

TRAVELLING HOUSES: TRANSLATION, CHANGE AND AMBIVALENCE

A.-Chr. Engels-Schwarzpaul

Paper for the **Symposium Session: Pacific Spaces and Sacred Buildings**

ASAO conference in San Diego, USA, Feb 2016.

Travelling Houses

Berlin, 2005: On the website, the Samoan Fale on its platform in the midst of the Tropical Village had signalled the South Seas' eternal sun and balmy breezes. Carving, weaving and lashing details suggested alternative ways of life where time moves at a different pace and simplicity harbours happiness. On site, approaching past the Bali lagoon and Borneo Longhouse, the fale is dwarfed by the massive steel structure of the former hangar that houses the Tropical Islands resort, and its handcrafted Pandanus mats and carved posts contrast with the dome's techno feel. The surrounding space is loud and busy, even though there aren't that many visitors on a Thursday afternoon in winter. The fale looks deserted.

London, 2012: Hinemihi is open today, surrounded by people – her people and half of London, it seems. It's the kohanga reo's hangi, and people are milling across the lawn in front of Clendon House in the morning sun. Hinemihi and the huge oak tree sheltering her make a strange contrast. As I contemplate this and watch the preparations going on, a karanga sounds, and suddenly the lawn transforms into a marae ātea. Local and visiting Māori begin to stand in formation as they would at home in Aotearoa, to take part in the pōwhiri and watch the performances before shopping at the stalls and eating some food from the hangi.

Hamburg, 2014: Turning a corner on the museum's top floor, I suddenly see Rauru. He looks very different from what I remember from the photos of a carefully kept specimen, like an exquisitely lit jewel on black velvet. I had read that the presentation was changed after his restoration, but I'm not quite prepared for this. The house, small and beautiful, is still impressive, but the simulation of New Zealand bush around it, with its garishly painted vegetation, is weird. Even stranger to approach walking down twelve steps - never before have I approached a whare from above. Of course, none of that was visible in the video I saw of the 100th anniversary of Rauru's arrival.

Laie, 2014: We are too late for the performances, so the visitors' benches and stage are empty as we walk towards the Samoan village from the Māori complex. There is a big stone, like a Māori mauri, and beyond the malae stands a huge fale afolau in the centre, and two smaller ones on either side. The houses are in an immaculate state, like most buildings here at the Polynesian Cultural Center, but then there has just been an extensive restoration a couple of years ago. There are no people now, but there must be many during the day when the reputedly hilarious performances attract visitors.

These are accounts of my first encounters with four Pacific houses in their current locations, three in Europe and one in the USA.¹ Some arrived as early as the 19th century, some only in the 21st. They all demonstrate, I hope to show, the importance of relationships impacting on their location, their status and their roles over time. To be able to engage with their histories and current

situation, there is an original context to be taken into account, which connects them to their source communities. Then, there is the context of their current location, where local people do or don't engage with them. Their own travel also unfurls a global relational context including researchers, art buyers, exhibition agents, and the managers or commissioners of theme parks and resorts. A birds' eye perspective of global contexts always entails the danger of generalising, of overlooking important, specific details. Looking at local context only, on the other hand, easily misses communalities between the houses and their stations. I tend to shift between both perspectives, but ultimately probably lean towards a broad view, looking for communalities and patterns.

Aware of the dangers of superficial analogies, though, before my 2014 visit at the Museum für Völkerkunde in Hamburg (MVH) I anticipated difficulties in explaining to staff my simultaneous interest in Rauru *and* their historical photographs from the South Seas. I need not have worried on this occasion: since the previous year, the museum was showing two special exhibitions from its Oceania collection: "Blick ins Paradies" (A glimpse into paradise) and "Südsee. Māori. Geheimnisse entdecken" (South Seas. Māori. Discover secrets).² In Rauru's local context in Hamburg, from where business people and ethnographers once set out to acquire artefacts for the museum's collections, Sean Mallon's notion of a "tangible representation of something 'Pacific'" seems to fit well: things that might appear disparate in the Pacific can seem related here (Mallon, 2010: 27). In the Pacific, on the other hand, a greater contextual rendering of details highlights other similarities and differences, which tend to disappear behind shared differences from contemporary Europe when seen from Hamburg.

Changing relationships: The journey

When, in the second half of the nineteenth century, Māori and Pacific houses began to travel far beyond their original sites and contexts, they also began to partake in very different types of exchange. Similarly, their contexts changed from potentially sacred settings to often short-lived spectacles. Encounters between buildings and people became mostly fleeting and inconsequential. Some houses became isolated specimen in exhibitions and shows, and they appear to have lost all connection with their source communities. In other cases, collaborations developed between the houses' guardians or producers and their overseas hosts or keepers. These collaborations changed the relationships between source communities, legal owners and the houses themselves. Thus, Māori whare whakairo (carved houses) or whare tipuna (ancestral houses) are increasingly addressed in the Euro-American expert literature by personal pronouns reflecting the gender of the ancestor the whare is named after. Thus, Hinemihi is "she" and Rauru "he".

