MĀORI AND MUSEUMS

THE POLITICS OF INDIGENOUS RECOGNITION

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Museum Studies
at Massey University,
Palmerston North**

**David James Butts
2003**

This thesis is dedicated to
my father, Lesley James Butts, and
my mother, Angelina Marea Butts (née Gargiulo)

ABSTRACT

As a result of colonialism indigenous peoples have been marginalised within their own customary territories. In an analysis of the politics of cultural recognition Tully (1995) proposes the reconceptualisation of the 'common ground': sites, including public museums, within which different cultures negotiate their relationships within the modern nation-state, where the rights of indigenous peoples can be recognised on the basis of the principles of mutual recognition, continuity and consent. This thesis examines the impact of the politics of indigenous recognition on the evolving relationships between Māori and museums, focusing on Māori participation in the governance of regional charitable trust museums in New Zealand.

The international context is explored through an investigation of indigenous strategies of resistance to museum practices at the international, national and local levels. The national context within which Māori resistance to museum practices has evolved, and subsequent changes in practice are then outlined.

Two case studies of regional charitable trust museums, which began to renegotiate Māori participation in their governance structures in the late 1990s, are examined. The different governance models adopted by Whanganui Regional Museum, Whanganui, and Tairawhiti Museum, Gisborne, both effected major shifts from the historical pattern of limited Māori participation in the museums to the representation of all tangata whenua iwi on the new trust boards. The governance negotiation processes and the responses of interested parties are analysed. The case studies demonstrate the importance of understanding the historical context within which public institutions are embedded and the forces that lead to contemporary adjustments in power relationships.

Both new governance models have resulted in genuine power sharing partnerships between tangata whenua and the museums. Finally, the extent to which the two institutions have subsequently moved towards becoming 'common ground' where the recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples can be realised is analysed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

E aku rangatira,

Tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā tātou katoa.

Ngā mihi nui ki a koutou.

Nā koutou tēnei mahi i tautoko, i āwhina.

Nā koutou i whakaae ki te whai wāhi o tēnei mahi

E ngā mate,

Koutou kua wheturangitia,

Haere, haere, haere.

Oki oki mai rā i te poho o ō koutou mātua tīpuna.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge my first museum director and mentor, Mina McKenzie (Ngāti Hauiti). Mina was the person who kindled my interest in the politics of indigenous recognition in the museum context.

This thesis would not have been possible without the enthusiastic participation of the trustees of Tairāwhiti Museum, Gisborne, and the Whanganui Regional Museum, Whanganui. These people were aware individually and collectively that the transformation of the governance arrangements in their museums was significant locally, nationally and internationally, and recognised the value of documenting the changing relationships between their institutions and tangata whenua. I am particularly grateful to the following trustees who agreed to be interviewed: Tairawhiti Museum: Sandy Adsett, Pam Bain, Michael Chrisp, Apirana Mahuika, Anne McGuire, Sir Henare Ngata, and Ingrid Searancke; Whanganui Regional Museum: Pam Erni, Grant Huwyler, Manu Mete Kingi, Karanga Morgan, Michael Payne, Rangi Wills. I also wish to thank Utiku Potaka for agreeing to participate in this research.

I acknowledge the considerable debt I owe to Michael Spedding, Director of Tairāwhiti Museum and Sharon Dell, Director of Whanganui Regional Museum. They have

supported and encouraged me throughout the long duration of this research project. Leading institutions through periods of transformation requires vision and commitment and these two people have these qualities in abundance.

I am also grateful for the support and enthusiasm of all the museum staff in both of these institutions during the period of this research. They have made me feel welcome in their institutions and provided access to archival resources and other information about collections and public programmes.

To my chief academic supervisor, Professor Mason Durie, I owe a considerable debt of gratitude for assisting me in the development and execution of this research project and the many hours of reading and commentary on successive drafts. His understanding of and contribution to the politics of indigenous recognition has been a continual inspiration during the time I have been privileged to work with him both as a doctoral candidate and an academic colleague. I also thank my second supervisor, Professor Jeff Sissons, for reading and commenting on two complete drafts of the thesis.

From February to March 2001 I held a Fellowship in Museum Studies at the Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C. This Fellowship gave me time to read and reflect on aspects of my thesis and made it possible for me to visit the Makah Research and Cultural Center, Neah Bay, Washington. I acknowledge in particular, the support given to me by Nancy Fuller and her colleagues in the Museum Studies Program during my Fellowship.

During the period of this research project my colleague Susan Abasa has willingly accepted many additional responsibilities within the Museum Studies Programme and has continually provided much appreciated support and encouragement. I also acknowledge the support and encouragement of my other colleagues in the School of Māori Studies Te Pūtahi-ā-Toi.

x

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART ONE
INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL CONTEXTS

PART TWO
LOCAL CONTEXTS

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The cultures of the indigenous peoples of North America, Australia and New Zealand were at best severely disrupted, at worst largely decimated, by the process of European colonisation. The history of appropriation, exchange, purchase and gifting of indigenous and non-indigenous cultural heritage, tangible and intangible, has been part of the ebb and flow of relationships between colonial settlers and indigenous peoples. Public museums were established to accommodate collections of indigenous heritage as an integral part of the colonising process. These collections were used by the colonisers to define and categorise indigenous cultures as part of the political process of establishing a hierarchical relationship between European and indigenous cultures. Although indigenous peoples did not enter passively into their relationships with private collectors and public museums, resisting, negotiating and accommodating their activities, the result has been an accumulation of indigenous heritage, tangible and intangible, in public institutions and private collections that has been largely beyond the control of indigenous peoples.

As part of the broad recognition of indigenous rights that has emerged both nationally and internationally since World War Two, cultural heritage maintenance has been identified as an essential element of indigenous cultural survival. Particularly since the 1970s, indigenous peoples have sought to negotiate new relationships with public museums within the broader context of the pursuit of self-determination, reclaiming control not only of the material heritage held by museums but also the right and responsibility of self-definition. Indigenous peoples are claiming the right to control their own cultural knowledge, the remains of their ancestors and their material cultural heritage, whether these resources remain in public institutions (museums, archives, libraries) or private collections or are returned to the care of their customary guardians. Fundamental to the control of those resources which remain in public museums is the negotiation of arrangements that enable effective participation by indigenous peoples in museum governance, management and professional practice within these institutions.

1.1 Research Objectives

In the last quarter of the twentieth century indigenous peoples focused on reclaiming control of their material cultural heritage held in public museums, primarily because they identified heritage resources as essential to maintaining and strengthening their cultural identities. This thesis addresses the following primary research question:

> **How has the emergence of the politics of indigenous recognition[1], since the Second World War, into the international, national and local arenas impacted on the colonial relationships between indigenous peoples and museums and, in particular, what has been the impact of these politics on the evolving relationships between Māori and museums, especially on Māori participation in the governance of regional charitable trust museums in New Zealand?**

Three interrelated propositions that explore the way in which indigenous peoples have engaged museums in the politics of indigenous recognition are investigated.

1.1.1 Cultural Heritage Maintenance and the Politics of Indigenous Recognition

The first research objective is to investigate the strategies used by indigenous peoples, collectively and individually, to assert the significance that material cultural heritage (including collections held in museums) has for the maintenance of indigenous cultural identity. This is examined through the identification and analysis of three sites of indigenous resistance to the traditional museum power structures: (1) international declarations and national policy statements; (2) strategies for the repatriation of cultural property; and (3) the establishment and maintenance of indigenous cultural centres. Strategies of resistance form an important part of the international and national context within which New Zealand museums have operated. They have generally influenced responses to local indigenous demands for museum reform.

---

[1] Also referred to as the politics of indigeneity.

1.1.2 Evolving Relationships and the Politics of Indigenous Recognition

The second research objective is to provide a conceptual framework within which the evolving relationships between indigenous peoples and museums can be documented and understood. The thesis focuses on the evolving relationships between Māori and museums in New Zealand and seeks to demonstrate how these relationships have mirrored the changing balance of power between indigenous peoples and the remnants of colonial systems of governance and administration.

1.1.3 Governance and the Politics of Indigenous Recognition

The third research objective is to document and analyse the evolving nature of Māori participation in museum governance and to investigate the proposition that without the reform of inherited museum governance models enabling appropriate recognition and participation of indigenous peoples in museum governance, museums will continue to perpetuate colonial assumptions of authority. Museum governance reform is occurring within, and is a part of, the broader pattern of indigenous resistance to the colonial practices of public museums that has intensified since the 1970s. This is referred to in this thesis as the politics of indigenous recognition.

It is argued that, without an appropriate governance relationship, indigenous peoples will not have the political power or authority within an institution to ensure a degree of control over the museum's strategic development and the management and use of the taonga Māori collections. Previous publications have already drawn attention to operational issues such as indigenous peoples' access to and co-management of collections, repatriation of collections, and appropriate processes through which indigenous peoples are able to determine and participate in the care, interpretation and exhibition of their own cultural heritage (e.g. Ames 1992, Clavir 2002, Clifford 1997, McLoughlin 1999, Simpson 1996). However, there has been little published research regarding the historical or contemporary participation of indigenous peoples in the governance of museums that

hold significant collections of their cultural property.[2] While recent studies by Tapsell and Whaanga have considered aspects of Māori participation in the governance of Te Papa Tongarewa The Museum of New Zealand and in Auckland War Memorial Museum,[3] there are no published studies on the evolving relationships of New Zealand regional trust museums with local Māori from colonial eras to modern times.

Regional trust museums are those museums, governed by charitable trusts, that have collections primarily derived from the region in which they are located and are primarily focused on the natural and cultural history and development of those regions.[4] The collections of taonga Māori held by these institutions are primarily, though not exclusively, derived from the iwi in the region in which the museum is located. Whereas in the past museums assumed prerogatives over these acquisitions, it is no longer possible to discuss a governance relationship with tangata whenua without recognising their cultural property rights and tribal mana as tangata whenua of the place where the museum is located. It is therefore the responsibility of each museum to determine a governance relationship with tangata whenua that recognises their cultural property rights and their mana as tangata whenua of the place where the museum is located. This thesis provides two regional trust museum case studies of institutions that have recently negotiated innovative governance models with the tangata whenua in their regions. The case studies provide the means of exploring the evolving nature of Māori participation in museum governance; the reasons why governance arrangements have been reviewed; those factors

[2] Note for example: Mattson 1997. Mattson does not include in her bibliography reference to any other substantial study in Canada or the United States relating to indigenous peoples' participation in museum governance. Mattson herself is more concerned with the production of knowledge in her case study institutions than an analysis of indigenous participation in governance, although some insight into this subject is a bi-product of her study.

[3] Tapsell's (1998) study addresses certain aspects of recent Māori participation in the governance of the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa and the Auckland War Memorial Museum. Tapsell's critique of the governance arrangements at Te Papa Tongarewa is confined to a commentary on the competing concepts of mana taonga and mana whenua/tangata whenua. Whaanga (1999) provides a detailed account of the history of the Taumata-ā-Iwi at Auckland War Memorial Museum.

[4] I exclude from the regional trust museum category the four metropolitan museums with major taonga Māori collections (Auckland War Memorial Museum, Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, Canterbury Museum, Otago Museum) and those regional museums that are entities within the organisational structure of their local territorial authority (including Rotorua Museum of Art and History and Aratoi (New Plymouth). The former have their governance arrangements determined by act of parliament and the latter do not have a trust board, but maintain relationships with tangata whenua through advisory committees and other processes.

that influence the outcome of governance review processes; and the characteristics of the new governance models and the opportunities and challenges they deliver.

1.2   Conceptual Framework:
          Towards a Politics of Indigenous Recognition

The central argument of this thesis is that museums have begun the transition from operating within the discourse of colonialism to engaging in the politics of indigenous recognition. It is argued that the politics of indigenous recognition requires the practice of 'mutual recognition' on a formally constituted 'common ground'.   Evidence of this transition at the international, national and local levels and, in particular, in the reform of governance structures is documented and analysed in the two case studies. The thesis will argue that these transformations have significance for the politics of cultural recognition beyond the museum for the wider society within which they operate. This section facilitates an understanding of this transition by outlining the nature of the discourses of colonialism and tolerance and the challenge to the dominant culture (Western democratic liberalism) inherent in the recognition of indigeneity.

1.2.1 Colonisation

When Europeans settled in North America, Australia and New Zealand they were met by peoples already living in these territories. Now referred to as the indigenous peoples of these lands, they were regarded by the colonisers as belonging to lesser civilisations. In response to the voracious demands of European settlers for land, imperial and settler governments either assumed or negotiated sovereignty in these territories and then chose to largely ignore the rights of the indigenous peoples (Fleras and Spoonley 1999: 2). If, as in Australia, the territory was considered *terra nullius*, the land was taken by the imperial power when sovereignty was claimed, without consideration of the indigenous peoples. Where the sovereignty of the indigenous peoples over their lands was recognised, as in New Zealand, the imperial power negotiated treaties with the indigenous peoples for cession of sovereignty, although in later years it often failed to observe the terms of the

treaties. When indigenous peoples resisted either of these colonising strategies, particularly when such resistance impeded the European settlers' acquisition of land, their opposition was met by force of arms.[5] From the time when an imperial power assumed sovereignty over their lands, colonisation has been and remains a lived reality for indigenous peoples (Tully 2000: 37).

A number of scholars have argued that the museum is an institution rooted in colonial practice and that it continues to perpetuate colonial structures of power or power relationships (Harrison 1997, McLoughlin 1993, Simpson 1996, Trigger 1988a). Understanding the nature of colonialism[6] is therefore essential to understanding the evolving relationships between indigenous peoples and museums.

1.2.2 Power/knowledge

Since Michael Foucault's seminal investigation into the nature of power[7], any discussion of colonialism begins with an acknowledgement of the intimate connections between power and knowledge and power and resistance (Dirks, Eley and Ortner 1994). In order to justify the subjugation of indigenous peoples the West had to create a hierarchical differentiation between themselves and the 'Other' (indigenous peoples). Dirks (1992:7) has argued that "the 'Other' has been created out of the collaboration of power and knowledge", that is, a collaboration between imperialism and the Enlightenment. While colonial expansion opened new territories for occupation, science opened its own territories of conquest, through cartography, geography, botany and anthropology. Both colonial expansion and scientific investigation required these new regions to be mapped,

---

[5] Tully (2000: 39-40) outlines three strategies used by settler governments to colonise indigenous peoples: (1) extinction of the indigenous peoples by population decline, intermarriage, and urbanisation; (2) extinction of the rights of indigenous peoples by crown sovereignty, policy of terra nullius, categorising peoples as 'primitive', military conquest, law making, cession by treaty; (3) "to transform indigenous peoples into members of the dominant society through re-education, incentives and socialisation so that they lose their attachment to their identity".

[6] Edward Said distinguishes between colonialism and imperialism as follows: "Imperialism means the practice , the theory and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distant territory; colonialism, which is almost always a consequence of imperialism, is the implanting of settlements on distant territory." (quoted in Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffen 1998: 46).

[7] The primary focus of Foucault's work is not so much the nature of power, rather a history of the different modes by which human beings are made subjects.

renamed and interpreted. Drawing on Foucault, Said demonstrated, in his elaboration of the notion of Orientalism, the connection between the expansion of this discourse during the nineteenth century and the "proliferation of disciplines, the univeralizing ambitions of many of these, and the systematizing classificatory approaches adopted" (Childs and Williams 1997: 100). With reference to Said's analysis, Smith (1999: 2) has argued that "the pursuit of knowledge is deeply embedded in the multiple layers of imperial and colonial practices". Smith continues:

> …research became institutionalised in the colonies, not just through academic disciplines, but through learned and scientific societies and scholarly networks. The transplanting of research institutions … from the imperial centres of Europe enabled local scientific interests to be organised and embedded in the colonial system.

Thus the museum, as an institution engaged in the production of knowledge, is implicated in the construction and perpetuation of the colonial discourse. Museum professionals exercise power in and through the institution and their authority to do so is derived from the larger society within which the institutions are embedded (Mattson 1997: 25).

1.2.3 Colonial Discourse

Power and knowledge are joined together in discourse.[8] The exercising of power through discourse is not constrained to repressive institutionalised apparatuses. Power is exercised at all levels of human relationships: "it belongs to the weak as well as to the strong; and it is constituted precisely within the relations between official and unofficial agents of social control and cultural production" (Dirks, Eley and Ortner 1994: 5). Bourdieu has drawn attention to the connection between classification and representation and the extent to which this makes institutions politically active:

---

[8] Discourse can be defined as: "a regularising collectivity; with discursive practices designed to exercise dominant control in society over a specifically identified field of objects. Discourse is a language that cloaks itself in the 'truth', a language characterised by its 'naturalness, authority, professionalism, assertiveness and antitheoretical directness' ". (Childs and Williams 1997: 229).

What is at stake in the struggles about the meaning of the social world is power over the classificatory schemes and systems which are the basis of representations of the groups and therefore their mobilization and demobilization. (quoted in: McLoughlin 1993: 9)

Social theory itself has been identified as a "language of power", "intimidating and disabling", privileging its users, giving authority to those who use it and silencing those who do not (Dirks, Eley and Ortner 1994: 18, Weaver 2000: 232). The irony here is that those whom social theorists often seek to empower through their deconstruction of the networks of power are frequently excluded, or exclude themselves, from participation in the theoretical discourse. This happens because, in order to participate in the theoretical dialogue, one must be inculcated into the language and concepts of the theoretical debate through a programme of academic training. This is one example of how the elitism of speakers of specialised professional languages, who close people out of dialogue about themselves, operates. The same thing can happen in the fields of medicine and law, where the language and practices of the coloniser predominate and exclude the language and cultural concepts of the colonised. On the other hand, some indigenous scholars, make little or no reference to or use of social theory in their analyses of historical or contemporary indigenous development issues, preferring to develop their own analytical frameworks based on their own cultural (indigenous) world-view (for example: Durie 1994 and Tapsell 1998).

Colonial discourse, in the form of Western political theory, both differentiates and assimilates the colonised subject, establishing difference and distance between the coloniser and the colonised. [9] Differentiation is maintained through a hierarchical interpretation of the attributes of 'civilisation', often posited in the binary categories of Western thought, such as religion/ritual, science/mythology, law/lore and history/oral

---

[9] "Generally speaking, at various points in history, different strands of Western political thought have not only been complicit with, but helped to justify, colonial expansion and imperial control over indigenous peoples and their territories. As much as political theory, especially in its liberal and social democratic variants, has emphasised universal human rights, equality before the law and individual and collective freedom, it has also explicitly denied such entitlements to indigenous peoples. …
Western political thought has often embodied a series of culturally specific assumptions and judgements about the relative worth of other cultures' ways of life, value systems, social and political institutions and ways of organising property." (Ivison, Patton and Sanders 2000: 1-2)

tradition. Assimilation of indigenous cultures is achieved through the control and application of Western political structures, religious, legal, educational and other institutional practices:

> Monocultural institutions … simply ignore or freeze out the cultures of those who do not belong to the majority. National cultures are evolved which are rooted in the values, systems and view-points of one culture only. Participation by minorities is conditional on their subjugating their own values and systems to those of 'the system' of the power culture. (From Puao-Te-Ata-Tū V. I p. 36, quoted in Sharp 1997: 212)

One outcome of this process of assimilation and appropriation has been the psychological, physical and intellectual fragmentation of indigenous cultures. It is argued that colonial discourse produced within indigenous peoples "the desire for acceptance and assimilation, as well as feelings of inadequacy, objectification and trauma" (Fanon, quoted in Childs and Williams 1997: 50). Tully (1995: 173) refers to this phenomenon as the "collective experiences of violated integrity". Many subsequent studies tend to support this conclusion.[10] For example, Smith describes colonialism as:

> …a process of systematic fragmentation which can still be seen in the disciplinary carve-up of the indigenous world: bones, mummies and skulls to museums, art work to private collectors, languages to linguistics, 'customs' to anthropologists, beliefs and behaviours to psychologists. To discover how fragmented this process was one needs only to stand in a museum, library or bookshop and ask where indigenous peoples are located. Fragmentation is not a phenomenon of postmodernism as many people claim. For indigenous peoples fragmentation has been the consequence of imperialism.
> (Smith 1999: 28)

This thesis attempts to document the historical shifts in configurations of power within museums and the communities they serve, from those who inherit power to those who would gain power, both Pākehā and Māori. Smith's description matches the findings of research in North America, Australia and New Zealand relating to the collection of

---

[10] See for example: Durie 1994: 27-40.

indigenous material culture and the establishment of museum collections by Europeans in colonial territories. European collectors became 'experts' on indigenous cultures. The Whanganui Regional Museum case study (Chapters Six and Seven) documents the role taken by Pākehā 'experts' in Māori culture in the development of that institution.

Smith also reinforces Fanon's observation about the extent to which some indigenous people, especially those who enter or are drawn into the colonial political, educational and religious systems, are drawn into the colonial culture, to the point where they become "estranged from their own cultural values" and "closely aligned to the colonisers in terms of their class interests, their values and their ways of thinking" (Smith 1999: 69-70, Povinelli 2002: 39). It has also been noted that the colonising power actively fosters "a co-opted native colonial elite" to assist in the administration of the colonial system (Tully 2000: 40).

Bhabha has argued that this imitation or mimicry of the colonisers by the colonised is a mixture of both deference and disobedience. As such, imitation itself becomes a site of resistance (Prasad 2003: 21). Bhabha uses the term 'ambivalence' to describe behaviour that is often characteristic of the colonised. Ambivalence, in this sense, is a continual fluctuation between wanting one thing and wanting its opposite, or the simultaneous attraction to and repulsion from something. This type of behaviour, argues Bhabha, characterises the relationship between the colonised and the coloniser, where complicity and resistance exist in a fluctuating relationship. [11] Colonial discourse "produces ambivalent subjects whose mimicry is never far from mockery" (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffen 1998: 12-13). Bhabha's analysis suggests that the colonised individual or collective has far greater agency than might have been supposed given the subordinate position occupied in the colonial power structure. This analysis provides a useful insight into the relationships local Māori have had with regional museums, particularly those elders who have been advisors and trustees and those who have deposited taonga Māori in museums.

---

[11] It should be noted that this is a two-way process where the coloniser is also alternately fascinated and then repulsed by the tangible and intangible elements of 'native' cultures.

1.2.4 Power/Resistance

Where there is power, there is resistance. One could equally assert: where there is resistance, there is power. Power is implicit in the act of resistance. Individuals both undergo and exercise power in any transaction or relationship. Foucault's analysis suggests that there will always be many points of resistance in the power network and that resistance will take many forms both covert and overt (Dirks, Eley and Ortner 1994: 8). Resistance can be actively expressed in engagement and/or disengagement, ranging from armed conflict to stories told about the coloniser within the colonised community. Referring to the colonisation of indigenous peoples, Tully (2000:39) observes:

> Indigenous peoples, although they comply and adapt (are *de facto* colonised), refuse to surrender their freedom of self-determination over their territories and continue to resist within the system as a whole as best they can.

In the museum context the resistance of indigenous peoples ranges from those who actively confront museum practices through governance reform processes or external public protest, to those who refuse to participate in museum activities and those who discreetly criticise the museum within their own community. Resistance arises at all points across the spectrum: from those who have long-term relationships with museums to those who observe museums from a distance. Those engaged in resistance may be competing for access to an already constituted system or may be seeking to transform the system itself. Tully outlines the ways in which internal indigenous resistance operates to counter colonial hegemony:

> The arts of resistance involved in struggles of freedom to modify the systems of internal colonialism from within are arguably more important and more effective than the complementary acts of legitimising and delegitimising struggles for freedom with which political theorists have been preoccupied. … They are the mostly quotidian acts of protecting, recovering, gathering together, keeping, revitalising, teaching and adapting entire forms of indigenous life that were nearly destroyed. … These practices of freedom on the rough ground of daily colonisation usually fall beneath the attention and interest of

Western political theorists .. Yet it is these unnoticed contextual struggles of human freedom in the face of techniques of government and strategies of legitimation that have brought the internal colonisation of indigenous peoples to the threshold of public attention and critical reflection in our time. (Tully 1995: 58-9)

Tully identifies the significance of change in public institutions, such as museums, that results from the consistent and accumulated resistance, on the part of indigenous peoples, to colonial practices. He also draws attention to indigenous processes of cultural maintenance as strategies of resistance. While museums can be regarded as complicit in the colonial processes against which indigenous peoples have resisted, it may also be argued that some institutions have, at various times in their development, provided a means for indigenous families and communities to pursue their own heritage maintenance strategies. For example, the placement of a waka in a local museum by the customary guardians can ensure the survival of a symbol of tribal mana. Had the waka not been placed in the museum at the end of its functional life it would have remained on the bank of the river and may eventually have disintegrated. In such a case the customary guardians have acted to ensure that the waka would remain accessible to the people as a symbol of mana. The deposit of the waka may also be seen as an attempt by tangata whenua to assert themselves into the museum - colonisation in reverse. In this sense the symbol of mana may be interpreted as a political statement within a bastion of colonial authority.

1.2.5 Colonialism and Museums

"The museum's mandate - to collect, preserve, interpret and educate - is inherently an assumption of power", a power to appropriate, to define and limit the meaning of objects and culture (McLoughlin 1993: 2). This assumption of the right to determine what should be preserved was originally derived from the responsibility of salvage, the notion that indigenous cultures would not survive without intervention. In assuming this responsibility the coloniser also appropriated history and symbols from the indigenous culture with which to construct a national identity for all citizens of the newly created nation state.

Colonial museum practice is concerned with defining and identifying 'authentic' indigenous peoples and material cultures. 'Authentic' indigenous peoples are generally identified by museums as those who lived in the territory before European settlement or who bridged the pre- and post-settlement periods. This classification often denies authenticity to contemporary expressions and practices that are not seen to be consistent with earlier expressions and practices. The absence of any substantial representation of contemporary (post-1930) Māori expressions and practices in New Zealand museums is indicative of the extent to which colonial tradition survives in these institutions. McLoughlin argues that museums have romanticised and mythologised indigenous peoples and that these myths have become the reality for the majority of the colonising population. Museums have been complicit in essentialising indigenous cultures, rather than portraying the evolving, complex and hybridised indigenous cultures that continue to struggle to survive, renew, develop and assert difference (McLoughlin 1993: 8).

In attempting to understand the museum as a place/space where cultures interact in a colonial context, the museum can be described as a 'contact zone', a 'border zone' or a 'boundary zone'. Clifford (1997: 204), borrowing from Mary Louise Pratt, describes the contact zone as a place where "geographically and historically separated groups establish ongoing relations. These are not relations of equality, even though processes of mutual exploitation and appropriation may be at work". Clifford (ibid.: 207) suggests that the negotiations that occur between peoples in these contact zones or borders are "historically structured in dominance", but that institutions such as museums "that once articulated the core or high ground now appear as sites of passage and contestation" (ibid.: 210). Museums, functioning as contact zones, are places of "hybrid possibility and political negotiation, sites of exclusion and struggle", "places of encounter and passage" (ibid.: 212-13). Clifford also considers the role of indigenous cultural centres/museums as contact zones, as sites of "resistance and mobilisation", responding to "histories of exclusion and silencing" by projecting "a vision of struggle, survival, renewal and ongoing difference" (ibid.: 213, 216).

