

Out there: Whare and *Fale* Performing Abroad

What was once classed as 'savage ornament', which could not possibly register as architecture, has today morphed into the stuff of 'iconic architecture'. From another perspective, what began as a whare tupuna or a fale tele has sometimes turned into curios, for a time only or for ever. Along with the changes in status, these houses also changed their performative roles.

This paper briefly traces the journeys abroad of Māori whare and Samoan fale, in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which were designed for purposes other than that of their destinations, and some fale and whare that were designed to travel abroad in the 1960s and early 2000s. The houses in the former group often travelled with an accompanying expectation: that relationships would be performed and fulfilled. In the latter case, this expectation seems to have been replaced with more instrumental ones. But on the websites promoting them, relationships still feature as important parts of their essence and performance.

This paper explores similarities and differences in the representation and performance of Māori and Samoan architecture and culture overseas, with respect to notions of relationships, visibility, agency, and interpretation.

Out there: Whare and *Fale* Performing Abroad¹

Makers or guardians of Māori whare and Samoan *fale* leaving Aotearoa or Samoa from 1879 onwards would have perceived them to be 'out there', in foreign territories and under foreign control. From a local perspective, it made no great difference whether the houses went to Australia, England, Germany or the United States of America.² While it is probably true that many white settlers in New Zealand and Australia have long regarded their countries as part of the British Empire (as "outposts of a particular brand of politics, beliefs, lifestyle and architecture")³ their views are by no means unequivocally shared by the indigenous peoples.

The discrepancy results from different positions and their respective regimes of visibility. When Māori and Samoan houses travelled from Samoa to Germany or New Zealand, from Aotearoa to Australia, England, or Germany, these regimes changed along with the relationships the houses were embedded in, and generated different modes of performance. Sometimes, the representation and performance of their architecture and art overseas may have meant something similar to Samoans and Māori as what their non-indigenous counterparts perceived. However, different relationships between what can be seen and what can be said prevail in different contexts. When *whare* and *fale* were inserted into imperial exhibitions, new subjects and objects appeared, while others disappeared from visibility in these novel spheres, which framed experience in specific ways.⁴ And, while there may be as many differences as there are similarities between *whare* and *fale* in their original context (concerning construction, use, or relationality), once displaced and displayed, they performed under similar categories and conditions. I am therefore not trying to give a complete as possible account of individual buildings that travelled from their countries of origin to be exhibited elsewhere, nor to compare selected buildings independent of the exhibition contexts they came to perform in. Rather, I want to engage with the circumstances and effects of such performances – not to prove anything but to shift perspectives and explore what can be seen.

The story of *whare* and *fale* performing overseas begins with Mataatua, *whare tupuna* of Ngāti Awa. Built in 1874-5, Mataatua soon developed into a “focus for opposition to government land confiscation and purchase” in the Whakatane area.⁵ In 1879, the New Zealand government sent the house to the *British Empire Exhibition* in Sydney “as one of the finest examples of traditional Maori art”.⁶ Ngāti Awa leaders had, probably under pressure,⁷ given conditional consent to Mataatua’s exhibition in Sydney, but could hardly have anticipated the transformation awaiting the house: 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”.⁸ Mataatua’s state of being and performance changed from that of “a ‘living’ meeting house, which the people used”,⁹ and which provides in its original context an intimate and actual connection between the living and the ancestor(s) who are embodied in the house, to a ‘curio’ exhibited out of context and to be looked at by strangers. After the exhibition, Mataatua was not returned by the New Zealand government, as promised,

but forwarded on to England, to be eventually displayed at the 1924 *Wembley British Empire Exhibition*, next to a Samoan *fale*.¹⁰

The different overseas contexts (international expositions, museums, or garden folly) produced similarities and differences in the representation and performance of Māori and Samoan architecture and culture, but notions of indigeneity or native-ness, the vernacular or traditional, and tourism or ethnographic entertainment were always in play. In New Zealand, for instance, Māori art and architecture were, as icons of “the New Zealander”, used opportunistically to profile the young colony overseas.

Since Mataatua’s expedition to Sydney, modes of visibility have changed along with what Jacques Rancière calls the “partition of the sensible”, which configures what can be seen and talked about within a given context. It also “determines the place and the stakes of politics as a form of experience”. Politics tries to change what can be seen and said about it, and “who has the ability to see and the talent to speak”.¹¹ Thus, changes in the wake of decolonising struggles and in the context of globalisation have turned *savage ornament*, which was in modernity feared and/or despised, and could not possibly register as architecture, into the stuff of *iconic architecture*.¹²

Exhibition – Staging Authenticity

Exhibiting, a deliberate act of showing something, not only celebrates and entertains, it also creates a reality effect and performs knowledge.¹³ No wonder, then, that the international, colonial or imperial exhibitions of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were popular arenas where “each colonial power could flaunt its possessions to its rivals”.¹⁴ During nineteenth century overseas exhibitions, Māori buildings were used as icons of New Zealand-ness to develop a recognisable national or local idiom, an important complement to claims to technological and economic progress.¹⁵ Simultaneously, Māori art and architecture were absent in most national political and cultural configurations, considered inferior by comparison with their European equivalents.¹⁶ Despite the fact that Māori and Pacific cultures have since gained in standing in Aotearoa, along with the increasing world wide acknowledgement of indigenous cultures and art forms, it is an open question whether their appreciation has changed fundamentally enough for them to be engaged with on their own terms, rather than those of a settler society or global players.

International Exhibitions, World Fairs and Theme Parks, in which *whare* and *fale* arrived at various stages of history, sometimes also have educational aspects. However, ultimately it is their economic success that vouchsafes their existence. Whether visitors are be-funned or thrown into a “jumble of foreignness”,¹⁷ entertainment is essential for the functioning of these exhibitionary contexts, often compromising educational goals, as already evident at the 1893 *World’s Columbian Exposition* discussed below.¹⁸

Each of the scenarios in which Māori and Samoan houses were relocated from the Pacific to strange contexts raises different questions about the visibility of particular aspects: the ways in which individuals and groups engage in the politics of perception and how, in these performances of houses or people, audience and actors relate.

