

THE PACIFIC CONNECTION - trade, travel & technology transfer

**FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE, BUILDING & PLANNING UNIVERSITY
OF MELBOURNE
19-21 FEBRUARY 2009**

Counter Currents: *Whare Nui* and *Fale* Abroad

A.-Chr. Engels-Schwarzpaul and Keri-Anne Wikitera

Abstract:

Since the 1860s, several Māori *whare nui* (meeting houses) and Samoan *fale* (houses) travelled overseas. Their fates are diverse: Mataatua, misappropriated and sent to overseas exhibitions under sometimes scandalous curatorial directions, returned in 1996. Others, like Hinemihi o te Ao Tawhito or Ruatēpūpū II, are likely to stay in their current locations, Clendon Park and the Field Museum. Samoan *Fale* travelled to the 1893 *World's Columbian Exhibition* in Chicago and to the 1924 *British Empire Exhibition* at Wembley. In 2004, a *fale* arrived at the *Tropical Islands Resort* in Brand, Germany. At the *Polynesian Cultural Center*, both *whare nui* and *fale* offer 'expat' edutainment as tokens of the exotic, but also maintain in their own ways traditional arts and crafts.

This paper explores the changing status and nature of some *whare nui* and *fale* through such journeys. These changes become manifest culturally, socio-economically and spiritually. In some cases, collaborations developed between the houses' guardians or producers and their overseas hosts or keepers. Some houses support diasporic communities, and some appear to have lost all connection with the cultural context that once made them coveted "objects".

Introduction

Visitors driving along the coastal Beach Road of Tokomaru Bay, New Zealand, past the deserted Sheep Farmers Store and Bank of New South Wales, normally do not realise that they are passing over the place where once stood the *whare nui* Ruatēpūpū II.¹ Ruatēpūpū left

Tokomaru Bay in the 1890s to arrive, after a detour through Germany, at Chicago's Field Columbian Museum in 1905. Today it functions not only as an exhibit of Māori art in the New World, but as the representation of a *marae*, which curator John Edward Terrell considers potentially "New Zealand's ... greatest gift to the world".²

Several Māori *whare nui* and Samoan *fale* have gone abroad since the 1860s. Their fates are diverse but not widely noticed: the global flow of people, objects and ideas is generally conceptualised in one direction only, from the Old or New World to the Rest, or from the centre to the colonies. This paper tells stories about reverse flows by which people and houses from Aotearoa and Samoa arrived, for instance, in London and Sydney, or Chicago, Lā'ie and Berlin. It is about the export of buildings, people and techniques from the Pacific to the Western World with regard to extra-ordinary, iconic buildings and the techniques that constructed their visibility in different contexts.³ The houses were perhaps early cases of 'kit-set' transport and assemblage, except that they sometimes permutated significantly during the dis- and relocations they went through. Sometimes, they left traces in people's minds and affected their new environments. Sometimes, they were overlooked. Whatever their effect, neither their materiality nor technology impacted significantly on the architectural discourses of their times.⁴

The emphasis is not so much on facts and evidence as on the relationships between the people concerned with the *whare* and *fale*, and the balance of power between them. Until today, these relationships determine in each case a building's changing status as *tāonga*, artefact or commodity – as the relationships change, so the "object's" status can change, long or short term, in either direction.

Travellers against the Flows

Mataatua, Hinemihi o te Ao Tawhito and Ruatepupuke left New Zealand in the 1880s and 90s. Coveted and acquired through various means by Government agencies, curios dealers, or museum curators, they went to Sydney, London, and Chicago – to be exhibited, reassembled as curios, sold on, circulated and displayed, or put into storage in museums. In 1893 a Samoan village was exhibited at the *World's Columbian Exposition* in Chicago. By this time, colonial and imperial politics had succeeded to the point that the exhibition of colonial acquisitions was a regular feature of international exhibitions – people and buildings alongside piles of produce and artefacts. When Ruatepupuke was bought by the Field Museum in 1905, a collecting frenzy amongst museum curators was caused not only by a growing interest of their visitors in "exotic others", but also by the perception that the indigenous cultures producing the coveted artefacts were, as one German museum director put it, living 'in the twelfth hour'.⁵

The reasons that caused the *fale* and *whare* at the *Polynesian Cultural Center* in Lā'ie, Hawai'i, and the *fale* at the *Tropical Islands Resort* in Brand, Germany, to travel in the 1960s and early 2000s were already part of a scenario evolving from the growth of tourism in the context of globalisation, and beginning decolonisation.⁶ Leisure and tourism became increasingly important contexts for a style of exhibition that progressively fused education and entertainment.

