While Fields specifically takes on the effects of gender in the commercial fishing environment, many of the women’s experiences easily could be those of men trying to get work on a boat, interacting with crew, and surviving the working environment at sea and on shore. Yet one of the points Fields makes in her discussion is that while sharing in “universal” aspects of the business, each woman has a distinctive personal experience; and, by extension, women may be challenged by a particular variation of the universals—which resonate with the challenges that women face in venturing into other formerly all male domains. Folklorists, anthropologists, and women’s studies specialists will find this short book of primary materials full of useful examples, cogent insights, and powerful, eloquent articulations, whether looking at commercial fishing in general, in Alaska, or at the women’s experience as fishermen. But beyond the scholars, this book is engaging, intriguing, and thrilling for anyone who might be fascinated by the lives of these extraordinary working women—working people—who thrive on hard challenges, physical and emotional stamina, and moments of grace within an elemental and fiercely beautiful sphere.


A spate of recent books unpacking our obsession with the “exotic” and the “primitive” (e.g., Micaela di Leonardo, Exotics at Home: Anthropologies, Others, American Modernity [University of Chicago Press, 1998]; Marianna Torgovnick, Primitive Passions: Men, Women, and the Quest for Ecstasy [University of Chicago Press, 1998]) has graced academic bookshelves across the country in recent years, which suggests a renewed vigor in the project to situate our most intimate desires and longings in objects of ethnographic investigation. The two books under review participate, perhaps unwittingly, in this project. Both are the culmination of approximately a decade of research and writing, and both deal with sets of similar issues surrounding the politics of representation, authenticity, museums, tourism, art, and the production of value. Both are also profusely illustrated, well written, ironic, witty, and perceptive in the observations made about the state of culture at the end of the 20th century. It is for this reason that I bring them together. In what follows, I wish to tease out some of the common strands of thought found within their pages but also to note some of their differences in terms of disciplinary approach and aesthetic style.

Although it is true that the two volumes touch on many similar points, the authors do not draw upon each other’s work. I find this rather surprising, given the fact that their objects of inquiry are similar in so many respects. Nonetheless, the two books can be seen possibly as an imaginative dialogue about the implications and consequences of display, and could be used for this purpose in the classroom. Errington’s volume is essentially two mini monographs in one, woven together by the metanarrative of “progress,” dealing as she does with the historical development of the concept of “primitive” art’s relationship to authenticity in the first part and with nationalism, modernization, and development in the second. On the other hand, Kirshenblatt-Gimblett’s collection of previously published essays (revised for the volume under review) takes the form of sustained historical analyses and contemporary critiques of a wide range of phenomena associated with displaying objects.
and peoples in museum settings and on the tourist trail.

During the course of the latter’s efforts, we receive a sophisticated recounting of the developmental logic behind museum display (e.g., “Objects of Ethnography”); the implications of displaying human specimens in controlled environments (e.g., exhibiting Jews at world expositions, performing pilgrims at Plymouth Plantation); the “staged ethnicity” of festival performances (e.g., Smithsonian Folklife Festival, Los Angeles Festival); a political examination of exhibitions at Ellis Island; the cultural constructions of “heritage” at the intersection of museum visitation and tourism; and the relativity of taste formation through an analysis of kitsch. To make her points, Kirshenblatt-Gimblett provides a provocative series of examples culled from her experiences in many parts of the world and written sources located in popular literature, archival materials, and journalistic accounts. Errington’s text is no less global in scope, but focuses more pointedly on Indonesia, her area of expertise, with a brief excursion to Mexico’s National Museum of Anthropology in chapter 6.

Briefly stated, Errington’s position, in her own words, is that “artifacts themselves are mute and meaningless. Their meanings are created by the categories they fall into and the social practices that produce and reproduce those categories” (p. 4). Discourse thus determines an object’s value through narrativizing categories within which a thing’s beauty or value may be bolstered by the institutions and the concomitant media apparatuses responsible for creating and perpetuating the dominant narratives of the time. And while an object might preexist or outlive a specific institution and its discourses, it is transformed into a different “kind” of object as it becomes appropriated anew. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett provides many examples of this phenomenon in her discussions of the objects of ethnography. For example, she states that “ethnographic objects are artifacts created by ethnographers” (p. 17) either in situ or in context. When she cunningly discusses the formulation of kitsch aesthetics in her examination of the items included in The Encyclopedia of Bad Taste (HarperCollins, 1990) and Quintessence: The Quality of Having It (Crown, 1983), which are “mirror twins” (p. 260) in evaluating the relative worth of such things as Tupperware or Frederick’s of Hollywood, we get a distinct sense of how objects are ascribed meaning and value by the purveyors of popular taste. Central to her argument, which remains incipient in Errington’s discussion, is the notion of agency. For Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, the ideological process of retrieving and then displaying an artifact is an “art of excision” (p. 18). Artifacts are, from this perspective, fragments whose poetic history still needs to be written fully.