Tully has also written about the contact zone, though he refers to it as "common ground":

> The politics of cultural recognition takes place on the intercultural 'common ground', as I shall call the labyrinth composed of overlap, interaction, and negotiation of cultures over time. Of course mutual recognition is not rendered unproblematic by the reconceptualisation and classification of the ground on which we stand, for encounters on the common ground are shot through with inequality, misrecognition, domination and strife. (Tully 1995: 14)

Before elaborating further on the nature of mutual recognition on the 'common ground', this discussion turns to a consideration of the politics of recognition, the discourse of tolerance and the politics of indigeneity.

1.2.6 The Politics of Cultural Recognition

Loss of cultural identity causes a deep sense of dislocation and alienation. The survival of culture is as important as the survival of the individual. This is the basis of group rights. A wide range of 'voices' are claiming recognition within nation-states, ranging from nationalist groups and immigrant ethnic minorities to indigenous peoples (Tully 1995: 2). All of these claimants assert that the dominant culture threatens the survival of their cultural practices by normalising its own practices in public institutions (ibid.: 5).

Underlying these claims is the aspiration to live in accordance with one's own culture even if it involves engagement in a struggle for liberty. The central focus of this thesis is an examination of the extent to which museums as public institutions are able to respond to the politics of indigenous recognition and provide avenues for genuine engagement with indigenous peoples. Do these institutions merely reflect the philosophies and practices of the dominant culture or are they actively engaged in exploring the potential of the 'common ground' to allow other cultures to operate according to their own cultural practices? Is this engagement driven by a coherent set of principles or by an adaptive survival strategy? Indigenous peoples have been active agents in challenging the practices of mainstream institutions and this agency amounts to a strategy of transforming internal

colonialism from within (Tully 2000: 42). The transformation of museums is occurring as part of this phenomenon.

The prevailing liberal democratic approach to cultural diversity is founded on a universal rather than a particularist perspective, 'a Rousseauean politics of recognition' that is:

> simultaneously suspicious of all social differentiation and receptive to the homogenizing … tendencies of a politics of the common good, where the common good reflects the universal identity of all citizens. (Gutmann 1994: 6)

Democratic liberals argue that cultural diversity can be protected by the recognition of universal human rights and equality can be sustained by political neutrality (particularly the separation of church and state), the right to retain cultural practices as a private matter and democratic accountability (Gutmann 1994: 10, Poole 1999: 118). Young (1995: 173) notes that in the New Zealand context:

> Many whites reacted to assertions of Māori specificity with a liberal individualist response. The political institutions of modern representative democracy do not or should not differentiate citizens.

Gutmann agrees with Taylor's (1994: 38) conclusion that "with the politics of difference, what we are asked to recognise is the unique identity of this individual or group, their distinctness from everyone else". The politics of recognition, he argues, should combine the liberal democratic notion of the protection of universal human rights and the acknowledgement of the needs of individuals as members of specific cultural groups.[12] Furthermore, he claims that liberal democratic states are obliged to protect minority cultures:

> This requirement of political recognition of cultural particularity extended to all individuals - is compatible with a form of universalism that counts the culture and cultural context valued by individuals as among their basic interests. (Gutmann 1994: 5)

---

[12] See also Pettit (2000).

In contrast to the individualism propounded by liberalism, communitarians argue that a culture, collectively, is more than the sum of its parts and that cultural rights cannot be reduced to individual rights. Collective rights include the right to maintain the language, religion, genealogy, intellectual and cultural property, and cultural history of a culture. These are claimed to be essential to the maintenance of any culture (Johnston 1995: 179-186).

Since World War II, the predominantly white settler nation-states of North America and Australasia have faced the challenge of developing policies and practices in response to increasing cultural plurality within their borders. In particular, nation-states are having to engage with immigrant communities that have relocated, but who resist the pressure to assimilate into the dominant culture. This phenomenon is generally referred to as multiculturalism. The dominant cultures have responded to this challenge in the same way they respond to all challenges to the dominant discourse of democratic liberalism: Nation states tend to give the appearance of embracing cultural diversity as a positive and enriching development for the nation, while in reality they do little more than engage in the discourse of tolerance. However, by recognising multiculturalism as an official doctrine, the dominant culture has also found a spurious rationale for treating indigenous peoples as just one minority group among many.

1.2.7 The Discourse of Tolerance

Tolerance is defined in different ways by scholars writing about racism and prejudice. Tolerance can range from forbearance, enduring or putting up with others, to a fair and objective attitude towards others and even a full accepting and valuing of others (Robinson, Witenburg & Sanson 2001: 73-4). Hage understands tolerance to be closer to the first of these definitions and argues that multicultural tolerance "should be understood as a spatial management of cultural difference while reproducing the structuring of this difference around a dominant culture" (Hage 1994: 19). In his analysis of the discourse of tolerance Hage argues that the increasing tolerance of multiculturalism by liberal

democracies indicates that the dominant culture has reassessed its ability to dominate, recognising the capacity of the dominated to resist and even challenge their domination. While tolerance, according to Hage, "reproduces the same relation of power", it also indicates that there has been "a change in the balance of forces between the dominant and the dominated, in the interest of the latter" (ibid.: 27). The dominant culture retains the same relation of power with the minorities by assuming the power to accept and position the 'Other' within their sphere of influence (Povinelli 2002: 39). In claiming the power to tolerate, the power culture also retains the power to be intolerant. It does not imply that multiculturalism is a discourse that should replace the colonial discourse of the dominant culture[13]; it is not a disinterested acceptance of cultural diversity (Hage 1994: 28-32). Therefore, the acceptance of multiculturalism is an adaptive strategy, signalling the shift from intolerant racism to tolerant racism. Hage (ibid.: 33-34) concludes that intolerant racism:

> deliniates a political economy of otherness through an ensemble of practices and techniques aimed at regulating the acceptance, positioning and valuing of otherness - which is also the practice of creating the Other as value. It is in this sense that the thematic of tolerance reveals itself to be the thematic of 'governmentality' as Foucault defined it. …tolerant racism is the racism of the government of Otherness.

It is clear from Hage's analysis that there is no advantage to be gained by indigenous peoples or other groups from a policy of multiculturalism alone, because this does not bring about a real change in the relationship between the dominant and the dominated within the nation-state.[14] Another danger of a policy of multiculturalism, in the absence of an indigenous policy, is that it does not allow for appropriate status to be given to indigenous peoples. In fact it becomes the new rationale for not differentiating indigenous peoples, because such a policy argues that all minority peoples should have the same individual human rights as any other individual in that society. Any argument for the recognition of the 'collective rights' of indigenous peoples or to recognise the status of

---

[13] Jane Kelsey (quoted in Fleras 1999:209) states: "Colonial leopards do not change their spots; they just stalk their prey in a different way."
[14] See also Fleras 1999: 189.

indigenous peoples as First Nations peoples with special rights, is seen to be inconsistent with a policy of liberal democratic multiculturalism. Indigenous peoples have had to look elsewhere for recognition of their indigeneity.

1.2.8 Indigeneity

> Indigeneity as discourse and practice pivots around the politicisation of indigenous peoples as 'First Nations' whose collective and inherent rights to self determination of jurisdictions pertaining to land, identity, and political voice have never been extinguished but prevail in international law as a basis for entitlement and engagement. (Fleras 1999: 187)

During the second half of the twentieth century the world witnessed the emergence of indigenous voices, internationally, nationally and at community level, as indigenous peoples sought to engage in the politics of indigenous recognition. The purpose of this engagement has been to reclaim rights and reassert a fundamental relationship with the land so often alienated by the colonisers.

The difference between human rights and indigenous rights is that human rights are generally defined, in international conventions and the laws of nation-states, as individual rights, while indigenous rights are claimed as self-determining collective or group rights (Thornbury 2002: 2-5). Liberal political theory has responded in three ways to the claims of indigenous peoples for cultural recognition. While some argue that there should be no change to their individualist and non-interventionist perspective, thus denying the recognition of distinct cultural group rights, others have explored the potential for reshaping liberalism to take account of these claims, but only to the extent of the limits given by liberal conceptions of equality and autonomy. A third group argues that a "reshaping of the conceptual framework of political theory is required in order to do justice to indigenous claims" (Ivison, Patton and Sanders 2000: 5). There appears to be a growing acceptance by political theorists that being able to maintain one's culture is essential to maintaining one's sense of self and well-being and that peoples have the right to maintain their cultures; therefore, nation-states have an obligation to actively protect

that right (Rowlands 2002).[15] However, when indigenous peoples assert their claims for collective indigenous rights, they find themselves not only in opposition to those who guard the sanctity of the nation-state, but there is also a backlash from the wider community "who characterise themselves as competitors in rights and resources or claim against 'privileges' assigned to one group over another" (Thornbury 2002: 14).[16]

In order to move towards a conceptual reshaping of liberal political theory it is necessary to define indigeneity. Indigeneity consists of the following elements: (1) the inherent rights of indigenous peoples to aboriginal title; (2) the relationship of indigenous peoples to their lands and territories; (3) the history of indigenous peoples' relationships with settlers; and (4) the cultural differences between indigenous peoples and Europeans. Stated in less positive terms, the claims of indigenous peoples arise because of the denial of their sovereignty (including the sovereignty of many peoples who signed treaties), the dispossession of their lands and the marginalisation of their cultural practices (Ivison, Patton and Sanders 2000: 9-10). While there has been much debate about how to define indigenous peoples, it is now widely accepted that indigenous peoples are distinguished by at least seven characteristics: precedent habitation, historical continuity, attachment to a particular territory, a sense of community, a distinctive culture, a cultural gap between the dominant groups in a state and the indigenous peoples, the colonial context and self identification as indigenous.

Indigenous peoples frequently link their intellectual and material cultural heritage to the establishment and maintenance of indigenous cultural identity. For some this heritage is seen as the essence of their distinctiveness (Thornbury 2002: 392). The power to control heritage resources has become increasingly significant in the politics of recognition (Rowlands 2002: 107-9). This realisation has focused the interest of indigenous peoples, to a much greater extent than previously, on the collections of indigenous cultural heritage

---

[15] Brownlie (1992: 37-9) notes that there are three types of group right that are not protected by protecting individual rights: (1) claims to maintain the cultural and linguistic integrity of communities, (2) protection of land rights in traditional territories, (3) the political and legal principle of self-determination.

[16] Fleras (1999: 206) quoting Richard Mulgan: "The issue threatens to polarise the country as the Māori seek to recover lost power and land, and as the Pākehā become increasingly intolerant of what they see as unrealistic and impertinent demands. Voices of reason and moderation become harder to hear amid the rising clamour of intolerance and prejudice."

held by museums and, consequently, it has increased their interest in museum governance. The fact that indigenous peoples have had such a struggle to regain control of their heritage resources throughout the twentieth century bears witness to the extent to which they remain colonised peoples, for it is not just the recovery of the material objects that is at stake, it is also the recovery of a history (Weaver 2000: 229).

1.2.9 Mutual Recognition

The challenge for nation-states, and for public institutions within the nation-state, is to move from a relationship of assimilation to one of accommodation, or reconciliation, with indigenous peoples, based on the principles of mutual recognition, continuity and consent (Tully 2000: 41). Mutual recognition is the acknowledgement of a people's independence, their right to be self-defining and self-determining. The principle of continuity is the recognition of a people's right not only to continue to exist but to be actively protected. The principle of consent assures people that they retain their rights in relation to customary lands and resources, including cultural resources. They retain the right to give consent and to withdraw consent. By adhering to these principles indigenous recognition can be attained on the common ground created by the negotiating parties.

One context in which the concept of mutual recognition has been articulated is the *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples* in Canada.[17] The Royal Commission argued that "the concept of renewal expresses … the blend of historical reality and creative sensitivity that should characterise future relations among Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people". They argued that such renewed relationships should be based on four principles: mutual recognition, mutual respect, sharing and mutual responsibility. These principles define a process that can sustain renewed relationships. This continuous process can be conceived as a circle moving from recognition to respect, from respect to sharing and from sharing to responsibility. As the cycle is repeated, the meanings associated with each principle change subtly to reflect a deeper level of understanding. The Royal

---

[17] *Report on the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples* Volume 1, Part Three, Chapter 16: The Principles of a Renewed Relationship. This document was only available to the author as a printout from a web site. The following quotes from this source can not be attributed to the original pagination of the report.

Commission argues that "relationships that embody these principles are, in the broadest sense of the word, partnerships."

The Royal Commission defines mutual recognition as indigenous and non-indigenous peoples relating to one another as equals, co-existing side by side and governing themselves according to their own laws and institutions. Mutual recognition is said to consist of three elements: equality, co-existence and self-government. Mutual respect is identified as an essential prerequisite for healthy and durable relationships. Particular emphasis is given to "the quality of courtesy". Courtesy is the "consideration and esteem extended to people whose languages, cultures and ways differ from your own but who are valued fellow-members of the larger communities to which we belong." When an attitude of cultural disrespect prevails in a public institution, cultural difference will be seen as a deficiency or disability. Public institutions should examine their organisational structures and practices "to ensure that they embody the basic consideration and esteem that are owed to Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal languages and cultures alike."

The third principle, sharing and reciprocity, is the giving and receiving of benefits that nourish and sustain social relationships. Sharing and reciprocity bind communities together and can also bind peoples in the same way. In the institutional context this can mean facilitating access to the resources that are essential for people to manage their own cultural resources in their own way. Indigenous participation in governance ensures participation in strategic planning and the allocation of resources.

Public institutions, including museums, can become a common ground if they recognise these principles. However, the common ground is only maintained if the principles continue to operate at the levels of governance, management and professional practice. Transition to the common ground can also be aided by an awareness of certain prerequisites.

Before negotiating relationships on the common ground, the language in which negotiations are to be undertaken must be considered.[18] In the past the power culture has consistently restated the claims of the colonised for cultural recognition in its own language and cultural conventions (Tully 1995: 54).[19] For example, in the negotiation of treaty grievances the dominant culture sets the parameters and conditions within which the negotiations will be conducted.[20] The dominant culture restates the claims of indigenous peoples in a way that does not challenge the hegemony of the nation-state or of the particular institution engaging in negotiation and will often seek an accommodation that recognises a range of indigenous or group rights in exchange for surrendering or denying the right to complete self-determination (Tully 1995: 34-44, Tully 2000: 41). This strategy has been applied by nation-states in the negotiation of international conventions and constitutional arrangements and by public institutions in the reform of governance structures.

In order to establish a lasting basis for negotiations, different modes of participating in the dialogue must be recognised, for example, the acceptance of the use of indigenous languages as a mode of communication and the use of oral tradition as evidence in judicial or tribunal proceedings to resolve grievances or establish rights. Tully (1995: 111) emphasises the importance of nurturing the attitude of diversity awareness "by enabling the interlocutors to regard cases differently and change their way of looking at things" (ibid.: 111), and he argues that the aim of negotiations over cultural recognition:

> is not to reach agreement on universal principles and institutions, but to bring negotiators
> to recognise their differences and similarities, so that they can reach agreement on a form

---

[18] "Each negotiator participates in his or her language, mode of speaking or listening, form of reaching agreement, and way of representing the people, or peoples, for whom they speak." (Tully 1995: 129).

[19] Jackson (2000: 200) draws attention to the way in which Māori convey core cultural values through the use of concepts such as mana atua, mana whenua, mana tangata, manaakitanga, and kaitiakitanga. Simple translations of these terms do not suffice to convey the complexity or centrality of the observance of these concepts to cultural maintenance.

[20] Each people will have their own negotiating processes. "The negotiators must turn to their diverse constituents, explain what has transpired, listen to their objections in their terms, reach agreement in the appropriate way on an acceptable response, and then return to the negotiations." (Tully 1995: 130). This is the way in which the Māori negotiators operated when negotiating the new governance arrangements with Whanganui Regional Museum, as described in Chapters Six and Seven.

of association that accommodates their differences in appropriate institutions and their similarities in shared institutions. (Tully 1995: 151)

Maaka and Fleras (2000: 97) argue that acceptance of difference is not enough. Recognition of indigeneity should be facilitated by "constructive engagement":

a more flexible approach that emphasises engagement over entitlement, constitutionalism over contract, relationship over rights, interdependence over opposition, co-operation over competition, reconciliation over restitution and power sharing over domination.

1.2.10 Treaty Relationships

The particular circumstances under which indigenous peoples are engaging in the politics of recognition in each nation-state have important implications for the level of political power/resistance that can be exercised within it. Thus, for example, the existence of the Treaty of Waitangi between Māori and the Crown in New Zealand has led to a level of engagement that might not otherwise have occurred. Durie (2000) argues that there is substantial evidence that the New Zealand government has recognised Māori indigenous rights both in terms of provision for Māori political representation and in a range of statutes passed by the New Zealand Parliament since 1975 when the Waitangi Tribunal was established. [21] Relationships between iwi (including tribes and urban Māori collectives) and the government are increasingly being negotiated within a Treaty of Waitangi framework and both historical and contemporary Treaty grievances between iwi and the Crown (the government of New Zealand) are being resolved through the Waitangi Tribunal dispute resolution process or by direct negotiations with the government. However, less attention has been given to the negotiation of ongoing relationships between iwi and the New Zealand government, and between iwi and local communities of interest within a Treaty of Waitangi framework. Although only tentative discussions have been held to consider the future shape of New Zealand's constitutional arrangements, there

---

[21] Tully (1995: 137) makes a similar observation in relation to Canada: "In this post-imperial dawn, treaties and agreements have begun to take on some of their former lustre and the Crown has started to discern its fiduciary responsibility in the relationship of protection".

has been increasing consideration of New Zealand becoming a republic and moving away from the constitutional ties to the British Crown. These are issues that have important implications for the maintenance of Māori rights.

It should also be noted that the negotiation of rights within a treaty framework is potentially problematic if the partners to the treaty do not have a mutual understanding of the provisions of the treaty. The property rights of Māori (hapū rights, collective rights) as the indigenous peoples of New Zealand, as recognised in the Treaty of Waitangi, were not established by the Treaty, they were affirmed by the Treaty, and in this sense they are not Treaty rights but indigenous rights; such rights are being progressively codified at the international level and recognised by national legal jurisdictions, including New Zealand. Unless Māori indigenous rights are recognised by the government and other public institutions, the Treaty will continue to function primarily as a justification for the colonisation of Māori, rather than as the basis for negotiating ongoing relationships that recognise Māori mana motuhake.

The intention of the Treaty of Waitangi, from the Māori perspective, is to recognise the continuing sovereignty (rangatiratanga) of Māori hapū and the ceding of the right to govern to the Crown as the basis of a relationship that would ensure the rights of each within a newly created nation-state. The challenge facing New Zealand society is to determine the extent to which the Treaty framework can provide the basis for ongoing relationships between Māori and local communities of interest (including museums). In this context it is important to acknowledge the coexistence of tribal ethnicity and an all-inclusive Māori ethnicity in New Zealand:

> The notion of Māori as a collectivity is a post-contact social construct. Before colonisation Māori saw themselves solely as a tribal peoples. While there was a considerable range of tribal and regional 'diversity', there was clearly identifiable cultural homogeneity, expressed in a commonality of language and customary practices. … As a result of this history there are two ethnicities, namely tribal ethnicity and an all-inclusive Māori ethnicity. What needs to be kept in mind when considering tino rangatiratanga as a social

reality as opposed to a political philosophy is that the two ethnicities co-exist symbiotically and in a state of tension with each other. (Maaka and Fleras 2000: 107)

There has been considerable debate about whether the governance of the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa should formally recognise the tribe within whose customary territory the museum stands or whether, because it is a national institution, the governance relationship should be with all Māori. On the other hand, regional museums, at least since the 1980s, have engaged in the less complicated challenge of renegotiating their relationships with the tribes in whose customary territories the institutions are located. This thesis explores these issues and the extent to which the Treaty of Waitangi provides the framework within which New Zealand museums engage in the politics of indigenous recognition.

Durie argues that the Treaty of Waitangi was intended to promote the well-being of Māori, including the active protection of cultural identity. He argues that a secure cultural identity depends on good access to te ao Māori (the Māori world) including heritage resources, and this access is dependent on Māori control over these resources:

> It is one thing to preserve a culture within the hallowed halls of academia, or public museums, but it is another to preserve a culture within the hearts, minds and day to day lives of men, women and children. In other words cultural identity is about living a culture, which in turn requires having ready access to that culture. …
> It is quite inconsistent with the Treaty of Waitangi, and with modern understandings of the rights of indigenous peoples, that Māori resources, whether they be physical, cultural or social, should not be under Māori control. Indeed the loss of control is widely regarded as a major cause of alienation.[22]

The Royal Commission on Social Policy (1988) recognised three Treaty principles: partnership, participation and protection. This thesis explores the implications of these principles in the context of Māori participation in museum governance. These principles

---

[22] Typescript of unpublished evidence prepared by Mason Durie for the Wai 262 Waitangi Tribunal Claim (2002).

require public institutions to make provision for the mutual recognition, continuity and consent of hapū Māori within their governance structures and to ensure that their governance, management and operations actively protect the interests of Māori individuals and hapū. These principles also require public institutions to be culturally safe (kawa whakaruruhau) places for Māori as museum trustees, managers, practitioners and clients. Ramsden (2002) argues that it is only by recognition of the inherent power relationships between the coloniser and colonised, historical and contemporary, that public institutions can move towards forming effective partnerships with hapū Māori and the delivery of culturally safe services to Māori.

1.3 Thesis Outline

Following this Introduction, Chapter Two provides an outline and discussion of the research methods employed in this research. Together these chapters provide an introduction to the purpose, conceptual framework and research process of the thesis.

Chapters Three, Four and Five provide both an introduction to indigenous cultural property rights and the international and national context for the institutional (local) case studies elaborated in Chapters Six to Nine. Chapter Three considers three sites of indigenous resistance to mainstream museum control of indigenous cultural property: declarations of indigenous rights, strategies for the repatriation of cultural property (including domestic legislation, treaty negotiations and moral suasion) and the development of indigenous cultural centres. Together these strategies sustain the argument that indigenous agency has begun to wrest control of indigenous cultural property from mainstream museums to indigenous peoples. Chapter Four traces the evolving relationships between museums and Māori at the national level since 1970, with particular reference to the socio-political context, the *Te Māori* exhibition, Māori advocacy for Māori control of Māori heritage, changing attitudes within the museum sector and the role of national museum organisations and Te Papa National Services. This chapter emphasises the dialogue that has developed between museums and Māori, particularly in the post-*Te Māori* period. National bicultural initiatives and developments in institutional policy and

professional practice are identified. Included in this dialogue has been an increasing emphasis on the importance of Māori participation in museum governance. The following chapters focus on this issue.

Chapter Five is an analysis of Māori participation in the governance of regional charitable trust museums, identifying innovative governance models that have led to increased participation of tangata whenua in museum governance. A bicultural museum governance continuum is outlined and two types of innovative governance model are identified: mana whenua models and regional tangata whenua models. Both types of model are based on the recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi in the museum constitution and provision for iwi representation on the trust board.

Chapters Six and Seven provide a detailed case study of the evolving relationships between Whanganui Regional Museum and the tangata whenua of the Whanganui region, with particular emphasis on Māori participation in the governance of that institution. Chapters Eight and Nine provide a detailed case study of the evolving relationships between the Tairāwhiti Museum, Gisborne, and the tangata whenua of the Tairāwhiti region, with particular emphasis on Māori participation in the governance of that institution. These case studies are based on archival research and interviews with museum trustees and the museum directors, providing both historical and contemporary analysis of the evolving relationships between the museums and tangata whenua. Significant changes are documented in the types of Māori participation in museum governance, particularly in response to recent changes in Māori political structures.

Finally, Chapter Ten provides a discussion of the major conclusions drawn from the study.

CHAPTER TWO

RESEARCH METHODS

2.0 Introduction

This chapter outlines the research methods used in this thesis and considers a range of methodological issues. A combination of three research methods were used: literature review, archival research, and interviews with key informants. These methods result in three intersecting narratives: synthesis based on secondary sources, historical narrative, and contemporary narrative. By integrating the three sources, conclusions and propositions can be confidently drawn and subjected to further investigation.

Qualitative research recognises that the process of research is emergent rather than tightly prefigured:

> All inquiry proceeds through a complex non-linear process of inductive, deductive, inspiration, and just plain old hard thinking. (Rossman and Rallis 1998: 10; see also Denzin and Lincoln 2003)

The qualitative researcher is reflexive; conscious of his/her own role in the research endeavour:

> Unlike the allegedly objective social scientist, the qualitative researcher values his unique perspective as a source of understanding rather than something to be cleansed from the study. (Rossman and Rallis 1998: 9)

My academic background in archaeology and my work experience as a museum curator with responsibilities for taonga Māori collections, as an Advisory Officer to the Cultural Conservation Advisory Council and finally as an academic teaching Museum Studies in the School of Māori Studies Te Pūtahi-ā-Toi at Massey University, all contribute to the

way I have constructed and undertaken this research. I have worked in and around the museum sector in New Zealand since 1979 and have observed and participated in many of the changes that have happened in the sector during that period. This experience has undoubtedly influenced the way in which I have interpreted the changing relationships between Māori and museums since the 1970s.

The particular intention of this research project was to generate greater understanding of the evolving relationships between New Zealand museums and Māori. It provides an historical perspective on relationships and informs contemporary initiatives and decision making (Rossman and Rallis, 1998: 3-11).

The research methodology employed in this thesis has been informed and guided by relevant publications and discussions over a period of years with my colleagues in Te Pūtahi-ā-Toi, School of Māori Studies, Massey University, about Kaupapa Māori and Māori centred research. In recent years I have had extensive discussions with my colleagues, Huia Jahnke and Dr Monty Soutar (both of whom teach research methods), about the politics and practice of working with Māori and I have learned a great deal from their observations about their own research experiences. Other scholars whose work has been influential in shaping my approach to working with Māori research participants include Bishop (1996, 1997), Bishop and Glynn (1999), Te Awekotuku (1991), and Smith (1999). These authors emphasise the need to apply research methods that are appropriate and relevant to Māori. As Jahnke and Taiapa (2003:42) state:

> Māori research occurs in a cultural environment which is spiritually and tribally based, where emphasis is placed on people, whānau and hapū, and where principles such as generosity, reciprocity and co-operation abound.