Chicago: Mata’afa’s *Fale* and Ruatepupuke II

Held twenty years after the *British Empire Exhibition* in Sydney, the *World’s Columbian Exposition* was to demonstrate American prowess. It compared the world, on a sliding scale between progress and underdevelopment, partially through the exhibition of buildings and artefacts providing a visible difference between underdeveloped and industrialised nations.¹⁹

While a collection of Māori artefacts was presented in the Anthropological Building, no *wharenuī* appears to have been included. A Samoan village, though, was constructed on the Midway, the exhibition’s amusement zone.²⁰ In 1893, Samoa was embroiled in a civil war, partially caused by tensions between would-be colonisers, so the *South Sea Islands Village* on the Midway was organised not by a colonising nation but by the Chicago-based Oceanic Trading Company.²¹ The ‘villagers’ re/constructed three or four *fale* on site,²² thus saving “the cost of labor and [giving] an atmosphere of authenticity to the village”.²³ Moors, an American trader based in Apia, had shipped the *fale* and enough “materials necessary to erect several Samoan houses” from Samoa.²⁴ He probably also created a well-tended myth: that the largest *fale* had “belonged to King Mataafa, the deposed ruler of Samoa, who occupied it for years”.²⁵ It is more likely that the *fale* was a replica.²⁶ Whether or not it was King Mata’afa’s, the “subliming of the exotic and oriental” had, by the end of the century, become a “requisite of the commercialization and commodification of exotic others in fairs and expositions”.²⁷

The story of the Samoan *fale* in Chicago ends with the close of the exposition – as far as I am aware, nothing is known about their subsequent fate. The Māori artefacts in the Anthropology building were purchased by the Chicago Field Museum, which in 1905 also bought for its collection the whareniui Ruatepupuke II from the German firm of JFG Umlauff.²⁸ Due to an ongoing relationship between the museum and the whare's original owners' descendants, Ruatepupuke's story is known in large parts. Commissioned by Mokena Romio, presumably as a whare tupuna, Ruatepupuke II was opened at Tokomaru Bay in 1881.²⁹ The house 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".³⁰ The period between opening and sale seems short for a whare tupuna, and the sale may have gone against the wishes of others with interest in the house.³¹ Ruatepupuke was stored at the Field museum until, in 1925, the curators contacted the New Zealand Dominion Museum for assistance in finding whariki and roofing material.³² Through the involvement of Apirana Ngata, a prominent leader, the East Coast hapū Te Whanau-a-Ruataupare was contacted who then wove whariki at Te Aotawarirangi whareniui, later shipped to Chicago. Contacts with Dr Hirini Moko Mead (1974) and elders from Tokomaru Bay visiting the Te Māori Exhibition at the Field Museum (1986) prepared a "unique bicultural [restoration] project",³³ during which the curators' suppositions about Māori culture and objects were challenged and revised. An understanding slowly developed that a whareniui is not just a building but stands in a relationship with its community of origin.³⁴ In 1986, leaders of Te Whanau-a-Ruataupare decided to leave Ruatepupuke in the care of the Field museum and to "restore it as a living Māori symbol in the New World in collaboration with the museum".³⁵

London: Hinemihi o te Ao Tawhito, Mataatua, and a *Fale* from Mulinu'u

In 1924, during the *British Empire Exhibition* in Wembley Park, two whareniui and a Samoan *fale* were located in London, by today's standards less than an hour apart: Mataatua and a *fale* from Mulinu'u in Wembley, and Hinemihi o te Ao Tawhiti in Clandon Park.

Built in 1881 at Te Wairoa, close to the famous Pink and White Terraces, Hinemihi was relocated to Clandon Park in 1892 by Lord Onslow, Governor General of New Zealand.

She had been carved by Wero Taroi and his assistant Tene Waitere, both as a *whare tupuna* and as a venue where tourists could be entertained by the tribe.³⁶

The physical and metaphysical representation of the *whare* reflects those early days of tourism: Chief Aporo Te Wharekaniwha named her Hinemihi o te Ao Tawhito, or Hinemihi of the old world, indicating a perception of a “new world” different from the “old”. 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.³⁷

Today, Hinemihi is still located in Clandon Park and is now more than ever on display: after her arrival as a memento for the Onslow family, she served as a boat shed, a ‘wendy house’, and storage room for outdoor furniture until she was discovered by convalescing Māori soldiers in WW1.³⁸ Since then, Hinemihi the expatriate has been connected to several expatriate communities, most notably Ngāti Ranana, the Māori expatriate community in London. Through those connections, her identity has remained intact in important ways, despite the repeated changes in function. Last year, I observed how a large part of Clandon park gets transformed into a marae, and hundreds of visitors, affiliated and non-affiliated, get drawn into the performances of Ngāti Ranana’s kohanga reo in front of Hinemihi during their annual hangi feast.

Hinemihi’s mode of performance today contrasts markedly with that of Mataatua and the Mulinu’u fale at the *British Empire Exhibition*. Neither of the latter were accompanied by members of their communities, due to a decision by the New Zealand government not to send any “Native troupes” to Wembley.³⁹ In the case of the *fale*, the New Zealand Administration did not want Samoans to accompany the building for fear of “the unsettling and bad after-effects which invariably follow on their return of the participants”,⁴⁰ i.e., a “fear of resistance to the New Zealand colonial authorities”.⁴¹ Not sending Native troupes, of course, also saved money. The *fale*, which had been commissioned to be built in Samoa by the New Zealand Department of External Affairs, was thus accompanied not by its builders or by Samoan performers but by Hubert Charles Reed, a trader from Apia like Moors, “with his half-caste wife”.⁴²

The Samoan Administration reported to the New Zealand Government that the *fale* would be “an excellent example of the Samoan’s art in house building and [...] one of the

best of its kind produced [in Samoa] within recent years”,⁴³ and that, on completion, it would be “dismantled for shipping, with each separate piece marked so that it could easily be ‘re-erected on reaching England’.”⁴⁴ The same would then have applied to Mataatua, to whose proportions the *fale* was matched, having spent the previous decades in various museums. Like the neighbouring *fale*, Mataatua had to stand alone: there was no Māori representation at Wembley. Pita Moko, private secretary to religious and political leader Tahupotiki Wiremu Ratana’s, who visited Wembley on a tour to England,⁴⁵ was disturbed about this absence, particularly given the representation of other “coloured races” at Wembley and in view of the Māori Battalion’s contribution during WW1. He was also dismayed about Mataatua’s presentation:

Mr Moko said it was a disgrace. ... The carving was excellent, but the panelling was an eyesore, and all European. As for the mats, he would not have them on his own doorstep. He maintained that if the authorities intended to have the Maori’s represented they should have made a display that was creditable to the race.⁴⁶

Lā’ie: The Polynesian Cultural Center

A lack of interaction between a *fale* or *whare*’s community of origin, particularly the experts responsible for their construction, and exhibition curators and visitors was typical of the *World’s Columbian Exhibition* in Chicago and the *Wembley British Empire Exhibition*. This is not the case for the *whare* and *fale* at the *Polynesian Cultural Center* (PCC) in Lā’ie, Hawai’i, where seven “native villages” have been on display since 1963. Since the second half of the 19th century, the Church of Latter Day Saints has had a long involvement in many of the Pacific Islands. In 1951, Matthew Cowley, 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, who was in ongoing contact with Ngata and aware of his marae development scheme,⁴⁷ assumed that Polynesian cultures and traditions would “endure if they were shared with others”, tourists included.⁴⁸ Cowley was probably also a driving force behind the Church’s funding for Kahungunu, a carved meeting house in honour of Māori returned soldiers, in Nuhaka after WW2. In 1960, the Church planned to move Kahungunu from Nuhaka to form the nucleus of a Māori village at the PCC. Met

with an uproar in the local community, the elders decided to commission a new whare for the *PCC*, Te Aroha o te Iwi Māori, which was modeled on Kahungunu.⁴⁹

In this way, Māori (and possibly Samoans) were from the beginning involved in the decision-making about the aesthetics and performance of their buildings to some extent.⁵⁰ Te Aroha o te Iwi Māori was largely produced by carvers and weavers in New Zealand and shipped to the *PCC* to be assembled on site.⁵¹ The Samoan village is composed of “outstanding examples” of Samoan *fale*, 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 *Tunoa*, and a round *Fale Tali Malo* or *Fale Fono*.⁵²

At *PCC*, which is today firmly established as a “living museum” for several Pacific cultures, Church College of Hawai’i students entertain tourists with Polynesian songs and dances, thus paying for their education.⁵³ *PCC* 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. The *PCC*’s ambivalence manifests in the relationship between education and entertainment: while the displays maintain an educational aspect, the main agenda today is clearly entertainment.