These houses, then, in all their diversity, have found themselves in changing contexts at different times. Collectively, they have ranged from shelter and taonga (prized possession) to tradable artefact, to museum specimen, to garden folly, to theme park exhibit, to transcultural meeting space, to temporary home for a diasporic community. These changes do not have to be one-directional or final, as has been too easily assumed – and the direction they take are at any given time dependent on the types of relationships in which they partake. More of that later.

I will now provide some context by briefly describing some of the transformations some selected Māori and Samoan houses underwent between the 1870s and now, en route to exhibition environments in Europe and the USA. Then, I will conceptualise these changes under the heading of translation (the move from one place to another) and the role of neighbours, kin, travellers, hosts, guests and ambassadors in the move between shelter and specimen. Finally, I want to explore re-translation, ambivalence and change, and the conditions of possibility that allow houses to take on different roles and support different relationships.

In 1892, the Māori wharenihi Hinemihi o te Ao Tawhiti from Te Wairoa in Aotearoa/New Zealand was sold to the Earl of Onslow, returning Governor of New Zealand, who took her home as a souvenir to grace Clandon Park in Surrey, UK. In WWI, Māori Battalion soldiers rediscovered her as a garden folly, and she was subsequently adopted by Ngāti Ranana, the Māori expat community living in London. Increasingly serving as “a Maori Ambassador at the centre of a transcultural partnership between British people and New Zealanders, Maori and non Maori”, she is today also a “National Trust property” with a Grade II listing, that is, a registered specimen in a collection of historic buildings. These different roles have frequently been in conflict in the past, but have also served to galvanise Hinemihi’s people.³

Rauru, by comparison, had a rather isolated existence for most of his time at the MVH. He was acquired by an earlier director, Thilenius, who had seen the house in Rotorua in 1898 (Triesch, 2012). Rauru’s origins are peculiar: many of the carved panels were originally carved for Te Waru, a local leader, and later sold to George Nelson, a Rotorua hotelier and art dealer. Nelson commissioned local carver, Tene Waitere (who had been amongst the survivors sheltering in Hinemihi in Te Wairoa) to use them to build a house. Rauru thus not only has two commissioners, it was also consecrated twice in 1900, by two tohunga (priests) from different tribes – a “highly irregular” occurrence (Mead, 2003: 79). Hirini Moko Mead suspects that Nelson wished to “authenticate the house as a traditional work” to raise its market value (79, see also Ellis, 2012; Triesch, 2012).¹ After protracted negotiations with potential buyers, Rauru was sold in 1904, and offered to the Hamburg museum by international art dealer, Umlauff, in 1910. Since 1912, Rauru has stood in the same custom made gallery. But his people moved: successive visits by Māori groups and individuals introduced different meanings and values into the curatorial process, to the effect that Rauru is now also seen increasingly as an “ambassador of the Te Arawa people, and of Māori culture in Europe overall” (Te Tenehi Teira in Köpke, 2012: 18; see also Tapsell, 2012).

The fale at Tropical Islands resort was commissioned by a Malaysian investor, built by Samoan Tufuga, and shipped to a resort close to Berlin, Germany. In 2004 it was opened and blessed, and for some months till 2005, it had the company of a Samoan performance troupe. The members would sometimes assemble at the fale during their contract and during lunchtime they performed on a stage opposite. Their time at the resort was not an entirely happy one: they were isolated, suffered from the weather and received significantly less than the minimal wages at the time. When the performers left, the fale sank into forgetfulness; some years later, visitors were unaware of its origins in Samoa, and it was used as a part-time bar and smoking lounge. While the Samoans had hoped to build a Samoan presence at the German resort, a new management crew saw no value in this proposal and replaced the Samoan troupe with exoticised local shows.⁴

My final example here is the Moata Samoa at the Polynesian Culture Center in Laie, Hawai’i. The Center realises an old dream of Matthew Cowley, Latter Day Saint missionary, who anticipated “the day when my Māori people ... will have a little village ... at Lā’ie with a beautiful carved house,” as well as the “Samoans and all those islanders of the sea” (Polynesian Cultural Center, n.d.-b). Cowley thought that Polynesian cultures and traditions would “endure if they were shared with others” (Polynesian Cultural Center, n.d.-b), and the Center to this day tries to negotiate the considerable tension between a community and educational mission, on one hand, and the requirements of a large commercial enterprise, on the other. The Samoan village was built in 1961–63 by matai tufuga Uga Muasau Alo of Faleniu, American Samoa, with tufuga Falefitu Masoe doing the afa lashing and finishing work (pers. comm. between Albert Refiti and Delsa Atoa Moe,

¹ Nelson also instructed the carvers to remove all contemporary imagery from the panels purchased from Te Waru to make them look traditional.

