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Launching

What can immersion in Austronesian-style seacraft and navigational practices do for advancing the political projects of decolonization and cultural survival among indigenous peoples of the Pacific?

Drawing on decades of active involvement in Central Carolinian seafaring traditions, including efforts to revive Chamorro traditions in the Marianas, this paper considers how vestiges of Austronesian seafaring knowledge and practice in the contemporary Pacific can be recovered in ways that help us rethink underlying assumptions about indigenous subjectivity and locality central to broader projects of decolonization and cultural survival for colonized peoples of the Pacific. My goal is to illustrate how the story of the survival and revival of traditional seafaring practices can provide an indigenously-ordered, anti-colonial praxis that can simultaneously furnish what we might identify as an indigenous oceanic critique of political programs that are centered firmly on nation-state based claims of sovereignty.

A particularly compelling example of the productive tension between the conditions and the demands of rootedness and routedness in indigenous terms, the vestiges of traditional Austronesian seafaring viewed as analytic and as practice also provide material for imagining networks and coalitions among indigenous peoples struggling against other histories of migration and settlement in other regions of the world. In other words, Austronesian seafaring, as practiced in the Central Carolines and the Marianas, can furnish an analytic and practical way to advance the political and cultural struggles of indigenous peoples in lands heavily-settler-colonized.

Moreover, as a Carolinian and Filipino from other archipelagos that evidenced sustained contact with the Marianas long before European and American contact, I have come to appreciate the circumstances of my birth and upbringing – and political and cultural engagement in the region – as having precisely to do with common historical circuitries, particularly ancient trading and exchange networks in the region, that have been profoundly rearranged even if they have been obscured by more recent histories of Euro-American and Asian colonialisms, and the range of Native responses to them. Such histories do not wash out difference and specificity, but rather call for theorizing and mobilizing them in relational, even fluidic, terms. One way to historicize such fluidities is to consider historical processes of cultural and social contact and interconnectivity not simply by valorizing movement, but by critically engaging the social and political processes of organizing space on and by which movement takes place (Smith 2003; 1993) precisely to combat exclusive categories of self and other and the bounded territoriality on which they are affixed, as western and modern, whether colonial or anticolonial, forms of nationalism and sovereignty define and constitute themselves. “Grounding” oneself in a canoe.
and an oceanic culture that survives the generative and transformative histories of colonialism, as well as the politics they beget, offers a particularly deep, substantive, and compelling vantage point with which to map and move what are after all the mobile coordinates of indigenous cultural and political consciousness. To view the mobility of the canoe as a cultural foundation as well as to understand foundational culture in fluidic ways is to capture through strategic mixing of metaphors the dialogical and generative tensions between cultural forces of routing and historical processes of rooting indigenous identity and tradition. Such a “grounding in canoe” interrogates in an indigenous way the underlying spatialities and cultural/political subjectivities that are born out of western (and Asian) colonialism and nationalist reactions to it; indeed, an examination of these fluidic matters might very well force us to rethink as a kind of indigenous sovereignty act itself the underlying spatialities and subjectivities that shore up western and nationalist notions of sovereignty itself.

**Following Ikelap**

*Ikelap* – the big fish—appeared pretty much where the ancient chants sung them to be. Let me explain: in 1997, after having worked with him on a film and with the Micronesian Seafaring Society, I brought the late Sosthenis Emwalu to the University of Guam to teach traditional navigation to our students. The first thing he did was teach us a chant called *Ufi Mwareta*. This name literally means “women weaving mwar”/ head leis – but in fact it is the song of the specific seaway between the Central Carolines and the Marianas. Among other things it names the sea creatures, land, and watermarks between the two regions. Among other things, the chant says to look out for *ikelap* – the big fish - which, when sighted, would indicate that you were east of Guam, the southernmost island of the archipelago. Known as “pilot whales” by western mariners, *ikelap* have likewise proven themselves to Carolinian seafarers as dependable guides for the constancy of their travel habits.