Patrons, curators and collectors' desires were significant factors in the houses' departures. Whether a house was built as a *whare tupuna*, a 'living' ancestral house in which family, political or spiritual events took place; whether its commission was a personal project; or whether it was produced with an eye on tourism or collectors' markets makes a difference regarding the relationships determining its function and place in the world. Similarly, the circumstances causing a change of ownership – from de facto confiscation to cheap or fair deal – impact on its makers or original owners' perceptions and relationships. And, finally, the ways in which current owners or visitors relate to the travellers and their communities of origin matter.

Edutainment: “as long as they have fun”

International Exhibitions, World Fairs and Theme Parks share an investment in the attraction of masses of visitors. While they sometimes have educational intentions, their economic base determines their *raison d'être*. Whether visitors are “be-funned”⁷ or thrown into a “jumble of foreignness” (Armstrong), their entertainment is essential for the functioning of these exhibitionary contexts.

The most recent instance of a *fale's* exhibition in a foreign context happened at the *Tropical Islands Resort* at Brand, 60km southeast of Berlin. Conceived around 2003 by Colin Au, a Malaysian multi-millionaire, it was to bring the tropics to Germany: the dome of a gigantic disused hangar built for the production of *CargoLifters* now houses 'rainforest flora and fauna and six [houses] representing indigenous cultures'.⁸ Like the collectors/curators of previous centuries, Au assembled what he considered the best specimen to convey a sense of authentic tropics. Aiming for quality, he had all houses produced in their countries of origin. Thus, he commissioned the Samoan Tourism Authority (STA) in Apia to have a *fale* constructed, by local *tufuga* using local traditional materials, on the basis of an image selected by him. Some months later, the *fale's* components travelled to Germany, to be erected by the *tufuga* in the centre of the resort's *Tropical Village*. In 2005, a Samoan troupe came to perform *The Call of the South Sea* to a German and international public in the vicinity of their *fale*.

Samoans were not asked for their advice when Au chose the type of *fale* he wanted built and, while they had a certain amount of control over its construction, they have no say in its ongoing use.⁹ The *fale's* presentation on the website bears only a tenuous relation with reality.¹⁰ While

its initial display at the resort indicated a sense of taste, by November 2009 it was a cocktail bar and smokers' lounge littered with cigarette butts, empty glasses and bottles.¹¹

At the *Polynesian Cultural Center* in Lā'ie, Hawai'i, seven 'native villages' have been displayed since 1963. In 1951, Matthew Cowley, Church of Latter Day Saints missionary in New Zealand during the 1920s, first expressed the hope '... to see the day when my Maori people down there in New Zealand will have a little village [...] at Laie with a beautiful carved house ... the Tongans will have a village too, and the ... Samoans and all those islanders of the sea.' Cowley assumed that Polynesian cultures and traditions would 'endure if they were shared with others', tourists included.¹²

At *PCC*, Church College of Hawai'i students entertain tourists with Polynesian songs and dances, thus paying for their education. Today, *PCC* is firmly established as a 'living museum' for several Pacific cultures.¹³ Māori were from the beginning involved in the decision-making about aesthetics and functions of their buildings:¹⁴ thus, Māori selected a house in Nuhaka, New Zealand, as a model for the Center's *whare runanga*.¹⁵ Its main elements were produced by carvers and weavers in New Zealand and shipped to the *PCC* to be assembled on site.¹⁶ The Samoan village is composed of 'outstanding examples' of Samoan *fale*,¹⁷ including a 'large high-roofed *Maota Tofa*' (with 'distinctive carved beams and coconut-sennit lashings', 'where the high chief and his family live') a smaller *Fale Nofo*, with a nearby *Tunoo* or kitchen, and a round *Fale Tali Malo* or *Fale Fono*.¹⁸

The *Polynesian Cultural Center* incorporates a range of aspects characteristic of exhibitions of Pacific buildings out of their own context: the display as museum exhibit, garden folly, theme park decoration, but also as transcultural meeting spaces. While the Center also maintains an educational aspect in the displays, their main purpose today is entertainment.