Following Kirshenblatt-Gimblett’s lead, Errington attempts to write the poetics of a fragment known as “authentic primitive art.” The concept itself is the conjunction of three separate discourses: of the authentic, of the primitive, and of art. When taken together and linked to the idea of linear time and notions of progress in Euro-American social scientific thought, the rationale behind the complex concept becomes sufficiently clear. Errington, based on this premise, provides a stimulating historical discussion of how notions of the authentic, the primitive, and art emerge, transform, and conjoin within circles of connoisseurs over a period spanning two hundred years.

“Authentic” primitive art, according to the author, was “discovered” (read: “invented”) at the turn of the century and reached a peak with the celebrated opening of the Michael C. Rockefeller Wing of Primitive Art at the Metropolitan Museum in New York. By 1984, however, the “death” of primitive art was declared by scholars after convincing deconstructions of the term were posited. Errington does not stop here, for she cleverly demonstrates how primitive art died a “second death” at roughly the same time when the supply of so-called authentic primitive art could no longer meet the demands of collectors who scoured the corners of the earth searching for its last vestiges. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett is in agreement with this hypothesis when she writes “collecting induces rarity by creating scarcity” (p. 25). It is what she elsewhere terms an “ethnography of error” (p. 162) that allows us to study what we have left behind on the road to civilization and progress. The paradox of which both authors are acutely aware is, of course, that documentation and display are
implicated equally in the disappearance of what they show.

The double death process, Errington argues, occurs in three historical phases. The concept of “authentic primitive art” first gains ground between the World Wars, and the second phase begins with the opening of the Museum of Primitive Art in 1984. We are currently in the third phase, during which the ruling powers of societies from which so-called primitive art was originally excised are themselves transforming objects and meanings again in their own attempts to create civil societies based on nationalism, modernization, and development. In other words, as the former “colonies” of imperialist powers become newly emergent nation-states and adopt the rhetoric of progress, they re-create the primitive in their own cultures to legitimize the state and to create economic potential through tourism.

To foster nationalistic pride, quell ethnic conflict, and achieve economic prosperity, the former colony’s intelligentsia must rewrite the past from an indigenous perspective filtered through years of colonial experiences. As Kirshenblatt-Gimblett writes, “Having a past, a history, a ‘folklore’ of your own, and institutions to bolster these claims, is fundamental to the politics of culture: the possession of a national folklore, particularly as legitimated by a national museum and troupe, is cited as a mark of being civilized” (p. 65). Errington provides plausible evidence for the above in her exploration of the role the National Museum of Anthropology in Mexico City plays in re-imagining and re-presenting the past (pp. 161–187). But even more to the point, they stand in a symbiotic relationship: tourism needs destinations, and museums are premier attractions; museums need visitors, and tourism supplies them (p. 136). The market-driven transformation that has occurred to museums in modern times as a result of this symbiosis has led to a shift from experience based on seeing to one based on doing. As Kirshenblatt-Gimblett points out, this has led to somewhat of a crisis of representation for museums that must now function in very different environments than when they were first conceptualized and built. For the disempowered curator the market mentality amounts to a movement away from the ivory tower toward the shopping mall; for the educator it signals a grand opportunity for inventive consciousness raising; and for the administrator and board of trustees the scheme is a vehicle to generate increasing profit.