Though meeting up with *ikelap* where the ancient chants sung them to be was enough to give us goosebumps, we had in fact already been snagged much earlier inside the modern classroom by Soste’s exegesis of the chant. Soste explained that there was a “superficial” or surface meaning, and a deep meaning. The surface meaning was the literal: the list of creatures, stars, reefs, waterways, landmarks, and flora – like the particularly fragrant *tibo* or basil plant, found in Saipan. When set to tune, and performed properly, this list was nothing less than an ancient and time-honored mnemonic map for travel. And successful travel, for the difference between chanting properly and improperly could likewise be the difference between life and death.

Moreover, this surface level of meaning expresses a range of historical, cultural, and political truths contained in oral traditions involving indigenous technologies of travel. For starters, the persistence of traditional maritime knowledge and practice, and a more general recognition of Pacific Islanders as a seafaring people, help us appreciate what I want to refer to as the temporal depth to the geographic reach that is manifest in our histories of travel. By “temporal depth to the geographic reach,” I am referring to a very long history of indigenous geo- and oceanographic dispersal, or a specifically indigenous time/space forged through maritime travel. This “deep time” is a Native long durée if you like, or better yet, a series of
older Native globalizations (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1. Map Austronesian and Outrigger Spread (Source: Finney 1994)](image)

This map shows the remarkable geographic reach of outrigger canoe technology as it coincides with the spread of “Austronesian” language branches. On outrigger canoes, with sophisticated maritime technologies and knowledge, Austronesian seafarers would fan out and settle roughly 2/3rds of the globe’s southern, oceanic hemisphere. This Diaspora begins at least 4,000 years ago. This temporal depth and geographic reach is discursive, and among other discourses, it queries the line between exclusivist and ahistorical definitions of indigeneity. Linguistically, for example, the Austronesian term *langit* (“sky” or “heavens”) occurs in Malagasy, in Madagascar, east of the “African” continent, as well as in some coastal vernaculars in “South Asia,” in aboriginal Taiwan in “East Asia,” and in most “Southeast Asian” vernaculars. Chamorros in the Marianas say *langit*. To the south and eastwards from the Marianas, in the Carolines, *langit* becomes *lang*. Further south, in Aotearoa, New Zealand, it is *rangī*, and to the north Pacific, Hawaiians say *lani*. Likewise, variations of the outrigger technology – the signature float or pontoon that reaches across either side of a canoe hull, including its evolution into a second hull in many parts of Polynesia – constitute material cognates of linguistic cognates proper. They are, in other words, closely related variations of the same theme albeit in the material form of carved and hewn wood.

Furthermore, historical and contemporary seafaring praxis interrogates other dimensions of Native cultural life – in religiosity, in historical, and literary consciousness – that still tend to be understood in binary logics. In a fieldtrip to the Northern Mariana island of Saipan, for example, Soste guided us through terrain, history, and practice among the Carolinian community that continue to befuddle efforts to draw heavy lines between “Christianity” and “Native spirituality,” or even between Carolinian and Chamorro spirituality, whether of the Native or the Christian versions, or even between 21st century global tourism industry practices and pre-colonial travel habits. At Managaha islet, a favorite sub-getaway for Asian and Euro-American tourists who come to Saipan, for example, Soste guided us past the beach and its typical offerings (sunbathing, snorkeling, banana-boats, volleyball, even sex with Chamorro and Carolinian “recreation staffers”) inland, to a life-sized bronze statue of the 19th Carolinian navigator, Aghurubw, founder of one of the several Carolinian communities in the Northern
Mariana archipelago (see Driver and Perry 1996). In fact, this statue, which commemorates one significant genealogy in the Carolinian Diaspora, stands a few feet from Aghurubw’s grave, which is marked by a white concrete cross, and from a distance, at the time, appeared to be littered with husked coconut shells, soda, and beer cans. On closer inspection, however, the coconuts and beverage containers turned out to be unopened, and Soste explained that even though Carolinians are now Christian (a condition, with initial resistance, of their resettlement among the long converted Chamorros), they still followed pre-Christian beliefs and practices by leaving food and drink for those who have departed the earth in human form. The presence of cans of soda and beer, he explained, was not litter, but drink, if coconuts were not readily available, which of course signals the permeability between tradition and modernity, the local and the global.