15.10.15). Much of the roofing was done by volunteer labor missionaries from Samoa (pers. comm. with Seamus Fitzgerald, 23.10.15). Opinions about the fale's integrity vary, but they are clearly not forgotten, and one of the PCC's employees described those working in the Samoan village as a "very tight community" whose members not only work but also "travel as a community" (HS, interview 16.9.14, Honolulu). Thus, the village serves, at least to some extent, as home away from home to Samoans in Hawai'i.⁵

These histories are examples of varying degrees of translation and re-translation processes and the relationships between those involved.

Translation: From place to place and ground to ground

A translation has to start somewhere: in my personal and academic life, the first cross-cultural, conceptual translations I experienced were from European languages, specifically German, to Māori. The result of those first translation attempts went beyond approximation of terms between different vocabularies and changed my angle of vision. Carl Mika describes this process for *whakapapa* as follows. "The ground that emerges from whakapapa," he writes,

and is important to Māori generally, is more powerful than its association with its common translation of 'genealogy' ... whakapapa deals with the world on its own terms and can reinterpret academic dogma ... whakapapa dishevels it in some way, or clears it even temporarily" (Mika, forthcoming 2016).

Since entering the long process of translation over thirty years ago, no single term has remained stable for me: I now look habitually for other ways of looking, placing and layering. In this spirit, I also bring writers and terms from different traditions together in this paper.

The two main notions emerging as important in this syncretic approach, as I am trying to make sense of the travelling houses' situations, relate to kinship and travel – important in both the Pacific and in Europe. In Aotearoa, writers like Hirini Moko Mead (2003) emphasise the importance of *utu* and *whakapapa* (reciprocal and intergenerational relationships) or, like Bob Jahnke (1999), of negotiations across the *pae* (threshold). Samoan Head of State, Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Efi elaborates on *tua'oi* (neighbour and boundary) and on *vā fealoaloa'i* (relations based on mutual respect) which help articulate relationships of separation and connection between self and other, first enabling hospitality (Tui Atua, 2007). In Germany, Walter Benjamin invokes a "secret agreement between past generations and the present one" (Benjamin, 1969/1940: 254), which commits us to redeem the past by recognizing its image in the present. He also insists on the original kinship of all languages (in which he includes, like Pacific thinkers do, non-human ones) and on the dialogical nature of translation (with its aspects of movement and travel, but also invigorating interaction). Paul Ricoeur (2006) in France establishes links between translation and hospitality and Mario Erdheim (1992) in Switzerland picks up on the ambivalence inherent in both (that is, always, between one's own and the foreign, *dem Eigenen und dem Fremden*), as potentiality in cross-cultural relationships. Epli Hau'ofa (1994) in Fiji compellingly appeals to the long tradition of Pacific peoples travelling and enlarging their world. Finally, an important assumption I adopt from Sean Mallon and Roger Neich is that the ways in which things are used are at least as important, if not more important, than what they are taken to mean and look like. Cultural products manifest and mediate social and cultural processes and their uses "often transcend [their] appearance, ... surface decorations and artistic intent" (Mallon, 2010: 24).

From my synthesizing perspective, I see correspondences between these writers' concerns, that is, differences and contradictions as well as affinities, and I want to engage resulting ambiguities

as potentialities – creating through mutual translations space for diverse ways of knowing, expanding both Pacific and European knowledge.

Translation: From Shelter to specimen

Translation (Latin *tra-ducere*) can be rendered as “conduct through, pass beyond, to the other side of a division or difference” (Bal, 2003 #3731: 6). As a conceptual device, translation allows me to look at different ways of moving houses and knowledge “from one place to another”, and “one language into another” (its Latin etymologies), and to explore how these affect the houses’ performance and meaning. When Samoan fale and Māori whare were transported from their communities of origin to be exhibited in US and European museum collections, one of their typical features, namely that their role and function changes according to context and event, found a new inflection: which processes of translation and change are set in motion in the context of their use in exhibitions?

Amongst contemporary curators, imperial attitudes oscillating between desire and fascination with the strange, on one hand, and fear and rejection, on the other, have given way to a greater interest in hosting and translating the strange into the local fabric. Erdheim regards this process as one of the fundamental conditions for cultural innovation (2002: 29); in the often chaotic encounter with the strange, ambivalence creates space for autonomy while antagonism provides challenges. Both are important factors in the development of spatio-temporal relationships beyond the individual (1992: 743). However, to understand each other in the appropriation and disappropriation between self and other that is at the core of the constitution and survival of self, it is also crucial that the parties can rely on a lasting commonality or agreement (Foran, 2012: 78, 81).