Berlin: Tropical Islands Resort

The most recent exhibition of a *fale* in a foreign context takes place 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”.⁵⁴ 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 (Western) 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.⁵⁵ Some months later, the *fale*’s components traveled to Germany, to be erected by the *tufuga* in the centre of the resort’s *Tropical Village*. Great play was made in the press of the fact that no nails were

used for its construction, just as it had been for the *fale* Samoa at the Wembley exhibition 80 years earlier. For the opening in 2004-5, a blessing was performed, which seems to indicate that – despite all up-with-the-play savvy in negotiating their indigenous identity as difference “out there” – the Samoan party collectively saw more in their *fale* than a commodity.⁵⁶ In 2005, a Samoan performance 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, whilst they had a certain amount of control over its construction, they have no say in its ongoing use.⁵⁷ The *fale*'s presentation on the website then and now bears only a tenuous relation with reality: the descriptions “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” are all misleading.⁵⁸ 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.⁵⁹ Needless to say, the resort makes no effort to maintain a relationship with the Samoans who constructed and assembled the *fale* or performed at the resort.

Performance at Crossroads – Collaborations and Neighbourhoods

The contrast between the *fale* at *Tropical Islands Resort* in Germany and the *Sinalei Reef Resort* on the southern coast of Upolo, Samoa, could hardly be greater. The latter is what visitors of the former can only dream of: accommodation at the resort consists of luxurious individual *fale* (modern type: square, air-conditioned, with TV and bar fridge) set either directly on the beach and looking out onto sea or into a landscaped garden bordering on the beach. While the *Sinalei* resort’s architecture is not without its own problems, its traditional *fale* are impressive buildings, many times the size of the *fale* at *Tropical Islands Resort*, and of superb craftsmanship. A spacious and impressive *fale afolau* serves as the restaurant and two smaller *fale tele* as a bar and entrance foyer respectively. The resort’s owners and managers are Samoans from the area and can plausibly draw on their “cultural heritage”. A particular version of *in situ* exhibition and performance strategies, aimed at the upper echelon of tourists, employs fantasy in the creation of virtuality, establishing a mimetic connection of objects and actions with place.⁶⁰ *Fale* abroad, on the other hand, have to perform this connection with place

themselves, without being able to rely on authenticity in their environment to stabilize them.

In environments of edutainment, displays inherently have hard-to-control performative aspects, outside of the intentions of curators or performers. They can give rise to new forms of power/knowledge (Foucault) “associated with cultural commodification and colonial state-formation”, with which Māori and Samoans engage(d) individually and collectively.⁶¹ What is culturally appropriate shifts according to the grounds on which such engagements take place. The “messy package” (see endnote 56) includes ‘pc’ formulations from a world outside that filter through bureaucracies back into indigenous cultures, who ultimately end up having to determine what “this indigenous voice” is in any given situation. Thus, the blessing for the *fale* at the *Tropical Islands Resort* in Germany is likely to be tied up also with changes in traditional Samoan value systems under pressures to market indigenous cultural forms. The *tufuga*, for instance, try to approach *fale* construction in a way that accommodates both the “traditions that they’ve had handed down to them, with all the sacred aspects associated [...] and, at the same time, the reality [of having] to feed their families”. The only pragmatic option is to work out the implications through “a negotiation not only of the letter of the law, the letter of the contract, but [also] with your own sense of tradition and guilt and all [...] you feel you end up compromising”.⁶²

However, the unpredictability of performativity can also produce redeeming side-effects. Performativity here basically means that the application or enactment of concepts and models can bring about the very conditions they attempt to explain or represent.⁶³ For instance, a Samoan dancer who was part of the Samoan 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!”⁶⁴ 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.”⁶⁵

The outcomes of performativity still depend crucially on relational contexts. Thus, the Samoan and Māori performers learnt new aspects of their culture in the context of the

own practices and traditions. For an uninformed audience, in contrast, the same performances can simply reinforce stereotypes.⁶⁶ “Hinemihi may appear merely as an interesting cultural artefact with no active cultural role”, and “her performative importance” remain invisible to Western eyes, but she is powerful and meaningful as a person to Māori and “to be actively engaged through performance”.⁶⁷ This puts a new spin on Rancière’s definition of politics as the endeavour to change the partition of the sensible as that which defines what can be seen and said about it, and “who has the ability to see and the talent to speak”.⁶⁸ Thus, a *whare* can not only be a curio, artefact or *tāonga* and *tupuna* on different occasions and in different environments, but also all at the same time to different parts of an audience. The fact that this slowly seems to become apparent is certainly a success of Māori politics.

The interactions through which architectural ideas, forms and relationships in the areas of education, ethnographic entertainment or cross-cultural collaboration are adapted or accommodated are still predicated on colonial circumstances – but they can be subverted. The power to choose forms of collaboration is always somewhat hegemonic, and official regimes of representation have always been undermined to some extent: thus, Mataatua’s ridge pole may have been taken and hidden by dissenting Ngāti Awa who did not want to let the New Zealand government use the house at the Sydney exhibition.⁶⁹ Similarly, Mokena appears to have withheld parts of Ruatēpupuke II, rather than handing over the complete house to Hindmarsh. Finally, the *fale* at *Tropical Islands Resort* seems self-consciously to undermine established opinions about Samoan carving, which hold that the poles on a traditional *fale* not be carved. This *fale*’s carved poles stand in a more recent tradition of a “‘going native’ of the ‘natives’” when producing for tourist or overseas markets,⁷⁰ a tradition that now appears to filter back into local building practices. A tradition grown out of the tourism market may perhaps be used by local Samoan carvers in an ironic reversal, to suggest that anthropologists, in the traditionalisation of Samoan architecture, suppressed divergent traditions.⁷¹ Be that as it may – even here, the effects of colonisation are still at issue, and asserting an unorthodox position can amount to an act of liberation.

