

NEW MARKETS FOR CONTEMPORARY PACIFIC ART: CREATIVE NEW ZEALAND AND THE PUSH 'OFFSHORE'

Karen Stevenson

For many Pacific Island nations/peoples, New Zealand is a land of milk and honey. A metropolitan nation located in the Pacific, it is not only home to the largest Polynesian populations, it has intimate ties to the United Kingdom and the West. A Western island nation – it seems a contradiction. Yet this reality has enabled New Zealand to sustain and support arts programs that other island nations can ill afford. This has resulted in the unique development and buoyancy of a contemporary Pacific art movement.¹ However, New Zealand is small and its art market smaller still. Creative New Zealand (New Zealand's arts funding body), with its focus on arts advocacy, has directed its attentions to moving contemporary Pacific arts 'offshore' – introducing them into a global art market.

International success is a priority for both the artistic and economic sustainability of our artists. International exposure allows them to develop their practice through observing and interacting with international colleagues. New Zealand artists also have unique perspectives and insights to add to the international arts community.

Access to international markets offers the potential to expand and diversify audiences, to extend the life of a work, and to provide additional employment and sources of income to artists. International success can also help develop New Zealand arts domestically, by inspiring other New Zealand artists to raise their sights and by giving a better understanding of international standards. Public appreciation of the arts in New Zealand is likely to increase the more the public is aware of, and has experience of our internationally successful artists.²

Hindering this process, however, are the perceptions and stereotypes that the West continues to hold of what Pacific arts are and what they should be. Typically, Pacific art is 'primitive,' perhaps craft, and made from traditional materials. This perception is reinforced by exhibitions of masterpieces of Pacific arts – those works most frequently collected at the time of contact. Even though such luminaries as Picasso, Matisse and Klee (amongst others) drew inspiration from these objects, they sit uneasily within a Western aesthetic. As Thomas comments: "Indigenous cultures are simultaneously 'traditional' and 'contemporary.' They are 'traditional' in the sense that distinctive views of the world remain alive, but they are also 'contemporary' in the sense that they belong in the present."³

In addition, there is a tradition of innovation and experimentation in Western art – a tradition that is not 'afforded' to non-Western artists. How then, can the expression and artistic creativity of contemporary Pacific artists be understood? Or, perhaps more to the point, why do American and European venues hold exhibitions of contemporary Pacific art when their viewers do not understand or recognise these art forms? Are exhibitions of contemporary Pacific art any more than an assertion of neo-colonialism by the American and European nations that host them? Are contemporary Pacific art exhibitions (outside of the Pacific) any different from the world fairs and international exhibitions of the nineteenth century – venues and events that fuel a stereotypical imaginary? And, if this is the case, what strategies can Creative New Zealand employ to reconcile these attitudes with contemporary Pacific art?

Even though most Pacific nations have acquired independence from their colonial partners,⁴ a relationship continues. Many scholars speak of the post-colonial, but for most in the Pacific the post-colonial has not arrived. The

power relationships still exist, as does the 'politics of primitivism'.⁵ The colonial relationships of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries have left a resounding legacy within the contemporary Pacific. Jewel Castro, a Samoan artist living in the United States has noted:

Cultural authenticity in contemporary art and the notion of the artist as a living specimen, are professional challenges that Oceanic artists must deal with as we push for transnational exposure. We must be aware that this exposure effects how our work is interpreted, exhibited, and written about ... as we negotiate our niche within world art history, we still face professional colonization.⁶

The question remains, has globalisation created cultural understanding, or has it just allowed movement across borders that remain intact? Do Americans and Europeans understand the urban nature of Pacific life, or do the stereotypical fantasies of paradise linger unscathed? This essay will attempt to address these issues, but also the strategies employed by arts organisations and galleries in their combined efforts to contextualise and support contemporary Pacific arts.