Translations are performed by mutually foreign tongues. My colleague Albert Refiti has often said that he finds English a very practical language; it makes it possible to separate and reassemble things in different ways. Perhaps Samoan is more poetic and internally consistent and therefore more difficult to dis- and re-articulate. Linda Tuhiwai Smith, when she describes a “process of systematic fragmentation” in the “disciplinary carve-up of the indigenous world” (in Chow, 2008: 565), may refer to the same capacity of English to separate and rearticulate that Albert found useful. How literal or metaphorical translations (carried out by a necessary mutual foreignness) ultimately work out, and whether they are generative or destructive, may depend on the degree to which the translator allows him- or herself to be moved (in both meanings of the word). In *The Task of the Translator*, Benjamin quotes Pannwitz, who said that even the best German translators of his time held “far greater reverence for the usage of their own language than for the spirit of the foreign works” (Benjamin, 1969/1923: 80). To do justice to the original, a translator must allow his own language to be “powerfully affected by the foreign tongue” so that it is expanded and deepened (81). Rather than about equivalences between two dead languages, translation is alive and it must assume a central kinship between languages. “[L]ovingly and in detail” must it “incorporate the original’s mode of signification” and “give voice to [its] *intentio*” (78). In this way, a translation can liberate what is imprisoned in the original, adding new dimensions in an interplay between kinship and mutual foreignness (74-5, 80). Conflictual *and* solicitous, it unfolds the strange that is always already enfolded in the familiar (Baecker, 2012: 16).

This applies, obviously, to translation as the “turn from one language to another” (*The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*, 1996). However, translation includes, of course, the world views and practices onto which a language opens like a window. Further, its etymology (e.g., “carrying across, removal, transporting” or “transfer of meaning” in Harper, 2001-2015) preserves an older sense of spatial distance to be overcome, and of the extraction and re-embedding of

meaning and value. Taking this spatial dimension seriously, we can see how Pacific houses are reconstituted in the transfer from the Pacific to new host countries.

In Samoa, the term *fale* stands for shelter, so much so that a *fale tele* cannot be conceived devoid of the relationships it structures, expresses and relies on (Refiti, 2015: 76, 101, 159, 250). When the travelling Pacific houses left their original communities, kinship and neighbour relationships in which they would have been embedded in the village were replaced by cross-cultural relationships. These are not necessarily based on difference but, intended or not, they are as fundamentally reciprocal as those in the Samoan *nu'u* (village): one's own is always enfolded with the strange. In the *nu'u*, notions of *tua'oi* (boundary and connection, neighbour) and *vā fealoaloa'i* (social relations based on mutual respect) articulate relationships of separation and connection between one's own and others'. According to Tui Atua, *vā fealoaloa'i* relates to relational bonds "between peoples, and their gods/God, peoples, and the seas, skies and stars" – referring "specifically to the relational bond between different entities" (Tui Atua, 2007). Depending on a speaker's context, one employs *vā fealoaloa'i* when speaking of one's "own personal relationships or about those relationships close to them"; whereas, when "speaking objectively of the relationships of others, particularly of those that are unfamiliar (at a personal level) to the speaker, the term *tua'oi* is the more appropriate" (Tui Atua). Thus, the boundaries between the terms are as conditional on relationships as the boundaries between people are. "Moving beyond *tua'oi*, challenging *tua'oi*, shifting *tua'oi*, fixing *tua'oi*, are all part and parcel of defining and living human life. Different *tua'oi* or boundaries mark the moving tides of culture and politics" (2007). These dynamic en- and unfoldings of own and other first enable hospitality.

Ricoeur deploys the notion of hospitality in the context of translation: translation seeks "a correspondence without adequacy" by acknowledging the irreducibility of "the peculiar and the foreign" (2006: 10). Linguistic hospitality invites retranslations and, in it, "the pleasure of dwelling in the other's language is balanced by the pleasure of receiving the foreign word at home, in one's own welcoming house" (10). In this type of relationship, a translator (or curator or writer) is powerfully affected by the other language (and the culture or world views it belongs to) and brings features to light that had remained enfolded in the original. In a local world, it is easy to imagine Benjamin's "secret agreement" with past generations which "cannot be settled cheaply" (1969/1940: 254). Remembering Māori views of *whakapapa* (genealogy) and *utu* (reciprocity), this agreement is also transferable to cross-cultural translations, particularly when they concern intergenerational relationships.

Metaphors of hosts and guests, and of visiting and taking care, are common in the consideration of mutual strangeness. In the Pacific context, for example, Michael Goldsmith has not only observed how the "dialogue between 'local' and 'foreign'" mirrors the "cultural relationship between hosts and guests", but also how it demonstrates the contextual subtleties of relations between sacred Pacific Buildings and their occupants (2013). When travellers and locals relate as guests and hosts, hospitality not only allows strangers access to local cultures, it also vitalises the local (Erdheim, 1992: 735). For his part, John Terrell, whose Field Museum in Chicago hosts Ruatēpupuke II, considers the marae "New Zealand's greatest gift to the world" (Terrell, Wisse, & Philipp, 2007: 109) and believes his own culture has a lot to learn from it. Hannah Arendt argues that, when one "trains one's imagination to go visiting" to understand others' standpoints (Arendt, 1992: 43), distance from the familiar extends the reach of our thought. To "look upon the same world from one another's standpoint, to see the same in very different and frequently opposing aspects" (Arendt, 1961: 51), changes not only the way in which one looks at an object, *seeing anew*, but ultimately also the object itself. When that happens, our own, particular conditions can stand next to those of our hosts – never becoming the same and maintaining their distance; and thus our common world is "produced as a result of visiting" (Peng, 2008: 74).