The 1893 *World's Columbian Exposition* in Chicago was an early case of exhibition torn between education and entertainment. Frederic W. Putnam, the exposition's director of Ethnology and Archaeology, was responsible for overseeing the exhibits on the Midway Plaisance, the exposition's amusement zone. Putnam had high hopes of the exhibition's potential to address and counteract common racial stereotypes towards non-white, 'obsolete people', despite the fact that amusement zones at international expositions of the time were areas of diversion, rather than instruction.¹⁹ The Midway's organisation primarily accommodated the entrepreneurial interests of 'marginal' show-people, giving the zone a 'honky-tonk' inflection so

strong that it had a degrading effect on the ethnological displays on, or even close to it – contrary to Putnam’s intentions.²⁰

The *South Sea Islands Village* on the Midway was organised by the Oceanic Trading Company and the “Samoa Islanders” were located directly next to the “Hagenbeck Animal Show”.²¹ Four Samoan *fale*, according to Culin brought from Samoa to Chicago, housed ‘natives from Samoa, Fiji, Rotuma and Wallis Islands’.²² One was ‘made of the wood of the bread-fruit tree, and thatched with the leaves of the wild sugar-cane’ and ‘said to have belonged to King Mataafa, the deposed ruler of Samoa, who occupied it for years’.²³ Whether or not the *fale* was King Mataafa’s, the ‘subliming of the exotic and oriental’ had, by the time of the Chicago exhibition, become a ‘requisite of the commercialization and commodification of exotic others in fairs and expositions’.²⁴

Trophies: to have “the finest”, “the best and most complete” ...

Earlier modes of exhibition were less candid about the entertainment value of exotic others’ buildings. In international exhibitions, the display of artefacts from the colonies served to enhance a country’s standing in the eyes of its subjects and rivals. In exhibitions and museums in Europe and America, the “best”, “most complete”, or “finest” specimen were displayed as trophies, as evidence of the ‘most progressive natives’ in one’s colonies.

The earliest *whare tupuna* to be sent overseas from New Zealand was Mataatua, built in 1874-5 by Ngāti Awa as a wedding gift.²⁵ Mataatua became a ‘focus for opposition to government land confiscation and purchase’.²⁶ In 1879, Ngāti Awa leaders allowed the New Zealand government to send the house to the *British Empire Exhibition* in Sydney ‘as one of the finest examples of traditional Maori art’.²⁷ They would hardly have anticipated the transformation awaiting the house at the exhibition, where, to save costs, it was erected with the walls ‘reversed so that the carvings showed on the outside; and the total cost, including painting and roofing with Chinese matting was reduced to 165 pounds’.²⁸

Not only was the house’s state of being changed from ‘a “living” meeting house, which the people used’,²⁹ to a traditional ‘curios’ exhibited out of context to be looked at by strangers. The Sydney exhibition was also the beginning of Mataatua’s depoliticisation as traditional artefact: rather than return Mataatua as agreed, the New Zealand government forwarded the *whare* on to the South Kensington Museum in England. Subsequently stored at the Victoria and Albert Museum, the *whare* was brought out for display at the 1924 Wembley *British Empire Exhibition*. Next, Mataatua was exhibited back in New Zealand, at the 1925 *South Seas Exhibition* in Dunedin, after which the house was handed over to the Otago Museum.³⁰

Ngāti Awa negotiated through various channels for Mataatua's return since the 1960s, holding that Mataatua is 'an ancestral house, the oldest Ngāti Awa house still standing [...]. The house and our ancestors are standing in a "foreign land" where they do not belong. It is time for them to come home.'³¹ In 1996, the New Zealand government finally signed a deed, paying the Otago museum '\$2,750,000 in return for acknowledgement of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Awa ownership of Mataatua Whare'.³²

Hinemihī o te Ao Tawhito was built in 1881 at Te Wairoa, near Mount Tarawera and the famous Pink and White Terraces, one of New Zealand's first tourism destinations. After the devastating 1886 volcanic eruption, the *whare* was sold to Lord Onslow, then Governor General of New Zealand, who relocated her to his estate at Clandon Park in England in 1892.³³

Master carver Wero Taroi and his assistant Tene Waitere built Hinemihī as a traditional meeting house for tribal gatherings, but also as a venue to entertain tourists.³⁴ The physical and metaphysical representation of the *whare* reflects those early days of tourism: Chief Aporo Te Wharekaniwha named her Hinemihī o te Ao Tawhito, or Hinemihī of the old world, indicating a perception of a "new world" different from the "old".³⁵ The carvings on the *whare*, representing significant ancestral genealogies, show signs of Western influence and changes in the economic environment: the ancestors were carved with bowler hats and Victorian shoes.³⁶