Durie has argued that Māori centred research locates Māori people as the focus of the research, taking account of Māori cultural knowledge, values, realities or needs. He has drawn attention to the need to allow research frameworks to emerge from the cultural context in which the research is taking place, consistent with the cultural world view of

the research participants (Durie 1998a, see also Cunningham 1998). These approaches have developed from an awareness of Māori mistrust and suspicion of Pākehā motivations and methods of research involving Māori. Smith has argued that Māori centred research "is about bringing to the centre and privileging indigenous values, attitudes and practices" (Smith 1999:28). Important in such an approach is the need to listen and not impose external understandings on the actions and motivations of the research participants. It has been an awareness of the need to acknowledge the cultural context in which this thesis research project has taken place that has determined the structure and emphasis of the work. Māori concepts, such as taonga tuku iho, kaitiakitanga, whānau, hapū, mana and rangatiratanga have emerged as keys to the understanding of relationships between Māori and museums.

I deliberately attempt to allow the voices of the participants in the development of relationships between local Māori and the case study museums to have a presence in the narrative. Much that has been written about these relationships excludes the voices of the participants, both historical and contemporary, from the telling of the story. It is the voices of the participants that provide the substance of this history. Where the record allows individuals to articulate their motivations, rationalisations, prejudices, and visions, these enrich the narrative and introduce to the reader the record that confronts the researcher. This presence forces both researcher and reader to confront the reality of individuals, families, and communities and other interest groups and their role in the development and maintenance of these relationships, rather than keep them hidden behind the anonymity of overview and generalisation.[1] Sometimes the complexity of motivations can only be comprehended in the close analysis of the written or spoken statement and the sequence of events that emerges from the historical perspective.

Having made the case for the inclusion of the voices of the participants I am also conscious that this still necessitates a process of selection (of inclusion and exclusion) and

---

[1] It has been important to systematically record the names of those who have maintained the relationships between these institutions and local Māori. While the writer recognises some of the whānau, hapū and iwi relationships between these individuals, Māori scholars who know these whānau, hapū and iwi well will recognise other relationships and be able to extend the analysis.

to this extent the researcher still controls the nature of the historical narrative and analysis presented to the reader, that is, the representation of the participants. I am aware that some participants are more fully represented in the historical record than others and this is undoubtedly true of the representation of the indigenous voice in the history of public museums. However, this research suggests that in the New Zealand context, Māori have taken a more active part in the development of some museums than has been accounted for in the limited historical accounts published to date and that the official and other records of these institutions provide a rich source of evidence of this. Evidence of the development of these relationships is to be found in a wide range of documentary sources within institutions. Evidence is also available from living descendants of past participants through oral history techniques. The use of these sources is discussed below.

2.1 Literature Review

Part One of this thesis is based primarily on a synthesis of published sources. A wide range of secondary sources have been consulted during this study, including the literature relating to indigenous peoples and the United Nations; indigenous peoples and museums in North America and Australia; indigenous cultural centres in North America and Australia; the colonisation of New Zealand; the history of museums in New Zealand; and the evolving relationships between Māori and museums. While the review of the New Zealand literature is thorough, the review of North American and Australian literature is deliberately selective and relates to selected topics and institutions.

Literature on the evolving relationships between museums and indigenous peoples has increased significantly since the 1980s, primarily in the form of journal articles and conference proceedings, although a small number of books has also been published. The number of substantial research projects on the subject is very limited. In the New Zealand context there are only a small number of doctoral and masters theses relating to the evolving relationships between Māori and museums.[2] There is also only a small number of

---

[2] Doctoral theses focusing specifically on Māori and museums include Tapsell (1998) and Cameron (2000). MA theses relating to Māori and museums include Clarke (19980, Pishief (1998), Tapsell (1995), Whaanga (1999), Hanham (2001), Butler, P. (1996).

New Zealand museum histories available and those that have been published are celebratory in nature, rather than critical historical analyses. None of these institutional histories provides a detailed account of the relationships between the institution and tangata whenua.

During a period of sabbatical leave in 1997 I visited the U'mista Cultural Centre in Alert Bay, British Columbia. While I was a Fellow in Museum Studies at the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, USA, from January to March 2001, I was able to visit the Makah Research and Cultural Center at Neah Bay, Washington State. The opportunity to speak to staff and investigate the facilities and exhibitions in each of these institutions assisted significantly in developing the discussion of each institution presented in Chapter Three.

2.2 Case Studies

Chapters Seven to Ten of this thesis present two institutional case studies: Whanganui Regional Museum, Whanganui (west coast, North Island) and Tairāwhiti Museum, Gisborne (east coast, North Island). Each case study presents the historical and contemporary development of relationships between the museum and local Māori (tangata whenua) of the region in which the museum is located. The case studies focus in particular on the participation of tangata whenua in the governance of each institution. Whanganui Regional Museum and Tairāwhiti Museum were selected as the case study institutions because both institutions have recently completed a comprehensive governance review process and adopted a new governance structure that provides for a significant change in the nature and extent of Māori representation. Both case studies place the evolution of Māori participation in the institution's governance within the wider historical development of the institution and are written using both archival research and interviews undertaken with trustees, the director and others who have observed the recent governance review processes. These are the first such accounts of the evolving relationships between regional trust museums and tangata whenua to have been researched and written.

Stake (2003: 136-139) differentiates between intrinsic and instrumental case studies. Intrinsic case studies are those undertaken because the researcher desires a deeper understanding of the particular case. Instrumental case studies are those in which the particular case is of secondary interest, while the primary interest is in developing understanding of a more general nature. Where a researcher "simultaneously has several interests, particular and general, there is no line distinguishing intrinsic case study from instrumental; rather a zone of combined purpose separates them" (Stake 2003: 137). The case studies in this thesis are in this zone of combined purpose. The case studies are important in their own right in understanding the development of each institution, and the context of each case is different, leading to different outcomes. However, there are also common issues that arise in each case that are instructive in understanding the evolving relationships between museums and Māori throughout New Zealand. The challenge for any researcher is to find the balance between the atypical and the generalisable features of case studies. In this study it is the atypicality of the outcomes in each case that leads to the conclusion that while these innovative governance models are based on similar principles, the form of each set of constitutional arrangements depends primarily on local factors.

2.2.1   Archival Research

Archival research was undertaken at both case study institutions during 2001-2. Both institutions provided access to trust board meeting minutes, trust board sub-committee meeting minutes, directors' reports, annual general meeting minutes, annual reports, newsletters, correspondence, newspaper cutting books and other documents relating to the history of the institution. While trust board minutes and directors' reports provide a basic account of museum activities, they do not always provide an adequate understanding of the way in which Māori advisors and even Māori board members have functioned in the trust board and other contexts. These records were read with care, to avoid reading more into the record than could be sustained by the totality of the evidence. The minutes of trust board meetings for both case study institutions generally provide only a basic record of the meetings, rarely providing an insight into discussion or debate.

In order to determine the informal influence of Māori trustees outside the context of trust board meetings, it would also be necessary to understand the relationships between individual Māori and Pākehā trustees. There are indications in the official records that Māori advisors and trustees interceded in disputes on behalf of members of the Māori community who had difficulties with the museum and that they also acted on behalf of the museum in seeking resolution of disputes with members of the Māori community. These activities are seldom recorded in detail in the official record.

2.2.2 Interviews

Interviews were undertaken with the museum trustees, directors, and others who could provide insight into the historical and contemporary relationships between Māori and the institution. Particular consideration was given to the processes that led to the recent reform of the governance structures in each of the case study institutions. All interviews were semi-structured, based on a set of questions developed by the author, but each interview was flexible enough to allow the interviewer and interviewee to pursue issues of particular interest to the interviewee or which reflected his/her particular role in the change process. All research participants were sent the interview question schedule at least one week prior to their interview. Interviews ranged in length from one to three hours. All interviews were recorded, transcribed and coded according to the major lines of enquiry. The coding categories evolved as a result of the close reading of the interviews.

For the Tairāwhiti Museum case study the interviews were undertaken concurrently with the archival research. It became apparent once the historical analysis had been written that this process could have usefully informed the interview process. Consequently, for the Whanganui Regional Museum case study the interviews were undertaken after the archival research had been completed. After having written the historical analysis, it was possible to identify important themes, individuals, families, and events and to have interviewees both provide information that was not available in the archival record and clarify or interpret information that had been recorded.

Interviews were undertaken with selected Māori and Pākehā trust board members, the director and one senior Māori member of staff at Tairāwhiti Museum. Attempts were made to arrange interviews with all trust board members, but unfortunately two trust board members were unavailable at that time. One Māori trustee was interviewed twice and the director was interviewed three times. A kaumatua who had been associated with the museum since its establishment and who was closely associated with Ngā Taonga a Ngā Tamatoa Trust was also interviewed.

Interviews were undertaken with selected Māori and Pākehā trust board members and the director at Whanganui Regional Museum. Interviews were also held with a number of other people who had participated in the governance reform process, including two former Māori trust board members and a Māori consultant with professional and tribal connections to the museum. Interviewees were selected because of their ability to discuss key aspects of the relationship between the museum and Whanganui Māori that had emerged from the historical analysis. The museum director was interviewed on three occasions.

2.2.3   Data Analysis

The interviews with Māori and Pākehā research participants were structured in three parts: (1) attitudes to and use of museums in general; (2) relationships with the case study museum before the recent museum governance review process; (3) involvement in and evaluation of the museum governance review process. Once the interviews had been transcribed they were coded to identify material relating to themes and relationships. While some themes and relationships had been identified as significant from the archival research, this process continued to evolve during the interviews and the review of the transcripts. In Chapters Ten and Twelve, which report the findings based on the interviews, the material is basically presented chronologically, documenting and exploring the key relationships that emerge from the historical narratives provided in Chapters Nine and Eleven.

2.3   Other Issues

2.3.1   Ethics/Informed Consent

Each person interviewed signed an informed consent form that outlined the purpose for which the interviews were being conducted and the rights of the research participant to withdraw from the research project at any time and to control the use of the information given in the course of their interview. Transcripts of interviews were sent to interviewees for comment and correction as appropriate. The interview tapes remain in the possession of the author by permission of the research participants and will be deposited in the School of Māori Studies Archive after the thesis has been examined. The research participants were sent drafts of the chapter based on their interviews and drafts of the historical narrative chapters of the case studies to comment on. Meetings were then arranged to discuss the draft chapters. Research participants' requests for omissions, additions and modifications were discussed and incorporated in the final versions of the chapters.

2.3.2   Insider/Outsider Dynamics

There are two issues to be discussed in this section. The first is to acknowledge the limitations of a Pākehā researcher investigating Māori participation in museums. As a Pākehā researcher, I am an outsider, not a member of the culture of those individuals and communities who are the central focus of the two case studies. An outsider must acknowledge the limitations of not being a member of the culture at the centre of the investigation. While Māori participants in the research have not overtly imposed any limitations on the research, it is possible that their responses during the interviews have been constrained by the fact that the researcher is Pākehā.

This research depends on the interpretation of archival records and interviews undertaken with both Māori and Pākehā research participants. The archival records have been largely recorded or written by Pākehā associated with the museum, such as trustees, staff and minute-secretaries. Even some accounts of what Māori have said in particular situations

have been recorded, possibly even translated, by Pākehā. While particular attention has been given to including the voice of the participants in the historical narrative to the extent that this is possible, it is acknowledged that some Māori statements (or paraphrasing of statements) have been recorded by Pākehā and thus may be interpretations or selections of the recorder. A researcher must also be wary of how he/she interprets the statements, actions or even in-actions of individuals of another culture as recorded in the official record of an essentially Pākehā institution. One means of subjecting an outside researcher's interpretations to critical review is to have draft material critically reviewed by cultural insiders. This has been done for both case studies, and the research participants have indicated that the case studies provide an informed and accurate account of the evolving relationships between these institutions and local Māori in so far as they have knowledge of these relationships.

In the final analysis the researcher must own what is written and take responsibility for the interpretations. Although the researcher must bring some experience and expertise to such research, it is also important that the researcher listens and learns as part of the research, writing and review process. The outsider cannot write with the same understanding as an insider would because they will interpret the public sources differently and they will not have access to the types of cultural knowledge that will be accessible to an insider. One example of this is that I do not have knowledge of the whakapapa or other links between all the Māori individuals who appear throughout each of the case studies. Had the author known more about these links the analysis would almost certainly have been improved. At times, as people have read the drafts of chapters, they have mentioned such links to me, but this has not been done systematically.

The second aspect of the insider/outsider issue arises from my involvement with the Whanganui Regional Museum as a member of the governance review process and later as a trustee of the Whanganui Regional Museum Trust. The museum directors of Whanganui Regional Museum and Tairāwhiti Museum have been my professional colleagues and friends for some years. As a researcher, I acknowledge the limitations inherent in having such relationships with my research participants. However, these

relationships also enable me to discuss the governance review process and its impact on the institutions with an insight that would not be possible for an outsider. Research participants are always selective in the information they communicate and no doubt my relationships with these research participants have influenced their selection of information communicated.

2.3.3   Confidentiality

All research participants in the Whanganui Regional Museum Case Study and the Tairāwhiti Museum Case Study agreed that the information they provided could be attributed to them using their real names. This has made it possible to establish their relationship with the case study museum and, in the case of the Māori research participants, their whānau and iwi affiliations. Each participant identified in the case studies has received and commented on drafts of the appropriate case study chapters.

2.3.4   Limitations

The case studies in this research are limited to the investigation of governance transformation in regional trust museums, excluding the major metropolitan museums and regional museums that are units or departments within territorial local authorities. While the regional trust museums have much in common with these other types of museum, they also form a coherent group because of the form of their governance. The governance arrangements for the major metropolitan museums are established in legislation and are difficult to amend. Museums within territorial local authorities do not have independent trust boards. This thesis focuses on the challenges facing museums engaging in the transformation of trust boards, in particular the issue of the recognition of tangata whenua within the museum's constitutional arrangements. The case studies are both institutions that have been through this process. The study does not include an institution that has not been through this process in the last decade, nor does it include an institution that has been through the process recently where only minimal change has occurred (e.g. Hawkes Bay Cultural Trust). The focus in this study is on understanding the prerequisites, motivations,

processes and outcomes of situations where there has been substantial transformation of governance arrangements, particularly with regard to the recognition of tangata whenua.

The interview participants are all people who are either museum trustees, directors or people who have close associations with the two case study institutions. This means that the research does not include the perspectives of those who have observed the transformation processes and who have an interest in them but who are not directly involved. Again the rationale for this exclusion has been that the research focuses on understanding the process of change rather than an evaluation of how the changes have been received in the wider communities of interest. A related limitation is the decision not to interview those people who publicly objected to the proposed changes in the governance arrangement for Whanganui Regional Museum. This decision was made on the basis that these people had articulated their positions very clearly through the local newspaper on a number of occasions and at meetings of the Wanganui District Council and these sources have been used in the analysis of the opposition.

PART ONE

INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL CONTEXTS

CHAPTER THREE
SITES OF INDIGENOUS RESISTANCE

3.0 Introduction

Heritage maintenance has been identified as an essential element of indigenous cultural survival within the broad advocacy of indigenous rights during the latter half of the twentieth century. As indigenous peoples negotiate new relationships with museums in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries they are doing so within the wider context of their pursuit of self-determination: they are reclaiming not only control of their material heritage held by museums but the right and responsibility of self-definition. The challenge for museums has been to accept that indigenous peoples are claiming the right to control (the ownership of) their cultural heritage.

Customary knowledge and the creative arts form the heritage of a people, the heart of a culture: language, history, incantation, song, poetry, dance, subsistence, technology, architecture, sculpture, weaving, pottery, painting. Understanding and interpretation of this heritage, tangible and intangible, evolves as it passes from one generation to another. Maintaining and developing the capacity to transmit cultural treasures from one generation to the next is both a right and a responsibility for all peoples. However, the impact of colonisation on these processes of transmission challenged the capacity of many indigenous peoples to maintain their heritage. While every indigenous nation has its own individual history, including the experience of colonial oppression, there are aspects of the experience of colonialism (and subsequent resistance, survival and development) that are common to all indigenous peoples. It is the recognition of this common ground that draws indigenous peoples together today in an awareness of shared predicaments and objectives. The sense of common shared journeys (or experience) amongst indigenous peoples involved in heritage management issues has continued to develop over the last twenty years.

There has been a continuous tradition of resistance to colonisation by indigenous peoples. This resistance has taken many forms, from passive resistance to armed conflict, and in current times indigenous peoples' resistance to the appropriation of their cultural heritage continues to find many forms of expression. This chapter documents and examines the nature of indigenous resistance to the appropriation and interpretation of cultural property by colonising peoples, including documentation of the agency of indigenous peoples in North America and Australia in asserting their indigenous cultural property rights. Three sites of resistance are identified: declarations of indigenous rights, strategies for the repatriation of cultural property, and the development of indigenous cultural centres, as evidence that indigenous agency has begun to wrest control of indigenous cultural property from mainstream museums. In order to achieve this momentum, indigenous peoples have made their cause one of human rights and in doing so have engaged the wider societies within which they live.

3.1 Declarations of Indigenous Rights

3.1.1 Draft Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

In 1970 the United Nations Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities recommended that a study be made of discrimination against indigenous peoples. The resulting report, along with the advocacy of non-governmental organisations such as the World Council of Indigenous Peoples, led to the creation of the Working Group on Indigenous Populations as an organ of the sub-commission. The working group, open to all indigenous peoples, meets once each year. In 1985 the working group began the preparation of a draft declaration of the rights of indigenous peoples. In 1993 the draft declaration was submitted by the working group to the sub-commission (Commission on Human Rights, United Nations 1993). It has yet to be adopted by the United Nations General Council.

Articles Twelve, Thirteen and Fourteen in Part Three of the Draft Declaration encapsulate indigenous cultural property rights. These articles, and article 29, which refers to intellectual cultural property, provide guiding principles for any institution responsible for

the care and interpretation of indigenous cultural property. As currently drafted, provision is made for indigenous peoples to exercise their rights, rather than a requirement that museums be proactive in the resolution of repatriation and other issues. There is a significant difference between this approach and the more proactive stance of the Mataatua Declaration and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) 1991 outlined below.

The governments of Canada, United States, Australia and New Zealand have responded to the draft declaration with support in principle, but have also noted a number of objections (see for example, Government of Australia 1995). All governments are concerned about the inclusion of the right to self-determination. Self-determination for indigenous peoples (the recognition of group rights) is seen to undermine the sovereignty of the nation state, contrary to the concept of individual rights that underpins the liberal democratic notion of democracy.

Daes (1997) outlined measures that should be taken by the international community to strengthen respect for the cultural and intellectual property of indigenous peoples. Her report provides a comprehensive overview of indigenous heritage issues including: the protection and use of sacred sites; the return and reburial of human remains; community control of research; professional organisations and ethics; and the recovery of sacred and ceremonial objects. The report also reviews international legal instruments and mechanisms available for the protection of indigenous heritage rights and makes recommendations on five issues: (1) indigenous peoples' right to define and control their own heritage; (2) indigenous peoples' right to control their own education system; (3) priority should be given to the location and return of appropriated heritage collections; (4) the development of museum collection inventories is an essential step in this process; and (5) strategies should be developed to prevent further losses of indigenous heritage (ibid: 21-23).

The combination of the draft declaration and the Daes report has made a significant contribution to international understanding and recognition of the rights of indigenous

peoples in relation to their tangible and intangible heritage. Even as a draft the declaration has set a benchmark against which heritage institutions can measure their recognition of indigenous peoples. A recent report on bicultural governance and leadership in New Zealand museums, for example, had both the draft declaration and the Mataatua Declaration appended to the report (Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa 2000).

3.1.2 The Mataatua Declaration

The Mataatua Declaration is evidence of the Māori contribution to the international debate on indigenous cultural property rights (Nanson 1997: 308). The First International Conference on the Cultural and Intellectual Property of Indigenous Peoples was hosted by the nine tribes of Mataatua at Whakatāne, Bay of Plenty, June 1993 (Mead 1995). The declaration is directed at indigenous peoples, heritage institutions, states, national and international agencies, and the United Nations. The first section urges indigenous people to be proactive in exercising their rights, while in the second section nation-states and heritage organisations are urged to recognise these rights and work constructively to protect them. Existing heritage protection mechanisms are deemed inadequate. The statements relating to cultural objects (Sections 2.12-2.14 in particular) are much more forceful than those in the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

The declaration requires governments and heritage institutions to be proactive in recognising indigenous peoples' rights. There is a clear hierarchy of actions recommended: priority is given to the return of human remains and burial objects; second, museums are asked to produce inventories of objects held in their collections and supply copies to the relevant indigenous peoples (Daes 1997: paragraph 172; see also Mataatua Declaration: paragraph 2.13). Because many indigenous peoples are not aware of the current location of much of their cultural property, the declaration views it as the responsibility of museums to be proactive in producing collection inventories in order to facilitate the process of reconnecting people with their cultural property.

The declaration also contains the statement that "indigenous cultural objects held in museums *must* be offered back to their traditional owners". The omission of qualifying terms, such as *significant* cultural property, limiting the range of material to be repatriated, makes it clear that this is an assertion of ownership of all cultural property and not, as in other documents, an assertion of the right to repatriate significant cultural treasures. This declaration is a much more assertive statement than the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as it was not subject to the same process of critique and modification by nation-states before it was adopted. However, consequently it has no official status other than an assertion by the conference participants.

The fact that this declaration emerged from an initiative of the Māori Congress is indicative of the significance of cultural property issues to Māori. The Mataatua Declaration is well-known and widely referred to by Māori involved in environmental, cultural and intellectual heritage maintenance issues.[1] While the declaration has not been adopted, or even formally acknowledged, by the New Zealand Government or Museums Aotearoa[2], it is nonetheless well known to staff within government agencies and to museum practitioners. It has also been recognised in the constitutions of museums such as the Whanganui Regional Museum and the Tairāwhiti Museum, Gisborne.

3.1.3 Turning The Page

Turning The Page; Forging New Partnerships Between Museums and First Peoples is an agreement outlining a set of principles and recommendations negotiated between the Assembly of First Nations and the Canadian Museums Association in 1992. This agreement emerged from the aftermath of *The Spirit Sings* exhibition at the Glenbow Museum, Calgary, Alberta, in 1988. This exhibition had been the centre of national and international controversy about the efficacy of museums claiming to be politically neutral public institutions.

---

[1] Observation of the author over the last ten years.
[2] The national museums association in New Zealand

The Spirit Sings began in 1983 when the museum decided to hold an exhibition of First Nations' cultural treasures in conjunction with the Calgary Winter Olympics (Harrison 1988b: 6). A curatorial committee of seven regional experts on First Nations' art, none of whom were indigenous scholars, was formed to identify and select objects from museum collections in North America and Europe. Shell Oil Canada Limited agreed to act as sponsor; however, when the Lubicon Lake Cree of northern Alberta, who had announced a boycott of the 1998 Winter Olympics in Calgary in order to draw attention to their unresolved land claims, realised that Shell Oil was sponsoring *The Spirit Sings* they decided to focus their boycott on the exhibition. Shell Oil was one of the companies continuing to drill for oil on the land for which they had made a claim to the government.

The Lubicon Lake Cree initiated a letter-writing campaign to religious, political and heritage organisations in North America and Europe seeking support for the boycott of the exhibition, and subsequently a number of national and international organisations supported the boycott.[3] The protest rapidly widened to encompass many of the issues the First Peoples had with museums (McLoughlin 1999: 10).

Despite a meeting in July 1986 between the staff of the Glenbow Museum and representatives of the Lubicon Lake Cree no agreement was reached. The exhibition opened at the Glenbow Museum in January 1988. It included an information panel reaffirming the Glenbow Museum's support for the expeditious and just settlement of the Lubicon Lake Cree land claim. While the Glenbow Museum claimed that only twelve museums of the 110 approached had declined to loan circa 140 objects for the exhibition (Harrison 1998a), Myers (1988: 13) states that Indian sources claim 26 institutions supported their boycott. The International Council of Museums took a strong stand in support of the boycott (McLoughlin 1999: 11).

---

[3] Organisations supporting the boycott included the Metis Association of Alberta, The Native Council of Alberta, The Grand Council of the Cree (of Quebec), The Assembly of First Nations, The National Congress of American Indians (representing 122 Indian nations), the World Council of Churches, The World Council of Indigenous Peoples and the Canadian Ethnology Society.

Julia Harrison (1988: 8), Exhibition Co-ordinator for *The Spirit Sings,* noted in her explanation of why the museum proceeded with the exhibition:

> The museum was and is committed to the idea that museums must remain independent of external political pressures so that they can determine their own political stands, which in this case was to promote a wider understanding of the continuing relevance of native heritage.

Harrison (ibid: 8) rejected the notion that the museum should or would be associated with the activities of its sponsor.

The Glenbow stance was supported by Professor Michael Ames, Director, Museum of Anthropology, University of British Columbia, who is known internationally for his advocacy for closer relationships between museums and indigenous peoples (see Ames 1992). In explaining the reasons for his support Ames stated:

> it is not necessary (nor even helpful) to denigrate the useful work of museums in order to support the causes of aboriginal peoples, it is wrong to use the plight of one group as justification for the suppression of the rights of others, and it is fundamentally immoral to censor the views or works of those who do not directly support one's own interests. Who then should govern our museums, and how should museums respond to contemporary issues? Museums must defend their right and responsibility to govern themselves, resisting pressures from political bullies. Museums do not claim immunity from criticism, but they certainly must claim immunity from suppression. (Ames 1988: 15-16)

When Ames spoke out in support of the Glenbow's decision to continue with the exhibition it had considerable influence in the museum community. Ames considered this debate as one that should be resolved at museum governance level, though he failed to address the issue of how indigenous peoples can participate effectively at that level. He implied that museum governance should resist the influence of such peoples who may want to use their power for political purposes; however, he appeared to overlook the self-interest of the museum sector and researchers in taking this position.

In response to the protest focusing around *The Spirit Sings,* the Ad Hoc Committee on Museums and Native Collections was held at Glenbow in September 1986, after the Glenbow and the Lubicon Lake Cree had failed to reach agreement, to "consider the possibility of a common policy in response to requests for the return of collections from Native Peoples" (Ames, Harrison and Nicks 1988: 47). While acknowledging the "interests of originating populations" in museum collections, it emphasises the "broader mandate" shared by all museums to serve the "the general public". Politicisation of issues is seen to have the potential to undermine "professional integrity and neutrality" (ibid.: 52).

Writing in support of the Lubicon Lake Cree Boycott of *The Spirit Songs,* Trigger (1988b: 13-14; see also Halpin 1988) acknowledged the history of museums and anthropology in the collecting of First Nations' heritage. After noting the rising level of criticism of museums by First Nations Peoples he proceeded to counter the argument advanced by Harrison and Ames:

> Claims that museums, as cultural institutions, must not become involved in political issues or that curators must, as a matter of principle, resist Native demands in order to defend their academic freedom have very little substance when they are subjected to examination. Even such substance as they might have pales beside the indefensible alienation of Canada's First Peoples from their cultural heritage. (Trigger 1988b: 15)

Trigger acknowledged that some museums were developing closer relationships with First Nations, but was concerned that:

> The failure of Canadian museums to boycott this exhibition has seriously impaired relations between museums and Native peoples and called into question the goodwill of Canadian museum authorities. If museums are to overcome this setback and truly begin to end their colonial treatment of Native people far more vigorous action is required. (ibid: 15)

The Spirit Sings was a turning point in the relationship between museums and First Nations in Canada. Both *The Spirits Sing* and *Te Māori* (1984-87) were effective sites of indigenous resistance to museum practices and recognised as such by the museum profession world-wide. However, whereas *The Spirit Sings* became a symbol of the need for change, *Te Māori* became symbolic of the extent to which Māori were able, in the mid-1980s, to grasp the initiative and control an international exhibition of taonga Māori from public museum collections, and to resist current museum practice.