Translation, as a creative and imaginative act, goes beyond understanding how other people “either construct the world or are constructed by the world” (Smith, 1999: 37): if the translator’s language is properly affected by the foreign, translation can become “a way of sharing the world” (37) that takes account of mutuality and multiple directions.

In the case of travelling houses, such translation processes have first led to Hinemihi’s recognition as an ancestor by the UK National Trust and, from there, to a gradual change in conservation policies. Similarly, the MVH recognises Rauru as an ambassador of Te Arawa people and of Māori culture generally (Te Tenehi Teira in Köpke, 2012: 18). The notion of an ambassador, though, still has a lot in common with that of a specimen, which is supposed to represent the group to which it belongs and its most typical features: precisely what it is separated from. A specimen is first isolated and immobilised, and then placed into relationships with other representatives of other groups (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998: 165). Both specimen and ambassador thus act apart from wider their relational and spiritual grounds. In terms of change and relationships, specimen and ambassadors appear to have reached the end point on a continuum from taonga to isolated object.

Change and ambivalence: global re-translation

However, an important part of recent scholarship is about dishevelled this assumption of a linear and unidirectional development between sacred and profaned. Ambiguity and ambivalence are unsettling factors that probably propel cultural change everywhere. Interestingly, the term ambiguity appears to originate at the beginning of European colonization, more precisely in the 1520s (from Latin *ambiguus* “having double meaning, shifting, changeable, doubtful” derived from *ambigere* “to dispute about”, but also “to wander” from *ambi-* “about” + *agere* “drive, lead, act”, Harper, 2001-2015). The more contemporary term ambivalence, “simultaneous conflicting feelings”, was coined in 1910, at the height of European imperialism, by Swiss psychologist Eugen Bleuler (from Latin *ambi-* “both” + *valentia* “strength”, Harper, 2001-2015). The plurality and energy implicit in these terms from the beginning can shift our perception from settled conventions to as yet unnoticed possibilities.

Accordingly, MVH director Wulf Köpke and Oceanic department curator Jeannette Kokott were both surprised during the ‘Rauru Project’ (Rauru’s renovation leading up to the 100th anniversary of his acquisition by the museum) which degree of frankness was possible during their collaboration with his source community. The Hamburg museum staff members got to know Jim and Catherine Schuster and other participants from Te Arawa and other iwi (Māori tribes) in ways that were previously unthinkable. The *whānau* (extended family-like) relationships initiated in this collaboration are expected to continue beyond the completion of the project. Köpke and Kokott understand that they have become part of Te Arawa history and that the “ancestors” in Hamburg are now also their “responsibility” to look after, jointly with Te Arawa: “We must make sure that, for the next one hundred years, the meeting house continues to be well looked after and does not feel lonely again, and that the contact with the Te Arawa people will not be broken.” (Köpke, 2012: 17). Te Tenehi Teira, National Māori Heritage Manager, strongly advises to treat Rauru “like a member of the diplomatic corps” so he can “create a bridge between the Māori culture and the German and European cultures, and thus also secure the future of the Māori culture in New Zealand” (in Köpke, 2012: 18). I didn’t have the opportunity to talk to the director in Hamburg, but in meeting and interviewing Kokott and her intern Marisol Fuchs, it seemed clear to me that they had taken on board, and were trying out in their speaking and thinking, new ontological and epistemological possibilities. It was remarkable how they managed to hold on to those thought habits in wintery and rainy Hamburg, which has such a different history of looking at houses.

Their newly forged understandings seem to run counter to Albert Refiti's proposition that one of the fundamental differences concerning exchange relationships in Pacific and Western contexts is the prevailing type of exchange. The generative relationships Māori and Samoans looked for historically, and still look for today, impel us to rewrite history with "courage, humor, cunning and fortitude" {Benjamin, 1969 #832: 255} – and from a perspective other than that of the apparent or factual historical victors. This re-writing is occurring at the MVH with varying success and depends on how the conflict between the different exchange relationships plays out. In Western cultures, objects are isolated from their contexts and relationships to better circulate as commodities, and in the Pacific, the exchange of objects ideally strengthens the relationships between the participants. Köpke says no when asked in an interview for the TV programme *Marae* whether the museum would return Rauru if Te Arawa requested repatriation. Yet, he tries out Pacific ideas at least rhetorically when he insists that this question should not be reduced to a legal matter: "it's a spiritual matter". In his answer, the different perspectives seem to clash:

we are the caretakers of the house, ... and so they would have to accuse us of neglecting that ... the spirits of Rauru will make up their mind. If they want to stay here, they will stay, and if they decide that they won't the house will go back" (Köpke, 4:48-6:21).