Now located in Clandon Park, Hinemihī is still in a tourism destination.³⁷ Her physical presence, as a Māori *whare*, appears to have not significantly changed over the past 127 years, although she is smaller than she originally was and the roof is now made out of thatch rather than shingle. What has changed since her relocation, though, is what she represents for the diasporic communities connected to her. Through those connections, her identity has remained intact in important ways, even when her function changed repeatedly: from a memento to the Onslow family, to a boat shed, a 'wendy house', and storage room for outdoor furniture.³⁸ While dislocated from her tribal origins, she has remained in tribal oral history dialogue.³⁹

Commissioned by Mokena Romio, Ruatēpupuke II left New Zealand at about the same time as Hinemihī.⁴⁰ The house was opened in 1861 or 1881, was in 'considerable disrepair by the late 1880s or early 1890s' and 'eventually sold to a local dealer in Māori curios, Mr Hindmarsh, sometime in the 1890s'.⁴¹ The period between opening and sale seems short for a *whare tupuna*, and the sale may have gone against the wishes of others with an interest in the house.⁴²

Sold on to the German firm of JFG Umlauff,⁴³ Ruatepupuke was purchased by the curator of the Field Museum in Chicago in 1905.

The house is unusual for its fully carved front with inlaid paua shells. Some parts were already discovered missing in Germany and replaced by plaster casts. In 1925, the Field museum contacted the New Zealand Dominion Museum for assistance in finding floor mats and roofing material.⁴⁴ Through the involvement of Sir Apirana Ngata, a Māori leader from the East coast, *whariki* were woven at Te Aotawarirangi *whare nui* in Tokomaru Bay and shipped to Chicago. Later contacts in 1974 with Dr Hirini Moko Mead and in 1986 with elders from Tokomaru Bay visiting the *Te Māori Exhibition* at the Field Museum, prepared what Anderson would later call a 'unique bicultural [restoration] project',⁴⁵ during which the curators' suppositions about Māori culture and objects were challenged and revised. An understanding slowly developed that a Māori *whare nui* is not just a building but stands in a relationship with its community of origin.⁴⁶ Contacts between the Field Museum and Te Whanau-a-Ruataupare of Tokomaru Bay are ongoing, the resulting relationship leading, according to the Chicagoans, to the 'beginning of a "living *marae*" at [the] Field Museum'.⁴⁷

Identity and Place

The conscious use of iconic architectural elements revolves crucially around their makers, users and/or owners' identity and sense of place. Thus, through Mataatua's display at Sydney the young colony New Zealand could present itself in a favourable light and assert its own identity at a colonial exhibition.⁴⁸ As a Dominion, New Zealand later hosted its own colonial or international exhibitions (e.g., Christchurch 1906-7), which included Māori and Pacific Island "villages". Such assimilation of indigenous cultures into that of colonising nations still happens today when the *marae* is considered a New Zealand concept.

In Mataatua's case, the politics of identity and claims to place, as important aspects of colonial and global power struggles, are particularly obvious. A *whare* so clearly affiliated with resistance groups that the Minister of Native Affairs accused Ngāti Awa in 1875 of 'building Mataatua "to raise an army"' was the first to be neutralised and 'traditionalised'.⁴⁹ Similarly, the sale of Ruatepupuke took place within a web of complex issues around identity, religion, politics and loyalties: at the East Coast, *whare nui* were easily suspected of being Ringatu houses serving affiliates of Te Kooti as meeting houses and churches.⁵⁰ These circumstances raise some questions: might the *whare nui* have become an embarrassment for Mokena, who was a "confirmed Church of England member"?⁵¹ Might this have reduced his attachment and made him amenable to selling?

During the 1930s, Sir Apirana Ngata, Māori member of parliament and deeply involved in the regional politics of the East Coast, promoted the carving of meeting houses in rural areas as a way of rebuilding pride and self-esteem in Māori communities. At this historical junction, Ngata's goals happened to coincide with those of the ex-colony's Pākehā government, which had conclusively established itself in power. Ngata's *marae* development project found support because it provided 'the best examples of authentic work' and fostered a 'form of decoration' that could become part of a national identity.⁵²

