> Aʻu i toʻou rangi
> As you step onto the surface of the land
> Fasten the umbilical chord
> Carve out your world[7]

This quote can be interpreted with reference to the Māori act of burying the placenta and pito (umbilical cord) of newborns into the earth, attaching them to the body of the land. This might be considered a "Māori" articulation of sorts, an act undertaken as a way of ensuring that newborns are situated, grounded, and put into kinship and relation with place. Clifford had highlighted the etymological roots of the word *culture* and its reference to the organic, and I find myself convinced that it is useful to retain concepts of the organic and the body (the organic body) when deploying articulation theory in the Cook Islands context, especially within a specifically Māori ontology—that being ʻakapapaʻanga.

ʻAkapapaʻanga

ʻAkapapaʻanga is a Māori cultural practice that is most commonly related to the custom of genealogical record. The root of the word is *papa*. It has multiple meanings, including to crouch, to lay down flat, or to hold or arrange something in position. It refers to the solidity of the earth, foundations, a layer, or a platform. Even in conceptualizing its form, *papa* connotes a much more dynamic relational logic than the seriality of the lorry/truck/train and a multilayered complexity that is absent from Teaiwa's articulated joint/limb. The noun *ʻakapapaʻanga*—the act of layering, positioning, and situating—implies that these various meanings must be actioned, that they are verbs or forms of cultural labor that occur within an ontological framework that understands relationality between not only people but also all things.

The word used by Māori to refer to a specific genealogy is *papaʻanga* (noun), and as with many other indigenous contexts, recounting genealogy is done for many purposes. Its most visible utility is illustrated in the ways that Māori understand their connection to land and, particularly, natal soil. In a legal sense, claims for succession to ancestral land are made by tracing blood connections to ancestors who have rights to land title(s) but, more important, by tracing connection to land *as* a relative. As Teaiwa proposes regarding Pacific epistemologies of descent and belonging more generally, translations of *papaʻanga* to *genealogy* should not be conflated exclusively with genetic discourse (Teaiwa 2014). For Māori, ʻakapapaʻanga refers to the relationality between individuals or cultural elements who are all part of an ever-growing whole or body—an organic, cultural whole—that includes the various layers of place and people: family, community, tribe, village, tapere, island, and now nation (James, Mitaera, and Rongo-Raea 2012, 9). The word and the practice imply that every person has some kind of relation to everyone and everything else through an array of relational proximities that are maintained through familial and social interaction or the act of ʻakapapaʻanga. Within this growing organic whole, Māori believe that there is a place for everyone and everything that is natural and correct, and that is determined by their various layers of papaʻanga.

In contrast to the deconstructed and fractionalized series or the human body made of complex and somewhat vulnerable joints, the conceptual organic body that I propose emphasizes a vast network of shifting and mobile relationships that is more temporally and spatially lithe than that of a serial train or a corporeal body. Instead, the organic body of ʻakapapaʻanga allows the act of situating, layering, and positioning to take place within temporal and spatial dimensions. Cultural connections transcend the corporeal body and understand it in deep relation with its multiple legacies and its expanding surroundings. The primary concern of ʻakapapaʻanga is how connections between elements are created and

sustained; the overall cultural aesthetic that is generated from the aggregated interconnectivity of cultural elements then becomes incidental. In other words, cultural alliances are formed because it is the prerogative of the organic body to grow, and to do so, it must develop through negotiated cultural tensions.