<to here>

Translation always involves interpretations, and interpretations in which self-assurance overshadows the interest in the thoughts of the other lean towards epistemic violence – when the desire for control of the object overshadows the interest in the source community, misappropriation looms large. Such violence that makes it difficult to develop new forms of relationships between other and own. When, however, ambivalence and antagonism properly open up a space, engagement with another culture no longer assumes to know the other in advance in, and on, one's own term (Gadamer, 1975: 360). Global translations and re-translations are never finished; they evolve in the interchanges between the participants and succeed or fail according, in large part, on the history that produced the current layers of the original to be translated. Their fate also depends on the contexts in which the translations play out, and the individuals and groups involved in the process at various stages.

In the context of the houses, there is a difference between fully profit driven theme parks and partially funded museums or historic places. There are also significant differences amongst the instance of each category: the travelling houses at the *Polynesian Cultural Center* not only offer edutainment and tokens of the exotic to outsiders, but they also nurture, in their own ways, traditional arts and crafts and local diasporic communities.⁶ By contrast, the fale at Tropical Island has fallen into near total oblivion and the Samoans who performed there would have triggered ambivalent reactions in the local population: fascination and fear, curiosity and rejection. Such ambivalent feelings can easily tip over into hostility, as the xenophobic attacks in the surrounding area have repeatedly shown, but they can also, as Mario Erdheim (2002: 21-22) suggests, provide space for the new and enlarge people's choices thereby propelling cultural change. Another vector in the interpretation of difference is the houses' connections with their source communities. Whereas Hinemihi and Rauru are connected to source communities, probably because they had local connections before they left Aotearoa, the Samoan houses were both commission pieces and therefore from the beginning embedded in capitalist systems of exchange. Also relevant are perhaps the different attitudes of Samoans and Māori with respect to their houses, which are affected by their self-understanding. Whereas Samoans consider themselves free and independent, Māori (like the kānaka maoli of Hawai'i) are First Nation people and consequently perhaps more protective of their culture.

Rauru and Hinemihi's changing roles, in any event, are direct consequences of the movements from place to place that are so intimately part of colonisation and globalisation. Today, in tandem with the identity politics of Indigenous peoples around the globe, the exposure to diverse cultures increasingly highlights the diversity of knowledges and interpretations. There is a growing realisation amongst Western scholars that all cultures, including their own, have blind spots; that each has questions it does not permit; and that all are unable to see what they cannot see (Baecker, 2012: 70, 109). This realisation has affected notions of control and ownership in museum practices, and it has indirectly impacted on the ways in which Hinemihi and Rauru are regarded by their keepers. Translation, moving from place to place, mobilises meaning and expands interpretive frameworks. It facilitates multiperspectival discussions that work around the blind spots in each culture and help uncover or articulate new affinities between Pacific and Western types of knowledge.

While, until recently, museums exhibiting Pacific houses asserted ownership in part by replacing the rules of their source communities by their own (e.g., as conservation requirements or curatorial strategies), the change in orientation brought about by the new Museology movement gives people more "control over their cultural heritage and its preservation as part of how they maintain, reinforce, or construct their identity" (Hakiwai, 2012: 383). A source community's "living culture and its continuing development" (Christina Kreps in Hakiwai, 2012: 383) leads to a vision of shared ownership in recognition of Māori's "real living relationships with their *taonga*" (Hakiwai, 2012: 387, 393; see also Tapsell, 2012). In line with international developments (Gurian, 1999), an acceptance of custodianship and mutual responsibilities has replaced the outright assertion of ownership also at MVH (Köpke, 2012: 17).

These changing circumstances also make it easier to think of the houses' changes in status (from a sacred/consecrated object to specimen or artefact to iconic object) in more than one way. Implicit in the sequence just mentioned is the idea of an irretrievable loss of authenticity. In the US context, Deborah Root prefers the term *integrity* to *authenticity* because, whereas the latter depends primarily on an object's external form, the former indicates "a relatively unbroken connection between the image or object and the culture in which it is made and used" (1996: 80). This connection does not depend on overt ownership and control but continues to impact on the houses' use and function. Changes in the relationship will most likely change the houses status as *taonga*, shelter, artefact, specimen or commodity – long or short term – in more than one direction, as Mataatua whareniui has clearly shown.

References

- Aikau, H. K. (2012). More than preserving a Polynesian paradise. *Arena Journal*(37/38), 129.
- Arendt, H. (1961). *Between past and future: Six exercises in political thought*. New York, N.Y.: The Viking Press, Inc.
- Arendt, H. (1992). *Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy. Edited and with an interpretive essay by Ronald Beiner*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Baecker, D. (2012). *Wozu Kultur?* Berlin, Germany: Kadmos.
- Bal, M. G. (2002). *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Benjamin, W. (1969). The Task of the Translator. In H. Arendt (Ed.), *Illuminations* (pp. 69-82). New York: Schocken. (Original work published 1923)
- Benjamin, W. (1969). Theses on the Philosophy of History. In H. Arendt (Ed.), *Illuminations* (pp. 253-264). New York: Schocken Books. (Original work published 1940, Suhrkamp Verlag)
- Chow, R. (2008). Translator, Traitor; Translator, Mourner (or, Dreaming of Intercultural Equivalence). *New Literary History*, 39(3), 565-580.