Rick Hill, Museum Director of the Woodland Cultural Centre, reflecting on the tensions between museums and First Nations at this time, identified the need for significant change in mainstream museums, particularly at the governance level:

> Museums have been manifestations of a colonial society for too long. It is in the best interests of all museums in Canada with First Nations' collections to open their boardroom doors and provide opportunities for creatively exploring and expanding new relationships. (Hill, R. 1988: 2)

George Erasmus, National Chief of the Assembly of First Nations (AFN), took the initiative to end the boycott when the exhibition closed at the Glenbow and opened at the Canadian Museum of Civilization (CMC) in Ottawa. He stated that it was time to negotiate a new relationship:

> We are well aware that many people have dedicated their time, careers and their lives showing what they believe is the accurate picture of indigenous peoples. We thank you for that, but we want to **turn the page**...' (Assembly of First Nations and the Canadian Museums Association 1992: 7)

Erasmus invited the director of the CMC to co-sponsor a symposium with the AFN to begin working towards the resolution of issues raised by First Nations in relation to their heritage held by public museums (Hill and Nicks 1992: 81). In November 1988 a conference, entitled "Preserving Our Heritage: A Working Conference Between Museums and First Peoples", was held at Carleton University, Ottawa. First Peoples raised issues of

access to collections for customary cultural practices and expressed dissatisfaction with many museum exhibitions that reinforced stereotypical notions of First Peoples. The conference agreed to establish a national task force "to develop an ethical framework and strategies for Aboriginal people to represent their history and culture in concert with cultural institutions" (ibid.:82). Three major issues were identified for consideration by the task force (a) the involvement of First Nations Peoples in the care and interpretation of their heritage; (b) increased access to museum collections; and (c) the repatriation of human remains and cultural treasures (ibid.: 82). The task force was formed in 1990 and met several times over two years before presenting a final report. While all of these issues had been identified by First Peoples before in various contexts and acknowledged by museum professionals, *Turning the Page* (Assembly of First Nations and the Canadian Museums Association 1992), the task force report, provided a comprehensive summary. The major issues raised were: (1) the importance of cultural objects in museums; (2) increased involvement of First Peoples in interpretation; (3) improved access to museum collections; (4) repatriation; (5) training for First Peoples; and (6) support for First Peoples' cultural institutions.

The task force report outlined seven principles that could provide a foundation for a partnership between First Peoples and museums: (1) Authority to speak; (2) Mutual appreciation of each other's knowledge systems; (3) Recognition of mutual interests in First Peoples' heritage; (4) Co-management and co-responsibility of heritage resources; (5) Equal partners in museum projects such as exhibitions; (6) Commonality of interest in research, documentation, presentation, promotion and education of various publics of First Peoples' heritage; and (7) First Peoples' involvement in development of policy and funding programs.

Encapsulated in this report in the discussion themes, the principles and the recommendations are statements that are reiterated in many documents that record the evolving relationships between indigenous peoples and museums. The first provision in the recommendations on access is particularly significant for this study:

2 (a) To ensure the proper interpretation and representation of Aboriginal heritage, histories and cultures, museums should provide for the participation of Aboriginal people as members of governing structures and on boards of directors. (Assembly of First Nations and Canadian Museums Association 1992: 8)

However, there is no discussion of specific details relating to governance reform and the document can be interpreted as suggesting that a museum could comply with the recommendation by appointing one First Nations person to the board. Nor is there any explicit requirement for a museum to enter into partnership negotiations with the indigenous people in whose territory the museum is located. In the absence of such considerations the power culture retains control, the notion of mutual recognition is not fully explored and the opportunity to create a common ground is diminished.

Two years after the task force published its report, Nicks (1995) noted that many museums and museum associations in Canada had adopted it as a basis for developing their own policies. The number of First Peoples appointed to museum boards and as co-curators was increasing and First Peoples were increasingly involved in partnerships to create exhibitions, rather than being consulted in the final stages of exhibition planning to approve work already done (Gibbons 1997: 311). The number of training and internship positions for First Peoples had also risen. Nicks (1995:143) considered that the least progress had been made in the area of repatriation. The task force report had created expectations among First Peoples for a degree of change in museums that had not been delivered.

Notzke (1996: 55) reported that there was a perception amongst First Peoples in southern Alberta "that the Task Force had not accomplished much". However, she does report on the changes made at the Glenbow Museum where *The Spirit Sings* was exhibited, including the adoption of many of the recommendations of the task force in its First Nations Policy: A First Nations Advisory Council and a First Nations' liaison position had been initiated; co-operative education initiatives had been developed; repatriation issues were being negotiated with active ceremonialists; and two tribes were working on the

establishment of their own cultural facilities to speed the return of significant cultural patrimony (see also Bharadia 1999).

The case of *The Spirit Sings* has been discussed here because it was a watershed in the recognition of indigenous rights within the museum sector in Canada, in much the same way as the *Te Māori* exhibition was a turning point in the relationships between Māori and museums in New Zealand. *The Spirit Sings* became a point of reference, symbolic of a turning point in relationships between museums and First Nations. While progress has been made in national policy development and many institutions are working at developing relations with indigenous peoples, some First Nations scholars and other commentators have been less than impressed by recent progress, suggesting that it has not really challenged entrenched networks of power in Canadian museums. Doxtator (1996: 63), an indigenous Canadian scholar, has observed that while the task force report called for co-management of First Peoples' collections in museums it did not call for co-ownership. And Mattson (1997: 30) stated that:

> Canadian museums continue to exclude aboriginal representatives' perspectives and political agendas in the planning of exhibitions and programmes, and the governing and operations of museums.

It is apparent that while national policies are useful tools of moral suasion, and co-management negotiations have advanced, changes in institutional power structures depend on the initiation of governance reform.

In 1993 Council of Australian Museum Associations published *Previous Possessions, New Obligations: Policies for Museums in Australia and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders*. This document has a similar purpose to *Turning The Page* in that it is designed to encourage the development of new partnerships between museums and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples (for commentary on this policy see Griffin 1996; McAlear 1996: 84-9; Dolan 2001; Sculthorpe 1994: 7; Pearce, T. 1996: 15). This policy was revised and renamed *Continuous Cultures Ongoing Responsibilities* (Council of Australian Museum Associations 2003).

3.2   Repatriation

This section examines the repatriation movement as a second major site of indigenous peoples' resistance to the appropriation and ownership of the skeletal remains of their ancestors and their cultural treasures by private collectors and public museums. The presence of these remains and treasures in museums is seen by many indigenous people to be symbolic of oppression and dispossession (Griffiths 1996:96). Indigenous peoples claim an inalienable right to control the disposition of the remains of their ancestors and to the ownership of their sacred and significant cultural property (Barkan 2002: 32-4). Doxtator (1996: 67) encapsulates the relationship indigenous peoples have with their material cultural heritage:

> For aboriginal people, culture encompasses much more than the objects, but the objects cannot easily be separated from culture. It is more a case of which people belong to and with their particular culture, which includes the languages, beliefs and objects. In Euro-Canadian terms, people own their 'heritage'. In aboriginal terms, the culture 'owns' the people.

If mainstream museums are to become a 'common ground' where indigenous peoples can build partnerships with the dominant culture, the issue of 'ownership' of the cultural property of indigenous peoples, held by these institutions, must be resolved. Three repatriation strategies are identified and discussed in this section: domestic legislation, treaty settlements, and moral suasion and collective direct negotiation.

Skeletal remains and cultural property were appropriated from indigenous peoples in North America and Australasia as part of the colonising process. In seeking the repatriation of skeletal remains and significant cultural treasures, especially secret/sacred objects, indigenous peoples have initiated a debate that "involves a wide array of complex, and sometimes competing, social interests, including human rights, race relations, religion, science, education, ethics and law" (Trope and Echo-Hawke 2000: 123). Most indigenous peoples accord the highest priority to the return and appropriate burial of their

ancestors' remains, even though the return of such remains may cause considerable debate within the descendant community, especially where there are no existing cultural practices to cope with such circumstances (Gulliford 2000: 25).

3.2.1 A Legislative Model: The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act 1990

In the 1960s, American Indian resistance to both the historical and contemporary appropriation of human remains and cultural property emerged as a concerted programme (Watkins 2000: 3). This programme of activism was driven by four major concerns: the way in which museums represented indigenous cultures in exhibits; the presence of sacred objects in museums; the belief that many objects in museums had been obtained illicitly; and the presence of human remains in museums (Nanson 1997: 292).

The American Indian Religious Freedom Act 1978 "required the United States to protect and preserve for American Indians their inherent right to believe, express and exercise the traditional religions ... including but not limited to access to sites, use and possession of sacred objects and the freedom to worship through ceremonies and traditional rites" (Watkins 2000: 12). The effectiveness of this legislation was limited because Congress did not provide legislative mechanisms for the enforcement of the provisions. However, it did provide Native American communities with greater moral authority in one-to-one negotiations with museums (Nanson 1997: 295).

In 1981 the newly-formed North American Indian Museums Association published its *Suggested Guidelines for Museums in Dealing with Requests for Return of Native American Materials*. Native American museum professionals were signalling clearly to the mainstream museum professionals that there were appropriate Native American museums able to receive repatriated collections and that Native Americans were primarily interested in the repatriation of human remains and sacred objects (ibid.: 296).

In response to increasing Native American discontent. led by organisations such as the Native American Rights Fund, American Indians Against Desecration, and the National Congress of American Indians, some museums were proactive in providing information to tribes about the material they held. The Smithsonian Institution contacted 225 federally recognised tribes in 1985 informing them of relevant holdings of human remains. Only six tribes responded to this information. One, the Blackfoot of Montana, negotiated the repatriation of Blackfoot remains (Simpson 1996: 229). Unfortunately, the lack of tribal response did not alert the museum to issues of process and resourcing.

In 1986 American Indian representatives began a campaign advocating the passing of legislation to have the large collections of American Indian remains held by the Smithsonian Institution returned to their descendants (Trope and Echo-Hawk 2000: 136). The Society of American Archaeology, desirous of retaining the remains for scientific study, opposed the enactment of legislation (Watkins 2000: 14; Nanson 1997: 293). However, the archaeological community had misread the political landscape and their opposition could not reverse the momentum that was to develop in the Congress for finding a legislative solution.[4]

In response to the repatriation claims made by Native Americans a number of museums had been engaged in complex negotiations for the return of cultural treasures to Native American tribes. One of the most notable and best documented is the return of the Zuni Ahayu:da from the National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution in 1989 after almost a decade of negotiations (Merrill, Ladd and Ferguson 1993). By 1989 some of the leading figures in the museum community realised that repatriation legislation was inevitable and began to engage in constructive negotiations with the proponents of the legislation to have their points of view considered (Nanson 1997: 297-8).

---

[4] Ten years later in 1996 the Society for American Archaeology held three sessions to discuss the relationships between archaeologists and Native Americans. These discussions demonstrated a constructive approach to the development of these relationships. One result of these discussions was the publication of *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground* (Swidler et al. 1997).

In 1989 the National Museum of the American Indian Act (Museum Act) created the Museum of the American Indian within the Smithsonian Institution. The Museum Act required the Smithsonian "to inventory human remains and funerary objects in its possession or control" (Trope and Echo-Hawk 2000: 137). Where the provenance of the remains or objects is known, the Smithsonian is required to notify the appropriate tribe. Such remains and objects must be returned upon request to a lineal descendant(s) or culturally affiliated tribe.

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) was enacted in 1990. Senator Daniel Inouye, one of the prime movers of the legislation, outlined the reasons for the legislation and its purpose:

> When human remains are displayed in museums or historical societies, it is never the bones of white soldiers or the first European settlers that came to this continent that are lying in the glass cases. It is Indian remains. The message that this sends to the rest of the world is that Indians are culturally and physically different from and inferior to non-Indians. This is racism.
>
> In light of the important role that death and burial rites play in Native American cultures, it is all the more offensive that the civil rights of America's first citizens have been so fragrantly violated for the past century. Even today, when supposedly great strides have been made to recognise the rights of Indians to recover the skeletal remains of their ancestors and to possess items of sacred value or cultural patrimony, the wishes of Native Americans are often ignored by the scientific community. In cases where Native Americans have attempted to regain items that were inappropriately alienated from the tribe, they have often met with resistance from museums ... The bill before us is not about the validity of museums or the value of scientific enquiry. Rather, it is about human rights. (Trope and Echo-Hawk 2000: 139-140)

Once the legislation had been passed Native Americans had clear legal rights when they came to negotiate with museums for the return of human remains and certain categories of cultural property.

NAGPRA has four primary provisions: (1) Native American burials on tribal and federal lands are protected and tribes are given powers to determine what action is taken when burials are found; (2) it is illegal to deal in Native American human remains and designated cultural objects (such as sacred objects); (3) museums and federal agencies are required to make summaries of their cultural property holdings, create inventories of their collections of human remains and associated grave goods, and provide this information to potentially affiliated tribes; and (4) museums and federal agencies are required to be proactive in resolving repatriation claims within defined timeframes where the required conditions are met (ibid.: 139-151).

NAGPRA requires museums and government agencies to return human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects and objects of cultural patrimony to descendants who request them. NAGPRA is innovative and instructional in the way it provides for Indian American definitions and standards to be applied in the decision-making processes. Native American religious leaders are able to identify those sacred objects necessary for the practice of their religion.

NAGPRA is also innovative in requiring museums to be proactive in providing First Nations with summaries and inventories. Once in possession of this information each community can make its own decision whether or not to pursue the return of the material. Of primary significance is the fact that First Nations are being informed about the location of their cultural property in museums throughout the United States.

Considerable resources are required by museums with substantial collections to undertake the research necessary to provide the inventories. Native American communities have similarly found that they do not always have the resources necessary to respond to the inventories provided by museums and to pursue their claims as expeditiously as they may wish. This has meant that the anticipated flood of claims has not eventuated. Where collections remain in non-Indian museums, American Indian representatives are concerned about their capacity to monitor access and use of the collections (Nanson 1997: 301, 304-6). Some tribes have indicated that they do not wish to have the remains of their ancestors returned because they are unable to undo the desecration that has been done to

them and have asked the museums to continue to care for these remains in an appropriate manner (NAGPRA at 10 2000: 44).

Tweedie (1999: 141-2) summarises the major concerns raised by Native Americans with regard to the NAGPRA implementation process: return of human remains, recognition of tribal knowledge versus scientific evidence, tribal control of tribal knowledge, and conflicting notions of ownership of cultural property. While many tribes have successfully repatriated human remains and sacred objects, some have difficulty establishing, to a satisfactory standard, their cultural affiliation to the remains and objects provenanced to their areas.

American museums have had to cope with a number of operational issues in the post NAGPRA period as they attempt to provide greater access to collections and photographic and archival records. This has required the development of new policies, additional resource allocation and the employment of staff who can work effectively with Native American clients. Museums have also had to explore ways of engaging more effectively with Native American communities. While complying with the requirements of NAGPRA, they must be sure that they are returning human remains and sacred objects to the right people. Where there are multiple claims it may take considerable time to reach a decision. Museums are also responsible for working within the definitions provided in the law. Some authors make the request that museums not always be confined by the letter of the law, but rather operate within the spirit of the law (e.g. Trope and Echo-Hawk 2000: 151; Gulliford 2000: 52-3).

Nanson emphasises the significance of NAGPRA for museums.

> It is undeniably true that many within the professional museum and scholarly community remained unconvinced by the arguments and viewpoints held by Native Americans. It is equally true that this lack of conviction no longer means much in the face of NAGPRA's passage. As perhaps the most important single example of cultural policy legislation in the history of the United States, NAGPRA has permanently changed the way in which

museums can operate. (Nanson 1997: 309; see also Trope, J. and W. Echo-Hawk 2000: 151)

How were Native Americans, a small and marginalised minority, able to convince the United States government to enact NAGPRA? Some commentators have suggested that progress with cultural property legislation is a trade-off for lack of progress with larger issues such as land claims, resource allocation and self-determination. However, important observations can be made about the effective strategies employed by Native American activists in the late 1980s. The focus of activism shifted from "the streets [museums] and the courts to state houses and the United States Congress" (Hutt and McKeown 2001: 198). By changing the debate from one to do with the rights of researchers and museums to one of human rights, and more particularly indigenous rights, Native Americans were able to associate their cause with broader political developments in the United States at that time. The issue became one of the rights of all peoples to practise their own religion and to respect their dead according to their own cultural practices, a constitutional principle recognised by most Americans. The United States was attempting to secure the return of the remains of soldiers who had died in North Vietnam. In this area the proponents of the legislation had found a 'common ground' with the mainstream society. Native Americans had captured the moral high ground. Equally important in the context of this study, NAGPRA recognises Native American heritage as a vital part of the ongoing life and well-being of these peoples (Strickland 1997: 85-7). However, the reality remains that in the United States, although the government recognises and legislates human rights, individual citizens, communities, even peoples, do not always have the resources necessary to exercise or enforce these rights.

3.2.2   A Treaty Model: The Nisga'a Treaty Agreement

The second repatriation strategy to be examined is the negotiation of heritage rights and the resolution of repatriation claims as part of a treaty settlement process. This section considers the significance of the repatriation provisions included in the 1998 Treaty Agreement between the Nisga'a Nation of the Nass area of British Columbia and the

Federal Government and the Province of British Columbia. [5] The Nisga'a Treaty Agreement has been selected as the focus for this discussion because of the accessibility of the agreement documentation. While there are other treaty agreements that include repatriation provisions, for example, The Yukon First Nations Umbrella Final Agreement, none include such a definitive set of provisions as the Nisga'a Treaty Agreement

In the same way that NAGPRA has set a legislative standard for resolving the disposition of Native American remains, sacred objects and significant cultural patrimony, the Nisga'a Treaty Agreement may have established a standard for the resolution of some of these issues in Canada, at least for those who have access to a treaty negotiation process. The question under consideration is whether or not such treaty agreements, and other types of agreement, provide a fetter that should be recognised in legislation in order to enshrine in law the rights of First Nations to control and maintain their own heritage.

The Nisga'a Treaty Settlement provides evidence that the federal and British Columbia provincial governments have been able to negotiate with the Nisga'a to resolve issues relating to the custody, management and care of Nisga'a cultural patrimony held in museums funded by these governments. Both the spirit and provisions of the agreement provide a model for other museums to emulate in their negotiations with First Nations.

In 1991 the Nisga'a Nation began to formally negotiate their treaty claim with Canada and British Columbia. An Agreement in Principle was signed in 1996 and the Nisga'a Final Agreement was signed in 1998. The Final Agreement includes provisions relating to land, forests, fisheries, environmental conservation, Nisga'a government, and cultural artefacts and heritage. Chapter Seventeen of the Final Agreement focuses on cultural artefacts and heritage and is divided into the following sections: general, return of Nisga'a artefacts (Canadian Museum of Civilization and Royal British Columbia Museum), access to other collections, protection of heritage sites, other Nisga'a artefacts and human remains. The general or introductory section recognises the importance of Nisga'a artefacts in the

---

[5] *Nisga'a Final Agreement* 1998. Federal Treaty Negotiations Office. All references to the agreement are taken from this two volume document (V1: Nisga'a Final Agreement, V2: Appendices)

continuation of Nisga'a culture and their ownership of such material unless there is evidence of the legal transfer of ownership.

The parties agreed that the Canadian Museum of Civilization (CMC), Ottawa, would transfer to the Nisga'a Nation "without condition all its legal interest in, and possession of", 109 specified artefacts, including "charms, soul catchers, masks, sculptures, figures, ornaments, rattles, and whistles". These artefacts are listed in the appendices to the agreement. The CMC and the Nisga'a Nation will share possession of the remainder of the collection in accord with negotiated custodial agreements that will respect Nisga'a laws and practices relating to Nisga'a artefacts. Custodial agreements may set out conditions for maintenance, storage, handling, access, use, study, display, reproduction and the incorporation of new information into the catalogue records and displays.

The parties made a similar agreement regarding the Nisga'a artefacts held by the Royal British Columbia Museum (RBCM), Victoria. Seventy-six artefacts in the RBCM collection were to be transferred to the Nisga'a and the remainder of the Nisga'a artefacts were to be co-managed. If either museum acquires any new Nisga'a artefacts, that institution will negotiate the disposition of those artefacts with the Nisga'a Nation. The parties also agreed that any artefact found within Nisga'a lands belongs to the Nisga'a Nation. It was also agreed that "subject to federal and provincial laws, any human remains of individuals of Nisga'a ancestry that are removed from a heritage site will be delivered to the Nisga'a Nation".

This agreement provides a model for the repatriation and co-management of indigenous nations' cultural property held by public museums. In this case, Nisga'a will have a collection of artefacts for use in a cultural centre to be created on tribal lands, while the two museums retain Nisga'a material for use in exhibitions and education programmes. The terms of the co-management of the collections remaining in the museums provide a comprehensive list of areas requiring regular consultation between the parties. This consultation process will be an important means of maintaining and developing the relationships between the Nisga'a and the two museums. Although there have been cases

of taonga Māori being returned to iwi in the treaty negotiation process in New Zealand, there are as yet no co-management agreements resulting from treaty negotiations.[6]

3.2.3 Moral Suasion: Australian Aboriginal Remains

Australian Aborigines have neither repatriation legislation nor treaty negotiations through which to facilitate the return of skeletal remains or cultural property from museums. Since the 1970s Aboriginal communities and national organisations have sought the repatriation of skeletal remains and sacred objects. Australian museums have been increasingly positive in their response to aboriginal repatriation requests and the major institutions have developed repatriation policies to facilitate this process (Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre 2000). In 1993 Museums Australia published *Previous Possessions: New Obligations,* a policy which included as its central principle the right of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples to determine the custodianship of their secret/sacred objects held in museums.

Griffiths (1996: 96-100) provides a summary of the history of repatriation of Aboriginal remains from Australian museums to Aboriginal communities, focusing in particular on the different perspectives of archaeologists and Aboriginal communities. Most contention has surrounded the desire of Aboriginal communities to rebury ancient skeletal remains that are considered highly significant by archaeologists. Mulvany, a noted Australian archaeologist, considered the Victorian Museum derelict in its educational mission and its responsibility to defend academic freedom, when it returned the Kow Swamp collection, consisting of 9-15,000 year old skeletal remains and associated grave goods, to the Echuca Aboriginal Co-operative for reburial in 1990.[7] Mulvany (quoted in Simpson 1996: 188) did not object to the return of the remains to the Echuca Aboriginal Co-operative, he objected to reburial rather than the retention of the remains in a manner that would have made them accessible for future research. Such incidents are rare. Many successful

---

[6] A co-management agreement has been negotiated with the Crown for the care of Pukaki, a carving of a Te Arawa ancestor, but this was not part of Treaty negotiations (See Memorandum of Understanding: The Return of Pukaki: 2 October 1997. In: Tapsell 1998: 321).

[7] This reference to academic freedom recalls one of Ames' fundamental objections to the Lubicon Lake Cree boycott of the *Spirit Sings* exhibition at the Glenbow Museum. See page 47.

repatriations have occurred and continue to occur throughout Australia. In 1998 the Cultural Ministers Council endorsed a Strategic Plan for the Return of Indigenous Ancestral Remains, recognising the complexity of the situation facing museums. The objective of this initiative was to ensure that, by the end of 2001, all Aboriginal communities would be aware of all skeletal remains and secret/sacred objects from their community held in museums in Australia (Butler, T. 2001a: 25).

Moral suasion is the major strategy available to indigenous peoples when they seek to repatriate human remains and significant cultural property from museums in other countries. Existing international agreements, such as the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, are not retrospective. Consequently, Aboriginal individuals, communities and organisations, and the Australian Government, have in recent years actively sought to apply moral suasion to persuade British museums, in particular, to return Aboriginal skeletal remains to their descendants for reburial.

The Foundation for Aboriginal and Islander Research (FAIRA) has been prominent in the campaign.[8] The research and advocacy for the return of human remains and secret/sacred material from British museum collections by Ormond-Parker, primary spokesperson for FAIRA in Britain, has been funded by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC). FAIRA has been funded by ATSIC as a non-governmental organisation to undertake this work. Requests are only made for the return of human remains on behalf of Aboriginal communities that have decided to pursue this course after having been advised of the existence of a collection. In the case of unprovenanced Aboriginal remains held in Britain, the National Museum of Australia in Canberra is prepared to act as a holding institution. Ormond-Parker's research suggests that there are 2-3,000 human remains of Aboriginal origin held in between 20 to 30 British museums and perhaps a similar number in other parts of the world (The United Kingdom Parliament Select Committee on Culture, media and Sport 2000a).

---

[8] See The United Kingdom Select Committee on Culture, Media, and Sport (2000a). Other individuals closely associated with this initiative are Michael Mansell and Bob Weatherall. See Simpson 1996. *Making Representations*. p. 185

Both FAIRA and the Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre (TAC) made submissions to the British parliamentary committee on the return of human remains and cultural property (The United Kingdom Parliament Select Committee on Culture, Media and Sport 2000b, 2000c). The TAC submission recommends that the British Government:

1. acknowledge that Aboriginal people have the primary and sole right to the ownership and control of all forms of their heritage, including human remains and other cultural property retained in collections in museums and other institutions in the united Kingdom;
2. endorse the principle of unconditional repatriation of all remains and other cultural property as required by Aboriginal people;
3. ratify existing international instruments which aim to regulate current trade in cultural property materials;
4. amend existing domestic legislation where necessary to enable repatriation to proceed, and enact new legislation where necessary, and
5. **encourage and support museums in the UK to develop policies, protocols and practices which deal constructively with repatriation, collection management and related issues in a spirit of forward-looking co-operation with indigenous peoples. (The United Kingdom Select Committee on Culture, Media and Sport 2000c)**

John Howard, the Australian Prime Minister, spoke to the British Prime Minister in July 2000 seeking his support in "persuading British museums and universities to repatriate the remains of more than 2000 aborigines" (MacAskill 2000). Neil Chambers, Director of the Natural History Museum, stated that the museum held 68 million items of which 20,000 were human remains from around the world, including 448 Australia Aboriginal remains. He stated that these remains are used to study human origins and evolution, human diversity, diet and disease, and that the scientific benefits of such research are global in their significance. However, not all British institutions have been reluctant to enter into constructive dialogue with Aboriginal organisations. In 1991 the first part of a collection of Aboriginal skulls housed in the Department of Anatomy at the University of Edinburgh were returned to Australia (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission 2000).