At the head of Aghurubw’s grave one finds a rather robust banyan tree, ao in Polowatese, whose characteristic above ground and outspread roots and trunks harbor, according to past and present Chamorros, both benevolent and malevolent spirits of the departed ones. In Polowatese, the banyan tree is said to “voice” history. Like the ones that breach time, religion, and material commodity in the breach between life and death, the very presence and composition of this banyan tree also crosses the often hard lines made between distinctly Native Carolinian and Native Chamorro cultural crossings. Moreover, accompanying us in this fieldtrip were young men, more recent transplants from the Central Carolines, who now live and work in Saipan among the older generations of the Carolinian Diaspora to the Marianas. In our group were three who work at Managaha Island as (the aforementioned) “recreation staffers” or tour guides, who are favorite hires by tour and resort companies (typically-Japanese or Chamorro owned) precisely because of their expertise and skill in the water. One of them explained to me that he moved from Polowat to Saipan in order to go to college, and works at Managaha for money, and I would add in much the same way that 18th and 19th century Carolinians relocated to the Marianas and other islands in order to expand their opportunities, and found quick employment by largely colonial entrepreneurs precisely because of their seafaring capabilities.

The “surface” meanings of the Carolinian seafaring chant, e.g. flora and fauna, stars, land and seamarks, constitute a veritable mnemonic map of the route from the Central Carolines to the Marianas. This route, would in turn, give us insight into the mobilities of roots, so to speak, which, when reconnected to the wider Austronesian seafaring cultural complex, requires us to rethink the terms, especially the limits, of our prevailing cartographies. And yet, the realization, alone, that the “surface” meanings of the chant were a time-proven map was profound enough. Out in the watery “field” – that other time-honored spatiality for ethnographic truth (Clifford 1997, 52) – the appearance of ikelap where they were sung to be only confirmed the integrity and efficacy or accuracy of our oral traditions of seafaring. But if this were superficial, what might we learn from what Soste called the chant’s “deep” meanings?

In fact, the deep meanings were metaphoric– like the scent of tibo/basil in Saipan, whose fragrance came to signify peace and tranquility that these northern islands provided to Carolinians fleeing either bloody inter-tribal warfare or natural disasters like typhoons, tsunamis, or droughts. Or the gendered stakes in/of seafaring, betrayed in the image and sonics of women weaving mwars/head leis. Like the engendered meanings behind the seafaring evocation of women weaving leis, the design and function of key parts of the canoe – the sail’s rigging, for
example – represents a gendered division of labor, whose successful interaction is also said to represent an ideal society. When carved correctly, lashed properly, and finally, when worked competently, the conjoining of the *rhurhu mwaan* (“male”) spar and the *rhurhu rwaput* (“female”) boom maximizes the capture of the right amount of wind to propel the canoe most efficiently. In this way, with man and woman working together - under the labor of the navigator who is always figured as male in a discourse that feminizes the sea as the man’s domain – does a smoothly sailing canoe get to stand for the ideal society. This gendered ideal, I believe, is informed by a deeper cultural value of interdependence, premised and conditioned on the virtues of reciprocity, that is said to obtain (or should obtain) between a chief and “his” subjects, a value which is captured in seafaring discourse. In the Central Carolines, the phrase *pungupungul fal wolsch* uses the image of waves pounding on the reef, which is likened to the chief or navigator. Solid and protective like the reef, a chief or navigator insulates his people in those moments when the world comes crashing down around them. But the phrase similarly captures the reciprocal relationship between the chief and his subjects insofar as the people are also supposed to form a barrier “reef” around their leaders. Finally, this reciprocity signifies the value of stewardship of land and community, which in turn signifies a broader reciprocity between humans and land that are spelt out in a host of other cultural prescriptions, protocols, obligations, and responsibilities. We can add this idea to the larger list of concepts and practices in the indigenous Pacific that signify deep and profound kinship between humans and the animal world, as well as the genealogical connections between humans and animals on the one hand with land and sea on the other. If the “superficial” or “surface” level of meaning indexes a range of historical, cultural, and political truths contained in oral traditions involving indigenous technologies of travel, the deeper truths are the metaphors. At both registers, “local” traditions, particularly those that involve ways of moving successfully, indicate a substantially and substantively wider field of discursive and cultural play and resonance. These modes and meanings of movement help us to question prevailing assumptions about our cultural subjectivities and the boundedness of their areas of coverage or play. Indeed as I progressed in my training in this system under Soste, and then later under Manny Sikau, I would come to learn other concepts and practices used in traditional Carolinian seafaring that could furnish me with new analytical frameworks to customize my own interdisciplinary training in critical theory and practice, indigenous cultural and historical studies, and postcolonial analyses. Let me turn to two examples that have transformed my thinking about history, culture, identity, and politics.