- Ellis, N. (2012). 'No hea koe? - Where are you from?' Māori Meeting Houses Overseas. In B. Schmelz & W. Köpke (Eds.), *The House Rauru – Masterpiece of the Māori. Mitteilungsband 44* (pp. 419-435). Hamburg, Germany: Museum für Völkerkunde.
- Engels-Schwarzpaul, A.-Chr. (2007a). Travel in Tropical Islands - Enemies Coexisting in Peace. *Interstices: Journal of Architecture and Related Arts*, 8, 21-30.
- Engels-Schwarzpaul, A.-Chr. (2007b). "A warm grey fabric lined on the inside with the most lustrous and colourful of silks": Dreams of airships and tropical islands. *The Journal of Architecture*, 12(5), 525-542.
- Engels-Schwarzpaul, A.-Chr., & Simati Kumar, B. (2014). A Fale Samoa at Tropical Islands Resort, Germany: Performing Samoa to the World. *Tracing Footprints of Tomorrow: Past lessons, present stories, future lives. Proceedings of Samoa Conference II (4-8 July 2011)*. Retrieved from <http://samoanstudies.ws/publications/samoa-conference-ii-proceedings/>
- Engels-Schwarzpaul, A.-Chr., & Wikitera, K.-A. (2009). Take me away ... In search of original dwelling. *Interstices: Journal of Architecture and Related Arts*, 10 *Adam's House in Paradise*, 42-54.
- Erdheim, M. (1992). Das Eigene und das Fremde: Über ethnische Identität (Native and Alien: On Ethnic Identity). *Psyche: Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse und ihre Anwendungen*, 46(8), 730-744.
- Erdheim, M. (2002). Verzerrungen des Fremden in der psychoanalytischen Perspektive. In O. Gutjahr (Ed.), *Fremde. Freiburger literaturpsychologische Gespräche. Jahrbuch für Literatur und Psychoanalyse Bd* (Vol. 21, pp. 21-45). Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Foran, L. (2012). Translation as a Path to the Other: Derrida and Ricoeur. In L. Foran (Ed.), *Translation and Philosophy* (pp. 75-88). Oxford, UK: Peter Lang AG, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften.
- Gurian, E. H. (1999). What is the object of this exercise? A meandering exploration of the many meanings of objects in museums. *Daedalus*, 128(3), 163-183.
- Hakiwai, A. (2012). 'Honour the Future by Caring for the Past'. The Bicultural Mission of New Zealand's National Museum Te Papa Tongarewa. In B. Schmelz & W. Köpke (Eds.), *The House Rauru – Masterpiece of the Māori. Mitteilungsband 44* (pp. 379-397). Hamburg, Germany: Museum für Völkerkunde.
- Harper, D. (2001-2015). *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Retrieved from <http://etymonline.com/>
- Hau'ofa, E. (1994). Our Sea of Islands. *Contemporary Pacific*, 6(1), 147.
- Jahnke, R. H. G. (1999). Voices Beyond the Pae [282]. In N. Thomas, D. Losche, & J. Newell (Eds.), *Double vision: art histories and colonial histories in the Pacific* (pp. 193-209). Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1998). *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kokott, J. (2012). One Hundred Years of Rauru in Hamburg. Building Bridges between Aotearoa/New Zealand and Germany. In B. Schmelz & W. Köpke (Eds.), *The House Rauru – Masterpiece of the Māori. Mitteilungsband 44* (pp. 26-37). Hamburg, Germany: Museum für Völkerkunde.
- Köpke, W. (2012). More than just a Meeting House ... In B. Schmelz & W. Köpke (Eds.), *The House Rauru – Masterpiece of the Māori. Mitteilungsband 44* (pp. 13-25). Hamburg, Germany: Museum für Völkerkunde.
- Mallon, S. (2010). Beyond the paperskin. In M. Page, S. Mallon, & I. Miller (Eds.), *'Paperskin: The Art of Tapa Cloth'. Exhibition catalogue (18 June 2010 – 26 September 2010)* (pp. 23-31)
- Mead, H. M. (2003). *Tikanga Maori. Living by Maori Values*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.
- Mika, C. (forthcoming 2016). 'Papatūānuku/Papa': Some thoughts on the oppositional grounds of the doctoral experience. *Knowledge Cultures*, 2(6). 4(1).
- Peng, Y. (2008). *A U-turn in the Desert: Figures and Motifs of the Chinese Nineteen Eighties* (PhD). University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