In 1941 René d'Harnoncourt created and exhibited "Indian Art of the United States" at the Museum of Modern Art, New York. He believed that his brief was "preserving, promoting, and displaying 'primitive' art and contemporary indigenous arts and crafts."⁷ This exhibition has been heralded as one of the most successful non-Western exhibitions in the United States (perhaps followed by "Te Maori" in 1984). D'Harnoncourt commented that the "worst injustice done to Indian peoples [is] their preservation only on the dusty shelves of museums of anthropology and in the books of James Fenimore Cooper."⁸ The fact that this exhibition was held at MoMA demonstrated not only the desire to promote contemporary indigenous arts and crafts, but asserted the artistic value of primitive art: d'Harnoncourt commented, "We have preserved the work of the Indians as ethnology, let us also enjoy it as art."⁹ William Rubin's *'Primitivism' in 20th Century Art* (1985) provided d'Harnoncourt's antithesis, demonstrating the influences that 'primitive art' had on modernist art practice and ideologies. Combined, they have created an American attitude about primitive art, primitivism and modernism in Western art. These attitudes have reinforced a curious relationship between ethnographic and art museums, both trying to find a home for Pacific arts. These attitudes – the 'politics of primitivism' – as Thomas suggests, demand that the arts of non-Western peoples must struggle for equality of both perception and acceptance.

Rosanna Raymond – New Zealand-born of Samoan heritage, now living in London – has been quite vocal about the myriad false perceptions that the art and academic worlds have held about contemporary Pacific art:

The celebration of my cultural heritage is fused into my work as an artist, whether perceived as invented, revivalist, authentic, traditional, contemporary, identity based, gendered, or craft based. Whatever label you want to call it, or has been called, this is not how I and other HYBRID Polynesian artists view our role in producing art that speaks, and relates to living in Polynesia today in a modern urban environment.

I cannot produce artworks, write poems, and create costumes without the knowledge of my cultural heritage, and the experience of living it. Producing art works is my way of putting my culture into the future ... not in past boxes ...¹⁰

Not only does Raymond assert the foundation of her artistic practice, she also addresses the synthesis that others find problematic in contemporary Pacific art. Historically, Pacific and Art have not been linked together: Art historians and anthropologists have fought many battles to elevate and recognise the material culture of Pacific peoples as Art. With the acknowledgement of Pacific art by Western artists and collectors, some sculptural images have come to be acknowledged as masterpieces. However, it is infrequent that these art forms are found in art galleries (or museums) – their home is more frequently within the ethnographic context of an anthropological museum. Contemporary and Pacific have an equally uneasy relationship. For many, the myth of the Pacific remains. Bougainville's island of love began a fantasy that the Pacific has not outgrown, and this image does not coincide with contemporary arts practices. The Pacific label exudes a particular image or attitude which does not equate with

contemporary art practice. Viewers do not want to see the urban in the island. To enhance the problem, there is an arrogance of the West that they and they alone are capable of artistic innovation. Abstraction, for instance, is their purview. As such, Pacific artists must continue their ancestral dictum. As Albert Wendt noted:

My objection to this literature [attitude] is that it gives the impression that our ancestors' art is still the Oceanic Art of today; or, that if it isn't, it ought to be, or that we have not produced any worthwhile art since the papalagi came: or that if we are producing some art it is not 'authentic' Oceanic Art and therefore not worthy of serious discussion.¹¹

When contemporary Pacific artists use Western materials, or draw inspiration from our global village, the label Pacific is quickly taken from them – they are contemporary artists – but their work is not Pacific/primitive enough. Eva Raabe reiterates this when commenting about German audiences: "Very often a contemporary artwork is denied its 'Pacificness' by the European audience because it seems not foreign enough. Pacific arts have changed, but not the habits of the European beholder."¹²

Doug Hall, writing about the Asia Pacific Triennial, suggests that Australian viewers have similar perceptions:

As with many aspects of Asian arts, Australians have viewed the Pacific cultures through Western 'discovery,' as exotic locations romanticised through the depiction of an idealised utopia. Possessing a geographic and climatic splendour, unchanging or, at best, complementing an Arcadian paradise. Perhaps museums have helped reinforce this perception by presenting their material culture as somewhat static and not revealing the effects of change, whether this be self-determined or that affected by external forces. It is a complex arena and one which future Triennials will address.¹³

What is unfortunate about these beliefs is that they are not new. Again, D'Harnoncourt in 1941 was convinced that the public would realise the value of contemporary Indian art when they were shown that it harmonised with the artistic concepts of modernism.¹⁴ If the primitive was actually modern, the ethnocentric schism could be overcome. This, however, has not transpired in relation to Pacific arts. On the whole, the viewing audience has been slow to accept contemporary art from the Pacific, and those practices which address social issues and concerns (though critically acclaimed) have not found patronage. Even though Western artists have drawn from Pacific themes, the modernist/abstract nature of these works remains embedded in the canons of the West. It is interesting to note, however, that contemporary African arts, Inuit art, Aboriginal art and Northwest Coast graphics have successfully found their way into the contemporary market. Frequently their imagery links to an indigenous spirituality and as such the relationship to the primitive (even though the medium is clearly contemporary) remains close at hand.

Similarly, Pacific artists embrace particular aspects of their cultural heritage to exemplify a position within contemporary practice. The concept of tradition is easily intertwined with contemporary art, especially since abstraction and metaphor are traditional Pacific practices. Nonetheless, Pacific art traditions are embedded in the Western mind (as well as the current literature on colonisation, representation, and gender), as Other, as exotic – as primitive or perhaps even a souvenir. These stereotypes create a two-sided sword; Pacific artists who hate the label often exploit it in their own work. They move beyond cliché, beyond fantasy, beyond the label Pacific, and in so doing create a new myth, neither traditional nor Pacific but firmly ensconced in their urban realities. They produce contemporary art negotiated under the guise of tradition in the context of Pacific.

CONTEMPORARY PACIFIC ART

Contemporary Pacific Art is a relatively new phenomenon that has only been recently acknowledged.¹⁵ In contrast to Contemporary Aboriginal Art, which burst on the scene in the mid-1970s and was immediately accepted, much of contemporary Pacific art was categorised as Tourist Art as late as 1990 (and in some instances continues to be so). As a result, the literature on this topic is not extensive, but one where there is a growing interest. This

ambiguous position was the focus of much debate in the 1980s and 1990s. As contemporary Pacific artists were utilising Western materials, many believed that this negated their practice as originating from the Pacific. Because they worked with Western materials and often came through a Western education system, their artwork was not authentically Pacific. These attitudes were based on a specific perception of Pacific art – something which was created pre-contact and has not changed since. Makerita Urale critiqued this notion when she commented, “It doesn’t matter what tools we use, it matters what’s in our minds.”¹⁶ Acknowledging a contemporary Pacific is an important factor in a better understanding of this arts practice. However, this stereotype remains.

Contemporary Pacific artists continue to push beyond the stereotype. They are demanding recognition of their position – one based in New Zealand; not in the myth, not in cliché. It is this position of knowledge offered through notions of identity that propels contemporary Pacific art into its own. This process is both conscious and politicised. Based on social, cultural, and economic realities, it focuses on their identity; an identity that is urban, global, and island-based. The question of what constitutes contemporary Pacific art remains. The answer is simple. It has no boundaries, as clearly any production of art at this time is contemporary. Perhaps the better question is: What makes it Pacific and how can people outside the Pacific translate these ideas and images into their own artistic language? Frequently, the key factor is the artists’ acknowledgement of a Pacific heritage – just living in the Pacific, like Gauguin for example, does not afford the label. More often than not, these artists of Pacific heritage create work that draws upon traditional knowledge, practices, art forms, and motifs. Their contemporary practice is not a reiteration of a past tradition but its use as a metaphor, or as a springboard for ideologies, or as a means of asserting a Pacific identity, political stance or commentary. Even so, acceptance is an issue. Raabe states:

Contemporary paintings without obvious traits of Pacific traditions are not accepted by the public as authentic Pacific art works – but as soon as they incorporate an ethnographic element they are not regarded as being contemporary or modern. In the first case the art work is not seen as genuine and therefore as not good enough to be included in any art show, in the second case the work is classified as ethnographic or folk art and is therefore excluded from modern art exhibitions.¹⁷

Notwithstanding these prejudices, contemporary Pacific artists do what artists across the globe do – they create, drawing on their interests, surroundings and experiences.

A PUSH OFFSHORE

With this in mind, it is essential that Creative New Zealand continue to support contemporary Pacific art offshore. And this they have done.

In 1998, a newly formed Pacific committee within Creative New Zealand allocated \$240,000 to Pacific initiatives. Being able to apply to a Pacific fund gave Pacific arts its own voice. This is not to say that Pacific projects were not funded previously, but with this restructure came the ability to promote and move Pacific, as opposed to New Zealand, into an international forum. Marilyn Kolhase noted: “increasingly, our artists are featuring alongside mainstream artists both in New Zealand and overseas. It is important this Committee continues to support Pacific Artists to develop their work and build new audiences.”¹⁸ Creative New Zealand’s constant desire to promote “provided an opportunity for these artists to gain international exposure, build networks, explore new markets and profile Pacific arts.”¹⁹

In this process, Pacific artists have formed working relationships to create opportunities at the Festival of Pacific Arts (Samoa, New Caledonia, Palau, American Samoa, and Solomon Islands), with the Tjibaou Centre in New Caledonia, and in association with the Asia Pacific Triennial in Brisbane. Artists have also been supported in their individual efforts in exhibiting in Australia, the United States, England, and Europe. In addition, CNZ has also supported the Tautai Trust, an Auckland-based organisation whose founding principle is seeking wider audiences and international recognition. Tautai has been instrumental in doing the groundwork for contemporary Pacific art in New Zealand. It

has facilitated many symposiums, workshops and lectures throughout New Zealand, and its advocacy of Pacific Arts often overshadows institutionalised arts bodies with larger resources. Since 1996, the trust has organised exhibitions of Pacific artists in Samoa, Fiji, the Cook Islands, New Caledonia, Australia and Germany. In that role, it has been an advocate for Pacific artists, both recognised and 'emerging'.²⁰ Exhibitions as a promotional strategy have also been embraced by CNZ.

EXHIBITIONS

Creative New Zealand has been involved in three key international exhibitions of contemporary Pacific art: "Paradise Now? Contemporary Art from the Pacific" (New York), "Pasifika Styles" (Cambridge, England), and "Dateline" (Berlin). Each of these provided the opportunity for artists to exhibit their work in important artistic communities. Each exhibition and venue created different opportunities and possibilities. Each curatorial agenda was set forth, and each included Maori artists as well ("Paradise Now? Contemporary Art from the Pacific" also included artists from the wider Pacific). These exhibitions were also accompanied by a catalogue with essays from the curator as well as 'selected' writers with expertise in contemporary Pacific arts. Melissa Chiu, a curator from the Asia Society states: "Paradise Now? Contemporary Art from the Pacific takes as its departure point the popular perception of the Pacific as a paradise, a worn cliché refreshed seasonally by tourism operators, drinking water companies, pearl traders, and other enterprises. While acknowledging the perceptions of their region, the fifteen artists included in this exhibition provide an alternative, more complex vision of the Pacific."²¹ She further claims that the exhibition is "reflecting a world of cultural intersections and tensions, one rife with competing social, cultural, and economic claims as well as the legacy of colonialism, this is an image of paradise interrupted."²² This is an image of reality. What this exhibition provided was a Pacific voice that spoke of a complex urban reality, one that is lived by Pacific islanders today. It is not the cliché, it is not how the Pacific is 'seen'. Murray Shaw, chair of the Arts Board, noted that "The potential benefits of this exhibition to New Zealand are huge ... offering a counter narrative to utopian images of the Pacific Islands."²³