How great the freedom is, in each case, playfully to take on the postcolonial game depends on the larger context within which all of these houses perform: Samoans, as citizens of an independent Third World State, may find it easier to engage in irony or

even flippancy than Māori, who inhabit a Fourth World, in which a majority settler society ensures “that there will be no full liberation, no ‘after’ colonialism”.⁷² At the *PCC*, Balme observes a contrast between Samoan and Tongan performances, on the one hand, and Māori and Hawai’ian performances, on the other. The latter, while sometimes light-hearted, seem to him sober, educative and protective of expressions and practices that historically had to safeguard cultural survival, as well as to serve as a starting point for the development of more contemporary modes of performance.⁷³ Further, Māori cultural concepts are still being assimilated into the larger national idiom while Samoans, at least internally, have greater day-to-day control over *Fa’a Samoa*. In any event, it is possible that historically, even when they parted with a house voluntarily, Māori thought more in terms of loan than a sale, building rather than extinguishing reciprocal relationships,⁷⁴ so that “when leaders from Whanganui sent items to a Philadelphia exhibition in the 1880s, for example, they expected the Americans to reciprocate in kind.”⁷⁵ Representation in the performances clustering around their houses has been a repeated demand from Māori.

It was well understood amongst organisers of international fairs that the presence of ‘natives’ provided elements of authenticity, necessary for buildings exhibited outside of their communities of origin to perform successfully. Colin Au’s intention regularly to showcase troupes from tropical islands at his resort stands in this tradition. However, there is an equally emphatic interest on the side of the communities of origin: “When Ngāti Awa in the Bay of Plenty agreed to send their new meeting house, Mataatua, to the Sydney International exhibition held in 1879 they expected to accompany it.”⁷⁶ It is likely that all houses travelled with an accompanying expectation: that relationships would be performed and fulfilled.

These expectations are related to the performative power of the ancestors, with which the descendants want to be connected. They are also about dignity and political prowess, as Pita Moko’s dismay about lack of Māori representation at Wembley indicates. For the latter part of the twentieth century, Robert Jahnke describes how Māori presence at international and national exhibitions set up a pae as “an inevitable spatial domain that every Māori artist must negotiate in order to rationalise their position”, “which establishes protocols for the interface between art and culture”.⁷⁷ The “ritual seizure” of the exhibition site, for instance in the United States during the *Te Māori*

Exhibition, contextualises “artefact as *tāonga* and *tāonga* as a condition of cultural [and curatorial] practice”.⁷⁸

While I am less familiar with Samoan positions on the matter, it seems clear that the *STA* anticipated an ongoing relationship with the *Tropical Islands Resort*. Even though it appears that the transaction concerning the Samoan *fale* was a clear-cut sale, and even though the *STA* regards the *fale*'s current owners responsible for its fate, there was nevertheless an expectation on their part that Samoan dancers would continue to perform at the resort, and that the *fale* would act as a representation of Samoa – as a tourist destination, at least, if not of *Fa'a Samoa* in a narrower sense.

While many expositions-cum-theme-parks today perpetuate the practices of 19th century exhibitions, a recognition is beginning to take shape among curators and researchers that long-term sustainable use of exotic others' artefacts has to involve their “originary producers and spiritual owners”.⁷⁹ 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’.⁸⁰ Terrell regards “the Māori concept of the marae” as potentially “New Zealand’s (and, by extension, the museum’s) greatest gift to the world”.⁸¹ His desire to use Ruatepupuke as an urban living marae for Chicago offers, on the one hand, a lot of potential for the development of the relationships between people in Chicago and Tokomaru Bay. On the other, the flourishing of such relationship and the ability of the house to function as a marae will in large part depend on whether or not the context into which Ruatepupuke is now embedded is open and flexible enough. Ideally, a marae provides a space for open debate, where differences of opinion are not only tolerated but engaged with. In cases of conflict, it counter-acts closure or the type of consensus politics that Rancière regards as the end of politics.⁸²

As long as the houses' communities of origin find themselves in a condition of “Human Diaspora” with “the resulting untenability of retaining vital cultural traditions”,⁸³ however, there are issues to be discussed and conflicts to be explored. Just as the reciprocity between colonial and indigenous cultures poses as-yet unanswered questions, so does the nature of internal and external relationships in which the houses endure.⁸⁴

Māori Glossary

hapū cluster of whanau descending from a common ancestor, descendants, pregnant

iwi	tribe
kaitiaki	guardian
kawa	protocol
kohanga reo	literally: language nest; pre-school care immersed in Te Reo, the Māori language
kawanga-whare marae	ceremonial opening of a whareniui open area in front of the whareniui, where formal greetings, gatherings and discussions take place
mauri	life force
pātaka	store house
pae	critical zone of interaction, conceptually positioning hosts and visitors (Jahnke)
tāonga	prized possession, heirloom
tapu	sacred, restricted
tohunga	expert, specialist
tohunga whakairo	master carver
tūrangawaewae	place where one has rights of residence
waka	ancestral canoe
whakairo	carving
whanau	extended family, birth, offspring
whareniui	also, whare whakairo (carved house), whare puni, whare tipuna (or tupuna, ancestral house), whare runanga (meeting, council house)
whāriki	mat

Samoan Glossary

ava	traditional drink, consumed at ceremonial occasions
Fa'a Samoa	distinctive Samoan culture
fale	house
fale tali malo	also, <i>fale tele</i> or <i>fale fonofale</i> : guest house, meeting house
malae	gathering place
tufuga	expert, specialist
tunoa	kitchen

Many thanks to Keri-Anne Wikitera, Albert Refiti, Ross Jenner, Moata McNamara for their comments on various versions and to the anonymous reviewer, who suggested restructuring to focus on performative aspects of whare and *fale* abroad.

¹ Māori and Samoan terms are translated in the glossary.

This paper is partially based on A.-Chr. Engels-Schwarzpaul, Keri-Anne Wikitera, 'Counter Currents: *Whare Nui* and *Fale* Abroad'. Paper presented at *The Pacific Connection - Trade, Travel & Technology Transfer*, Faculty of Architecture, Building & Planning, University of Melbourne, 19-21 February 2009; available at <http://arden.aut.ac.nz/moodle/mod/data/view.php?id=15&rid=733>.

² From a Māori perspective, a whare can be on foreign territory even inside New Zealand: Ngāti Awa held that, while in Dunedin, Mataatua and their "ancestors [were] standing in a 'foreign land' where they do not belong." Ngāti Awa Māori Trust Board, quoted in Jeffrey Sissons, 'The Traditionalisation of the Māori Meeting House', *Oceania*, 69, 1 (1998), 40. The houses chosen for this paper all travelled internationally. For a fuller overview of Māori

wharehenui in foreign territories, see Roger Neich, 'The Maori House Down in the Garden: A Benign Colonialist Response to Maori Art and the Maori Counter-Response', *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 112, 4 (2003), 331-68, and Dean Sully (ed.), *Decolonising Conservation: Caring for Maori Meeting Houses Outside New Zealand* (Walnut Creek: CA: Left Coast Press, 2007). The latter gives detailed accounts of history and current status quo of Hinemihi o te Ao Tawhito (now Clendon Park, Surrey), Ruatēpūke II (now Field Museum, Chicago), Rauru, (now Museum für Völkerkunde, Hamburg) and Te Wharepuni a Maui (now Linden Museum, Stuttgart).