While, until recently, exotic others' artefacts have normally been decontextualised and aestheticised, a recognition that their long-term sustainable use has to involve their 'originary producers and spiritual owners' is now emerging internationally amongst curators and conservation specialists.⁵³ Such engagement implies an interest in the historical and current circumstances of the houses' communities of origin. Tokomaru Bay, for instance, once a thriving township and port for overseas trade, was left depleted by the exports of produce, houses, and people. Those involved in the 'three interrelated projects [...] of national identity, tourist marketing and ethnology',⁵⁴ which link colonialism to globalisation, never returned to Tokomaru Bay what was taken. When the Field Museum wants to establish a 'living *marae*' in Chicago today, there is a danger that this concept turns into yet another export article cut loose from reciprocal relationships. Likewise, the celebration of a *tāonga* for the sake of enhancing an institution's standing, or its attraction to potential audiences,⁵⁵ becomes a glib and unconvincing posture unless it is accompanied by a genuine interest in the problems its community of origin currently faces in maintaining its own *tāonga*. The celebrated *tāonga* is then turned into a commodity, regardless of whether dedications were performed or not, and regardless of whether the *whare* was once a *tūrangawaewae* for a community of origin or whether it was from the beginning conceived as a tourism object.⁵⁶

Concerns with conservational integrity and 'authenticity' have, in the cases of Ruatēpupuke and Hinemihi, caused the Field Museum and the English National Trust to contact Te Whanau-a-Ruataupare and Ngāti Hinemihi.⁵⁷ Conservational concerns developed over the years into an understanding that

'conserving the essential elements of *tāonga* includes encouraging an active relationship with their Māori spiritual owners. [...] objects do not exist in a vacuum but must be connected to people and their communities' (Lindsay 1991, 7). Or said somewhat differently, 'keeping the *tāonga* warm', from a Māori point of view, means re-establishing links with Māori people where they have been broken, and by so doing, helping to conserve the essence – the life force (*mauri*) – of the *tāonga* themselves.⁵⁸

Perhaps it is a shared sense of quality and excellence that has allowed Ruatēpupuke and Hinemihi (and to an extent the *whare* and *fale* at PCC) to become places that support diasporic communities. Other houses, which appear to have lost all connection with the cultural context that once made them coveted objects, have fared much worse.

However, there can be surprising aspects to even the poorest scenarios, which have to do with the unpredictability of performativity. A Samoan dancer who was part of the troupe performing at the *Tropical Islands Resort* said in an interview: ‘I learned a lot about my culture, being there. One thing I learned was doing the *ava*, I’ve never known how the *ava* ceremony worked, but I learned that in Germany!’⁵⁹ Similarly, a Māori student at PCC stated that he learned ‘everything that I know now (about Māori culture) [...] at PCC. I learned about each building, what it meant. ... I became more proud of my culture than when I was in New Zealand.’⁶⁰

The changes of physical structure, location, ownership and usage have, in Hinemihi’s case, not stopped her from embodying her original cultural and spiritual reference points, which now have relevance to Māori in England, her people at home in Aotearoa, and Māori visiting England. Originally linking people through *whakapapa*, she now presents a focus through which more contemporary notions of Māori identity can be performed.⁶¹ She is an example of how iconic cultural references can maintain their Māori identity regardless of where they are. Furthermore, she provides a context for socio-cultural issues facing many Māori who, like Hinemihi, no longer reside in or connect to their *tūrangawaewae* in Aotearoa, New Zealand. She thus supports the diasporic communities of her ancestral origins as well as other non-traditional communities such as Ngāti Rānana.⁶² She acts as a foundation with which new forms of ‘cultural *kawa*’ can be created within an environment that, on the surface, is foreign to Māori concepts of place.

Nevertheless, there are open questions about the relationship between her host and her community of origin. The English National Trust’s assertion of legal ownership of Hinemihi hampers the development of genuine mutuality. Assertions of ownership paired with a continuing Western craving for primitive spirituality do not augur well for collaborative relationships. Such questions need to be debated, in the same way in which differences and conflicts can be accommodated in the protocols and relationships of *marae*. In an era of consensus politics and claims to *Aloha*,⁶³ the *marae* provides a space where differences can be explored and debated, and where those voices from Ngāti Hinemihi or Te Whanau-a-Ruatāpāre are heard who have not yet agreed to the models proposed to them. ‘Counter Currents’ could then begin to mean a reverse flow of energies and resources, back to where the houses came from.