One of the key contrasts between ʻakapapaʻanga and articulation theory, then, is their divergent approaches to construction. While articulation theory makes it possible to understand cultural formation within a serial mode of (de)construction, ʻakapapaʻanga concerns itself explicitly with growth and the inevitable entanglements of relation and affect. Pacific scholars Tengan and others and Te Ahukaramū Charles Royal have explored this idea further (Tengan, Kaʻili, and Fonoti 2010; Royal 1998). The latter discussed genealogical practice as a research method in his paper "Te ao Mārama: A Research Paradigm," where he described whakapapa—the Aotearoa Māori practice of genealogy—as an "organic analytical method . . . concerned with growth rather than deconstruction" (3). Although this is not the same cultural context, there are strong equivalences between whakapapa and ʻakapapaʻanga as genealogical praxis. Royal discussed the difficulty of deconstruction when using whakapapa as a research method because organic growth, he argued, required antecedent phenomena in order to produce new "phenomena": two-parent phenomena, a meeting or relationship, creating something new. He emphasized how the genealogical method "urges us to consider relationships" and how, in understanding the creation of these parental elements, "slowly, the researcher is drawn 'out' to a wider field, rather than being drawn 'in' to a smaller one. Hence, the method might be considered to be organic rather than one of deconstruction" (3). In contrast to the implied ease of Hall's and Clifford's disarticulated carriages and cyborgs, Royal's underscoring of the organic within the paradigm of whakapapa highlights the importance of what is being produced from any change to culture, articulation or otherwise. The idea that all "phenomena" or cultural change come from some moment of negotiated tension between two "parent phenomena" suggests to me that even disarticulation within the context of genealogical practice is perceived as a progressive change, fixed into the genealogical aesthetic that signals the further organic growth of the papaʻanga.

In the case of the Cook Islands name and the culture it represents, what might we learn about cultural articulation if we view it through the paradigm of ʻakapapaʻanga? By way of Clifford's and Teaiwa's critical positions on disarticulation, to what extent is potential cultural deconstruction apparent or relevant in the Cook Islands context when considering the disarticulation of our national name as a way of reforming the nation and its identity/culture? In the articulation of the Cook Islands name, did we then proclaim the death of our pre-nation cultural elements having been transformed into something new? And, if not, is it actually possible to deconstruct the cultural body into its constitutent cultural elements, or have they been superseded by something new?

Te ʻakapapa nei tātou: Naming Articulations

Whenever Māori meet for the first time, they ask each other's names: *Ko ʻai toʻou ingoa?* Asking one's name is an example of ʻakapapaʻanga in practice. It is the simultaneous act of tracing and making a new connection with someone else. My name—indeed, me, Emma, the person—is an organic body made of various literal as well as metaphoric cultural DNA, a genealogical aesthetic that is quite clearly discernible in my multicultural name. Of course, articulation theory and ʻakapapaʻanga are concerned primarily with how such aesthetics are created.

In Māori culture, to name someone is a very important cultural practice. The formulation of my name, as recounted earlier, followed some of the rationalizations that I quoted from Jonassen in the introduction of this article. My grandparents and mother discussed my legal names at length, and throughout my life I have been given many others. My aunties and mother all call me Emily. My whole family will call me Ems. My extended family on my mother's paternal side will sometimes call me Ngarua when I do or say something that they believe has come, through the papaʻanga, from my biological grandfather. My Māori name, Ngakuraevaru, is used in Māori contexts, especially in academic and professional settings, because it enables Māori people to identify me in an older and more distant part of our shared papaʻanga. I *am* Ngakuraevaru, my great-great-grandmother, traveling through time. In addition, there is always the potential for new articulations. If I ever have children, they will also be named from the papaʻanga. Should I ever marry another Māori person, I would receive a new name, as would they. As part of Atiuan naming traditions (the island to which my maternal papaʻanga belongs), ancestral names are gifted and exchanged during marriage so that wedded couples are acknowledged in the genealogies of each other's families, a joining of genealogical lines.

In the situations I have described, names are mobile markers that are not appended to a person as much as they are invoked. As usefully described by Henderson (2010) in her article "Gifted Flows: Making Space for a Brand New Beat,"

> People can also be gifted, at least in the sense that the shifting collections of memories and material effects webbed around the sign of the proper name can pass from one person to another.