Both Errington and Kirshenblatt-Gimblett investigate the cognitive shift in museological strategy through an exploration of Te Papa Tongarewa, the national museum of New Zealand. But one might ask what kinds of experiences are generated through such new approaches to display. Errington suggests that the tourist’s experience of approaching the center of a newly refurbished Borobudur is quite different from the way it must have been conceived for pilgrims in its original context. I wonder, however, how we can definitively fusion of knowledge production, performance, and display. Dying economies, resulting from the aftermath of colonial rule, can be reborn as displays of heritage. The discovery of this principle has led to a boom in the creation of postcolonial museums in the so-called Third World. Such museums, backed by the authoritative power of the state and the propaganda of regulated media, are in a good position to exploit simultaneously the need to unify the nation and generate revenue. Errington demonstrates this quite forcefully in her discussion of Taman Mini, an Indonesian cultural theme park representing an orderly and unified picture of the country’s polyethnic citizenry.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett convincingly shows that the complicity between tourism and museums is a time-honored economic tradition. She understands their cooperation as a merger of “actuality” and “virtuality” (p. 131). But even more to the point, they stand in a symbiotic relationship: tourism needs destinations, and museums are premier attractions; museums need visitors, and tourism supplies them (p. 136). The market-driven transformation that has occurred to museums in modern times as a result of this symbiosis has led to a shift from experience based on seeing to one based on doing. As Kirshenblatt-Gimblett points out, this has led to somewhat of a crisis of representation for museums that must now function in very different environments than when they were first conceptualized and built. For the disempowered curator the market mentality amounts to a movement away from the ivory tower toward the shopping mall; for the educator it signals a grand opportunity for inventive consciousness raising; and for the administrator and board of trustees the scheme is a vehicle to generate increasing profit.

Both Errington and Kirshenblatt-Gimblett investigate the cognitive shift in museological strategy through an exploration of Te Papa Tongarewa, the national museum of New Zealand. But one might ask what kinds of experiences are generated through such new approaches to display. Errington suggests that the tourist’s experience of approaching the center of a newly refurbished Borobudur is quite different from the way it must have been conceived for pilgrims in its original context. I wonder, however, how we can definitively
“know” what ancient Buddhist pilgrims to the site experienced or were expected to experience without recourse to textual evidence, which is lacking. In any case, to make her point, she contrasts the original structure’s cosmological mapping with the contemporary re-framing that occurred when the site was reclaimed and refashioned by the state during the 1970s as part of Suharto’s New Order. Errington seems to be suggesting that the tourist experience of this previously sacred shrine is highly regulated by the panoptic gaze of the state.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, however, is more forgiving and open to the possibility that a visitor might take away numerous interpretations from a site. Although she acknowledges that the sites of heritage production and the instruments of display create a “problematic relationship” (p. 160), she is optimistic in her statement that this disjunction creates the opportunity for generating multiple new meanings. Both authors would agree that representation and knowledge are linked to power, but how that knowledge is construed is a potential point of disagreement between them. For Errington, an incarceration model seems to be more viable for understanding the role of the nation in policing its citizens and visitors, while for Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, the consciousness model seems more appropriate, especially with regard to experimental sites such as the Te Papa Tongarewa mentioned above.

In short, Errington and Kirshenblatt-Gimblett share many common concerns in their variegated explorations of the politics of representation. They are politically engaged, and both bring the thrust of many common theoretical models to bear on their materials; the voices of Benjamin, Anderson, Hobsbawm and Ranger, Foucault, and many other theorists residing in the interstitial spaces between anthropology and cultural studies echo repeatedly throughout their works. Both authors also share a common concern for the detrimental effects that rapid development may have on the indigenous populations where the “drama of culture” is enacted, and both empathize with their subjects, even while maintaining a healthy sense of humor about the ironies of postmodernism. Yet the crossroads leading to their parting of ways might be located methodologically.

Errington’s perspective is grounded concretely in the American anthropological tradition, while Kirshenblatt-Gimblett’s is to be located more squarely within the interdisciplinary arena of performance studies. Although they both freely crisscross the contours of the globe with the ease of a seasoned traveler, their sites of fieldwork differ somewhat. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, acting in various capacities as guest curator, advisor, consultant, and board member, looks from within the infrastructures of festivals, museums, and boardrooms. Errington’s field site is on the other side of the administrative door, focusing more on the anthropological subject: the museum visitor, the tourist, and the occasional curator. But both revel in the ephemera of postcards, cartoons, advertisements, and other paraphernalia that create souvenir memories of a place’s power in the mind of the visitor. Indeed, the strategic placement of illustrations throughout their texts provides visual subtexts to complement their narratives.

Whatever their differences in the final analysis, Errington and Kirshenblatt-Gimblett have produced timely critiques of modern society and the culture industry. Their analyses of globalization processes are extremely valuable, and theoretical gems can be mined on virtually every page of their respective books. Given the constraints of a review, I have only touched on some of the many useful ideas contained in Death of the Authentic Primitive and Destination Culture. As a whole, however, their works serve as provocative reminders that scrupulous attention to the details of everyday life may yield insights into the contemporary state of human affairs, even when we are just sojourners on the road to personal discovery or waiting to board a plane at Gatwick Airport.


SHANNON THORNTON-WALSH
Dallas, Texas

Collections and anthologies of folklore are staples of our profession. We use them for reference, as