As far as I am aware, there is no equivalent literature about Samoan *fale* to date. However, Treadwell mentions several *fale* that were commissioned and built in Samoa during the period of New Zealand Administration: one each sent to the 1924 Wembley *British Empire Exhibition* and the 1940 *Centennial Exhibition* Wellington; and several model *fale* for the 1925 *New Zealand and South Seas International Exhibition* in Dunedin; Jeremy Treadwell, 'Shifting Houses'. Paper presented at the *Southern Crossings. Whaka Whitiwhiti au Tonga*, Auckland 2002. Johnston reports on several *fale* exhibited at Chicago, St. Louis and Wembley exhibitions; Ewan C. Johnston, 'Representing the Pacific at International Exhibitions 1851-1940' (PhD Thesis, University of Auckland, 1999).

³ From this conference's Call for Papers.

⁴ See Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies. Research and Indigenous Peoples* (Dunedin: University of Otago Press, 1999), 53, and Jacques Rancière, 'The Politics of Literature', *SubStance*, 2004, 33, 10-24, 10.

⁵ Meetings aligned with the King Movement and Te Kooti were hosted at Mataatua; David James Butt, 'Māori and Museums. The Politics of Indigenous Recognition' (Massey University, 2003), 98; Sissons, 'The Traditionalisation of the Maori Meeting House', 39.

⁶ 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.

⁷ Different perspectives generate different view: according to a 19 May 2008 *New Zealand Herald* article "Ngāti Awa felt it had no choice after suffering several military campaigns on its soil" when asked to lend the house for the purpose of its exhibition; http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/print.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10510879&pnum=0. Colin McCarthy suggests that "Ngāti Awa of Whakatane wanted to take part in the exhibition and responded positively to the government's plan to 'show to the world the work which the Maori people were doing in the erection of carved dwellings ...'"; Colin McCarthy, 'Objects of Empire? Displaying Maori at International Exhibitions, 1873-1924', *Journal of New Zealand Literature: JNZL*, 2005, 23, 52-70, 58-9.

⁸ "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>.

⁹ 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." Sissons, 'The Traditionalisation of the Maori Meeting House', 39.

¹⁰ In 1925, Mataatua was exhibited back in New Zealand, at the *South Seas Exhibition* in Dunedin, after which the house was handed over to the Otago Museum; Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 53. 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." Ngāti Awa Maori Trust Board quoted in Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 40. 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*". Butt, 'Māori and Museums', 98.

¹¹ Jacques Rancière, *The Politics of Aesthetics. The Distribution of the Sensible*, trans. Gabriel Rockhill (London: Continuum, 2004), 14-15.

¹² But visibility in this context does not simply operate in terms of the inclusion or exclusion of indigenous culture. Settler societies tend to include indigenous representation the more they develop a sense of nation and their desire grows to be seen as distinct, to have a specific identity. Indigenising settler nationalism then foregrounds “the importance of the indigenous contribution to national culture”, but usually appropriates in shallow ways the outward signs of this culture and co-opts indigenous identities; Anthony Moran, ‘As Australia Decolonizes: Indigenizing Settler Nationalism and the Challenges of Settler/Indigenous Relations’, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 25 (2002), 1013-1042, 1014 & 36; Sam Furphy, ‘Aboriginal House Names and Settler Australian Identity’, *Journal of Australian Studies*, 72 (2002), 68. Like New Zealand settlers, who often favourably compared their ‘natives’ with, for instance, Australian aborigines, Germans highlighted the natural grace of Samoans, their ‘new compatriots’. Imada refers to the perception of ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ natives: Tahitians and Hawaiians were seen as soft, while Māori and aboriginal Australians were ‘hard primitives’. Adria L. Imada, ‘Hawaiians on Tour: Hula Circuits through the American Empire’, *American Quarterly*, 56, 1 (2004), 146. See also Robert Rydell, ‘The World’s Columbian Exposition of 1893’, *Journal of American Culture*, 1, 2 (1978), 270.

¹³ See Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), and Timothy Mitchell, ‘The World as Exhibition’, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 31 (1989), 217-36.

¹⁴ Burton Benedict, ‘International Exhibitions and National Identity’, *Anthropology Today*, 7, 3 (1991), 7. These possessions included what Benjamin, as a contemporary, would call a “cultural heritage” which, once appropriated by a victor, “falls from one set of hands into another”. (Thesis XII), Walter Benjamin, ‘Theses on the Philosophy of History’ in *Illuminations*, edited by Hannah Arendt (New York: Schocken Books, 1969), 253-64.

¹⁵ Within New Zealand, both *whare* and *fale* were featured, for instance, at the 1906-7 *New Zealand International Exhibition* in Christchurch and the 1925 *New Zealand and South Seas International Exhibition* in Dunedin. New Zealand’s developing sense of nationhood after WW1 went along with the incorporation of Māori motifs in the ornamentation of buildings: e.g., Lippincott’s Massey University Building, 1929; Grierson, Aimer and Draffin’s Auckland War Memorial Museum, 1929; various 1930s buildings in Napier.

¹⁶ For instance, Augustus Hamilton, *Maori Art* (London: The Holland Press, 1901), 6. See also Robert Jahnke, ‘Voices Beyond the Pae’, in Nicholas Thomas, Diane Losche, Jennifer Newell (eds.) *Double Vision: Art Histories and Colonial Histories in the Pacific* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1999), 195.

As Bell comments: “For most Pākehā Māori art remained the stuff of the exotic, ethnography, touristic décor or entertainment – at the most craft work rather than fine arts. Thus the institutional separation with its implied differentiation of value, that with few exceptions prevailed until the return to New Zealand of *Te Maori*: Maori art in museum, Pākehā or Euro-American style art in art galleries.” Leonard Bell, ‘Walters and Maori Art: The Nature of the Relationship’, in James Ross and Laurence Simmons (eds.) *Gordon Walters: Order and Intuition* (Auckland: Walters Publication, 1989), 13.

¹⁷ ‘be-funne’d’ is a literal translation of a new-German term. Meg Armstrong, “‘A Jumble of Foreignness’: The Sublime Musayums of Nineteenth-Century Fairs and Expositions”, *Cultural Critique* 23 (1993), 199-250, 201.

¹⁸ For a conflict between Putnam’s education goals and the economics of the exposition, see Benedict, ‘International Exhibitions and National Identity’ and Rydell, ‘The World’s Columbian Exposition of 1893’. The same predicament applies more and more to museums insofar as they, too, move out of an environment of public funding into one of entrepreneurship. This move may, in the longer term, abolish the difference between museums as educational institutions and theme parks as places of entertainment. What the two scenarios share already now is their need for authenticity – which can be very differently interpreted.

¹⁹ See Zeynep Çelik, Leila Kinney, ‘Ethnography and Exhibitionism at the *Expositions Universelles*’, *Assemblage*, 13 (1990), 35-59. Johnston, ‘Representing the Pacific’, 118, 120.