The multiplicity of names represents the multiplicity of those who have held it before, and, depending on when, how, and who is invoking the name, those legacies and cultural identities are brought forward and animated through various cultural practises of relation we refer to as ʻakapapaʻanga. I have referred to some examples in this article: the planting of the pito, the onward sharing

of names, and so on. Naming traditions, as Jonassen described, "create a link to ancestors, friends, family members, titles and land" and, through such genealogical links, give shape to our conceptions of culture.

Whether or not we are able to recognize essentialist Māori cultural aesthetics in a name like Emma Powell or, indeed, the Cook Islands, the process by which my parents arrived at my many names is still fundamentally born from Māori epistemology. My grandmother married an Englishman after she had my mother (my biological grandfather was also a Māori person from the same island). Still, when I was born, my grandmother engaged in ʻakapapaʻanga. She began the labor of resituating our familial and social proximities, beginning with my name, bringing me and therefore us (my family and the children and relationships I have yet to form) closer to the genealogy of my English grandfather and acknowledging articulations and alliance forged through her marriage to him. Through the paradigm of ʻakapapaʻanga, the Māoriness of my name is determined not through a recognizable cultural aesthetic of indigenous Māori names but through the practice of ʻakapapaʻanga represented in the names my parents, family, and friends have deliberately chosen to call me.

Likewise, a Māori epistemology recognizes that in the making of culture, it is not the aesthetic of the tourist brand or the cultural symbols that hold the "cultural magic" and "emotional sovereignty" that Sobel-Read referred to. As Teaiwa suggests, the trauma that can sometimes occur from the violence of attempting to remove cultural norms can itself produce the sentiment or emotional sovereignty that marks our growing organic body of culture. While the Cook Islands name has become the primary cultural reference for Māori people, we cannot remove its articulation, meaning, and constitution from the colonial, Māori, and culturally and historically traumatic associations that it has.

When I began writing this article in early 2019, the public discourse surrounding the potential change of the nation's name was in a very different place. Early discussion with traditional and government leaders concluded shortly after Pā Marie Ariki's announcement that "they [would] support a Maori name to go beside the 'Cook Islands,' and leave the Cook Islands as it is" (Radio Cook Islands 2019). This dual name would follow New Zealand's example, where "Aotearoa New Zealand" and "Aotearoa," the Māori name for the entire New Zealand archipelago, had been used increasingly since the nineteenth century by organizations and citizens alike. In 2020, the House of Ariki confirmed that they would abandon their endorsement of the name change because of the time, money, and resources required for a referendum for which public interest and coherence had waned, and for now, the nation remains without a name in any Māori language other than the transliterated Kūki ʻĀirani.

Despite the resurfacing of public discussion, contemplation, and reflection on the possible change of the Cook Islands name in 2019, its name remains,

associated with a singular and homogeneous culture that represents us all. Despite that, I argue understanding that formation through the paradigm of ʻakapapaʻanga, and its associated naming tradition suggests that Māori society is shaped by a capacity to hold multiple cultures and identities in sustained tension.

Conclusion

Both Clifford and Teaiwa acknowledged that the promise of articulation theory was its signaling toward the possibility of disarticulation. In other words, its utility came from its ability to separate one's culture from certain cultural regimes and rearticulate and develop the sociocultural ensemble differently and separately from what went before. When I began writing the first draft of this article, even though I felt resonance in descriptions of the articulated body of the cyborg and the prosthetic limb rather than the cultural train/truck, there were still elements of Clifford's and Teaiwa's metaphorical theorizations that did not fit neatly onto the Cook Islands context. If my Pacific studies training thus far has taught me anything, it is that such theoretical disappointments are exactly why theories are so useful. Such moments signal that there is something peculiar about the circumstance that deserves our attention.