_Etak and Pookof_

Since the 1970s, navigators from Polowat and Satawal have become famous for continuing to carve and sail outrigger canoes using ancient techniques and methods that continue to illustrate radical cultural alterity. Two particularly good examples are the voyaging concepts and techniques of *etak* and *pookof*. Typically translated as “moving islands,” *etak* is the technique for calculating distance traveled, or position at sea by triangulating the speed of the islands of departure and destination with that of a third reference island. This is accomplished, furthermore, by plotting these islands’
courses in the celestial sky, which in effect serves as a veritable map for the world below. A map and time piece, a way of negotiating emplotment in time/space - or more precisely, a way of conceptualizing time/space in order to fix one’s place - *etak* was a critical technological development, along with outrigger design and technology, asymmetrical hulls, and the inverted lateen sail, that permitted humans to traverse over 2/3rds of the globe’s southern hemisphere millennia before Europeans ventured from eyesight of their shores.

In theory and practice, it works like this: first you steer towards the stars that mark the island of your destination. While doing so, you back sight your island of departure until you can no longer see it. At the same time, you calculate the rate at which a third island, off to the side, moves from beneath the stars where it sat when you left your island of departure, toward the stars under which it should sit if you were standing in the island of your destination.

Let me simplify: you get on your canoe and you follow the stars in the direction where lies your destination island. As your island of departure recedes from view, you pay attention to a third island, as it is said to move along another prescribed star course. David Lewis’ description makes it the easiest to understand: for the navigator, the canoe remains stationary and the islands zip by. Alas, the same observers who have encountered this sensibility in their studies of Carolinian navigation have felt compelled to explain that the islands are not *actually* moving. According to Steven Thomas, *etak* is “a purely mental construct that the navigator imposes on the real world.” Lewis (1972) himself wrote, “*naturally*, the Carolinians are perfectly well aware that the islands do not literally move.” Tom Gladwin wrote, “I would certainly not suggest that they believe the islands *actually* move” (1970, 182). For Gladwin *etak* is but “a convenient way to organize the information (the navigator) has available in order to make his navigational judgments readily and without confusion” (182). Ever helping himself to the positionality of the navigator, Thomas (1997) explains,

* (etak) evolves from the sea-level perspective one has when standing on the deck of a vessel observing the relative motion of islands and land features. *Etak* is perfectly adapted for its use by navigators who have no instruments, charts, or even a dry place in which to spread a chart if they had one.

He contrasts this etakian perspective to that of the Western navigator who “in fact constantly shifts between the bird’s eye view he has while scrutinizing his chart, and the fish-eye view he has on the deck.” Gladwin calls *etak* “a figure of literary style ... (although) for the Puluwat (sic) navigator it is not a matter of style.”

I say, it is a question of style, recalling throwback theory and following Hayden White, James Clifford, and other formalists, who first troubled hard distinctions between content and form. Moreover, we can take a lesson from Soste, and plumb the cultural and historical depths of metaphoricity: islands are moving, tectonically and culturally. They also move as phosphate, as the Teaiwa sisters (T. Teaiwa 1997 and K. Teaiwa 2005) have reminded us in their work on the routes and roots of Banaban birdshit and Banaban peoplehood respectively. Atomically, the islands have been and continue to be obliterated, hurled skywards into the stratosphere through US (and French) nuclear testing, or inwards and outwards in under water tidal waves. Greg Dvorak’s (2007) dissertation reminds us that the Marshall islands move in the form of their sand,
through the hands of the surviving relatives of Japanese soldiers who perished in those islands but whose bodies were never subsequently recovered in those perennial pilgrimages to the islands taken by their surviving family members. In time, the still-grieving family members would soon view Marshallese sand as surrogate bones of their lost loved ones, and send these calcified remains of coral polyps and other seaforms back to family and community shrines in Japan. Such is one path by which we might follow our islands to some of their destinations.