Māori Glossary

<i>iwi</i>	tribe
<i>kawa</i>	protocol
<i>marae</i>	Māori gathering place
<i>mauri</i>	life force
<i>tāonga</i>	prized possession, heirloom
<i>tapu</i>	sacred, restricted
<i>tohunga</i>	expert, specialist
<i>tūrangawaewae</i>	place where one has rights of residence
<i>whakapapa</i>	genealogy
<i>whare nui</i>	also, <i>whare whakairo</i> , <i>whare puni</i> , <i>whare tipuna (tupuna)</i> , <i>whare runanga</i> : meeting house
<i>whāriki</i>	woven mat

Samoa Glossary

<i>ava</i>	traditional drink, consumed at ceremonial occasions
<i>fale</i>	house
<i>fale tali malo</i>	also, <i>fale fono</i> : guest house, meeting house
<i>malae</i>	gathering place
<i>tufuga</i>	expert, specialist
<i>tunoa</i>	kitchen

Many thanks to Moana Nepia, Pefi Kingi, Albert Refiti, Ross Jenner and the anonymous referee for their feedback on various versions of this paper.

¹ Māori and Samoan terms are explained in the glossary at the end of this paper. Should readers not familiar with Māori language and culture be at times confused between names of houses, names of people and names of tribes, this may also be because the delimitations between these entities are not as sharply drawn in Māori thinking than, for instance, in English. *Whare nui* are usually named after, and embody, the ancestors of a community.

² John Edward Terrell, Désirée C.J. Wisse, and Christopher J. Philipp, "Ruapehupuke II, the Field Museum, Chicago: The Past and Possible Futures," in *Decolonising Conservation: Caring for Maori Meeting Houses Outside New Zealand*, ed. Dean Sully (Left Coast Press, 2007), 109.

³ These techniques are in some contexts very different from the techniques-of-self (Foucault) promoted and promulgated in the Western imperial centres for centuries.

⁴ If there was an influence on architectural processes or styles, this would have been indirectly through the general world-views. What discourses did take place around their materials and assembly methods concentrated mostly on conservation and expediency. Expediency and ideas of authenticity were important factors in the decision-making processes leading up to expositions and exhibitions, aspects of conservation and a different concept of authenticity were crucial in the more serious context of education and museums.

⁵ Thilenius quoted in Eva Garbutt, "The Care of Living Objects: Conserving Rauru and Te Wharepuni a Maui in Germany," in *Decolonising Conservation*, 124.

⁶ Samoa, at least, was presenting itself as an independent State from 1962.

⁷ 'be-funne'd' is a literal translation of a new-German term.

⁸ dpa, "World's Largest Indoor Rainforest Gets the Nod," SkyscraperCity, <http://www.skyscrapercity.com/showthread.php?t=88305>.

⁹ Contractual relationships were fraught and, today, relationships appear to have lapsed. Further, the fact that the Samoan troupe assumed the ability and mandate to represent numerous other Pacific Islands in their performance may well be contested by other communities.

¹⁰ It is described as a 'typical Polynesian straw hut', 'a sort of "community house" for several villages', with '28 beautifully carved wooden posts [representing] one of the participating extended families' "Samoa Fale. Open Houses for Living in the South Seas," Tropical Island Management GmbH, <http://www.my-tropical-islands.com/village/samoa-fale-e.htm>.

¹¹ This development paralleled that of a shift from theme park with an education component to fun-bath pure and simple.

¹² Polynesian Cultural Center, "Early History | Polynesian Cultural Center," <http://www.polynesia.com/early-history.html>; T.D. Webb, "A New Kind of Plantation. The Polynesian Cultural Center in Lā'ie, Hawai'i," *CRM*, no. 8 (1998): 35.

¹³ Amy Ku'leialoha Stillman "Pacific-Ing Asian Pacific American History," *Journal of Asian American Studies* 7, no. 3 (2004).; Webb, "A New Kind of Plantation."