- Refiti, A. L. (2015 forthcoming). *Mavae and Tofiga. The Spatial Exposition of Samoan Architecture*. Auckland University of Technology, Auckland.
- Ricoeur, P. (2006). *On translation*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- Root, D. (1996). *Cannibal Culture. Art, Appropriation, and the Commodification of Difference*. Boulder: WestviewPress.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies. Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Stillman, A. K. I. (2004). Pacific-ing Asian Pacific American History. *Journal of Asian American Studies*, 7(3), 241-270.
- Tapsell, P. (2012). Rauru and the Genesis of Ngā Whare Wānanga o Te Arawa. In B. Schmelz & W. Köpke (Eds.), *The House Rauru – Masterpiece of the Māori. Mitteilungsband 44* (pp. 87-113). Hamburg, Germany: Museum für Völkerkunde.
- Terrell, J. E., Wisse, D. C. J., & Philipp, C. J. (2007). Ruatēpupuke II, The Field Museum, Chicago: The Past and Possible Futures. In D. Sully (Ed.), *Decolonising Conservation: Caring for Maori Meeting Houses Outside New Zealand* (pp. 89-109). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Trask, H.-K. (1991). Coalition-building between Natives and non-Natives. *Stanford Law Review*, 1197-1213.
- Triesch, C. (2012). From Rotorua to Hamburg. Rauru Finds a New Home. In B. Schmelz & W. Köpke (Eds.), *The House Rauru – Masterpiece of the Māori. Mitteilungsband 44* (pp. 191-223). Hamburg, Germany: Museum für Völkerkunde.
- Tui Atua, T. T. E. (2007, 29 October). *Samoan jurisprudence and the Samoan Lands and Titles Court: The perspective of a litigant*. presented at the meeting of the University of Hawaii, Mānoa, Honolulu. Retrieved from http://www.head-of-state-samoa.ws/pages/speech_jurisprudence.html
- Webb, T. D. (1998). A New Kind of Plantation. *The Polynesian Cultural Center in Lā`ie, Hawai'i. CRM*(8), 33-36.
- Wineera, V. (2000). *Selves and Others: A Study of Reflexivity and the Representation of Culture in Touristic Display at the Polynesian Cultural Center, Laie, Hawaii* (PhD thesis). University of Hawai'i, Honolulu, HI.

Notes

¹ Other houses that travelled from the Pacific to Europe or America include: Mataatua, the first whare to leave Aotearoa/New Zealand. Built in 1875 by Ngāti Awa in Whakatāne, the house was sent to an exhibition in Sydney in 1879, then purloined and expedited to London in 1881, sent back to Aotearoa only to be incorporated in the collections of the Otago museum, and finally returned to Whakatāne in 1996. Hinemihi, Rauru and three other Māori houses are likely to stay in their current overseas locations: Ruatēpupuke II from Tokomaru (opened 1881) was sold to Hindmarsh/Umlauff in the 1890s and then on to the current location at the Chicago Field museum, arriving there in 1905; Te Wharepuni a Maui from Rotorua (opened prior to 1906) was hired out to the 1906–7 New Zealand International Exhibition in Christchurch and sold in 1911 to Germany, where it is now in the Linden museum; Te Aroha o Te Iwi Māori was commissioned by and built for the Polynesian Culture Center in 1963 (for a discussion of several of these whare, see Ellis, 2012). The first known Samoan *fale* (allegedly previously owned by King Mata'afa) travelled to the 1893 *World's Columbian Exhibition* in Chicago; a *fale* from Mulinu'u, commissioned by the NZ Government, travelled to the 1924 *British Empire Exhibition* at Wembley; and another *fale* was commissioned for the 1925 NZ and South Seas International Exhibition in Christchurch, New Zealand. In the 1970s, a cluster of Samoan *fale* were included in the Little World Museum of Man in Aichi, Japan, and, in 2004, a *fale* arrived at the *Tropical Islands Resort* in Brand, Germany.

² The collection covers a wide field: Samoa, Aotearoa and several other Pacific Islands ("South Seas Treasures and Maori Art"), along with Australia, Micronesia, Melanesia, Malaysia, Indonesia, and the Philippines.

³ Ngāti Ranana hope that a growing partnership between Hinemihi and her source community, Ngāti Ranana and the UK National Trust will see Hinemihi “transformed from a vulnerable historic building into an active marae (Maori ceremonial space) and a cultural centre for Maori activities and learning in Britain.” <http://www.hinemihi.co.uk/page.php?id=24>. For more details about Hinemihi’s history and current involvements, see (Engels-Schwarzpaul & Wikitera, 2009).

⁴ For more information about the fale at Tropical Islands, see Engels-Schwarzpaul & Simati Kumar (2014) and Engels-Schwarzpaul (2007a, 2007b).

⁵ For more information about the fale at PCC, see Aikau (2012), Wineera (2000), Stillman (2004) and Webb (1998).

⁶ For a counter argument, see Trask (1991: 1201-2).