²⁰ Johnston, ‘Representing the Pacific’, 103.

²¹ The “Samoan Islanders” were located directly next to the “Hagenbeck Animal Show”.
<http://www.samoa.co.uk/old-exhibitions.html>

²³ Gertrude Scott quoted in Johnston, ‘Representing the Pacific’, 111. The account of the numbers of Samoans in the village also vary considerably: while the impression was created that the villagers were mostly Samoans, only two women were from Samoa, since the “Mulunu’u Government’ had opposed the enterprise and [...] refused to allow any Samoans to accompany [Harry J. Moors, an American trader] to the United States”. Johnston, ‘Representing the Pacific’, 111, 112.

²⁴ Moors, quoted in Johnston, ‘Representing the Pacific’, 108.

²⁵ A myth Prof. Culin promulgated in his academic report on the exhibition. “It is made of the wood of the bread-fruit tree, and thatched with the leaves of the wild sugar-cane.” Stewart Culin, ‘Retrospect of the Folk-Lore of the Columbian Exposition’, *The Journal of American Folklore*, 7, 24 (1894), 57. The same version, almost verbatim, is contained in Smith’s *Art, history, midway plaisance and World’s Columbian exposition (1893)*,
<http://www.archive.org/details/arthistormidway00smit>.

²⁶ According to Johnston, “during the exhibition, the original *fale tele* was destroyed when Mata’afa was forced to burn his entire village following his defeat”, Johnston, ‘Representing the Pacific’, 113.

²⁷ Meg Armstrong, ‘A Jumble of Foreignness’, 200. While undoubtedly belonging to those artefacts at the exposition which provided the contrast (through underdevelopment) needed to make the White City stand out, the Samoan *fale* were nevertheless admired for their success to keep out the heat in a smouldering Chicagoan summer. Johnston, ‘Representing the Pacific’, 114.

²⁸ A clearing house for “natural history specimens and cultural objects”, which also bought and sold Rauru, see endnote 43 below. John Edward Terrell, Désirée C.J. Wisse, and Christopher J. Philipp, ‘Ruatepupuke II, the Field Museum, Chicago: The Past and Possible Futures’, in Dean Sully (ed.), *Decolonising Conservation: Caring for Maori Meeting Houses Outside New Zealand* (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2007), 91.

²⁹ Ruatepupuke was conceived and built during a period of substantial changes in the wake of the New Zealand Wars; see James Belich, *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict* (Auckland: Penguin, 1988), and Ranginui Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou. Struggle without End* (Auckland: Penguin, 1990). Two different dates, 1861 and 1881, 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 Koromirira Ngawehenga.

³⁰ Terrell, Wisse, Philipp, ‘Ruatepupuke II’, 92-3.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 94.

³² *Ibid.*, 93.

³³ Catherine Anderson, ‘Conservation and Installation of Ruatepupuke II: A Maori Meeting House’, *AICCM Bulletin*, 20, 1 (1994), 23.

³⁴ 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-Ruatoupare (Tokomaru Bay).

³⁵ Terrell, Wisse, Philipp, ‘Ruatepupuke II’, 95.

³⁶ The *whare* is referred to as a person as she represents an important ancestor of the sub-tribes, Ngāti Hinemihi and Tūhourangi.

³⁷ Engels-Schwarzpaul, Wikitera. ‘Counter Currents’, 41. 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* (London: Running Horse Books Limited, 1998), 33. With respect to the carvings, see Roger Neich, ‘The Maori Carving Art of Tene Waitere: Traditionalist and Innovator’, *Art New Zealand*, 57, Summer (1990-1991).

³⁸ 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. See

also 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, 1 (1978).

³⁹ Johnston, ‘Representing the Pacific’, 150.

⁴⁰ Gray quoted in Johnston, ‘Representing the Pacific’, 145.

⁴¹ Johnston, ‘Representing the Pacific’, 145.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 150. A drawing by Steven Spurrier, in *The Illustrated London News* (May 24, 1924, 933), appears to show the latter in the *fale* during construction, together with two European builders. It is difficult to fathom what might have been visible to Europeans when looking into the *fale*. Treadwell believes the “European figures” in the drawing, pausing at the threshold to the *fale*, to be “gazing into the indigenous world, ... a world of disorder confused and unfathomable, in which both the [*fale*’s] structure and the Samoan figures elude their colonial categories”. Treadwell, ‘Shifting Houses’, 580.

⁴³ The Secretary, Administration of Western Samoa, quoted in Johnston, ‘Representing the Pacific’, 149. Thus, the production for the *fale*’s exhibition at the Empire’s centre, in the service of New Zealand colonial prowess, in one sense contributed to the maintenance of Samoan crafts traditions by a call for excellence and presumably higher than normal funding. On the other hand, the judgement made by Gray, the Secretary of the Western Samoan administration, is reminiscent of Augustus Hamilton and George Nelson’s attitude towards Māori carving and building, as evidenced in the case of Rauru’s recarving: Te Waru, leader of Ngāti Whoa at Waiotapu had originally commissioned this whare, which was initially carved by Te Poroa and Tara Te Awatapu between 1850 and 1870. The house was nearing completion when Te Waru broke tapu by smoking in the unfinished house (Cowan). After several severe misfortunes, which were correlated to the progress on the house, Te Waru sold the carvings for the house in 1897 to Nelson, owner of the Geyser Hotel in Whakarewarewa, a thriving tourist attraction at the time. Nelson considered himself a “white tohunga” and was befriended with Hamilton, museum director and author of *Māori Art*. He intended to have “the finest carved house ever built by the Māori” (Cowan), as a showpiece at Whakarewarewa, and commissioned Anaha Te Rahui, Neke Kapua and Tene Waitere between 1897 and 1899 to complete Rauru, as he named the whare to refer to a mythical inventor of carving (Cowan; Neich, *Carved Histories*, 200). The carvers chosen by Nelson were instructed to use Hamilton’s book for guidance, a book that promulgated that “the whole of the art work of the Māori comes under the head of ornament” and diagnosed a “lack of practised skill in the present representatives of the race” (Hamilton 6, 5). Nelson and Hamilton “exerted their orthodox views on Rauru’s carvers in terms of iconography and stylistic elements” (Garbutt, 122). In Neich’s words, they “imposed their ‘Greek’ concepts of art on the carvers. Their encouragement of copying a form divorced from its context produced ‘a truly representative work of Maori Art’ spelt with a capital A. Frequent comments such as those of Hamilton labelling Anaha, Tene and Neke [the carvers] as the last surviving true traditional carvers could only make them more self-conscious of their special status as ‘artists’ in the European sense of being ‘rare spirits’.” (Neich, ‘The Veil of Orthodoxy’, 257). In March 1900, two tohunga from different tribes each conducted a tapu lifting ceremony to open the house (Cowan). Hirini Moko Mead comments: “It was highly irregular to employ two sets of tohunga of different iwi and waka to open the one house but Rauru was unusual in many ways. It belonged to a Pākehā dealer and not to a hapū. The kawanga-whare ceremonies were performed to authenticate the house as a traditional work before being sold” (79). Within six months, Nelson was thinking of selling Rauru and, in June 1904, the house was bought by Umlauff, and then in 1910 by the Museum für Völkerkunde (Garbutt, 112). The short time between opening and sale suggests that Nelson had a sale in mind already when he commissioned the recarving of the house.