-
- ¹⁴ Polynesian Cultural Center, "Aotearoa (New Zealand): The Pa or Village," <http://www.polynesia.com/new-zealand/the-pa-or-village.html>.
- ¹⁵ According to the website, the first ever built outside of New Zealand
- ¹⁶ Today, the *whare runanga* is used to greet dignitaries and travelling groups from New Zealand while the *whare puni* serves as a museum of Māori culture in New Zealand.
- ¹⁷ ... 'among the most unique in all of tropical Polynesia'.
- ¹⁸ Placed on the opposite side of the *malae*, it represents a village's guest house or chief's meeting house. Polynesian Cultural Center, "Villages | Samoa," <http://www.polynesia.com/samoa/index.html>.
- ¹⁹ An illustrated book accompanying the exhibition formulated the exposition's context from a popular perspective when suggesting that 'obsolete people came out of their mist' to the exposition, Midway Types, "A Peep at Algiers" quoted in Meg Armstrong, "'A Jumble of Foreignness': The Sublime Musayums of Nineteenth-Century Fairs and Expositions," *Cultural Critique* (1993).
- ²⁰ Burton Benedict, "International Exhibitions and National Identity," *Anthropology Today* 7, no. 3 (1991).
Robert Rydell, "The World's Columbian Exposition of 1893," *Journal of American culture* 1, no. 2 (1978).
- ²¹ <http://www.samoa.co.uk/old-exhibitions.html>
- ²² Rydell, "The World's Columbian Exposition of 1893." See also Benedict, "International Exhibitions and National Identity." 'The native inhabitants consisted of one man from Fiji, twenty-four men from Samoa and Wallis Island, five Samoan women, and one infant. Native dances of the different islands were performed in the theatre.' Stewart Culin, "Retrospect of the Folk-Lore of the Columbian Exposition," *The Journal of American Folklore* 7, no. 24 (1894): 57.
- ²³ Culin, "Retrospect of the Folk-Lore of the Columbian Exposition," 57.
- ²⁴ Armstrong, "A Jumble of Foreignness", 200.
- ²⁵ Named after the shared ancestral canoe, the *whare* was built (with the assistance of other tribes) with the intention of strengthening bonds with neighbouring Tuhoe and Te Whakatohea.
- ²⁶ Hosting meetings aligned with the King Movement and Te Kooti David James Butt, "Māori and Museums. The Politics of Indigenous Recognition" (Massey University, 2003), 98, Jeffrey Sissons, "The Traditionalisation of the Maori Meeting House," *Oceania* 69, no. 1 (1998): 39.
- ²⁷ For a rent of £300, and despite vigorous protest by some members (who may have taken and hidden the ridge-pole) Sissons, "The Traditionalisation of the Maori Meeting House," 39.
- ²⁸ "The House, now in the Otago Museum, had been exhibited 'inside out' at the Indian and Colonial Exhibition in London and, before that, at the Sydney Exhibition. The 'inside out' plan, conceived by Sir (then Mr) James Hector, was to enable a steady flow of people to view the carvings." VUW Files 10 & 10/1, <http://www.nzetc.org/tm/scholarly/tei-WalRobl-t1-front-d7.html#reference-to-fn58-12>
- ²⁹ Sissons comments further: "The turning of Mataatua inside out proved to be an apt metaphor for its traditionalisation. Carved wall slabs and lattice work which had defined and given contemporary meaning to an interior space of inter-tribal debate and political dialogue were transformed into mysterious and passive surfaces, now readily available to the European gaze", 39.

³⁰ Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies. Research and Indigenous Peoples* (University of Otago Press, 1999), 53.

³¹ Ngāti Awa Maori Trust Board quoted in Smith, 40.

³² Butt, "Māori and Museums. The Politics of Indigenous Recognition", 98.

³³ The *whare* is referred to as a person as she represents an important ancestor of the sub-tribes, Ngāti Hinemihi and Tūhourangi.

³⁴ Tene Waitere was frequently commissioned to carve 'traditional' replica artefacts for commercial projects.

³⁵ "As a nostalgic reminder of *Aotearoa's* years before the European migration and before the tourism boom began, Aporo gave his completed meeting house the full and dignified name *Hinemihi o te Ao Tawhito – Hinemihi of the old world*" Alan Gallop, *The House with the Golden Eyes* (Running Horse Books Limited, 1998), 33.

³⁶ Roger Neich, "The Maori Carving Art of Tene Waitere: Traditionalist and Innovator," *Art New Zealand* 57, no. Summer (1990-1991).

³⁷ The National Trust, "Repairing the Maori House at Clandon Park," (2008), http://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/main/w-chl/w-places_collections/w-architecture_buildings/w-architecture-buildings_conservation/w-architecture-buildings_conservation-maori_house.htm.

³⁸ Gallop, *The House with the Golden Eyes*. In 1978 a visiting New Zealand historian, W. T. Parham described her as "this little building wearing the rather forlorn air of a friendless expatriate cast upon a foreign shore", indicating that the significance she played for the hapū, survivors of the eruption and indeed Lord Onslow were not represented at that time William Thomas Parham, "Historical Review : Bay of Plenty 'a Vice-Regal Legacy'," *Journal of History* 26, no. 1 (1978).

³⁹ Photos taken of her at Tarawera continue to be reproduced and sold and multimedia displays of Hinemihi can be viewed at several cultural tourism destinations around New Zealand.