In the closing paragraph of Teaiwa's "The Articulated Limb," she contemplated the various ways that the Pacific body had been marginalized, underscoring the reluctance of "dominant groups" (assumedly Western epistemes) to

> surrender its paradigms, for one of the most profound effects of a genuine reckoning with indigenous knowledge is having ones epistemological foundations challenged. This is certainly the case around issues of embodiment . . . indigenous concepts of the body—and therefore knowing through the body—are radically different from the strictly sensory and individualised experience that western scientific literature inscribes. (Teaiwa 2017: 14–15)

My early reading had also become snagged on Clifford's (2000) phrase, "The word culture is deeply tied up with organic notions of growth, life, death—*bodies that persist through time* [emphasis added]" (46). It was not until I began reviewing this article that I paid further attention to Clifford's passage and Teaiwa's concluding paragraph. I should be clear that their use of the humanistic form and the articulation of foreign elements felt limiting in my contemplations of articulated Cook Islands culture. However, their conceptualization of bodies as persistent and expansive provides a new, critical space where we might start a discussion of articulation via a different, genealogical register.

With ʻakapapaʻanga, it is possible to understand Cook Islands culture and the cultural significance of the nation's name on Māori terms. Articulation theory allows us to expunge the binary of the "traditional" and the "modern" and to understand culture as a series of historical and ongoing connections, but it cannot comfortably describe the ways that Māori continue to animate cultural and genealogical legacies. These intranational cultures and identities seem contradictory through a constructivist lens, particularly when articulation theory implies a supposed homogeneous Cook Islands culture, and people and I have attempted to describe a reality for Māori people that steps past this paradigm in order to frame this as a legitimate and much-practiced cultural reality for Māori people. While there are other theories that transcend the serial metaphor, like the network, arborescence, and rhizomatic growth, ʻakapapaʻanga's unique acknowledgment of spatial and temporal scale fits more comfortably in a Māori ontology that understands the human body in deep relation, not only with other people but also with other divine and physical cultural elements.

Within the paradigm of ʻakapapaʻanga, the Cook Islands name is not simply appended to the cultural body sequentially but is invoked as all Māori names are when they are bestowed. So, while the Cook Islands national identity might be considered the latest iteration of Māori culture, ʻakapapaʻanga compels us to acknowledge that its relevance—and the relevance of ancestors like Captain Cook—cannot be separated from the trajectories of our respective and distinct genealogical and cultural legacies. Cook—the name and the man—is a genealogical intersection, not a cumulative assembly. As is the nature of papaʻanga and organic bodies, the name is descendant and antecedent, having come from a man and a historical context, and simultaneously generative of a new cultural element that Māori and others continue to animate through the cultural practice of ʻakapapaʻanga. Unlike articulation theory, the promise of ʻakapapaʻanga does not lie in its ability to disarticulate. Instead, its strength lies in its assurance that it is possible to honor and hold genealogical and cultural legacies—as well as new cultural trajectories—simultaneously. Like my own, the "Cook Islands" is but one name in a much larger, ever-emergent national and cultural genealogy. And, like my own, its Māoriness should be considered with the expectations of a developing genealogical aesthetic in mind. Clifford, Teaiwa, Jonassen and even articulation theory itself assures us that it is possible for our cultural bodies to grow, to change, to take on multiple names that are animated in specific relational contexts. To acknowledge the relevance of Cook and his name in who we are is not to say that his name must necessarily persist or that his must be our singular and primary (re)birthed name. Our naming traditions deny that subjugating persistence. ʻAkapapaʻanga instead allows us to articulate *through* disarticulations, knowing that even the elements that we may wish to disarticulate are key parts of what make our cultures an ever-expanding organic body.

NOTES

1. In the PASI401 course, students are tasked with writing a series of short written assessments called KCQs (key concepts and questions) that measure the student's developing understandings of key concepts in the course. The question quoted here is from the third KCQ assigned to the 2018 PASI401 class.

2. "'Avaiki" is associated primarily with the ancestral homeland of the Polynesian people and is a cognate for equivalent terminology in other Polynesian languages and cultures (Savaiiki, Hawaiiki, etc.). In Cook Islands Māori, 'Avaiki also more broadly connotes the places from which we come forth into the world of light and has been interpreted in some Māori pe'e (traditional chants) as the mother's womb.