See James Cowan. ‘Legends of the Māori. The Rite of the Kawa-Whare - the Carved House and the Two Priests: A Tale of Tapu’, (New Zealand Texts Collection, 1930),

<http://www.nzetc.org/tm/scholarly/tei-Pom01Lege-t1-body2-d41.html>; Roger Neich, *Carved Histories: Rotorua Ngāti Tarawhai Woodcarving* (Auckland: Auckland University Press., 2001);

Roger Neich, 'The Veil of Orthodoxy: Rotorua Māori Woodcarving in Changing Context', in S. Mead, B. Kernot (eds.), *Art and Artists in Oceania* (Palmerston North: Dunmore, 1983); Eva Garbutt, 'The Care of Living Objects: Conserving Rauru and Te Wharepuni a Maui in Germany', in Dean Sully (ed.), *Decolonising Conservation: Caring for Maori Meeting Houses Outside New Zealand* (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2007), 113, 122; Sissons, 'The Traditionalisation of the Maori Meeting House', 41; Hamilton, *Maori Art*, 6,5; Hirini Moko Mead, *Tikanga Maori. Living by Maori Values* (Wellington: Huia Publishers, 2003).

⁴⁴ Johnston, 'Representing the Pacific', 150.

⁴⁵ Ratana and his group were in London to convey a petition, signed by over 30,000 Māori, for the return of confiscated lands and implementation of the Treaty of Waitangi. King George V did not receive him, but the visit to England may have moved the New Zealand Government to set up an inquiry in 1926. Ministry for Culture and Heritage. 2009. *Tahupotiki Wiremu Ratana*, History Group of the New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage, <http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/people/tahupotiki-wiremu-ratana> (accessed 26 April, 2009).

⁴⁶ 'Article by Telegraph-Own Correspondent', (*Wanganui Sunday* 1924) quoted in Arahī R. Hagger, 'The Last of the Great Prophets, Sacred Icons of the Ratana Movement and Ratana Church', Te Haahi Ratana, <http://www.theratanachurch.org.nz/worldtour.html>. See also Colin McCarthy, 'Objects of Empire?'

⁴⁷ Damian Skinner, *The Carver and the Artist: Maori Art in the Twentieth Century* (Auckland: Auckland University Press: 2008), 62-66.

⁴⁸ 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*, 8 (1998), 35.

Sir Apirana Ngata's 1930s *marae* development project involving the carving of whareniui in rural areas, was an attempt to create icons of commonly shared values and to rebuild 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. Ngata quoted in Sissons, 'The Traditionalisation of the Maori Meeting House', 44.

⁴⁹ Skinner, *The Carver and the Artist*. Hone Taiapa, the tohunga whakairo, was in some respects critical of the Church, particularly about the fact that budgets were so tight that he had to work with carvers he did not consider professional. The work on the house, carried out at the Church's centre in Hamilton, proceeded only slowly (66).

⁵⁰ Polynesian Cultural Center, 'Aotearoa (New Zealand): The Pa or Village', <http://www.polynesia.com/new-zealand/the-pa-or-village.html>.

⁵¹ According to the website, Te Aroha o te Iwi Māori was the first whareniui ever built outside of New Zealand. 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.

⁵² 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>. I have not been able to locate specific information about the Samoan *fale* at the PCC beyond that on the PCC's own website.

⁵³ Amy Ku'leialoha Stillman, 'Pacific-ing Asian Pacific American History', *Journal of Asian American Studies*, 7, 3 (2004); Webb, 'A New Kind of Plantation'.

⁵⁴ dpa, "World's Largest Indoor Rainforest Gets the Nod," SkyscraperCity, <http://www.skyscrapercity.com/showthread.php?t=88305>. For more detailed accounts of this particular *fale*'s context, see A.-Chr. Engels-Schwarzpaul, "'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 (2007), 525-42; Engels-Schwarzpaul, 'Tillers of the Soil/Traveling Journeymen: Modes of the Virtual'. In *Transformations 5. Walter Benjamin and the Virtual: Politics, Art, and Mediation in the Age of Global Culture*, 2007, http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_15/article_12.shtml.

⁵⁵ Any comments about Samoa after 1962 refer to Western Samoa. I am not familiar with the situation in contemporary American Samoa.

⁵⁶ In the words of a participant in the research project, “if you're getting out there and having to sell yourself as different to others, inevitably you come across ... indigenous identity, which the blessing is part of ... it's a messy package ...”. Interview for research project “Tropical Islands – Virtual Worlds” conducted by Engels-Schwarzpaul, 2009.

⁵⁷ Contractual relationships were fraught and, today, relationships appear to have lapsed.

⁵⁸ Tropical Island Management GmbH. 2005, ‘The Samoan Fale. Tropical Living in the South Seas’, <http://www.tropical-islands.de/index.php?id=344> (accessed 6 May, 2009).

⁵⁹ This development paralleled that of a shift from theme park with an education component to fun-bath pure and simple.

⁶⁰ See Brian R. Johnson. ‘Virtuality and Place’. Paper presented at *ACADIA 2002: Thresholds Between Physical and Virtual*, Washington 2002, <http://faculty.washington.edu/brj/presentations/acadia02/3.Experience%20Virtuality%20&%20Place/4.Virtuality%20+%20Place/0.default.html>. For *in situ* exhibition strategies, see Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage*, 19ff.

⁶¹ See Sissons, ‘The Traditionalisation of the Maori Meeting House’, 44. This applies even to the processes into which Rauru and Hinemihi were embedded from the beginning: they were both built and sold during a time when Māori carving and weaving was beginning to be employed for other than ‘traditional’ purposes, mostly in the context of the developing tourism industry. Neich, ‘The Veil of Orthodoxy’, 259.

⁶² Participant in an interview for the research project “Tropical Islands – Virtual Worlds” conducted by Engels-Schwarzpaul, 2009.

⁶³ For an overview of competing definitions of performance and performativity, see Diana Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (London: Duke University Press, 2003), 3f.

⁶⁴ Interview for research project “Tropical Islands – Virtual Worlds” conducted by Engels-Schwarzpaul and Refiti, 2008.

⁶⁵ Webb, ‘A New Kind of Plantation’, 34.

⁶⁶ See Benedict, ‘International Exhibitions and National Identity’, 8.

⁶⁷ Digby quoted in Dean Sully, and Alan Gallop, ‘Introducing Hinemihi’, in Dean Sully (ed.), *Decolonising Conservation: Caring for Maori Meeting Houses Outside New Zealand* (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2007), 127-48, 129.

⁶⁸ Rancière, *The Politics of Aesthetics*, 14-15.