⁴⁰ Like Hinemihi, Ruatepupuke was conceived and built during a period of substantial changes in the wake of the New Zealand Wars James Belich, *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict* (Penguin, 1988), Ranginui Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou. Struggle without End* (Penguin, 1990). Other houses leaving New Zealand at this time were Rauru (now at the Museum für Völkerkunde in Hamburg), and Te Wharepuni a Maui (acquired by the Linden Museum in Stuttgart in 1911, following its exhibition at the 1906-7 international exhibition in Dunedin).

Two different dates are given in different sources for the opening of Ruatepupuke – a perhaps significant discrepancy, given that politics at the East Coast of New Zealand were turbulent during that period. The house was carved by either Wiremu Mangapouri or Koromiria Ngawehenga.

⁴¹ Terrell, Wisse, and Philipp, "Ruatepupuke II," 92-3.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 94.

⁴³ A clearing house for 'natural history specimens and cultural objects', which also bought and sold Rauru *Ibid.*, 91.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 93.

⁴⁵ Catherine Anderson, "Conservation and Installation of Ruatepupuke II: A Maori Meeting House," *AICCM Bulletin* 20, no. 1 (1994): 23.

⁴⁶ The project took place between 1992 and 1993 under the co-curatorship of Terrell and Arapata Hakiwai (curator at New Zealand's national museum Te Papa Tongarewa), and in collaboration with members of its community of origin, Te Whanau-a-Ruataupare (Tokomaru Bay).

⁴⁷ Tory Light, "The Family of Ruatēpupuke - Reviving a Maori Meetinghouse," *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin* 58, no. 10 (1987), http://libsysdigi.library.uiuc.edu/OCA/Books2008-03/fieldmuseumofnat/fieldmuseumofnat58chic/fieldmuseumofnat58chic_djvu.txt.

⁴⁸ See Dipti Bhagat, "Review of Barringer, Tim and Tom Flynn (Eds.) 1997, *Colonialism and the Object: Empire, Material Culture and the Museum*," *Journal of Design History* 12, no. 1 Design, Commercial Expansion and Business History (1999): 89.

⁴⁹ Sissons, "The Traditionalisation of the Maori Meeting House," 42.

⁵⁰ "As a result of Te Kooti's programme, the 1870s and 1880s was a period of intense activity in meeting-house construction. Many new large houses were built under Te Kooti's direction, at his request or in preparation for a visit from him." Roger Neich, *Painted Histories. Early Maori Figurative Painting* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1993), 115-6.

⁵¹ Anonymous type written manuscript received from Phil Aspinall on 15.01.09.

⁵² Ngata quoted in Sissons, "The Traditionalisation of the Maori Meeting House," 44.

⁵³ e.g., Terrell, Wisse, and Philipp, "Ruatēpupuke II," 96.

⁵⁴ Sissons, "The Traditionalisation of the Maori Meeting House," 42.

⁵⁵ E.g., Terrell, Wisse, and Philipp, "Ruatēpupuke II," 90.

⁵⁶ See *Ibid.*, 98. for plans to develop an urban multicultural *marae*, as a *tūrangawaewae*, 'a place to stand', 'for all the people of Chicago within the museum's walls'.

⁵⁷ In 1956 Lord Onslow's granddaughter gave the estate, including Hinemihi, to the English National Trust due to the burden of upkeep and taxation Gallop, *The House with the Golden Eyes*. In the 1980's the English National Trust approached tribal members to assist with restoration work which has essentially restored her relationship with her peoples. Now there is a working relationship between the hapū and the Trust which has resulted in Hinemihi becoming 'home away from home' for many Māori expatriates in England.

⁵⁸ Terrell, Wisse, and Philipp, "Ruatēpupuke II," 96.

⁵⁹ Interview for research project 'Tropical Islands – Virtual Worlds' conducted by A.-Chr. Engels-Schwarzpaul and A. L. Refiti, 2008.

⁶⁰ Webb, "A New Kind of Plantation": 34

⁶¹ See Mason Durie, "2008 Manu-Ao Lecture: The Determinants of Transformation," in *Nga Pae o te Maramatanga writing retreat* (Hopuhopu: Massey University, 2008); Carla Anne Houkamau, "Identity and Socio-Historical Context: Transformations and Change among Maori Women" (University of Auckland, 2006).

⁶² Ngāti Rānana is the Māori expatriate community in London.

⁶³ Jacques Rancière, *The Politics of Aesthetics. The Distribution of the Sensible*, trans. Gabriel Rockhill (London: Continuum, 2004). Keiko Ohnuma, "'Aloha Spirit' and the Cultural Politics of Sentiment as National Belonging," *The Contemporary Pacific* 20, no. 2 (2008): 366.