3. In January 2019, Pā Marie Ariki of Rarotonga proposed that an opportunity for another referendum about the Cook Islands nation be tabled with Cook Islands Māori people both inside and outside the home islands. As part of that, further context of the 1994 referendum has come to light in public discourse, with some commenting on the prominence of Rarotongan decision makers who fostered a reluctance in Cook Islands people to accept the change in 1994, especially those from the outer islands. I recognize that while "acceptance" of the Cook Islands name in 1994 might be one reading of the historical narrative, there is much missing from the public record, including the diverse opinions of Cook Islands Māori people at the time (Radio New Zealand 2019; Roy 2019).

4. The House of Ariki is an advisory body comprising Ariki, or high chiefs, from each inhabited island of the Cook Islands with some exceptions, including Manihiki/Rakahanga, Nassau/Pukapuka, and Palmerston. Further details are set out in 1966 House of Ariki legislation.

5. In 1959, the Spaniard Álvaro de Mendaña and his Portugese pilot, Queirós, sighted what was later identified as Pukapuka and its motu. They named it San Bernado, having sighted four atolls on St. Bernard's Day, and were the first European explorers to name one of the modern-day islands of the Cooks group. Others went on to sight and land on the rest of the group, and some gave European names. A comprehensive list of these names, the dates they were given, and the narratives describing how and why European travelers passed by or landed on them can be found in Brian Hooker's (1998) article "The European Discovery of the Cook Islands" and Kloosterman's (1976) *Discoverers of the Cook Islands and the Names They Gave*.

6. The southern group includes the capital and main island of Rarotonga; the islands of Mangaia, Aitu, Mitiaro, Ma'uke, and Aitutaki; and the uninhabited islands of Manuae and Takutea.

7. Puati Mata'iapo's passage has been quoted numerous times in various texts. The translation here is from Jon Jonassen, published in his book *Kama'atu*. Jonassen's citation is from a Tumu Korero Conference (a meeting of cultural experts) held in 1990 (Jonassen 2005).

REFERENCES

Clifford, James
2001 Indigenous articulations. *The Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2): 467–90.
2003 Interviewer: Manuela Ribeiro Sanches, Santa Cruz, Winter 2000. In *On the edges of anthropology (interviews)*, 43–78. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.

Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus, eds.
1986 Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Crocombe, Ron, and Marjorie Tuainekore Crocombe
1995 The Cook Islands, July 1992 to June 1994. *The Contemporary Pacific* 7 (1): 138–44.

Diaz, Vicente, and J. Kēhaulani Kauanui.
2001 Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge. *The Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2): 315–42.

Gilson, Richard Phillip
1980 *The Cook Islands, 1820–1950*. Wellington: Victoria Univ. Press in association with the Institute of Pacific Studies of the Univ. of the South Pacific.

Grossberg, Lawrence
1986 On postmodernism and articulation: An interview with Stuart Hall. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10 (2): 45–60.

Hall, Stuart
1978 Policing the crisis: Mugging, the state, and law and order. London: Macmillan.
1986 Gramsci's relevance for the study of race and ethnicity. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10 (2): 5–27.

Henderson, April
2010 Gifted flows: Making space for a brand new beat. *The Contemporary Pacific* 22 (2): 293–315.

Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds.
1992 *The invention of tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hooker, Brian
1998 The European discovery of the Cook Islands. *Terrae Icognitae: The Journal of the Society for the History of Discoveries* 30 (1): 54–62.

Jackson, Ronald, and Michael Hogg
2010 Articulation theory. In *Encyclopedia of identity*, ed. R. Jackson and M. Hogg, 36–9. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

James, Ani, Jean Mitaera, and Apii Rongo-Raea
2012 Turanga Māori: A Cook Islands conceptual framework transforming family violence—Restoring wellbeing. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.

Jonassen, Jon
2003 A book of Cook Islands Maori names|Ingoa. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, Univ. of the South Pacific.
2005 *Kama'atu: Verses of wisdom*. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, Univ. of the South Pacific.

Kloosterman, Alphonse
1976 Discoverers of the Cook Islands and the names they gave. Rarotonga: Cook Islands Library and Museum.