Following a report on cultural property by the United Kingdom Parliament Select Committee Culture, Media and Sport Select Committee in July 2000, a government working party on the return of human remains from British museums was formed in May 2001 to examine current legislation, and "determine how the law might be changed to

allow museums and galleries to repatriate remains" (Butler, T. 2001b: 5). While the working group included museum directors, curators, a solicitor, a professor of surgery and a social anthropologist, indigenous peoples were not represented.

Recent campaigns to have Aboriginal remains in British museums returned to their descendants have made an important contribution to the decision by the British government to re-evaluate the existing laws and policies.[9] However, the establishment of the working group should not suggest that the scientists and museum trustees will easily change their attitudes to the issue, particularly given the situation where an oppositional framework has been established with British heritage professionals on the panel and indigenous peoples' representatives limited to presenting evidence. Museums in Australia will inevitably be caught between the British museums and Aboriginal communities if the working party recommends the return of remains to museums in the originating countries and not to the indigenous communities. A number of the world's leading museums announced in December 2002 that they had signed a declaration opposing the wholesale repatriation of cultural artefacts seized during imperial rule or by means now considered illegal, claiming that the universal role of major museum collections in promoting culture outweighs the desire by individual countries or racial groups for their return. Although the British Museum did not sign the declaration, the director, Neil MacGregor, stated that he supported its intent (Frey 2000).

The common element in the repatriation strategies presented in this section is that each one enables or asserts a degree of self-determination for the indigenous peoples involved. These strategies also demonstrate the ability of indigenous people to shift the site of resistance and negotiation in order to align their cause with broader issues of human rights or, more specifically, indigenous rights. In order to respond effectively in this evolving environment, where indigenous peoples are reconnecting with their cultural property in museum collections and asserting their rights in relation to these collections, many

---

[9] In parallel with these developments at governmental level, the Museums Association in Britain has commissioned two reports in order to provide information for the museum professional about repatriation issues. See Simpson, 1997 and Legget 2000.

museums have realised that they must move beyond the colonial paradigm that has determined their relationships with indigenous peoples.

3.3 Indigenous Cultural Centres

An indigenous cultural centre is a cultural centre that is owned and controlled by an indigenous people (Oxendine 1992: 5; Broyles 1989: 89-90). This section identifies and analyses indigenous peoples' cultural centres[10] as a third site of indigenous peoples' resistance to the appropriation and interpretation of indigenous cultures in mainstream institutions. Following a brief introduction to the generic characteristics of indigenous cultural centres, three cultural centres are discussed in order to elucidate some of the different motivations for developing cultural centres and some of the issues they face in servicing their own people and providing a 'contact zone' between the tribe and the outside world. The three institutions emphasise how different the genesis and development of indigenous cultural centres can be. They are representative of indigenous cultural centres in North America in the sense that they convey the significance of cultural heritage maintenance to indigenous peoples, both in their daily lives and in the larger political struggles that engage all indigenous peoples.

In this chapter a direct relationship between indigenous peoples' resistance to mainstream museum appropriation of their human remains and significant cultural property, their international assertions of self-definition and self-determination, repatriation claims, and the establishment of tribal cultural centres is asserted. Mainstream museums have been an essential component of the knowledge-making apparatus of colonising societies. As such museums have been complicit in creating the commonly held perceptions of indigenous peoples by non-indigenous peoples. Indigenous communities are now using their own cultural centres to communicate to the wider society their own understanding of themselves and their right to self-determination (Oxendine 1992: 89-90).

---

[10] Generally known as 'keeping places' in Australia.

To use Clifford's terminology, indigenous communities are creating their own "contact zones" in cultural centres where knowledge and meaning are negotiated in the midst of uneven power relationships. Cultural centres are places where cultural history can be made known, historical grievances aired and contemporary issues examined. The essential differences between the cultural centre and the mainstream museum is that cultural centres "allow Native peoples relatively greater ability to demonstrate and assert an authority to interpret their own culture" in an institutional context that is recognised and understood by the wider society (Erikson 1999: 568).[11]

Indigenous peoples' cultural centres have emerged in many different circumstances, the outcome of different processes and motivations. McAlear claims that indigenous peoples' "cultural centres have developed through global heritage consciousness, cultural tourism developments, repatriation actions, and indigenous political and cultural restoration initiatives" (McAlear 1996: 101). These institutions are seen to reconstitute heritage objects back into the fullness and complexity of community life. Many cultural centres manage a range of functions, including language schools, performing arts programmes, fine arts programmes, archives and libraries and research programmes, as well as the collection and interpretation of customary cultural property. Such functions are normally performed by separate mainstream institutions.

A survey undertaken in 1998 by the American Indian Museum Studies Programme at the Smithsonian Institution identified circa 127 cultural centres in the United States and 33 cultural centres in Canada (Cooper 1998:33). Oxendine (1992: 39-40) has identified three basic requirements for a successful indigenous cultural centre: tribal governance, tribal management and curatorship and tribal interpretation. Cultural centres are an institutional manifestation of indigenous people taking control of the management of their heritage resources, tangible and intangible, for the purpose of cultural heritage maintenance,

---

[11] Cultural centres emanate from "communities whose populations have been under stress to assimilate but who still want to continue their ways of knowing, their values , their cultural distinctiveness. … While cultural centres certainly entail reconstructions and rediscoveries of sometimes forgotten pasts, the process of research, interpretation, representation and narration are based on living communities intent upon perpetuating themselves" (Erikson 2002: 199).

"connecting the past and the present to the future" (ibid.: 40). Te Awekotuku (1988: 36) identified these characteristics in her vision of a tribal cultural centre:

> The tribal museum is primarily that - tribal - for the people of the community. The tribal museum is the place to care for the taonga tuku iho; to present and interpret them with sensitivity and pride; to love and cherish and be physically near them; and most of all, to let them inspire and motivate those younger Māori coming on.

3.3.1 U'Mista Cultural Centre and Kwagiulth Museum and Cultural Centre, British Columbia, Canada.

U'mista Cultural Centre at Alert Bay on Cormorant Island and the Kwagiulth Museum and Cultural Centre on Quadra Island, both situated between Vancouver Island and the mainland of British Columbia, Canada, were created to provide homes for a repatriated potlatch collection (Assu and Inglis 1996; Cranmer-Webster 1988, 1995; Broyles 1989; Clifford 1990; Jacknis 1996, 2002; Mauze 1992; Saunders 1995, 1997; Simpson 1996). Between 1880 and 1920 significant collections of Kwakwaka'wakw material culture had been acquired for Canadian and American museums, including the American Museum of Natural History in New York and Field Columbian Museum in Chicago. Northwest Coast art had become a commodity highly valued by both museums and private collectors, a fact that became all too apparent when the government illegally appropriated a potlatch collection from the Kwakwaka'wakw in 1921.

Potlatch ceremonies were occasions when communities celebrated birth, puberty, marriage, death, and other important events. Equally important was the opportunity for chiefs and other individuals to exercise their hereditary rights. In 1884 the Canadian Government amended the Indian Act (1880) to make participation in potlatch ceremonies illegal. This 'Potlatch Law' was seldom enforced during the next forty years. However, by 1920 there were various missionaries, politicians and government officials who objected to potlatch ceremonies as wasteful and degrading and insisted that the law be enforced. In response to this First Nations communities continued to hold potlatches but did so secretly.

In 1921 the Nimpkish chief Daniel Cranmer from Alert Bay held a potlatch at Village Island, the home of his bride's people. William Halliday, the government Indian Agent based at Alert Bay, uncovered the potlatch and arrested some of the participants; however, rather than send these people to prison he offered them the option of handing over their potlatch regalia, coppers, masks, rattles, whistles and other objects, in exchange for their freedom. Halliday sold thirty items to George Heye, founder of the Museum of the American Indian in New York before seven hundred and fifty items of regalia were crated and dispatched to Ottawa. When the main collection arrived in Ottawa it was consigned to the basement of the Victoria Memorial Museum (later the National Museum and now the Canadian Museum of Civilization) where all but one hundred items, given to the Royal Ontario Museum, were to remain until the 1960s (Jacknis 1996).

Although potlatches continued to be held after this event, their frequency was greatly reduced until the 'Potlatch Law' was omitted from the statutes in 1951. In this same year a system of First Nations band councils was introduced and the rest of the decade saw a resurgence of cultural activity, particularly in the form of traditional masked dances. In 1958 the local Member of Parliament made an attempt to locate and return the Potlatch Collection. In 1963, Chief James Sewid visited the Potlatch Collection in the National Museum in Ottawa and advised the museum that he wanted it returned. However, the museum was reluctant to enter into negotiations for the return of the collection because of fears that such a repatriation would create a precedent and thus initiate an avalanche of requests from across Canada.

During the 1960s First Nations politics were influenced by the wider context of the American civil-rights movement and the Vietnam War, as well as the domestic developments fostered by Pierre Trudeau's Liberal Party government. The desire to create First Nations museums was part of the self-determination discourse that was developing within First Nations politics. In response to this and the desire to decentralise its programmes, the National Museum developed the Museum Assistance Programme that was to provide funding for cultural centres.

In 1967 the government enacted the New Museum Act which allowed the National Museum to repatriate items from its collection. Initially the National Museum negotiated with the Kwagiulth Tribal Council. The museum agreed to return the collection on two conditions: all items were to be housed in an appropriate 'museum' facility and no items were to be returned to individuals or families. These conditions were designed to ensure the long-term preservation of and access to the collection and avoid the possibility of returned items being sold by individuals or families.[12] In 1972 the tribal council agreed to these conditions and decided to build a museum at Cape Mudge. Gloria Cranmer Webster, Daniel Cranmer's daughter, objected to this decision and asked that negotiations continue with the descendants. Saunders (1995: 44; see also Jacknis 1996: 279) notes there were:

> broader issues of longstanding rivalry and jealousy between tribes and lineages, issues which were never publicly enunciated or revealed to outsiders, issues which have sustained a thread of continuity in Kwagiulth life through all its cosmetic adaptations and vicissitudes.

In 1974 the tribal council decided that two museums would be built: one museum at Cape Mudge and the other at Alert Bay. The U'mista Society[13] was formed in 1974 to create the museum at Alert Bay and the Nuyumbalees Society[14] was established in 1975 to create the museum at Cape Mudge. Following difficult negotiations between the two societies the Potlatch Collection was divided on the basis of original ownership, based on the available documentation and the memory of tribal members. Eventually the Department of Indian Affairs 'persuaded' the ROM to return the items in 1978. The final division of the collection between the two societies was agreed on in 1979.

The two museums differ significantly in appearance and mode of interpretation. The Kwagiulth Museum opened in Cape Mudge village in 1979. Built of traditional materials, the museum combines features of the traditional big-house with a curving snail-like design

---

[12] Note that no such conditions were included in the Final Nisga'a Agreement signed twenty years later.
[13] U'mista means the return of a captive, either through payment of a ransom or a retaliatory raid.
[14] 'Nuyumbalees' means 'stories from the beginning of the world'.

that represents continual change.[15] The Potlatch Collection is exhibited in glass cases and the labelling acknowledges the families who originally owned the regalia, although pieces belonging to some families are still held by other museums.

> All our stuff that was brought back from Ottawa is in glass cases in the museum according to the family that owns them. That's what the masks and other things mean to us: family ownership. We are proud of that! It tells our family rights to people. With our people we don't talk about what rights to dances you've got; you call the people and show them in the potlatch. (Assu and Inglis 1996: 355)

Saunders (1997:114) confirms the low-key approach of the Kwagiulth Museum and suggests that the real activity takes place beyond the public gaze:

> … to a Lekwiltok audience, what makes sense of the Regalia, its personal, social, religious, historical and ideological context, its meaning in local community terms, is carefully nurtured: a fully engaged behind-the-scenes policy of ethnography and history is in full swing. But this knowledge belongs to the Lekwiltok alone, undermining the democratic notion of knowledge (science) as a free-for-all.

The U'mista Cultural Centre, Alert Bay, is located close to the shore, beside the former residential school. In the grounds around the centre there are a number of contemporary carved poles. The centre is constructed of timber and follows the design of a traditional big-house. Upon entry to the cultural centre the first space one encounters is the dual-purpose reception and retail area. This leads to the introductory exhibitions displayed in a wide corridor that takes the visitor to the main exhibition gallery. Included in the introductory exhibition are both historical and contemporary photographs and accounts of the origins of particular descent groups.

The main gallery, where the Potlatch Collection is exhibited, takes the form of a big-house internal space. It is basically a large room with a narrow wooden stage around the four walls. The room is dimly lit. The gallery is entered from the right side as a dancer would

---

[15] *Kwagiulth Museum and Cultural Centre* (pamphlet).

in a potlatch ceremony. The regalia have been arranged on the narrow stage around the perimeter of the room in the order of their appearance in a potlatch ceremony. Unlike other museums, the regalia are not in cases to protect them from the destructive attentions of the visitors. The presentation is understated compared with the elaborate interpretations now common in many mainstream museum exhibitions designed to both educate and entertain. Instead of the usual anthropological labels, copies of official documents relating to the confiscation of the potlatch collection are strategically located throughout the gallery. This creates a powerful reflective space in which to appreciate the history and cultural significance of these regalia. However, it is also clear that the space has been designed to facilitate customary cultural practice, such as speech making and other ceremonies, as well as the exhibition. The space is also used as a classroom for young Kwakwaka'wakw learning their own language, traditions and visual and performing arts.

The U'mista Cultural Centre can only be understood in the context of Alert Bay: the divided settlement and the marginalised state of many Indian people in the community; the rich natural environment over-exploited by the fishing and forestry industries; the vitality of the cultural renaissance evident in the Traditional Big House, the Language Retention Programme and contemporary Kwakwaka'wakw art. The cultural centre is a symbol of cultural continuity and renaissance and continuing dependency: part museum, part art gallery, part heritage centre, part community centre and part tourist facility.

Saunders' (1997: 109) observations about the U'mista Cultural Centre provide a different perspective to the mostly celebratory accounts in the mainstream museological literature (e.g. Clifford 1990). Saunders (1997: 111) is of the view that the U'mista Potlatch Collection gallery is really designed to provide a comfortable experience for metropolitan art gallery patrons. On the other hand, her comments about the Kwagiulth Museum and Research Centre are more complimentary. She suggests that claims by commentators such as Clifford that the Kwagiulth Museum is more in the mainstream museum mould demonstrate a significant mis-reading of the exhibitions:

U'mista has gained renown in anthropology and cultural studies as a result of Clifford's influential publications. It is a fully self-conscious 'oppositional' museum and articulates both ethno-nationalism and standard utopian discourses of 'freedom', 'autonomy', 'authenticity' and nostalgic 'return' relying precisely for effect on the texts, practices, and records of the photological apparatus of cosmopolitan museums. In contrast, the Kwagiulth Museum and Cultural Centre ... belongs fully to the Fourth World. It is marginalised and neglected by the centre, and bullied, exploited and intimidated by U'mista, it is 'unprofessional' in organisation, unable to marshal families living in the city and surrounding district an ethno-national discourse, and survives - just - in the midst of incommensurable contradictions. It is almost an anti-museum. It seems to resist the structures of power inherent to a museum. (1997: 113)

It is clear from these comments by Saunders that indigenous cultural centres can take very different approaches to their role as sites of resistance.

The mandate of the U'mista Cultural Centre is to ensure the survival of all aspects of the cultural heritage of the Kwakwaka'wakw. All programming is developed and evaluated on the basis of this mandate (U'mista Cultural Society 1999: 65). The centre is governed by a Board of Directors elected by the honorary, individual and family members of the U'mista Cultural Society.

The U'mista Cultural Centre Annual Report (1995:1-2) outlines the objectives of the centre:

a) Collect, preserve and exhibit native artifacts, of artistic, and historical value to Kwakwaka'wakw;
b) Promote and foster carving, dancing, ceremonials, and other cultural/artistic activities engaged in by the Kwakwaka'wakw;
c) Collect, record, and make available information and records relating to the language and history of the Kwakwaka'wakw;
d) Promote, build and maintain facilities for carrying out the above aims;
e) Recover from other institutions and individuals artifacts and records of cultural, artistic, and historical value to the Kwakwaka'wakw.

These objectives were to be pursued through a set of priorities and projects. Completion of a number of collection cataloguing projects and the genealogical research project were in-

house priorities as was the language programme. The centre has also given priority to the development of a marketing strategy for local artists. Other responsibilities are related to assistance with the development of the tribal claim, the care and maintenance of the Traditional Big House, and the development of tribal performing arts programmes (U'mista Cultural Centre 1995: 5). It is apparent that this cultural centre, in common with most other cultural centres, is involved in a range of activities that are not normally associated with mainstream museums.

The maintenance of the cultural centre, the collections and the wide range of cultural activities is funded largely from non-tribal sources (Sanborn 1995: 12-3). The director spends a significant portion of her time writing grant applications to ensure the survival of the cultural centre. This is the reality for many cultural centres in communities that do not have the resources to sustain their cultural centres without external grants. Hence, the development of facilities and programmes must be made to 'fit' with the criteria established by these external agencies and long term planning and security of tenure for staff is uncertain. Although these cultural centres have emerged from their particular communities and their primary focus is indigenous heritage maintenance, their autonomy is still subject to some degree to external funding agencies.

The history of the Kwakwaka'wakw Potlatch Collection and the development of the two cultural centres demonstrate many common factors in the development of such centres. The policies of colonial governments, designed to assimilate or marginalise indigenous peoples, have been enacted by local officials in ways that have led to the appropriation of cultural property. Such cultural property has often eventually entered public museum collections in both Canada and abroad. The process of repatriating such cultural property to indigenous peoples can be stressful. This stress is often caused by the mainstream institutions' attempts to negotiate certain conditions before the return of cultural property; however, the decisions about the disposition of the material, once it has been returned, can be equally stressful. The Kwakwaka'wakw communities accepted the conditions stipulated by the National Museum for the material to be placed in 'appropriate' facilities. On the surface they also appeared to accept the condition that the items should not be returned to

the ownership of particular families, when in fact the acknowledgement of family ownership is very clear in the different modes of interpretation in both cultural centre exhibitions of the Potlatch Collection. In this way the exhibitions in the two cultural centres are themselves sites of resistance. The significance of family ownership is also reinforced by the increasing number of family regalia being placed in the museum for safe keeping by community members.

Communities (sub-tribes) within a tribal confederation, such as the Kwakwaka'wakw, may strive to retain their own identity. Each of these communities has chosen to present and interpret the Potlatch Collection in quite different ways. In so doing these communities have not only chosen different ways of re-presenting themselves to non-Indians, they have also taken the opportunity to mark the boundaries and connections between each other as sections of the Kwakwaka'wakw.

3.3.2 Makah Cultural Center and Research Center, Makah Reservation, Neah Bay, Washington State, USA.

Makah Cultural Center, Neah Bay, northwest Washington State, United States, was initially established to provide a home for and exhibition of the Ozette Village archaeological assemblage. [16] This institution has subsequently assumed three major functions in contemporary Makah development: the center provides a focus for language recovery strategies and the recording and translation of oral traditions; it has also become the focus for Makah claims under the NAGPRA legislation; and the exhibitions at the center have become one means of responding to the external protests against the Makah asserting their treaty right to hunt whales. The Makah, whose traditional territory is in the northwest of Washington State, had their first contact with Europeans in 1788 (Colson 1953: 3-24; Tweedie 1999: 91). Their customary economy was based on sealing, fishing and whaling (Tweedie 1999: 65-72). Although they had little contact with Europeans before the 1840s, within a short period the Makah became subject to United States law

---

[16] Erikson (2002) is a detailed account of the history and operation of the Makah Cultural and Research Center. Unfortunately, this book only became available to the author of this thesis at the time the thesis was being prepared for submission.

and government policy: a national border was established to demarcate Canada from the USA, in the process imposing divisions between the Makah and their northern relatives.

Since 1991 the Makah Museum and Research Center has received over 150 'summaries' from public museums advising them of their Makah holdings, as they are required to do by the provisions of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (Tweedie 1999:52, 131). These museum collections represent only a fraction of the cultural material that has left the reservation. The Makah were not relocated by the government to distant reservations or massacred by government troops, as many Native American peoples were, but their families and communities were disrupted and their capacity to continue customary practices, both subsistence and ceremonial, was severely compromised. This history of disease, population decline, loss of land, local relocation, forced re-education, individual land allotments, changing subsistence patterns, and the transition to a cash economy preceded the eventual alienation of the tribe's material heritage in the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century. In addition to this, traders, private collectors and public museum agents developed a range of strategies designed to enable them to acquire cultural treasures. There is also evidence of an adaptive strategy on the part of the Makah, as there has been within many Native American communities, in the development of a productive capacity within the community to produce craft/art products (mainly baskets and carvings) that met the demand for 'traditional' products from collectors (Erikson 1999: 571-3).

In 1969 storms eroded archaeological material from coastal foothills at the long abandoned Makah village of Ozette on the northwest coast of Washington State. Ozette had been one of the five permanent Makah villages inhabited until the early twentieth century when most Makah relocated to Neah Bay because the government had made it compulsory for their children to attend school there. In order to stop the fossicking of eroding archaeological material at Ozette the Makah Tribal Council agreed to allow archaeologists from Washington State University to undertake a major excavation programme that was to continue for ten years. During this period 55,000 objects were recovered.

The archaeological remains at Ozette consisted of a series of house sites that had been covered by an extensive mudslide in the fifteenth century, which had come down over the houses and sealed their contents. This anaerobic environment meant that, as rarely occurs, items made of wood and fibre had been preserved. The range of objects included house parts, sea mammal hunting equipment, fishing equipment, tools, carvings (wood, bone and ivory), wooden boxes, bowls, basketry, cloth, items of personal adornment, and toys.

The perception of Ozette by the Makah changed significantly as a result of the excavations. In the early twentieth century Ozette was reduced from a permanent village site to a seasonal resource site and was eventually essentially deserted when the families that formerly lived there relocated to Neah Bay, no longer returning even for seasonal food gathering purposes. The deserted village became a symbol of the impact of the American government's assimilationist policies. However, according to Broyles (1989: 146), with the recovery of the archaeological assemblage from Ozette, the village has now come to "symbolise the essence, strength and tenacity of Makah culture and identity". This demonstrates how the materiality of heritage collections can provide an important element of cultural renaissance and play an important role in the politics of indigenous recognition.

The Makah living in Neah Bay today assert a direct descent relationship with the fifteenth century people of Ozette. This line of descent establishes their customary rights as Makah, such as the right to hunt whales, which are enshrined in their 1855 treaty with the government. Consequently, it was essential that the Ozette archaeological assemblage be retained on the Makah Reservation where the Makah can retain ownership and control. When the Makah Cultural and Research Center (MCRC) was opened in 1979, the preservation and presentation of the archaeological assemblage in Neah Bay formalised this descent relationship in a tangible way both within the Makah community and to the outside world. Makah concerns about the ownership and control of archaeological assemblages were also stimulated by the debate occurring throughout the United States at that time between Native Americans, museums and archaeologists (Broyles 1989: 150-1).

Makah resistance to cultural assimilation continues and was a primary motivation for the development of the Makah Cultural and Research Center. Whereas the U'mista Cultural Center and the Kwagiulth Museum were established to receive the Potlatch Collection repatriated by the Canadian Government, the Makah Cultural and Research Center was built to accommodate an archaeological assemblage. However, in the twenty-two years since it was created the center has developed a broad mission.

The center is a purpose-built facility. Initially conceived as a storage facility for an archaeological assemblage, the notion of a culture center emerged as the significance of the resource developed. It is located close to the main road leading into the Makah Reservation and consists of two wooden buildings of similar design, which meld naturally into the edge of the forest.[17] The smaller of the two buildings is the single story storage facility where the Ozette archaeological, and other, collections are housed that are not on display. Less than two percent of the collection is on display in the center. The larger two story building houses the exhibitions, work areas, education rooms and staff offices. From the first welcome to visitors and the introduction to the permanent exhibitions, connections are drawn between the ancestors and the Makah living in Neah Bay today. The permanent exhibitions present the Ozette archaeological material in a seasonal cycle. Historic photographs and oral tradition are used to provide a context for the collections.

The Makah Tribal Council foresaw economic benefits for the Makah community in the establishment of the MCRC. Because the cultural centre was seen to have significant development potential for Neah Bay, the Economic Development Administration provided a grant of $US1.4 million for the construction of the MCRC (Tweedie 1999: 124). A broad range of cultural benefits were also anticipated, including further development of the fledgling language revitalisation programme, an oral history programme and the repatriation of cultural treasures from mainstream museums.

---

[17] The author made a research visit to the Makah Research and Cultural Center in 1991.

The Makah Research and Cultural Center, collection, exhibits and programmes, provides an 'ethnic charter'.[18] The reintroduction of whale hunting by the Makah and the supportive role taken by the MCRC illustrate the notion of the ethnic charter in action. The recovery of objects such as harpoons and a decorative panel carved with whale designs from the Ozette archaeological excavations confirmed oral traditions about the significance of whale hunting to the Makah. This focus by the Makah on their whaling tradition, enhanced by the Ozette findings and the subsequent presentation of the Makah whaling tradition in the MCRC since the late 1970s, led to considerable interest within the Makah to re-activate whale hunting. The Makah had not actively hunted whales since 1913 because of the devastating effect that commercial whaling had had on the whale population. In May 1995 the Makah announced unilaterally that that they would begin hunting the grey whale again, because it had recently been removed from the Endangered Species List (Erikson 1999: 556).

Some anti-whaling animal rights groups objected strongly to this announcement and their protests attracted considerable media attention. These groups argued that it was inappropriate for one group to assert traditional whale hunting rights when whale numbers are still low. They also suggested that the Makah may have the intention to develop whale hunting as a commercial enterprise. Other groups, such as Greenpeace, have chosen to recognise the rights of indigenous groups to pursue their customary practices, and have kept a low profile in the debate over Makah whale hunting (ibid.: 559). On October 25 1997 the International Whaling Commission granted Makah permission to catch four gray whales a year for subsistence and ceremonial purposes. In 1998 a whaling canoe was constructed in the grounds of the MCRC; however, it was not until May 17, 1999, that the Makah whalers hunted and killed their first whale since 1913 (Tweedie 1999: 127).

During this time the MCRC operated very effectively as a 'contact zone' through which the Makah have been able to communicate to the protestors, the visiting public and the media, their rationale for the recuperation of their customary whaling practices (Erikson 1999:

---

[18] Boyles (1989: 163-7) defines an ethnic charter as "a symbolic construction that draws from a people's past (historical and mythic) to set out self-perception of the definitive traits which unify them and set them apart from others", thus becoming a "central component in processes of ethnic mobilisation."

558). The museum not only makes visible the archaeological evidence of Makah whaling history, it also provides access to the oral history that has sustained this customary practice. The MCRC is far more than a place in which to preserve Makah heritage; it has become an active partner in the tribe's strategy for heritage maintenance, self-definition and self-determination.