Wherever, and however they go, the conceptual takeaway from etak/moving island as a technology to measure time/space is that indigenous subjectivity can similarly be understood as a technology if not a measure of time/space. Thus, from the vantage point of etak, we might think of indigeneity in these terms: being = time/space, or rather that to reckon Native selves we need to consider travel through time/space. At the same time, the reverse applies here: the abstract concept of time/space is a product of social and cultural formulation and reckoning. Finally, the mutual reckoning of self through time/space in the cultural context of Carolinian seafaring always privileges narrativity or storytelling. For instance, the late Satawalese navigator, Mau Piaiilug, often remarked how having a clear image of the destination island in one’s head was indispensable for a successful voyage. This visual clarity was needed, he explained, because out at sea, the navigator will be challenged so vigorously by the elements. In the face of this rigorous test of nature, all that a navigator could rely upon is “faith in the words” of one’s father or grandfather or teacher. It is in this sense that land and sea, and mobility, and all staked in it, are fundamentally discursive and narratological. Thus, indigeneity=time/space/self/ narrative (or story).

The second important technique is Pookof. Pookof is the inventory of creatures indigenous to a given island, as well as their travel habits and behavior. This is where we first encountered ikelap, the big fish, in sound. Actually, pookof is part of a larger system of land finding by way of expanding island, which can likewise be contracted to the point of invisibility if necessary. When you see a given species of bird or fish, and you know who belongs where and most especially, their travel habits - the pookof of an island - you also know into whose island home you have sailed. Thus are islands known by dint of the furthest travels of their indigenous creatures. Jim Clifford’s poststructuralist cultural analyses only helped me to recognize etak and pookof as a home grown theory of the mutually-generative relationship between cultural roots and historical routes. Soste added to this home grown theory of subjectivity the primacy of non-human creatures, while Piaiilug linked this expanded notion of human subjectivity to the essential processes of narrativity or storytelling (the “words of your father”).

The notion of expanding an island includes knowing things, like the distinct look of clouds above and around an island, the character of currents and waves as they deflect around islands, and of course, the group of stars associated with an island and the range of stars under which an island can travel, as for instance, in etak. Navigators can also expand an island by smelling it long before they can see it, reminding us how modernity has privileged sight over other senses in ascertaining truth (Classen et al 1994; Sturken and Cartwright 2001). After all, we have become accustomed to saying things like “ah, I see” when we comprehend something, but never “ah, I smell” - which would probably be just as well, save for the fact that it is yet another indicator of the negation of that sense of perception that I think our ancestors probably used in ways that could allow them to know with certainty so much more than our present-day
sensibilities permit. Like that of the fragrance of *tibo/basil* in Saipan, we need to learn how to smell and feel our cultural and political futures inasmuch as seafaring is a profoundly visceral, thoroughly embodied, practice. For instance, in his classical study of traditional navigational practices in the Pacific, David Lewis (1994) relates a story from Tungaru, present-day Micronesian Republic of Kiribati, about a particular navigator who was so adept at his craft that he was able to detect bearings by laying his testicles upon the bow of the canoe in order to discern the slightest movement in the calmest of seas (127).

**Ruddering On**

However we do it, this much is certain: from the vantage point of *etak* and *pookof*, we might say that 1) islands are mobile, 2) that they expand and contract, and 3) that their coordinates in time and space are emplotted via the farthest reaches of their indigenous creatures. From this vantage point, we cannot say that islands are isolated, tiny, and remote, regardless of how they have been defined, and thus marginalized, in western historical and cultural and natural cartography.

The famous British writer, John Donne, penned the phrase, “no man is an island,” to dispel the myth of the intrinsically autonomous, independent man. Poststructuralist and feminist deconstructions would only sharpen the critique. To be sure, Donne reminds us that nobody can work in isolation, and that we are interdependent. Feminist criticism questions the terms of that interdependency even as it sharpens the critique. Older and wiser than Donne, however, traditional seafaring takes the line further and teaches us that no island was ever an island to begin with. Thus, no island is an island. Never was, never will be. At least this is how I cling on to islands in the advanced wake of their disappearance on account of rising waters. This insight calls attention to the fact that islands are products of continental thinking. If islands played a privileged role in the production of modern science through evolutionary theory, which played a privileged role in the modern conceptualization of knowledge about island cultures, then something of the epistemological rug has been pulled out from beneath the entire knowledge producing system about place and peoples that have come to be called “Islanders.” I may be overstating it a bit but I’m still on more firm “ground” (or stronger current) in drawing from seafaring to further destabilize the firmaments of political analyses, especially of how colonialism operates discursively. In any case, like the insularism that straightjackets modern, colonial, and anticolonial definitions of “islandness” and “island culture,” colonialism works not just through government, but also by redefining our subjectivities, including the containment and halting of “Native” movement and flow in order to privilege its own movement and flow. And surely we don’t have to replicate colonialism even if we are a traveling people.
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Notes