Marsh, Selina Tusitala
2004 Ancient banyans, flying foxes and white ginger. PhD thesis, Univ. of Auckland.

Nicholas, Sally Akevai
2016 Alive to change. Ingenio: The University of Auckland Alumni Magazine. https://www.ingenio-magazine.com/alive-to-change

Paranihi, Regan
2019 Removing Cook's legacy—Cook Islands seek name change. *Te ao Māori News*. March 6. https://teaomaori.news/removing-cooks-legacy-cook-islands-seek-name-change

Pigman, Geoffrey Allen
2012 Public diplomacy, place branding and investment promotion in ambiguous sovereignty situations: The Cook Islands as a best practice case. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* 8 (1): 17–29.

Radio New Zealand
2019 Cook Islands chief wants to talk Kuki Airani Maori name. January 17. https://www.rnz.co.nz/international/pacific-news/380278/cook-islands-chief-wants-to-talk-kuki-airani-maori-name

Radio Cook Islands—The Voice of the Cook Islands
2019 The House of Ariki had their final discussion yesterday regarding the Cook Islands name change idea that was posed. March 14. https://www.facebook.com/143223219032811/photos/a.188600961161703/2230769063611539/?type=3

Roy, Eleanor Ainge
2019 Cook Islands considers name change to "reflect true Polynesian nature." *The Guardian*. March 5. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/mar/05/cook-islands-considers-name-change-to-reflect-true-polynesian-nature

Royal, Te Ahukaramū Charles
1998 Te Ao Mārama: A research paradigm. *He Pukenga Kōrero: A Journal of Māori Studies* 4 (1): 1–8.

Scott, Dick
1991 Years of the Pooh-Bah: A Cook Islands history. Rarotonga: Cook Islands Trading Corporation.

Sissons, Jeffrey
1999 Nation and destination: Creating Cook Islands identity. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, Univ. of the South Pacific Centre in the Cook Islands.

Slack, Jennifer Daryl
1996 The theory and method of articulation in cultural studies. In *Critical dialogues in cultural studies*, ed. S. Hall, D. Morley, and K.-H. Chen, 112–27. London: Routledge.

Sobel-Read, Kevin
2012 Sovereignty, law, and capital in the age of globalisation. PhD thesis, Duke Univ.
2016 A new model of sovereignty in the contemporary era of integrated global commerce: What anthropology contributes to the shortcomings of legal scholarship. *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law* 49 (4): 1045–107.

Tagata Pasifika, ed.
2013 Kiwi Cook Islanders get a chance to celebrate loud and proud in their own Maeva Nui. August 15. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sNPE5kZxN90

Teaiwa, Teresia
2001 L(o)osing the edge. *The Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2): 343–65.
2005 Articulated cultures: Militarism and masculinities in Fiji during the mid 1990s. *Fijian Studies: A Journal of Contemporary Fiji* 3 (2): 201–22.
2010 For or *before* an Asia Pacific studies agenda? Specifying Pacific studies. In *Remaking area studies: Teaching and learning across Asia and the Pacific*, ed. T. Wesley-Smith and J. Goss, 110–24. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaiʻi Press.
2014 The ancestors we get to choose: White influences I won't deny. In *Theorizing native studies*, ed. A. Simpson and A. Smith, 43–55. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press.
2017 The articulated limb: Theorizing indigenous Pacific participation in the military industrial complex. *Pacific Dynamics* 1:1–20.

Tengan, Ty P. Kāwika, Tēvita O Kaʻili, and Rochelle Tuitagavaʻa Fonoti
2010 Genealogies: Articulating indigenous anthropology in/of Oceania. *Pacific Studies* 33 (2/3): 139–67.

Wesley-Smith, Terence
1995 Rethinking Pacific Islands studies. *Pacific Studies* 18 (2): 115–36.
2016 Rethinking Pacific studies twenty years on. *The Contemporary Pacific* 28 (1): 153–69.