Within an indigenous community a cultural centre can provide a focus for cultural renaissance. This may take the form of creating collections of cultural treasures, archives, photographs and contemporary artworks, language recovery programmes, and performing arts programmes. Cultural centres also provide a contact zone where indigenous communities can communicate on their own terms with the wider society. The main difference between the cultural centre and the mainstream museum is that the cultural centre provides a forum in which the indigenous community can be self-defining; the cultural centre becomes one element in a strategy of self-determination.

While many mainstream museums are increasingly becoming places where indigenous peoples can negotiate accommodations with those caring for and interpreting their cultural property, such museums remain sites essentially operating within a non-indigenous museum paradigm. As museums move towards negotiating a common ground with indigenous peoples where the cultural practices and imperatives of indigenous peoples can flourish, they will undoubtedly be influenced by the policies and practices of indigenous cultural centres.

CHAPTER FOUR

MĀORI AND MUSEUMS:
THE NATIONAL CONTEXT 1970 -2002

4.0 Introduction

From the 1970s through to the turn of the twenty-first century there was rapid change in museum practice relating to the care and use of taonga Māori. This process was primarily driven by Māori demand for change, but also reflected increasing awareness by museum practitioners of the changing relationships between museums and indigenous peoples internationally. While museum practitioners had begun to initiate change in their relationships with tangata whenua and in the care and interpretation of taonga Māori in museum collections during the 1970s, from the opening of *Te Māori* in 1984 Māori concerns and aspirations hastened the pace of change. Moreover, it was a period in which Māori assertion of the right to self-determination was also a significant catalyst for change in the museum sector. This was apparent in the increasing participation of Māori as museum practitioners, advisors, and trustees, as well as in the increasing tribal emphasis on the reclamation of heritage and culture. Museums seemed to respond to these forces in a positive manner. However, the politics of cultural recognition can be deceptive and the question remains as to whether the ideological frameworks and institutional power structures really did change significantly.

This chapter provides an overview of the evolving relationships between Māori and the museum sector at the national level during the period 1970 - 2002. The following topics are discussed: the broad political, economic and social context; *Te Māori*; Māori control of Māori heritage; repatriation of cultural property, national museum organisations; and Gerard O'Regan's (1997a) report on *Bicultural Developments in Museums of Aotearoa*. A selective overview of the national context within which individual museums were developing their own relationships with tangata whenua is provided. During this period

the National Museum and National Art Gallery of New Zealand made the transformation into the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa.[1]

4.1 Political, Economic and Social Context 1970-2002

The last quarter of the twentieth century was a period of significant political, economic, and social change for Māori, as for all New Zealanders. Change in the museum sector from the 1970s onwards was influenced by events in the wider society, particularly the introduction of the Labour government's free market economic policy, and the ongoing dialogue between the government and Māori about Treaty grievances, as well as the movement for Māori self-determination. Māori demands for increased political autonomy emerged with renewed focus in the 1970s. The land rights movement helped to bring Treaty grievances to public and political notice and it was becoming increasingly apparent that many Māori were marginalised within the wider society (Poata-Smith 1996: 103-6). This was reflected in a range of socio-economic, health and education statistics (ibid.: 106). The Treaty was seen as a means of redressing inequalities and re-establishing indigenous rights.

The Waitangi Tribunal had been established in 1975, providing for the first time a vehicle for exploring Māori grievances against the Crown where the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi had been breached. The Tū Tangata[2] policy developed from 1977, signalled an important change from the assimilationist policies of previous governments, because it encouraged the development of a range of educational and cultural initiatives that celebrated Māori cultural identity (Ward and Hayward 1999: 394). It was the desire for greater Māori control over their own resources that found expression in the *Te Māori* exhibition. *Te Māori* provided the vehicle for those who were advocating Māori control of their own heritage resources, including taonga Māori in museums, to promote their cause.

---

[1] See Appendix One for the governance implications of this transformation.
[2] Tū Tangata was a policy developed by the Department of Māori Affairs from 1977 that linked cultural retention and revival with social and economic advancement (Durie 1994: 56).

The 1980s can be described as a high water mark in the government's recognition of the Treaty. In 1985 the new Labour government extended the powers of the Waitangi Tribunal to hear historical grievances[3] and in 1986 the State Owned Enterprises Act was passed requiring the crown to act in a manner consistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. The significance of the inclusion of a Treaty clause in this legislation was that the Treaty became the basis for an ongoing partnership between Māori and the Crown, at least in respect of State Owned Enterprises. In the following year the Court of Appeal outlined a set of Treaty principles in the case *New Zealand Māori Council v. Attorney General* (Ward and Hayward 1999: 395). There was broad agreement between the courts and the Waitangi Tribunal that the principles of the Treaty included "tribal self-regulation, partnership, consultation, and active protection, within the wider understanding of a bargain between Māori and the Crown" and these principles were to become influential in the ongoing dialogue between Māori and the Crown (Durie 1998: 29).

In the early 1990s the government drew back from full legislative recognition of the Treaty in response to both political and public opposition. However, when the Resource Management Act was passed in 1991 it included a requirement to "take into account" the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (ibid.: 28). The government was reluctant to include any further form of recognition of the provisions or the principles of the Treaty in legislation, although the Auckland War Memorial Museum Act 1996 is an important exception. In the midst of this political shift there was an upsurge of Māori protest at Waitangi Day 'celebrations' and an occupation at Pakaitore/Moutoa Gardens, Wanganui, which lasted for 79 days. The government had turned its attention to the resolution of historic grievances with a sense of urgency and a desire for finality; the first major settlement was concluded with Tainui in 1995 but the conclusion of the Treaty grievance process was nowhere in sight.

When the fourth Labour government came to power in 1984 it sanctioned the emerging notion of biculturalism as official policy, leading to "the incorporation of Māori personnel,

---

[3] Between 1985 and 1991 the Waitangi Tribunal heard eighty-three new claims and wrote thirteen reports. The consciousness-raising in the Māori community resulting from this level of activity should not be underestimated.

Māori models of organisation and Māori social practices and cultural symbolism within the institutions of the state" (Poata-Smith 1996: 108). Against this backdrop, biculturalism became the centre-piece of government response to the Māori demand for increasing cultural recognition (rangatiratanga) (Fleras and Spoonley 1999: 121).

This notion of biculturalism permeated most government agencies and public institutions, including museums, and became increasingly important in the evolving relationships between Māori and museums at the national and institutional levels. However, government policy was a double-edged sword: while on the one hand the bicultural policy went some way to recognising the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi, it was off-set by the government's free market economic policy that led to a significant rise in Māori unemployment and further marginalisation (Durie 1999: 5). Yet despite the outward signs of 'progress' it has been argued that whether the government advocates biculturalism or multiculturalism the reality is that New Zealand remains a monocultural society that is "inescapably rooted in Eurocentric values and structures" (Fleras and Spoonley 1999: 235).

4.2   *Te Māori*

Chapter Three identified three sites of indigenous resistance that have led to significant change in the relationships between museums and indigenous peoples in North America and Australasia: international declarations and national policy statements, repatriation strategies, and indigenous cultural centres. There are also significant sites of resistance within museum practice, including indigenous insistence on the co-management of collections and exhibitions: the *Te Māori* exhibition was a site of resistance that significantly changed the Māori-museum relationship. To assess the significance of *Te Māori* it must be seen in the wider cultural and political context outlined above and not simply as a major museum event. As Mead (1985b: 4) observed at the time:

> Museums took over a part of Māori culture that has today become very important in the context of tū tangata, kohanga reo and mana motuhake. There is a felt need among the people to be reunited with their heritage and to regain control of it.

It is difficult, in retrospect, to balance the significance of the changes in museum practice that had begun in the 1970s and those that emerged as a consequence of the *Te Māori* planning process during the period 1980 to 1984. However, the *Te Māori* planning process would not have progressed as constructively as it did, had it not been for a predisposition within government departments, public agencies and the museum sector to facilitate change and to recognise Māori aspirations for both autonomy and a greater sense of ownership over Māori assets, including cultural assets. Moreover, there were Māori public servants and academics in key positions who were able to maximise the opportunities offered by *Te Māori*, as well as individuals in the museum sector who recognised the need for change. In the 1980s, for the first time the museum sector was forced to reach beyond those with whom it had always dealt, the people O'Regan (1984: 15) termed the "paepae Māori", to engage a younger generation of highly educated and articulate public servants, academics and urban activists.

In 1981 the New Zealand Government agreed to support the proposal to take an exhibition of taonga Māori to the United States (Te Māori Management Committee 1988: 8-9). Later, when it was decided the exhibition would tour New Zealand after it returned from the United States, local organising committees in each metropolitan centre and in the regions were established for developing educational resources and training kaiārahi (guides). These committees included both Māori community members and museum staff.

Te Māori was exhibited in the United States from September 1984 until June 1986.[4] The exhibition then returned to New Zealand and was exhibited in the four metropolitan cities

---

[4]*Te Māori* opened at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, on 10 September 1984 and subsequently at the St Louis Art Museum (February 1985), the M H de Young Memorial Museum, San Francisco (July 1985) and the Field Museum of Natural History (March 1986).

from August 1986 until September 1987.[5] The taonga were returned to the twelve New Zealand museums from which they had been borrowed towards the end of 1987. The total attendance at the four venues in New Zealand was circa 920,000, nearly 300,000 more visitors than had seen *Te Māori* in the four venues in the United States.

The Māori sub-committee[6] was formed "to ensure that Māoridom had a voice in all operations of the exhibition from the time of approval and agreement of the exhibition to the time of the return" (Te Māori Management Committee 1988: 16). Consisting of senior public servants, scholars and arts administrators, the sub-committee ensured that approval was sought from the traditional owners of the treasures for their inclusion in the exhibition. The round of consultations seeking permission to include the taonga raised the awareness of many Māori to the presence of these treasures in museum collections. This was the first time museums in New Zealand had sought iwi consent to travel taonga overseas. In 1978, for example, the National Museum of New Zealand had sent an exhibition of 110 taonga Māori to China but there is no record in the 1978 annual report that there had been consultation with iwi before the taonga were sent, nor is there evidence of kaumātua accompanying this exhibition to ensure the appropriate protocols were observed (National Art Gallery, National Museum and national War Memorial 1978: 15(G-12)).

In contrast, the Māori sub-committee made arrangements for the tribes represented in the exhibition to have representatives at each opening ceremony for the Te Māori exhibition in the United States. For the first time Māori were in control of a major museum exhibition of treasures, which had been beyond their reach for so long in museum collections. When the exhibition returned to New Zealand, Māori managed the opening ceremonies at each venue and the day-to-day management of the exhibition, including

---

[5] *Te Māori* opened at the National Museum, Wellington, on 16 August 1986 and subsequently at Otago Museum (29 November 1986), McDougal Art Gallery (14 March 1987), and Auckland City Art Gallery (27 June 1987).
[6] Membership of the Māori sub-committee included: Kuru Waaka (Chairman), Piri Sciascia (Deputy Chairman), Professor Hirini Mead, Mina McKenzie, Bill Cooper, June Mead, and Eric Tamepo (Executive Officer).

welcoming visitors in customary Māori form and training Māori students to interpret the exhibition to visitors.

When the exhibition opened in New York, the television coverage of the dawn ceremony with elders chanting karakia as they ascended the front steps of the Metropolitan Museum of Art heralded in a new period of museum practice in New Zealand. New Zealanders saw taonga Māori exhibited as art works of international standing rather than ethnological specimens and were able to glimpse something of the relationship between taonga and the people from whom they had originated. This revelation reinforced the already growing recognition in many New Zealand museums of the need to redevelop the exhibitions of taonga Māori that had remained essentially unchanged for decades and to reinterpret taonga as part of a wider cultural context with contemporary relevance. The Māori protocol used by the elders to ceremonially open *Te Māori* quickly became the accepted form for opening most exhibitions of taonga tuku iho Māori and even exhibitions of contemporary Māori art in New Zealand museums. The level of consultation between Māori and museums about issues of Māori collection care and interpretation increased significantly in the wake of *Te Māori*. The planning process followed for *Te Māori* had an immediate effect on museum practice in many institutions. Hawkes Bay Museum and Art Gallery, Napier, for example, opened the exhibition *Ngā Tukemata: Ngā Taonga o Ngāti Kahungunu* in 1986. The planning process for this exhibition was significantly influenced by *Te Māori* (Butts 1990b).

Te Māori continues to be a focus for scholars interested in the evolving relationship between Māori and museums (see for example McManus 1992, Butler, P. 1996, Hanham 2000 and Butts 2002). It is now clear that the exhibition took place at a time when new and more vigorous Māori voices were joining those of the elders, who had been advising museums for generations, in a call for greater Māori participation in museum governance, management and operations. *Te Māori* provided an impetus for those Māori and Pākehā in metropolitan and regional communities, who recognised the need for change in the way museums cared for and interpreted taonga Māori, to bring these issues to the attention of museum practitioners. Tribal kaitiakitanga (customary practices relating to guardianship

of and authority over taonga) was recognised by museums during *Te Māori*; consequently, this recognition has been continued by individual institutional negotiations with tribes at the local level.

4.3   Māori Control of Māori Heritage

There is an extensive literature about the *Te Māori* exhibition in the United States and New Zealand and assessment of the impact of the exhibition on Māori, museum practitioners and the general public (e.g. Mead 1986, O'Biso 1987, Te Māori Management Committee 1988). This literature has been reviewed in depth elsewhere (Butler, P. 1996). An attempt is made here to document some of the Māori commentary that appeared at the time, which outlined changes that were required in museum governance, policy and practice.[7] There are two groups of commentators: those who wrote at the time of and directly after *Te Māori*, and a second group who reinforced the message of rangatiratanga in the 1990s.

A number of Māori closely involved with *Te Māori* and with close connections to the museum and heritage sector, such as Professor Hirini Mead and Tipene O'Regan began to make regular contributions to the museological literature from 1984. Common themes run through most of these papers: negative Māori perceptions of museums; the need for Māori representation on museum boards; the need for more Māori staff to be trained and appointed to curatorial and administrative positions in museums, and the desire to repatriate significant taonga tuku iho.

---

[7] A hui wānanga was held at the National Museum, Wellington, 18 October 1986, to consider future directions for Māori involvement in museums. The hui made the following recommendations to museums:

(1)   that Māori people should determine how their own taonga or cultural treasures are presented and interpreted;

(2)   that museums are caretakers of the taonga, not the owners; the mana of the taonga resides with the iwi from which it originates;

(3)   that the relevant iwi or tribe should be consulted on all matters regarding their taonga;

(4)   that Māori taonga in the museum setting should be presented as part of a living culture rather than as a relic of the past;

(5)   that Māori staffing levels should be dramatically increased to enable the appropriate cultural considerations regarding the well-being of the taonga to be put in place; and

(6)   that museums with significant collections of Māori taonga should begin to effect institutional change to enable them to become bicultural institutions in the future.

Some were not optimistic about the ability of mainstream museums to change:

> In terms of a bicultural ideology museums and art galleries are taha Pākehā institutions which are probably too firmly welded into the past of Pākehā society to be amenable to radical change. Therefore, they should be left to make whatever cosmetic changes they can. (Mead 1985a: 19)

Therefore, it was not surprising that Mead should advocate for Māori to develop their own heritage institutions:

> In light of recent changes in Māori attitudes we should now be looking towards alternative structures which will accommodate the new realities. Self-determination is a principle that can not be denied. Tribal groups need to design and run their own cultural centres which specifically meet their heritage and cultural needs. (Mead 1985b: 4)

Tipene O'Regan (1987: 144) also anticipated a difficult time for museums:

> Phenomena such as the 'Te Māori' exhibition enormously enhance the Māori perception of their past and therefore their self-esteem. That process heightens the awareness of distance and tauiwi (outsider) control. The more status is heaped on their treasures, the more distant they become from the descendants of those who shaped and wove those treasures. This process has led to increasing calls for the withdrawal of taonga from museums and their return to the marae, to louder cries for Māori control and Māori interpretation. Greater awareness brings with it a more confident assertion of Māori proprietorship of Māori heritage. It's going to be a difficult decade for museums.

Broadcaster, Henare Te Ua (1987: 9) sounded a cautionary note about taonga returning to marae:

> There has…been a euphoric cry from some tribes to take back their taonga from institutions to their home marae. I hope these tribes will pause in this clamour. Māori

people at this time do not have the expertise to preserve tribal taonga. Decrepit meeting houses around the country bear testimony to this.

However, he also acknowledged the need for change in museum practice:

> On the other hand, there should be imaginative displays mounted by institutions of taonga which are not usually seen. Mini Te Māori could be devised together with Māori people's involvement. Institutions should raise their profiles and explain during marae live-ins, what they do. The professional must use lay language to explain the areas of trusteeship, conservation, research and design. And the Māori people must explain their true and euphoric feelings about the taonga. (ibid.: 9)

In 1985 museum curator Ngahuia Te Awekotuku (1985: 8) seemed to be optimistic that Māori could change the nature of museums:

> … we the Māori people must move into the wharetaonga of this country with the radiant reassurance of our kinship with the contents, to the images and the memories within the walls. We must reclaim them as a vibrantly meaningful past of a colourfully complex design of our dynamic culture. For what is a museum? No more a rua kōiwi, a death house, a sad repository of plunder and grief, a cave of relics, but instead a place of joy and laughter and memory, a haven of inspiration and hope, the silently sleeping seeds of life itself.

Three years later she felt the need to outline in detail the need for Māori representation in museum governance as a prerequisite to meaningful change:

> It is essential that the governing boards and decision-making bodies of museums firmly and equitably represent Māori interests - an assemblage of well-meaning, well-intentioned, pākehā gentlemen scholars, academic liberals, token Māori appointees, and local body representatives will never be enough. There should be a bilingual and articulate Māori presence on every museum governing body with Māori collections in this country, as of right, in accordance with the principles of the Treaty and the mana of the taonga in these collections. Selection of Māori board members could be done by the tribal authority of

that museum's region, or, in the case of a national or metropolitan institution, by a consensus of tribal authorities. This option offers the status quo - certainly all that is good about it - while empowering the Māori community to determine how they can participate in, benefit from, and ultimately direct institutional activities, while still celebrating and learning from the taonga tuku iho within these walls. (Te Awekotuku 1988: 36)

These voices represent the call for change and recognition of mana Māori during the 1980s. While these individuals continued to advocate for change into the 1990s there were also new voices. Some were optimistic that significant changes were occurring in museum practice, especially with the appointment of kaitiaki Māori (Mane-Wheoki 1995: 6), but others remained cautious, citing continuing Māori ambivalence towards museums arising from difficulties with access to collections and other forms of cultural insensitivity (Hakiwai 1995: 286)

In a 1995 report on the relationship between Māori and museums, Jones (1995: 1) identified four issues facing museums: (1) ownership of taonga; (2) institutional authority over Māori heritage; (3) the development and empowerment of Māori communities through museum resources; (4) a vision for the future which has an indigenous focus. The groups and individuals Jones consulted in Māori communities throughout the country identified the importance of Māori control of heritage collections. For some this meant the return of taonga to families, marae or iwi cultural centres:

These centres should be supported as part of an overall strategy to enable Māori to take control of their 'patrimony' as represented by material culture. This is a matter of self representation and representation of oneself to the rest of the world. These centres would be a response to the existing museums which continue, it is argued, to function as a validation of colonisation. (ibid.: 2)

Jones also encountered the view that museums need to examine the values underlying the institutions. Respondents observed that Māori advisory committees were no longer seen by the Māori community as an effective means of relationship building or exercising control. Priority was given to the appointment of Māori staff to museum positions:

> The point was consistently made that the values of an institution are unlikely to change unless the people inside the institutions are exposed to a competing set of values or are working in an evolving relationship with members of different communities who bring different ways of valuing art and heritage to their respective positions. (ibid.: 4)

Māori participation in museum governance was also identified as a priority:

> The purpose of locating Māori at the governance level is to ensure that the functions and the parameters of the purpose of the institution is integrated with a Māori expectation of what the institution should be doing. As the purpose is implemented specific attention is paid to a range of key Māori outputs. These outputs are delivered by both Māori and Pākehā professionals. (ibid.: 4)

In summary, Jones (ibid.: 7) identifies a set of principles that should underlie active protection by museums of Māori interests in the taonga held in public collections:

> These include the exercise of customary authority, the flow of the Māori narrative, the outward looking institution, the recognition of the inherent right, the entitlement of separate development, the need to avoid dislocation between object and people.

Gerard O'Regan (1997b: 29) also draws attention to the importance of Māori participation in museum governance, distinguishing between partnership and tino rangatiratanga. He derives his position from the principles inherent in the Treaty of Waitangi, the Mataatua Declaration and the Draft Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. O'Regan argues that the basis of a sound bicultural relationship, a genuine partnership, is cultural recognition. Until museums acknowledge the rangatiratanga of the hapū and iwi with whom they want to form an enduring relationship there can be no basis for a partnership. Furthermore, hapū and iwi must be able to exercise their rangatiratanga autonomously, not only within the context of the relationship. In drawing attention to the significance of cultural recognition, O'Regan also exposes the insidious nature of bicultural rhetoric. Institutional biculturalism is often applied like makeup: it can create the appearance desired by both the wearer and the viewer, while beneath the surface the ravages of time

remain. In the case of museums, the inherited ideologies of the western museology may be covered for public consumption, but after the performance, when the makeup is cleaned off, the old face remains as it has always been, the face of colonialism (see Butts 1994).

Māori commentators argued during this period that the most effective means of eroding the colonial power structures within museums was to increase Māori participation in museum governance and to increase the number of Māori museum practitioners. By the mid-1990s many Māori commentators were also distinguishing between biculturalism and mana motuhake Māori (Māori self-determination). The danger with notions such as biculturalism, which are adopted as government orthodoxy, is that they are captured and translated by the power culture to serve the discourse of tolerance rather than facilitating any meaningful recognition of indigeneity. This frustration with biculturalism led to the exploration of new museum governance models in the late 1990s. These new governance models are the subject of Part Two of this thesis.

4.4   Repatriation

As Māori awareness has grown of the taonga held in New Zealand museums, particularly since *Te Māori*, many Māori have been rebuilding connections with these cultural treasures and asserting their rights in relation to their management and interpretation. Rights have also been asserted in relation to the return of kōiwi (human remains). In some instances the outcome of these reconnections has been to make formal requests for the repatriation of these taonga to public museums within the tribal territory of the people concerned or to have the taonga returned to the people.

Repatriation requests were not a new phenomenon for museums in the 1970s. In 1979 Roger Neich (1979: 8), then a curator at the National Museum of New Zealand, noted that there had been a history of requests from Māori for the return of taonga from museum collections and that at that time major institutions such as the national museum often advised placing such taonga in appropriate regional institutions close to the customary

owners. Taonga were also returned from metropolitan museums to regional museums to supplement exhibition projects focusing on the taonga tuku iho of particular iwi.

Three repatriation strategies - legislation, treaty negotiation and moral suasion - were discussed in Chapter Three. As there is no equivalent to the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act in New Zealand, there is no legislative framework within which Māori can claim the return of taonga tuku iho. Taonga tuku iho that have been found in archaeological sites since 1975 can be returned to hapū and iwi through the provisions of the Antiquities Act 1975, although many taonga that have been found during this period have remained Crown property and custody has been assigned to public museums or registered collectors. Some hapū and iwi have chosen to become registered collectors and have the custody of taonga assigned to them, rather than taking the issue of custody to the Māori Land Court. Some taonga have been repatriated to iwi as the result of Treaty of Waitangi negotiations and some have been returned as a result of direct negotiation between whānau, hapū or iwi and museums that have accepted the validity of such claims.

When questions of repatriation arise, priority appears to be given to the return of kōiwi tangata. In the past, museums in New Zealand and overseas have accepted into their collections Māori skeletal remains that have been fossicked or excavated from archaeological sites, including burial grounds, and toi moko (tattooed preserved heads) that have been stolen or traded (see for example King 1981: 91-106). Since the 1970s New Zealand museums have ceased to collect such material without close consultation with the iwi concerned. Some museums have been proactive in returning kōiwi tangata, long held in collection storage, to the appropriate iwi when the provenance of the remains is known. No museum in New Zealand publicly exhibits kōiwi Māori and those that still hold such remains do so under strict protocols in a secure and consecrated facility.[8] By the early 1980s Māori had made it clear that such exhibits would not be tolerated.

---

[8] For example the Policy on Human Remains, approved by the Council of the National Museum of New Zealand, March 1989.

Māori also face the challenge of securing the return of ancestral remains from museums and private collections overseas. New Zealand museums, Te Papa Tongarewa in particular, are working closely with iwi to facilitate the resolution of these issues. However, there has been much debate recently about what should be done with the toi moko currently being returned to New Zealand from Australia, Europe and North America and the significant collection held at Te Papa Tongarewa. Decisions relating to those with known provenance will be made by their descendants, while those with no known provenance will remain in a consecrated facility at Te Papa Tongarewa, and managed according to protocols drawn up in consultation with Māori.

Ngāi Tahu, whose tribal territory covers most of the South Island, have been the most proactive iwi in resolving the disposition of their ancestors held by museums in their tribal territory. Rather than immediately negotiating agreements with museums, Ngāi Tahu first consulted with their own people and wrote their own Kōiwi Tangata Policy (Te Rūnanganui o Tahu 1993). This policy asserts that the authority (kaitiakitanga) to manage the human remains of their ancestors was granted to Ngāi Tahu by way of the Treaty of Waitangi. Ngāi Tahu consider the collecting of such remains culturally insensitive. Following the development of the policy Ngāi Tahu have negotiated agreements with each of the museums in their tribal territory to continue to care for the remains they hold, in special storage facilities, until further decisions are made about the long term disposition of the remains. Applications for access to the remains for research or other purposes will be considered by Te Rūnanganui o Tahu. This is an example of negotiated repatriation where an iwi asserts its mana and kaitiakitanga and the parameters of that assertion are acknowledged by museums.

As noted above, several iwi have sought the resolution of repatriation cases through the Waitangi Tribunal dispute resolution process. To date there have been two notable cases where taonga tuku iho have been returned as part of the Treaty negotiation process. Korotangi, a kaitiaki in the form of a bird carved in stone, claimed by Tainui to have travelled to Aotearoa on the Tainui canoe, was found and deposited in the national museum. Tainui had been requesting the return of the kaitiaki for many years without

success. Although Korotangi was not formally claimed as part of the Tainui Treaty claim, the government returned Korotangi to Tainui at the signing of their Treaty settlement as a gesture of good faith for their future relationship.