⁶⁹ Sissons, ‘The Traditionalisation of the Maori Meeting House’, 39.

⁷⁰ The courtyard at Aggie Grey’s hotel in Apia contains early examples of carving for a tourist market. Already in 1988, Semsek and Staudt observed a twist in the simulation of meanings, since in “the ‘going native’ of the ‘natives’, the conscious play of life world representation and reference, the simulation of the content of reality and meaning in practical life, the territorialization of culture and its symbolic representation” can be used as tools by local communities to advance their positions in the “distribution and exchange of symbols within the new system of communication”, Hans-Günter Semsek and Georg Stauth, ‘Contemporary Processes within System, Cultures and Life Worlds: Some Reflections on Colonization and Resistance in Everyday Life’, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 5, 4 (1988), 713.

⁷¹ See Sissons, ‘The Traditionalisation of the Maori Meeting House’.

⁷² Stephen Turner, ‘Sovereignty, or the Art of Being Native’, *Cultural Critique*, 2002 (51), 76. Samoans are further able to draw on their tradition of *Faleaitu*, a satirical village comedy; see Jeannette-Marie Mageo, ‘Samoa, on the Wilde Side: Male Transvestism, Oscar Wilde, and Liminality in Making Gender’, *Ethos*, 24, 4 (1996).

⁷³ Christopher B. Balme, ‘Staging the Pacific: Framing Authenticity in Performances for Tourists at the Polynesian Cultural Center’, *Theatre Journal*, 50 (1998), 53-70, 64. An important aspect of Fourth World configurations is that the indigenous culture is also always under threat of being assimilated into that of the nation state. Any resistance and claim of independence is quickly branded as, for instance, “essentialist”. See Jahnke, ‘Voices Beyond the Pae’, 207.

⁷⁴ The concept of selling a house, i.e., alienating something that was home for the members of its community of origin, may not have been fully developed in the 1880s. Regarding reciprocity in Māori relationships, see Tuwhakairiora Williams and David Robinson, ‘Social Capital and

Philanthropy in Maori Society', *International Journal of Not-for-Profit Law*, 6, 2 (2004), http://www.icnl.org/KNOWLEDGE/ijnl/vol6iss2/special_4.htm.

⁷⁵ Jeffrey Sissons, 'Reviewing Exhibiting Māori', *Blogs at NYU* (2007), http://blogs.nyu.edu/projects/materialworld/2007/10/reviewing_exhibiting_maori.html (accessed 11 January, 2009).

⁷⁶ Sissons, 'Reviewing Exhibiting Māori'.

⁷⁷ Jahnke, 'Voices Beyond the Pae', 193, 200.

⁷⁸ Jahnke, 'Voices Beyond the Pae', 200.

⁷⁹ E.g., Terrell, Wisse, Philipp, 'Ruatepupuke II', 96.

⁸⁰ Tory Light, 'The Family of Ruatepupuke - Reviving a Maori Meetinghouse', *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin*, 58, 10 (1987), http://libsysdigi.library.uiuc.edu/OCA/Books2008-03/fieldmuseumofnat/fieldmuseumofnat58chic/fieldmuseumofnat58chic_djvu.txt.

⁸¹ "We are of the opinion that the Māori concept of the marae may potentially be New Zealand's (and, by extension, the museum's) greatest gift to the world. For over a century, our museum has been famed as a place where people come to learn about other people and places on earth. We are convinced that the museum can also become renowned as a place where people come to learn from one another. By fostering what we are calling 'marae encounters', Ruatepupuke II and the marae on which it stands within the museum will bring home to Chicago and to the world how people everywhere on earth enrich our understandings of what it means to be human." Terrell, Wisse, Philipp, 'Ruatepupuke II', 109. Unnoticed, perhaps, Māori culture is again subsumed into New Zealand national culture here.

⁸² E.g., Rancière, 'The Politics of Aesthetics', KEIN THEATER [Submitted by Bojana Cvejic on Mon, 08/09/2004], <http://theater.kein.org/node/99>. On the other hand, Ohnuma observes how the "very taken-for-grantedness" of the concept of *aloha* [love] "serves to evoke closure where one would expect to see debate and dissent: in cases of conflict"; Keiko Ohnuma, "'Aloha Spirit" and the Cultural Politics of Sentiment as National Belonging', *The Contemporary Pacific*, 20, 2 (2008), 366.

⁸³ "Whatu ngarongaro he tangata, toitu he kainga (The people have disappeared—only the land remains)." Julie Rauer, 'Paradise Lost - Contemporary Pacific Art at the Asia Society', Asia Society and Museum, <http://www.asianart.com/exhibitions/paradise/article.html>. This condition applies to both Samoa and Māori rural areas.

⁸⁴ "[Allen] identifies the nineteenth-century New Zealand regime as the new imperial centre to the ever-marginalized Maori periphery. She disrupts the conventional binary of centre-periphery, metropole-colony, which only serve to emphasize the monolith, the binary, and insists on a recognition of the pluralistic metropole." 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, 1: Design, Commercial Expansion and Business History (1999): 89.

When the Call for Papers for this conference suggests exploring "the relationship of *our countries* with others in terms of sources of architectural ideas, interaction, forms and materials" (my emphasis), it is far from clear who is in- or excluded. As long as a country's architectural practice and theory continue to share more with the former colonial centre than with indigenous theories and practices, there is a principal problem regarding the "critical conversation of postcolonialism". "[H]owever invigorating and pertinent for white majority settlers, an international academic audience, or others", this conversation remains largely irrelevant to the need for indigenous populations to find ways of "sustaining themselves [when their environment is] quite opposed to their survival". Turner, 'Sovereignty, or the Art of Being Native', 76. When national rhetorics unproblematically subsume indigenous peoples into a country's general population, colonial preconceptions have not been "whittled away", as the CFP seems to assume, and engagements between settler and indigenous populations are not likely to be mutual.

From the point of view of settler societies, it is important to find "new ways of coming to terms with their pasts, including the nature and legitimacy of their national beginnings"; Moran, 'As Australia Decolonizes', 1018. The need to be indigenous, however, must not again override the needs of indigenous cultures for a sustainable life context. It is necessary to confront "often terrible histories of oppression, and find ways to deal with the feelings of guilt and shame that accompany that confrontation ... Typically, this process of engagement with the past involves a questioning of

identity, with some settler nationalists calling for a new, more inclusive national identity that can embrace cultural diversity and accept the legitimacy of different historically based claims on the nation, while others cry foul and call for the re-assertion of national pride and united identity” (1018). A sincere confrontation with the nation’s history hopefully prevents mechanisms such as the stakeholder paradigm, interest group models, or even the more recent host/guest model serving to “provide a mask of democracy and fair play to what is, in reality, further colonial appropriation that externalises communities from their heritage”. Communities of origin in Samoa and Aotearoa must have control over the processes of negotiation with their houses’ keepers, rather than being “invited as participants in somebody else’s process”. Sully, ‘Decolonising Hinemihi and Conservation Practice’, 226.