In contrast, "Pasifika Styles" at the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology at Cambridge University positioned contemporary Pacific art as part of a continuum of the Pacific's traditional cultures. The new and the old were exhibited side by side, and as such created "a fusion of contemporary style and technological innovation with ancient traditions. *Pasifika Styles* unites the contemporary new wave of contemporary Pacific art and culture with extraordinary historical collections."²⁴ "Pasifika Styles" was not only accompanied by a catalogue, it also had a website and a program of presentations, symposia, artist talks, markets and festivals that spanned a 22-month period in 2006-08. Over this time, both Cambridge and its environs were exposed to Pacific islanders as individuals and as artists. They not only brought their knowledge and arts practice with them to England, they were able to bring back knowledge learned from interactions with the objects of their cultural heritage. As Rosanna Raymond commented, "I see the future of collections and museums becoming an arena for cultural exchange, going outside the boundary of space into everyday life ... my life ..."²⁵

"Dateline," exhibited in Berlin in 2007, was based on a contrasting curatorial prerogative, one that addressed the stereotype of the 'primitive' – to realign a German perspective about the Pacific. The title itself was "intended to symbolise – as a symptom – the temporal and spatial distance characterising our contemplation of art from far away."²⁶ Even though "Paradise Now?" and "Pasifika Styles" contradicted the stereotype by demonstrating both the urban realities of Pacific peoples as well as their current interaction with their past, "Dateline" chose to address the inequitable perception that German audiences had about Pacific art. Alexander Tolnay, speaking about the exhibition "Dateline," commented: "The very character of the last two locations, "Asia Society" and "Anthropology," highlights a misunderstanding that our exhibition seeks to resolve. These artists do not belong in museums of ethnology, as was often the practice until quite recently, but in reputable art museums, art galleries, and art societies; on an equal footing with their Euro-American contemporaries."²⁷

This notion was reiterated by Jewel Castro, Eva Raabe and Marion Struck-Garbe in their articles in *Pacific Island Artists Navigating the Global Art World*. These scholars have not only detailed the difficulties of finding the proper

venue for contemporary Pacific artwork, but have also demonstrated the need to both educate and create opportunities for Western audiences to gain an appreciation of these arts. As Tolnay describes "Dateline": "Works of the exhibition are an outcome of the innovatory developments of the indigenous cultures in the Pacific region and represent independent changes in the current practice of artists with a Pacific heritage ... fundamentally different from [those] ... which serve to satisfy false dreams of the South Pacific."²⁸ These false dreams are indeed the issue. Eva Raabe notes: "At the moment the European art scene has no fundamental knowledge of Pacific art. Art historians and anthropologists must join in an effort to develop a practice of art presentation, which takes into account that tradition and modern artistic expression are linked ... the way we represent Pacific art will shape the development of an European art criticism."²⁹

This issue is key. How does one change this perception? How does a curator interpret an artistic language not universally understood? Does one provide contextual information that will inform and perhaps enhance the viewer's appreciation of the work? If so, do you then suffer the accusation of neo-colonialism? This, of course, leads to another question as to the appropriate venue to display contemporary Pacific art. Art museums have been accused of being monoliths of Western ideologies – yet without access to these localities, non-Western ideologies have no voice. Does one exhibit in a museum and be accused of being inauthentic, or in an art gallery and be seen as old hat? Again, these questions are not new. Difference in location demands a difference of approach by both the curator and the viewing public. In the case of "Indian Art of the United States," d'Harnoncourt purposely decontextualised the ancient arts, contextualised the historic arts, and recontextualised and aestheticised the contemporary art.³⁰ This was deemed necessary due to the "inherent difficulty in evaluating new art forms outside their cultural context."³¹ Raabe feels that providing context is critical today and suggests that "Curators must reconcile the intellectual dissonance between the Pacific artists, who constantly develop new means of aesthetic expression, and the stagnant habits of the European art audience."³²