The second example is the return of the Ngāti Awa whare tupuna Mataatua (Mead et al. 1990; Mane-Wheoki 1993; Mead 1995). The Crown negotiated the use of this house for the British Empire exhibition in Sydney in 1879 and never returned it to Ngāti Awa, eventually giving it to Otago Museum. In the 1960s Ngāti Awa began to establish their claim over Mataatua Whare. In 1980, the Ngāti Awa Trust Board was formed and soon after this the board began to negotiate with the government for the return of the whare as part of their Waitangi Tribunal claim. However, it was not until 1996 that the New Zealand Government signed a deed with Otago Museum whereby the government paid the museum $2,750,000 in return for acknowledgement of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Awa ownership of Mataatua Whare. In the same month the government signed a deed with Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Awa, declared no further interest in Mataatua Whare and made a formal apology for failing to return the house after the Sydney Exhibition in 1879. The government agreed to pay Ngāti Awa $2,000,000 to transport the house back to Whakatāne for reconstruction on an appropriate site. There are indications that Mataatua Whare will become the focus for a Ngāti Awa cultural centre near Whakatāne under a system of tribal governance.

Iwi have also, from time to time, sought the return of significant taonga tuku iho through direct negotiation with museums. The most thoroughly documented case of this type is the return of Pukaki from Auckland Museum to Rotorua at the request of Ngāti Whakaue (Tapsell 2000). Pukaki, a carved ancestor, was gifted by Ngāti Whakaue to the Crown in 1877 to seal the agreement to allow the township of Rotorua to proceed. Judge Francis Fenton accepted Pukaki on behalf of the Crown and immediately transferred the carving to Auckland Museum. The inclusion of Pukaki in the *Te Māori* exhibition drew the attention of Ngāti Whakaue kaumātua to its presence in the Auckland Museum collection. A process of research and the development of a claim to return Pukaki to the Crown and relocate him to Rotorua then began. In 1997 Ngāti Whakaue, the Crown and Auckland

Museum signed a memorandum agreeing to the return of Pukaki to the care of Rotorua District Council in recognition of the relationship between Ngāti Whakaue and the Crown.

This range of strategies employed by Māori to establish their rangatiratanga over certain significant taonga tuku iho has contributed to the growing recognition by museums of Māori Treaty rights in relation to cultural property. At the time of *Te Māori* museum practitioners differentiated between Māori spiritual ownership of taonga Māori in museum collections and legal ownership by museums. Museums are moving increasingly to recognise Māori rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga in relation to these taonga, strengthening the case for Māori participation in museum governance.

4.5   Changing Attitudes and Practices within the Museum Sector

As a result of *Te Māori* and subsequent Māori advocacy for change, combined with increasing recognition of the need for change by many museum practitioners, a number of fundamental attitudinal shifts in the relationships between museums and Māori occurred during the latter part of the twentieth century, although these changes have not occurred evenly across the country (Butts 2002). Māori collections were reconceptualised and revalued, not as ethnological curiosities, but as taonga tuku iho and as art and the link between these collections and the people for whom they have particular significance was acknowledged. The manner in which Māori collections were exhibited began to shift from an emphasis on typological and static displays towards recognising that the collections are part of the living heritage of tangata whenua. There was also the beginning of a significant shift from Māori inclusion in museums, primarily as the subject of collecting and representation, to increasing Māori participation in all aspects of museum activity from museum practice to museum governance. While it is possible to identify this broad pattern of changes, it must also be emphasised that the rate of change varied throughout the country and even within institutions. These caveats are elaborated below when Gerard O'Regan's (1997a) report is considered.

However, it is not so easy to document the extent to which Māori attitudes towards museums have changed since 1970. While it is true that there are more Māori participating in museum governance and museum practice and museum visitor surveys suggest that the number of Māori visiting some museums has increased, it is not possible to indicate whether Māori feel more or less positively about museums.

4.6   National Museum Organisations

The establishment of the Art Galleries and Museums Association in 1947 was an indication of the growing maturity of the museum sector. Although the metropolitan museums tended to dominate the association in its early years, there were individuals from the regional institutions who recognised the value of a strong national organisation that could advocate professional standards and represent the interests of the sector to government. The contents of the newsletter published by the association in the first thirty years reveal that the members of the association were concerned primarily with issues of funding and professional development. Until the late 1970s, there was little, if any, attention given to the need to develop better relationships between Māori and museums and to increase the number of Māori museum practitioners. However, from this point on, the leadership of the association recognised the need to engage with these issues, even though it created stresses within the organisation.

One AGMANZ initiative demonstrates the level of commitment at a national level to making changes in museum practice in the period before the *Te Māori* exhibition. Announcing the establishment of the AGMANZ Māori Curator's Fellowship in 1982, Ken Gorbey (1982: 15), the Director of the Waikato Museum of Art and History, stated:

> For many years now, I believe, the museum profession has been aware that, despite the fact that our museums contain vast collections of Māori material and despite the fact that our art galleries see the growth and development of Māori art as an important element of their general task, we employ very few Māori people, especially in curatorial and administrative roles. This is a most unfortunate position and one we should be actively working to change.

The fellowship was funded jointly by private sponsorship and museums and administered by the Māori Education Foundation. The first, and as it turned out, only fellowship, was awarded in 1983 to a Māori archaeology graduate who went to the United States to undertake an internship at the Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C. Unfortunately, on his return to New Zealand he was unable to secure a position in a museum. While the AGMANZ Māori Curator's Fellowship was only awarded once, it is indicative of the growing awareness of the need to employ more Māori in museums and to develop closer relationships with Māori. However, it was not until 1984, the year that *Te Māori* opened in New York, that the sector began to enter into the type of intensive dialogue with Māori that would eventually lead to significant changes in the national association.

The first goal of the AGMANZ Corporate Plan adopted in 1988 was to actively develop the partnership between Māori and Pākehā within the museums of New Zealand (Coster 1994: 22). In 1989 AGMANZ changed its name to The Museums Association of Aotearoa New Zealand Incorporated - Te Rōpū Hanga Kaupapa Taonga (MAANZTRHKT). In June 1989 the Pākehā members of the council attended a Treaty workshop at Flockhouse in the Manawatū. At the same time 23 members of Kaitiaki Māori from the museum sector met at Rātā Marae. Rātā was the home marae of Mina McKenzie, Director of Manawatū Museum, Palmerston North and member of the AGMANZ Council. When the two groups subsequently met and formulated a set of partnership principles, the meeting also recommended that the council's membership should comprise equal numbers of Māori and Pākehā and that Māori members of council were to be elected in accordance with Māori custom (Coster 1994: 23). A new structure for the association incorporating these recommendations was endorsed by the 1991 MAANZTRHKT Annual General Meeting. The council would consist of ten members elected from the general membership and ten members appointed by Kaitiaki Māori. Kaitiaki Māori members were to be appointed by consensus at a kaitiaki hui prior to each Annual General Meeting (ibid.: 26).

In 1994 Coster suggested that the bicultural governance model adopted by MAANZ had been achieved despite the level of uncertainty and argument that had preceded the change and that this had been most evident at the annual conferences where Kaitiaki Māori were

taking a more active role than before. Coster (ibid.: 26) also claimed that there was evidence that the number of Māori working in museums was increasing significantly. Bishop (1998: 4), a Kaitiaki Māori member of MAANZTRHKT Council, agreed that the changes were positive:

> These changes in the constitution were a clear sign of the commitment of many in the museum profession to fundamental structural change which would result in effective power sharing. Many positive Māori projects and hui were supported by MAANZ.

Butts (1994: 33), writing in the same year, acknowledged the progress made by the association but also made a cautionary observation:

> It is sad that so many senior museum professionals, particularly museum directors, have walked away, preferring to concentrate their energies elsewhere. Not one director from a major metropolitan museum in New Zealand is on the recently elected Council of MAANZ. When I began working in museums fifteen years ago this Council was dominated by senior museum professionals including the directors of our major museums. This suggests that while there are many positive things happening in the museum community in New Zealand there are also some very deep divisions and some of these are in part related to the challenge of bi-culturalism and Māori self-determination.

Many museum directors had turned to the New Zealand Museum Directors' Federation as the organisation they felt could best represent their interests at the national level. However, the existence of two national museum organisations suggested to some that there was a lack of cohesion in the museum sector. In 1996 MAANZTRHKT and the New Zealand Museum Directors' Federation (NZMDF) held a joint conference at which NZMDF proposed that the two organisations should amalgamate. The new organisation was to be called Museums Aotearoa, Te Tari o Ngā Whare Taonga o Te Motu, The Museums of New Zealand Incorporated. However, the proposal did not include equal Māori representation as in the MAANZTRHKT constitution. The board was to consist of three members elected by the institutional members and three members elected by the individual members, one of whom would be a person nominated by Kaitiaki Māori

(Museums Aotearoa 1999). It was clear that the museum directors did not support a governance model that gave Kaitiaki Māori equal representation on the board. Kaitiaki Māori were prepared to endorse the proposal if the new organisation would make a commitment to the Treaty and support Kaitiaki Māori (Bishop 1998: 5; Kaitiaki Māori and Museums Aotearoa 1997). They also asked Museums Aotearoa to create a position for an activities co-ordinator for Kaitiaki Māori. This position has never eventuated and Kaitiaki Māori has rarely met since the amalgamation.[9]

The constitution of Museums Aotearoa begins with the following statement:

> The objects of Museum Aotearoa are to do any and all things as are conducive or likely to promote and foster the development of museums as essential public resources, for the collection, care, development, dissemination and interpretation of the natural and cultural heritage of Aotearoa/New Zealand, in a manner which respects and promotes the dual heritage of the partners of Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Treaty of Waitangi).
> (Museums Aotearoa 1999:2)

Apart from this statement and the requirement of a Kaitiaki Māori nominee for the board there is no other mention of Kaitiaki Māori, tangata whenua or the Treaty in the constitution. This would seem to indicate that the progress made in the MAANZTRHKT Constitution had been largely reversed. For several years Museums Aotearoa struggled to survive and it was only in 2001 that the board began once again to address its relationship with tangata whenua.

While there has never been any attempt to develop a national policy statement of the type developed by the national museum associations in Canada and Australia, there are signs that the national association recognises that it has an important role in facilitating and advocating relationships between museums and Māori at the national level. However, before it can carry out this role, Museums Aotearoa will need to renegotiate appropriate Māori participation in its own governance structure and commit substantial resources to the development of Kaitiaki Māori as a vital component of the museum sector.

---

[9] A successful attempt was made to rejuvenate Kaitiaki Māori at a national hui at Taupō in 2003.

4.7   The O'Regan Report

One significant project that MAANZTRHKT did initiate and complete, in partnership with Te Papa National Services, was a national review of biculturalism in museums. In 1995 Gerard O'Regan was commissioned to report on bicultural developments in New Zealand museums. He reviewed heritage legislation, museum governance, and Māori staffing levels, and interviewed Māori working in the museum sector. O'Regan's (1997a) report was the first attempt to provide a national overview of Māori participation in museum governance and the development of bicultural policy and practices in New Zealand museums.

While O'Regan acknowledged the importance of international declarations of the rights of indigenous peoples, he emphasised the primacy of the Treaty of Waitangi as the source of a set of principles that should guide relationships between museums and Māori. These principles include the government's right to govern; tribal self-regulation of their own resources, that the Treaty partners will act reasonably and in good faith; active participation of both partners in decision making; the active protection of Māori interests in the use and management of their resources; and redress for past grievances.[10] He acknowledged that progress had been made in relation to some aspects of the partnership between Māori and museums, but also identified areas such as governance, management structures and procedures, which required further change.

O'Regan's interviews with Māori museum staff provide a sobering insight into Māori views of museums. Māori staff indicated that relationships between museums and iwi had not progressed as much as some museum practitioners thought they had at that time. In their opinion Māori viewed museums as essentially Pākehā-centric institutions. Museums were seen by some Māori staff as culturally insensitive, to varying degrees, towards taonga Māori, Māori issues in general and to Māori staff. Some provided evidence of

---

[10] These principles provide the framework for the Auckland Museum Taumata-ā-iwi Kaupapa. The Taumata-ā-iwi is a Māori advisory body to the Auckland Museum Trust Board. The Taumata-ā-iwi Kaupapa is a policy document outlining the principles to which the Taumata-ā-iwi will adhere in discharging its responsibilities. See Whaanga 1999.

institutional racism and it was suggested that some managers lacked understanding of Māori culture. Some institutions, both metropolitan and regional, with significant Māori collections did not have Māori curators. Māori staff acknowledged the progress made in this area in some institutions, but noted the need for significant change in others.

This inside view provides a balance to the notion that since *Te Māori* museums have made the type of fundamental changes that are required to create bicultural institutions. However, O'Regan acknowledged that some progress had been made and argued that the sector should continue to invest in the development of bicultural relationships. His recommendations include the provision of cultural awareness training, iwi values training for managers, training for Kaitiaki Māori, and the appointment of Māori to positions across all divisions of museums. Finally, he recommended a series of regional hui to facilitate such substantive discussion between museums and iwi. With the demise of MAANZTRHKT, the responsibility to enact the recommendations shifted to Te Papa National Services.

4.8   National Services Bicultural Programme

With the demise of MAANZ in the mid-1990s Te Papa National Services became the primary agency able and willing to develop projects to promote biculturalism in the museum sector at a national level. Te Papa National Services organised, resourced and facilitated national forums and worked in partnership with museums to develop bicultural initiatives at the local level. The Te Papa National Services' bicultural programme provided support, direct and indirect, for those institutions, such as the two case study institutions discussed in Part Two of this thesis, which had initiated the governance reform process and were in the process of discussions with tangata whenua.

Te Papa National Services adopted O'Regan's final recommendation and funded eight regional hui in 1998-9 (Murphy 1999). These hui focused on three issues: the nature of taonga Māori (Māori heritage); the nature of biculturalism; and the implications of biculturalism for museum organisations. Reviewing the findings from this series of hui,

Murphy concluded that Māori and non-Māori museum practitioners meant different things when they spoke of biculturalism. For many museum people biculturalism was about bringing Māori and non-Māori together as one. For Māori biculturalism referred to the recognition of indigeneity (their status as tangata whenua) and rangatiratanga (Murphy 1999: 10).

A number of scholars provided analyses of biculturalism in the 1990s. For example, Durie (1994: 102-4), in his analysis of biculturalism, refers to Sharp's notions of 'bicultural reformism', which is the "adapting of Pākehā institutions to meet Māori requirements", and 'bicultural distributivism', which refers to "developing different and specifically Māori institutions to share the authority defined by the Treaty". Durie (ibid.: 103) proposed his own concept of the 'bicultural continuum', arguing that biculturalism is a "continuum with a gradation of goals and a number of possible structural arrangements". This continuum ranges from unstructured mainstream institutions to those that increasing provided for Māori perspectives and involvement to those that are increasingly independent Māori institutions.

Murphy (1999) has recorded Māori frustration and cynicism with public institutions, including museums, which develop bicultural policies that have little impact on governance, management or professional practice. Māori engage with biculturalism in the expectation of mutual recognition; however, in reality, most public institutions have no intention of implementing tikanga-ā-rua, the equal recognition of both Māori and Pākehā cultural practices.

Murphy also noted the pivotal role of museum directors in communicating their vision of biculturalism and their responsibility to actively nurture bicultural relationships. The hui identified four areas that are currently the focus of bicultural activity: governance, training, resourcing, and communicating and networking. She recommended that Te Papa National Services support bicultural partnership projects that "seek to strategically develop relationships with Māori and fit into an overall plan for developing a bicultural organisation" and develop a bicultural training plan (ibid.: 14).

In order to sustain bicultural developments at a national level, Te Papa National Services organised wānanga (conferences) on bicultural development in New Zealand museums in 1999 and 2000. These wānanga provided an opportunity for directors and trustees from museums throughout New Zealand to share their experiences and identify important issues requiring further exploration. The wānanga participants concluded that bicultural partnerships should be based on a clear understanding of separate and common interests, supportive governance structures, committed leadership and formal agreements (Museum of New Zealand Te Papa National Services 2000: 4). The second wānanga, Bicultural Governance and Leadership in Museums, featured presentations about innovative bicultural governance models for museums, the subject of Part Two of this thesis. Other topics discussed included heritage legislation, local government, repatriation, kaitiakitanga and taonga. These were continuing themes that echoed the issues identified by O'Regan and Murphy.

Some of the most innovative developments that have occurred since the mid-1990s have been at the institutional level. Te Papa National Services Bicultural Programme provided support for a range of institutionally based initiatives, including governance projects, taonga Māori documentation projects, Māori museum trainee projects and marae exhibition projects. For example, Project Tauhora at Puke Ariki (formerly Taranaki Museum) established in 1998, is a joint initiative between Ngā Iwi o Taranaki, Puke Ariki and National Services (Coffin 1999: 4-5). The project was designed to collect information on taonga held in the museum collection, develop formal protocols and tikanga to manage the collection and provide training for the Tauhora curator. A second example, Rangahaua Tō Mātou Taonga - Researching Our Treasures, was a project established at Tauranga Museum in 1998 with the assistance of Te Papa National Services and in consultation with Ngāti Ranginui, Ngāi Te Rangi and Ngāti Pukenga. The purpose of the project was to make an inventory of taonga Māori held by Tauranga Museum, research the provenance of taonga Māori in the collection, consult with local iwi, locate taonga Māori from the Tauranga region in other museums and private collections, and prepare a register of taonga Māori sourced to the Tauranga region (ibid.: 4-5). Similar projects were

subsequently established at Hawkes Bay Museum, Napier and Whanganui Regional Museum. These projects challenge museums to secure the resourcing to establish permanent positions for Māori staff when the projects are complete, so the expectations created in the Māori community can be sustained.

In 2001 Te Papa National Services facilitated the Wānanga on Iwi Cultural Initiatives, the purpose of which was to bring together people who were involved in iwi cultural centre projects. This was followed by a similar regional hui at Waihirere Marae, Gisborne, in May 2002. At this hui iwi representatives spoke of archive and cultural centre projects being developed in the region. There was also a discussion of international developments in the protection and management of cultural heritage by indigenous peoples. There was substantial evidence presented at these two hui that many hapū and iwi are considering the development of their own cultural centres. Most of these projects were only in the early planning stages.

After a period of intensive exploration of biculturalism in museums, in which Te Papa National Services took a leading role, it is apparent that bicultural partnerships evolve over time as relationships grow and trust is earned. The nature of each partnership depends on historical and contemporary factors, originating within both the national context and the local context. It is increasingly apparent that while national projects, such as those originating from and supported by Te Papa National Services, can assist in initiating dialogue, the recognition of tangata whenua by each institution must be initiated and driven at the local level. Key factors identified during this period as essential to the development of bicultural museums were the participation of tangata whenua representatives in museum governance, the commitment of museum directors and the employment of Māori museum practitioners in all areas of museum operations.

PART TWO

LOCAL CONTEXTS

CHAPTER FIVE

REGIONAL CHARITABLE TRUST MUSEUM GOVERNANCE MODELS

5.0 Introduction

Chapters Five to Nine examine the nature of Māori participation in the governance of regional charitable trust museums and the extent to which this participation reflects the influence of the politics of indigenous recognition. This chapter begins with an overview of Māori participation in the governance of regional charitable trust museums, followed by an outline of the provisions in three innovative recently negotiated governance models. The following chapters then present detailed case studies of Māori participation in the governance of two of these institutions, Whanganui Regional Museum and Tairāwhiti Museum, including an in-depth examination of the recent review of governance arrangements.

Within the group of museums that can be generally described as regional charitable trust museums[1] there is a smaller group that were established in the major regional centres to provide a general museum service for a large region.[2] These museums include: Whanganui Regional Museum; Te Manawa, Palmerston North; Tairāwhiti Museum, Gisborne; Hawkes Bay Museum, Napier; Nelson Provincial Museum; and Southland Museum and Art Gallery, Invercargill.[3] Regional charitable trust museums range from institutions such as Whanganui Regional Museum and Hawkes Bay Museum, Napier, which had their origins in the late nineteenth century, to museums such as Te Manawa and

---

[1] Charitable trust museums are those that are registered under the Charitable Trusts Act 1957. To register under this act a trust must exist exclusively for charitable purposes for the benefit of the community as a whole or an appreciably significant section of the community.

[2] The regions are generally based on the nineteenth century provincial boundaries, although in recent times they have changed to take account of tribal boundaries and more recent local government boundaries.

[3] The name of the trust by which each museum is administered is as follows: Whanganui Regional Museum (Whanganui Regional Museum Trust), Te Manawa (Te Manawa Museums Trust), Tairāwhiti Museum (Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Trust), Hawkes Bay Museum (Hawkes Bay Cultural Trust), Nelson Provincial Museum (Tasman Bays Heritage Trust), Southland Museum and Art Gallery (Southland Museum and Art Gallery Trust).

Tairāwhiti Museum, which were not established until after the Second World War. These institutions are distinguished from the smaller regional charitable trust museums in the following ways: the size of the geographical regions they service; the size of their taonga Māori collections, the extended period over which these collections have been developed, the number of professional museum practitioners employed; and the size of their museum facilities.

There are a number of other smaller regional charitable museum trusts in New Zealand, many of which have been established since 1975 (e.g. Te Aratoi (Wairarapa Cultural Trust), Masterton; Wairoa Museum (Wairoa District Heritage and Museum Trust) and South Taranaki District Museum Trust). However, these museums are generally situated in smaller centres and have much smaller and more localised collections of taonga Māori than the larger regional institutions listed above. While these smaller institutions are not included in this analysis, it is recognised that they face the same issues in terms of establishing governance relationships with tangata whenua.

In confining the scope of this thesis to an investigation of regional charitable trust museums a number of other types of museums that have major collections of taonga Māori have been excluded, including the major metropolitan museums (Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa[4], Auckland War Memorial Museum Te Papa Whakahiku[5], Canterbury Museum[6] and Otago Museum[7]) which have been created by legislation, and those museums that are part of a territorial local authority (TLA) organisational structure

---

[4] The Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa Act (1992) governance provisions are discussed in Appendix One.
[5] The Auckland War Memorial Museum Act (1996) governance provisions and subsequent developments are discussed in Appendix Two.
[6] The Canterbury Museum Board Act (1993) makes provision for a board of eleven members, one of whom is to be appointed by the Ngāi Tahu Māori Trust Board.
[7] The Otago Museum Trust Board Act (1996) makes provision for the appointment of one member by mana whenua, the appointment procedure to be determined by the parties responsible for the appointment. This was the first provision for Māori membership on the Otago Museum Board since the first legislation in 1955. Two Māori Advisors had attended board meetings since 1986 when this arrangement had been initiated during the planning for *Te Māori.* Otago Museum has a Māori Advisory Committee.

(e.g. Rotorua Museum and Art Gallery Te Whare Taonga o Te Arawa[8], Waikato Museum of Art and History[9], Hamilton, and Puke Ariki[10], New Plymouth).

Indigenous peoples in North America and Australasia have consistently maintained that in order to take an effective part in mainstream museums and ensure the appropriate care and interpretation of their cultural heritage resources, they need to participate in museum governance. Indigenous advocacy has focused on governance as an important site of resistance to the colonising processes within mainstream museums because those who participate in governance control museum funding and policy and monitor the performance of the director (Malaro 1994: 8-16). Without effective participation in museum governance, tangata whenua will have limited influence on the strategic development of the institution and the way in which the museum is organised and managed. Defining effective participation for tangata whenua in museum governance is a difficult task. Developments to date suggest that there is no standard governance model that will fit all contexts. The initial challenge is to establish the principles that underpin the process by which such participation will be negotiated.

Since the establishment of the first museums in New Zealand in the 1860s, the governance relationships between museums and tangata whenua have slowly evolved. It is possible to place any given governance arrangement on a bicultural museum governance continuum (see Figure One). The continuum ranges from those museums that make no provision for the participation of tangata whenua in their governance arrangements to those that are primarily controlled by tangata whenua. This continuum can be divided into five categories. The first category is that of the Private and Society Museums where the

---

[8] The director of Rotorua Museum of Art and History reports to the director of Community Services, and is a member of the Community Services Management Group of Rotorua District Council. Tangata whenua advisory services are available to the museum director from the Te Arawa Standing Committee of the district council and the Te Arawa Kaumātua Liaison Council (est. 1994) that is elected by the Te Arawa Trust Board (McManus, pers. comm., 2002).

[9] Waikato Museum of Art and History is a unit of the Hamilton City Council. Tangata whenua participate in the governance of the institution through the Paepae Tapu appointed by Arikinui Dame Te Atairangikahu. The museum also has a relationship with Te Rūnanga o Kirikiriroa through the city council (Sheehan, Pers. Comm. 2003).

[10] Puke Ariki has formed a Komiti Māori consisting of representatives of all the iwi in Taranaki to advise the museum on tikanga Māori and all matters relating to the taonga Māori collection.

collection is controlled by an individual or a group of people, primarily for their own use. The second category is the Colonial Museum configuration where a public institution (created by legislation, territorial local authority, charitable trust, or incorporated society) makes no provision in its constitution for the inclusion of tangata whenua in the governance of that institution, though there may be an informal or formal advisory role taken by individual tangata whenua. The third category of Transitional Public Museums identifies those museums that have made provision for tangata whenua in their governance arrangements but this is not based on mutual recognition (two peoples development and partnership) and the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. In Category Three, tangata whenua are placed in the position of a small minority (one or two members) on the governance body. The fourth category, Common Ground Museums, are those institutions that have negotiated with tangata whenua to develop a form of governance that is based on mutual recognition and the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. Common Ground Museums have developed governance arrangements in which there is a power-sharing arrangement at the trust board level ensuring that tangata whenua have an influential position in the power structure. The final category in the continuum consists of those public institutions, sometimes referred to as cultural centres or whare taonga, that have been established by tangata whenua. These institutions are governed by the hapū or iwi that have established them and may or may not include other communities or institutions in their governance arrangements. Such institutions could provide appropriate care and interpretation of taonga Māori repatriated from mainstream institutions by whānau, hapū and iwi.

Some museums, such as Auckland War Memorial Museum[11] at the present time, may be located on the border between two categories on the continuum. This institution is required by law to "observe and encourage the spirit of partnership envisaged by the Treaty of Waitangi, the implications of mana Māori and elements in the care of Māori cultural property that only Māori can provide".[12] The legislation created the Taumata-ā-

---

[11] For a discussion of the Auckland War Memorial Museum governance arrangements see Appendix Two.
[12] Auckland War Memorial Act 1996 S12c.

iwi, an advisory body that appoints one member of the museum trust board. The museum has also made considerable progress in developing a policy framework that attempts to ensure the recognition of the rights of tangata whenua in the governance of the institution. Two documents, *The Taumata-ā-Iwi Kaupapa* and *The Guiding Principles* (for the trust board's relationship with the Taumata-ā-iwi) encapsulate the recognition of tangata whenua and the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. However, Merita Kawharu (2002: 300) acknowledges the limitations in practice:

> As primarily an advisory body, the Taumata has minimal decision-making powers in comparison to the board. Despite the act requiring the board's policies to accord properly with matters provided for in the treaty (section 16 (8)), and despite principles two and four of the kaupapa relating to partnership and active protection of Māori interests, little by way of equal partnership exists.