1 The late Epeli Hau’ofa (1993) preferred the descriptor “Oceania” to “Pacific” to recall a culturally appropriate and politically-empowering legacy of travel and interconnectedness in the face of the region’s colonial and postcolonial histories. Hau’ofa’s aim was to substitute a deep, enduring, and “belittling” colonial tendency to define the watery region as separating and insulating – and its inhabitants as fixed – in favor of seeing the ocean as connector and pathway, first via canoe, later by aircraft. For Hau’ofa, as for cultural studies critic and historian James Clifford (1988; 1997), travel in space, and travel in time, make for empowering ways of understanding, especially, “Native culture.” This new perspective, celebrated inside and outside Pacific Studies for different reasons (see Teresia Teaiwa 2001, 1997; Hereniko and Wilson, eds 1999; Wilson and Dissanayake, eds 1996; Wilson and Dirlik, eds 1995), is also cautioned against for tendencies to overlook capitalist desires for transoceanic crossings (Connery 1995 and 1996; see also Jameson 1982), and for precluding the vast majority of inhabitants of the Pacific who are landlubbing and whose opportunities for offshore travel are curtailed by economics or by national policy (Jolly 2001; 2003).

2 I capitalize Native, as has already been a common practice in Native Pacific Studies circles, to signify a properly historical subjectivity that is always in formation.


4 I do not want to be misconstrued as simply anti-nationalist, or guilty of disavowing colonialism in the Pacific. Here I am inspired especially by early critiques of postcoloniality (Bhabha 1984; Mani 1987; Rafael 1988 and 1989; Spivak 1988) that analyze residual and new power inequalities in the wake of decolonization and national liberation. From such critical perspectives, “successful” national liberation and decolonization did not result in widespread political freedom and the termination of social inequalities and injustices but only abetted if not intensified the sins of Euro-American colonialism proper precisely because of inabilities or failures to adequately interrogate colonialism’s cultures. An important general insight in the early postcolonial critique was the idea of colonialism’s ability to reconsolidate itself precisely through its abilities to establish the terms of social and cultural subjectivity. I think that those of us who still live under formal structures of colonialism have much to learn from critics who from experience have discovered that the political and cultural assumptions that underlie the category of nationhood and national liberation are part of the problem to begin with. This said, it is important not to see “nationalism” as solely the product of western colonialism and reactions to it. We can’t preclude, for instance, indigenous forms of nationhood and nationalism that have predated and continue to co-exist in complex relationship to colonialism.
In calling specific attention to the robustness of the banyan tree that sits at the head of Aghurubw’s grave, I’m riffing off of David Hanlon’s (1994) critical historiography of the Pohnpeian oral historian, Luelen Bernart, whose own grave, according to Hanlon, nourishes an adjacent tree in ways that signify the symbiosis between Native narrative and Native locality, between stories and place. In Aghurubw’s case, however, I’m noting the symbiosis between indigeneity and travel on the one hand, that also bridges lines between one set of Natives and others in material and spiritual practices.

This is precisely the common narrative David Chappell (1997) finds in his history of Pacific Islander travelers aboard European and American ships in the past four hundred years.

Elsewhere (Diaz 2007) I pursue more systematically how “traditional” seafaring in the Pacific has been engendered and sexualized in colonial and postcolonial discourses. The semiotics of the lashing of the spar and boom for Polowat social ideals were explained to me by Sosthenis’ brother, Celestino Emwalu in conversation.

Interview with Mr. Lino Olopai.

See Diaz “Sniffing Oceania’s Behind” for a whiff of an olfactory history of Oceania.