All of this becomes the foundation to the real question, which is: How do contemporary Pacific artists create a market for their work? The relationship between art and markets, or art as economic policy, was clearly demonstrated by d'Harnoncourt, MoMA, and United States policies in 1941. D'Harnoncourt believed that his exhibition should "stimulate and organize production and assist in merchandising of arts and crafts."³³ To facilitate this, a market was included in the exhibition space and artists were present to demonstrate and explain their arts practice. This strategy was included to create a better understanding of these arts processes, a better cultural understanding between the museum-going public and the American Indians and, as d'Harnoncourt wrote, to "demonstrate that Indian art is not savage."³⁴ This practice is now commonplace. It provides artists with the opportunity to explain their own art and in so doing break down the barriers of misconception. However, this practice has also backfired, reinforcing preconceptions, either of the 'primitive/exotic' or of the 'Western artist.' These realities demonstrate the contradictions found not only in the global art market, but in the many conflicts seen in the institutions, funding bodies and artistic practices themselves. Working through the critique of a "museum's complicity with colonialism,"³⁵ many institutions have embraced Pacific art production as an entity in its own right; others use the contemporary as evidence of an evolved cultural process, and still others fight valiantly to destroy a stereotype that remains. Yet this process is slow and many Pacific artists have become frustrated. Shigeyuki Kihara comments that "the system in place is not giving equal opportunity for people from the Pacific to speak and contribute to the conversation. So everyone needs to shut up for awhile until we can have our say."³⁶

Jewel Castro "wondered [in] what lofty halls of United States institutional bliss were their cutting edge works hanging, setting, and in collection? Where was the theoretical writing that provided discussion of these twenty-first century expressions of a contemporary world identity?"³⁷ Perhaps the world needs, as Marion Struck-Garbe has suggested, to "put aside its prejudices and embrace new artistic voices."³⁸

In that art continues to be supported by governments, have things changed? Is there a difference between an artist's desire to obtain international recognition and therefore create a larger market for their work, and a government body mandating that art should provide "economic rehabilitation of both the individual artist and the whole tribe?"³⁹

What then is the role of government funding of the arts? Our global village is a long way from cultural and artistic understanding. Knowledge, perception and context are essential to grow an appreciation and recognition that contemporary artists can draw on universals without losing themselves (and their cultural heritage). Funding bodies play an important role in this process – educating and enlightening, offering possibilities and opportunities to exchange and communicate, to share cultural ideologies, to move beyond the stereotype. Creative New Zealand's role is clear: They have supported artists, writers, and institutions not only to 'develop and promote' Pacific art, but to create new markets. This 'push offshore' has provided the art world with a better understanding of the Pacific's cultural and artistic foundations. As we (Pacific artists and the arts community) begin to reap the benefits of these initiatives, we must endeavour to contest the borders that remain.

Karen Stevenson is based at the Oceania Centre for Arts, Culture and Pacific Studies at the University of the South Pacific, Fiji. She specialises in the contemporary arts of the Pacific and is the author of *The Frangipani is Dead: Contemporary Pacific Art in New Zealand, 1985-2000*. She has recently edited *Pacific Island Artists Navigating the Global Art World*.

- 1 Karen Stevenson, *The Frangipani is Dead: Contemporary Pacific Art in New Zealand, 1985-2000* (Wellington: Huia Press, 2008).
- 2 Creative New Zealand, *Arts Council of New Zealand Toi Aotearoa Strategic Plan and Statement of Content/te mahere rautaki me tauaki whakamaunga atu, 2010-2013* (Wellington, 2010), 18.
- 3 Nicholas Thomas, *Possessions: Indigenous Art/ Colonial Culture* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1999), 17.
- 4 Samoa was the first Pacific nation to acquire its independence in 1962. Since then, most island nations have become independent except for the French and American territories: French Polynesia, New Caledonia, Wallis and Futuna, American Samoa and Guam.
- 5 Thomas, *Possessions*, 8.
- 6 Jewel Castro, "Without Boundaries: Contemporary Oceania Artists, A Movement Happening Now," in *New Voyagers: Pacific Island Artists and the Challenges of Negotiating Within the Global Art World*, ed. Karen Stevenson (Oakland: Masalai Press, 2011) 159.
- 7 W Jackson Rushing, "Marketing the Affinity of the Primitive and the Modern; René D'Harnoncourt and 'Indian' Art of the United States," in *The Early Years of Native American Art History*, ed. Janet Catherine Berlo (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1992) 192.
- 8 *Ibid.*, 198.
- 9 *Ibid.*, 224.
- 10 Rosanna Raymond, "Full Tusk Maiden Aotearoa: Ramblings of a New Voyager in Words and Visions," in *New Voyagers*, ed. Stevenson, 149.
- 11 Albert Wendt, "Contemporary Arts in Oceania," in *Art and Artists of Oceania*, eds Sidney Mead and Bernie Kernot (Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press, 1983), 198.
- 12 Eva Raabe, "Individualism and Tradition, Curating Contemporary Art from Papua New Guinea," in *New Voyagers*, ed. Stevenson, 137.
- 13 Doug Hall, *Asia-Pacific Triennial of Contemporary Art* (Brisbane: Queensland Art Gallery, 1993), 6.
- 14 Rushing, "Marketing the Affinity of the Primitive and the Modern," 215.
- 15 Stevenson, *The Frangipani is Dead*.
- 16 *Ibid.*, 166.
- 17 Raabe, "Individualism and Tradition," 138.
- 18 Marilyn Kohlhase (2001), <http://www.creativenz.govt.nz/mi/news/grants-support-pacific-artists-to-showcase-work>.
- 19 Marilyn Kohlhase (2005), <http://www.creativenz.govt.nz/mi/news/grants-reflect-growth-of-pacific-arts>.
- 20 Karen Stevenson, "Refashioning the Label, Reconstructing the Cliché: A Decade of Contemporary Pacific Art 1990-2000," in *Paradise Now? Contemporary Art from the Pacific* (New York: Asia Society, 2004), 30.
- 21 Mellisa Chiu, catalogue essay, *Paradise Now? Contemporary Art from the Pacific*, 11.
- 22 *Ibid.*, 19.

- 23 Murray Shaw, (2002), <http://www.creativenz.govt.nz/en/news/major-exhibition-of-new-zealand-and-pacific-art-to-open-in-new-york>.
- 24 Pasifika Styles, <http://www.pasifikastyles.org.uk>, "Pasifika Styles" exhibition and Festival was based in the University of Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, 2006-2008.25 Raymond, "Full Tusk Maiden Aotearoa," 158.
- 26 Alexander Tolnay, *Dateline* (Neuer Berliner Kunstverein, 2007), 12.
- 27 Ibid.
- 28 Ibid.
- 29 Raabe, "Individualism and Tradition," 147-8.
- 30 Rushing, "Marketing the Affinity of the Primitive and the Modern," 195.
- 31 Ibid., 208.
- 32 Raabe, "Individualism and Tradition," 138.
- 33 Rushing, "Marketing the Affinity of the Primitive and the Modern," 197.
- 34 Ibid., 224.
- 35 Bernice Murphy, *Localities of Desire: Contemporary Art in an International World* (Sydney: Museum of Contemporary Art, 1994), 44.
- 36 Castro, "Without Boundaries," 165.
- 37 Ibid., 159.
- 38 Marion Struck-Garbe, "'Ai Bilong Meri': Making and Marketing the Contemporary Vision of Papua New Guinea Women Artists," in *New Voyagers*, ed. Stevenson, 136.
- 39 Rushing, "Marketing the Affinity of the Primitive and the Modern," 198.