It is clear that Auckland War Memorial Museum remains in the transitional category on the continuum, but that the trust board and management of the museum are conscious of the limitations of the governance model.

Some institutions such as Whanganui Regional Museum have passed serially through each of the first four categories on the continuum. The core of the collection of this institution was first formed as a private collection, which was purchased by the people of Wanganui as the basis of a public museum. Initially there was no Māori participation in governance, subsequently Māori advisors were appointed and, eventually, Māori board members were elected. In 2001 the museum revised its constitution and has thus met the criteria set out for Category Four in the continuum, a Common Ground Museum.[13] Moreover, it is possible that in the future the taonga Māori collection in Whanganui Regional Museum may be divided from the rest of the collection and governed primarily by local iwi or that components of the collection will be relocated to separate hapū or iwi cultural centres to be governed solely or primarily by these hapū and iwi.

---

[13] While the constitution of a museum may meet the criteria for a Category Four institution this does not guarantee that the museum is functioning effectively as a common ground.

In Chapter One it was argued, drawing particularly on the writings of Tully, that it is important to understand the power relationships between the coloniser and the colonised and the ways in which the power culture, the coloniser, has controlled negotiations of cultural recognition by restating the claims of the indigenous peoples in its own language and cultural conventions. Accommodation and reconciliation, according to Tully (2000: 41), are based on the principles of mutual recognition, continuity and consent. Mutual recognition is the central concept and, according to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples in Canada, is said to consist of equality, co-existence and self-government. These are the principles that should underpin the negotiation of indigenous peoples' participation in museum governance, the negotiation of the common ground that is required for cultural recognition.

Effective Māori participation in museum governance can only be achieved when tangata whenua have the right to negotiate the nature of their participation through a process of mutual recognition. Such a process requires mainstream institutions to recognise the status, language and cultural practices of the negotiating party, that is, to recognise the indigeneity of tangata whenua. An effective negotiation process cannot be achieved if the dominant culture develops a proposal in-house and then seeks ratification from tangata whenua, or if the museum negotiators consistently restate the objectives of the indigenous party or parties in their own terms. The case studies presented in the following chapters demonstrate that the tangata whenua were aware of these dangers and acted to ensure that they were able come to the negotiation table as equal partners in order to clearly articulate their objectives in the governance review processes.

It is important that both parties have clearly mandated representatives to negotiate the governance relationship and that each party is able to bring to the negotiations proposals stated in their own language. This may mean that tangata whenua bring their proposals in te reo Māori, thus conveying their own cultural concepts and practices by the most direct means, or it may mean that they bring proposals in English that encapsulate the cultural concepts and practices that in their view recognise their status as tangata whenua and the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. Two elements are essential: first, the museum needs

to acknowledge the status of tangata whenua; and second, the principles of the Treaty provide the basis for ongoing relationships. These two elements are essential for mutual recognition. The negotiation of Māori participation in museum governance is not a grievance settlement process, though there may be references to grievances in the negotiations: it is the negotiation of an agreement that will provide the basis for creating a common ground within which the principles of tikanga-ā-rua (two peoples development) and partnership can operate.

5.1   Overview

As outlined above, this analysis focuses on the governance arrangements of the six largest of the regional charitable trust museums in New Zealand. The data upon which the following discussion is based is presented in Figure Two. Each of these institutions has a trust constitution reviewed or established since 1990, with most of these constitutions dating to the post-1998 period. This reflects the considerable focus on constitutional, particularly governance, issues throughout New Zealand during the 1990s. This focus is reinforced by the fact that the legislation for the four major metropolitan museums was also revised during the 1990s. The review of governance arrangements in regional charitable trust museums has focused on three issues: trust board size, creating skills-based boards and Māori representation.

Following the recent review of museum constitutions the size of regional charitable trust museum trust boards has decreased. While the Southland Museum and Art Gallery Trust board has eighteen members, the remaining five boards range from seven to twelve members. Another trend that is apparent is the reduction in the number of territorial local authority councillors appointed to these trust boards. Of the six institutions under consideration, only Southland Museum and Art Gallery Trust and Hawkes Bay Cultural Trust have councillors appointed to their trust boards. This fact suggests that larger regional trust museums are attempting to distance themselves from their primary funding agencies; however, this is only partly true. Although the proportion of the budget derived from local territorial authorities is declining for each of these institutions, they could not

operate without local authority funding. In those cases where there are no councillors appointed to the trust board the local authority is involved in the appointment process for trust board members.

Some interesting patterns are emerging in these six institutions with regard to Māori representation in governance structures. Provision for Māori representation within the constitutions of the institutions ranges from six members to no members. Tasman Bays Heritage Trust Constitution does not stipulate the appointment of any fixed minimum number of Māori members of the trust board. To date the appointment committee has always appointed two. Southland Museum and Art Gallery Trust Constitution provides for only one representative from tangata whenua. Both Hawkes Bay Cultural Trust and Te Manawa Museums Trust constitutions make provision for two representatives. In contrast, Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Trust and Whanganui Regional Museum Trust have increased tangata whenua representation significantly, providing for five and six members respectively.

The Treaty of Waitangi is not referred to in the constitutions of the Southland, Nelson and Napier museums. These are also the museums that have well established Māori advisory committees. Te Manawa Museums Trust does not have an advisory body but has negotiated the Te Rangimarie Agreement with Rangitāne, the provisions of which are outlined below. Whanganui Regional Museum Trust has Tikanga Māori House, a formal component of the governance system, the provisions for which are outlined below. Tairāwhiti Museum does not have a Māori advisory committee or any other Māori forum beyond the five iwi members of the trust board.

While there have been positive developments in Māori participation in each of the six institutions during the 1990s, there has not been the same general progress made in the employment of Māori staff in these institutions; some have even lost ground in this regard. Tairāwhiti Museum is the only one of the six institutions to have Māori appointed to both curatorial and management positions. There are no Māori curators or managers in the

other five institutions.[14] Te Manawa previously had a curator of taonga Māori, but when she resigned, no replacement was appointed. Although there is now an indication that Māori curatorial appointments may be made in the near future at Hawkes Bay Museum and Te Manawa, appointments will be dependent on external funding. While Māori representation in museum governance is increasing, there is an urgent need for a complementary increase in Māori museum practitioners if the principles of the new constitutions are to filter down from governance into museum practice and ensure Māori participation in the development of museum programmes and increased Māori access to and use of collections of taonga Māori.

5.2   Governance Models

There are two basic types of governance model that have been adopted by the regional charitable trust museums with regard to representation of tangata whenua. The first type is the mana whenua model where the primary relationship is between the museum and the iwi on whose customary land the museum is located. Other iwi in the region in which the museum operates may or may not be represented on the trust board or an advisory committee. The second type of governance model is the regional tangata whenua model. Institutions that adopt this type of governance model, while recognising the significance of their relationship with the mana whenua of the land where the museum is located, make equal provision in their governance arrangements for all the iwi in the region in which they operate. The two examples outlined in this chapter are the Whanganui Regional Museum and Tairāwhiti Museum. Although these two institutions have regional tangata whenua governance models, there are significant differences in the governance provisions in the constitutions.

---

[14] As at September 2003.

5.2.1   Mana Whenua Model: Te Manawa

The Manawatū Museum Society Incorporated established a taonga Māori collection when it was founded in 1969. The collection was transferred into the care of the Science Centre and Manawatū Museum when it opened in new facilities in 1994. The ownership of the collection remained with the Manawatū Museum Society until 2002 when it was transferred to The Science Centre, Manawatū Museum and Manawatū Art Gallery Trust which had been formed in 1999 when these institutions were formally amalgamated into one institution.

Rangitāne, the tangata whenua iwi, have had a representative on the Manawatū Museum Society Council since incorporation. In 1991, when writing a history of the museum's early development, Mina McKenzie, the first director of the museum, described how this occurred:

> Throughout the planning stages of the museum, the late Wiremu Kingi Te Awe Awe, rangatira of Rangitāne, the tangata whenua of Manawatū, was consulted about Māori lore and local history and gave his blessing to the Museum project. … His daughter, the late Mrs Pareautohe Matenga, supported the museum as a member of the Museum Council until her death in 1986. The Rangitāne Māori Committee of which Mr Tanenuiarangi Te Awe Awe (Joe Larkins) and other Kaumātua of Rangitāne are members, assumed the role of *kaitiaki o ngā taonga tuku iho* - guardians of the treasures in the Manawatū Museum. Designated kaumatua, Mr Taitoko Rangiharuru Te Huatahi Fitzgerald, advises the Museum Council and staff on Rangitāne protocols and on Māori material for the collections and the exhibitions. (McKenzie 1991: 4)

McKenzie (Ngāti Hauiti), the first Māori director of a museum in New Zealand[15], who had connections to Rangitāne, worked hard to maintain the relationship between the museum and Rangitāne. Her personal relationship with the Te Awe Awe family meant that Rangitāne played a major part in the way in which the taonga Māori collection was developed, maintained and used. An indication of the strength of the relationship can be

---

[15] Tā Te Rangi Hiroa, Sir Peter Buck, was director of the Bishop Museum in Hawaii at an earlier period.

seen in the fact that the Rangitāne flag Tanenuiarangi was deposited in the museum for safe-keeping and taken out to Rangiotu Marae for special occasions until it became so fragile that a replacement had to be used. The replacement (Tanenuiarangi II) continues to be exhibited in the Tangata Whenua Gallery in the museum. Rangitāne continued to provide a member of the Manawatū Museum Society Council until The Science Centre, Manawatū Museum and Manawatū Art Gallery Trust was formed in 1999.

The purpose of the trust that manages the amalgamated institutions, now known as Te Manawa, is

(a) To provide governance of an organisation which is a regional museum complex advancing interest in art, science, including interactive science, and heritage.

(b) To provide study, education and enjoyment opportunities through acquiring, conserving, researching, communicating and exhibiting material evidence of people and their environment.

(c) To acquire, control, develop, enhance and maintain collections to the maximum benefit and enjoyment of the peoples of the Manawatū and New Zealand.

(d) To recognise and act in accordance with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.

(e) To ensure that the facility functions as a valued professional education resource and community asset for the citizens of Palmerston North and the Manawatū region.

(f) To encourage and support the Societies in accordance with the objects of this Trust Deed.

(g) To recognise the organisation's location in the Manawatū and be aware of a regional focus.[16]

The trust board is to consist of not less than five and not more than nine members, comprising:

(i)   up to two (2) Trustees appointed by the Tangata Whenua

(ii)   up to five (5) Trustees appointed by the Palmerston North City Council.[17]

---

[16] Trust Deed for the Science Centre, and Manawatū Museum and Manawatū Art Gallery, 1999, Clause 3.
[17] Trust Deed for the Science Centre and Manawatū Museum and Manawatū Art Gallery, 1999, Clause 5(3)

The board may also co-opt two further trustees as long as the total number of trustees does not exceed nine.

The trust deed does not indicate who is to appoint the two tangata whenua members to the board or the process to be used to determine such appointments. In a paper proposing the establishment of the trust, the Palmerston North City Council City Manager stated that "the Tangata Whenua, as treaty partners, and at their request, would be responsible for the appointment of two members".[18]

Neither this paper nor the trust deed indicate exactly which iwi is/are to be recognised as tangata whenua, although it could be assumed that both papers refer to Rangitāne since Rangitāne is the iwi recognised as mana whenua of the city by Palmerston North City Council. The museum's catchment extends into the territories of other iwi, including Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Kauwhata, Muaupoko, Ngāti Apa and Ngāti Hauiti.

Since the establishment of the trust Rangitāne have held hui-ā-iwi, with representatives of Muaupoko, Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Kauwhata, Ngāti Apa, and Ngāti Hauiti attending, when required, to appoint members to the board. The inclusion of these other iwi reflects the close historical relationships between these iwi and Rangitāne and the fact that the museum's 'region of responsibility'[19] extends to the rohe of these iwi.

In 2002, following a period of facilitated negotiations, the Te Manawa Museums Trust Board entered into the Te Rangimarie Agreement with local iwi members (Huwyler 2001). This agreement is between the Te Manawa Museums Trust (Te Manawa) and iwi within the boundary of the Te Manawa catchment area. The agreement is founded on three principles:

---

[18] M. Willis, Establishment Board Proposal for the Creation of a Science Centre, Manawatū Museum and Manawatū Art Gallery Trust Board. Paper presented to the Community Affairs Committee, Palmerston North City Council, 1999.
[19] I have used this term to refer to the geographical region mentioned in the museum's collection policy and the area considered by the museum to be its primary area of interest.

The people of Te Rangimarie are the descendants of Te Awe Awe and Hoani Meihana Te Rangiotu, who were the leaders of Rangitāne who occupied the Manawatū region and who established relations between Rangitāne and non-Māori in Manawatū.

Institutions within Palmerston North, such as Palmerston North City Council and Te Manawa, have developed a strong relationship with Rangitāne through Te Rangimarie. These relationships are founded, upon a long historical relationship, between city leaders and officials and the people of Te Rangimarie.

These relationships have been ongoing and the people of Te Rangimarie have protected the interests of neighbouring Iwi. They have been empowered to do so on the basis of takawaenga, having maintained strong alliances with these Iwi. (Te Manawa Museums Trust Board 2002: 2)

This formal relationship is underpinned by two relationship principles:

The relationship recognises the special status of the mana o te whenua, where Te Manawa is physically located, which belongs to the hapū of Rangitāne.

The relationship recognises the interests of the other Iwi and hapū present within the general collecting area of Te Manawa.

The relationship is meaningful, whereby it empowers hapū and Iwi to the extent that hapū and Iwi are satisfied with the level of participation in Te Manawa. (ibid.: 2-3)

Te Rangimarie Marae, the 'marae of peace' and the principal marae of Rangitāne in Manawatū, is symbolic of the relationships between Rangitāne and the other iwi in the region, and was named after an event when Hoani Meihana Te Rangiotu negotiated a peace settlement between these tribes. Te Manawa has agreed that it will take issues to the monthly meetings of the Te Rangimarie Marae Committee and that Te Rangimarie will have regular contact with Te Manawa through the Tangata Whenua trustees on the Te Manawa Trust Board. Other conditions outlined in the agreement include:

Other Iwi are asked, as a matter of tikanga, to consult with Te Rangimarie prior to engaging Te Manawa. This can take place at the monthly meetings of Te Rangimarie.

There shall be an annual meeting at Te Rangimarie of all the Iwi from the catchment area of Te Manawa to evaluate and review the workings of this agreement.

The people of Te Rangimarie shall appoint the tangata whenua trustees to the Board of Te Manawa, in consultation with Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Apa, Muaupoko, Ngāti Kauwhata, and Rangitāne and in agreement with Ngāti Hauiti, the other iwi from the Te Manawa catchment area. (ibid.: 3)

This agreement gives primacy to the relationship with mana whenua (at least as expressed by Rangitāne based at Te Rangimarie). The model has close similarities to the way in which Auckland Museum has interpreted its legislation by recognising a primary relationship with Ngāti Whātua as mana whenua of the land on which the museum stands, even though there are other iwi who have tangata whenua status within the museum's catchment area.

5.2.2   Regional Tangata Whenua Models

The majority of regional museums with significant taonga Māori collections are governed by charitable trusts. The advantage of this form of governance is thought to be the opportunity it provides for community stakeholders to be represented on the trust board. A number of the trusts discussed in this section have been formed since late 1989 and reflect significant changes to institutions whose histories in some cases reach back to the nineteenth century.

Tairāwhiti Museum Trust

The Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Trust (now known as Tairāwhiti Museum) was established in December 1999. The drafting of the trust deed was influenced by elements of the Auckland War Memorial Museum Act 1996. Section Three of the deed, entitled Treaty of Waitangi, reads as follows:

> The Board and each individual member of the Board shall at all times act in accordance with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and will:
>
> (a) observe and encourage the spirit of partnership and goodwill envisaged by the Treaty, the implications of mana Māori and elements in the care of Māori cultural property which only Māori can provide; and
>
> (b) actively pursue a policy of involvement of Māori in such a way that will retain the trust and confidence in and support of Māori for the objectives of the Trust and that will promote among Māori a sense of ownership, in common with the rest of the community, of the museum and its undertaking. (Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Charitable Trust Deed, 1999: 4)

The objectives of the trust include requiring the board:

> To provide and operate a cultural centre where the history, art, culture, environment and heritage of Aotearoa New Zealand with special reference to the Tairāwhiti Region, may be conserved, interpreted, studied, cherished and made available for the benefit of the people of New Zealand. (ibid.: 5)

Section Six of the trust deed outlines the composition of the trust board:

> 6.1 The Board shall consist of not fewer than six members and not more than twelve members of whom:
>
> (a) five may be appointed … one each by the following Iwi:
>
>   (i) Te Aitanga-ā-Māhaki
>
>   (ii) Ngāi Tāmanuhiri
>
>   (iii) Rongowhakaata

> (iv)   Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti
>
> (v)   Ngāti Porou

(b) four may be appointed … by GMAC as long as that Society shall be in existence but upon its winding up by the Friends of the Museum of Te Tairāwhiti Incorporated or its successor or if there is no successor by Gisborne District Council (or its successor).

(c) two may be appointed by … the Gisborne District Council (or its successor) in consultation with the Friends of the Museum of Te Tairāwhiti Incorporated (or its successor).

(d) the Director (ex-officio) (ibid.: 6-7)

Clause 6.2 requires the members of the board who make the appointments to have regard for the appointees having the management skills, experience and professional judgement necessary to achieve the objectives of the trust.

This was the first museum trust deed to provide explicitly for the representation on the trust board of all the iwi in the region serviced by the museum, where there was more than one iwi within the region and will be discussed in more detail in Chapters Eight and Nine.

Whanganui Regional Museum Trust

The Whanganui Public Museum (commonly known as the Whanganui Regional Museum) was replaced by the Whanganui Regional Museum Trust in July 2001. The Board of Trustees of the Whanganui Public Museum had been elected by the members of the museum society since the museum was established.

The objects of the Whanganui Regional Museum Trust are:

(a) To enhance understanding of the natural and cultural heritage of the Whanganui region and its place in the world;

(b) To develop a collection by holding, collecting, preserving, documenting and managing objects of natural and cultural significance to the Whanganui region;

(c) To facilitate the sharing of the stories of Whanganui and its place in the world by providing exhibition, education, research and advisory programmes; and

(d) To undertake any other activities that will help achieve the objects of the museum. (Whanganui Regional Museum Trust Constitution 2000: Section 3)

The Constitutional Principle states that:

The principles of partnership and two cultures development arising from the Treaty of Waitangi will be fully implemented within the Museum. (ibid.: Section 4)

Also included in the constitution are eight principles of governance:

Governance will be conducted in such a way that:

(a) the principles of partnership and two cultures development will be interpreted in the manner of the 'Mihinare' model of governance;

(b) The Joint Council will respond to stakeholders' needs, interests and views without compromising other principles;

(c) The strategic direction, goals and objectives pursued by the Joint Council are consistent with the values and principles agreed with the community;

(d) Accessibility to the museum's collection, programmes and activities is optimised;

(e) The physical and cultural wellbeing of items in the collection is maintained and enhanced;

(f) The rights and interests of owners of items in the collection shall be recognised;

(g) International declaration and conventions such as the UNESCO Declaration on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (1970) and the Mataatua Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (1993) will be recognised. The Joint Council will be guided by other recognised codes of ethics and professional practice such as the Museums Aotearoa code of ethics and professional practice; and

(h) The institution and its purpose are maintained into the future. (ibid.: Section 5)

The trust is governed by the Joint Council of a maximum of twelve members, up to six of whom are appointed by the Tikanga Māori House and up to six members appointed by the

Civic House. Therefore, iwi and hapū appoint fifty percent of the members of the Joint Council.

The Tikanga Māori House meets monthly and its membership currently consists of mandated representatives from iwi and hapū including Mōkai Patea (Ngāti Whitikaupeka and Ngāti Tamakōpiri), Ngā Rauru, Te Ati Haunui-a-Pāpārangi, Ngāti Tamahaki and Ngāti Rangi. Any person who is a descendant to these iwi and hapū is able to attend the meetings of Tikanga Māori House.

The Civic House meets monthly (if a meeting is required). Its membership currently consists of the six members of Joint Council appointed by the Civic House Electoral College. Civic House Electoral College consists of stakeholder representatives including natural heritage organisations, educational organisations, cultural heritage organisations, the business community, and the territorial local authorities in the Whanganui Region, as well as representatives of the museum society and the Queens Park Partners (Sarjeant Art Gallery and Whanganui Public Library).

It is the purpose of each house to bring forward policy proposals or other matters to the Joint Council. All proposals bought forward by either of the houses must be consistent with the Treaty of Waitangi and adequate consultation between the partners (houses) must have taken place before the matter is debated in the Joint Council (Whanganui Regional Museum Trust Constitution, September 2000, Section 6.5c). When the Joint Council votes on matters there must be a majority of members from both houses agreeing to a motion before it can be adopted. Joint Council meetings were held monthly for the first twelve months and then reduced to two-monthly meetings from June 2002. Monthly meetings resumed from March 2003.

Tangata whenua participation in the governance of Whanganui Regional Museum is discussed in detail in Chapters Six and Seven.

5.3   Comment

Most institutions that have their origins before 1980 have been founded with governance structures that reflect the interests of their founders and their primary funding bodies. The founders and developers of the metropolitan and regional institutions were predominantly Pākehā male collectors, scholars (professional and amateur), businessmen, and educators. An analysis of the recent constitutional changes, particularly of the composition of the trust boards, confirms a significant change from the representation of founding stakeholders to increased representation of the communities that now fund the museums through local bodies. There has also been an increasing recognition of the need to provide specific representation of tangata whenua, although this is usually limited to one or two representatives. There is no standard approach to Māori representation: each institution has developed its own variation.

There is clear evidence that South Island museums have been slower to change the nature of Māori representation than North Island museums. For example, the Canterbury and Otago museums and the Southland Museum and Art Gallery Trust retain a wide range of representation from community and professional organisations that were important in the early development of the institution and there has been little or no increase in the representation of tangata whenua. Although Tasman Bays Heritage Trust makes provision for representatives of all local iwi to participate in the selection of trust board members, there is no explicit provision for tangata whenua representation on the trust board. To date the selection committee has selected two Māori representatives, though it is not clear which sections of the Māori community they represent.

Most trust museum constitutions still allow for tangata whenua to be out-voted by non-Māori on matters relating to the care and interpretation of taonga Māori in museum collections. However, in practice, museum trust boards are increasingly guided by the Māori members of their trust boards and the advisors who support them when it comes to issues concerning taonga Māori. Such advisors may be legally constituted within the institution, such as the Taumata-ā-Iwi at Auckland Museum, or as a sub-committee of the

trust board. Another approach is for the Māori advisory body to be responsible to the museum director, as at the Hawkes Bay Museum. The extent to which a small minority of Māori members (one or two) on a trust board or a Māori Advisory committee is able to influence the determination of short, mid and long term priorities for expenditure within the strategic planning processes of their institutions, or monitor the performance of directors, has yet to be determined though does not appear substantial.[20]

Clearly, museums have multiple relationships with their communities. The governance arrangements are only one type of relationship. Other relationships, including the establishment of advisory groups and memorandums of agreement relating to the care, use and interpretation of particular taonga/collections, occur outside the formal governance arrangements. Partnerships may also be negotiated directly between hapū or iwi to define the processes through which a relationship will be maintained. The role of the governing body is to create a strategic policy framework that facilitates the development of such partnerships. Without such partnerships the promise of the new governance models may not be realised. It is also possible that, as these partnerships evolve, hapū and iwi may begin to develop their own heritage facilities and repatriate elements of the museum collections as part of their own cultural and economic development strategies.

In the case of both metropolitan museums and charitable trust museums it can be misleading to assume that the legislation or the trust deeds indicate the full extent of Māori participation in the governance of the institution. A number of trusts have Māori advisory committees that take an active part in the care and interpretation of taonga Māori in the collections, although they may not be formally connected to the governance structure and decision making processes. Although there appears to be increasing Māori dissatisfaction with participation in advisory committees rather than full membership of the governance body, it is clear that these committees ensure that a larger representation of tangata whenua contributes to the governance of the institution than the limited representation provided for at trust board level allows. It is critical that the mandate of such advisory committees is clearly articulated and understood by all parties and that such

---

[20] My own observation over the last decade suggests that their influence is limited.

groups have clear lines of communication to both the chief executive and the trust board. Frustrations emerge where the expectations of the Māori advisory bodies, museum trust boards and museum practitioners are not clearly understood by all parties.

Many museums established within a territorial local authority structure are able to draw on the services of their authority's iwi advisory body and, in some instances, on an iwi advisory body created specifically for the museum, as in the case of the Rotorua Museum of Art and History. The Komiti Māori for the new museum in New Plymouth, Puke Ariki, has taken an active role in the development of the facility and the exhibitions. This advisory committee has also taken an active part in facilitating the increase in Māori staff members within the museum. The Komiti Māori formed a partnership with Te Papa National Services to phase in a position for a Māori curator, known as the Tauhora Curator. Further research is needed to determine the extent to which these advisory committees to local authority museums are able to initiate projects and determine strategic priorities for the institution as a whole.

Changes in the Local Government Act 2002 and the Local Electoral Act 2002 may have some influence on the way in which museums develop their relationships with tangata whenua in the future. One of the objectives of the review of the Local Government Act 1974 was to clarify the extent to which local bodies are bound by the Crown's Treaty of Waitangi responsibilities. The 1974 act makes no reference to Māori. Public submissions on this issue demonstrated the division within New Zealand society on this issue. While a majority of submissions (primarily Māori and local body submissions) accepted the need for a reference in the new act to local body Treaty responsibilities, there were a significant number of submissions (from business and ratepayer organisations, councils and individuals) that expressed the view:

> that the relationship between Māori and local government should be the same as between all other citizens and local government. Some of the submissions from individuals claim that giving Māori 'preferential treatment' is a form of 'apartheid' which fails to recognise New Zealand's multicultural society. (Department of internal Affairs 2001: 36)

These comments are very similar to those made by opponents to the proposed changes to the Whanganui Regional Museum constitution. The comments are an example of the way in which tolerant multiculturalism is used to deny indigeneity, while stating a strict adherence to the liberal democratic position based on individual rights, which is in itself a denial of multiculturalism. The government decided to include a Treaty of Waitangi reference in the new legislation.

The Local Government Act 2000 Section 4 reads:

> 1.　　Treaty of Waitangi
>
> In order to recognise and respect the Crown's responsibility to take account of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and to maintain and improve opportunities for Māori to contribute to local government decision-making processes, Parts 2 and 6 provide principles and requirements for local authorities that are intended to facilitate participation by Māori in local authority decision-making processes.

The new act does not deliver all that Māori requested. Māori submissions to the review had sought acknowledgement of the principles of the Treaty, recognition of tangata whenua, and prescribed Treaty obligations and guidelines for consultation. These are all issues that are equally relevant to the review of museum legislation and trust museum constitutions. However, the provisions of Section 6 of the new act indicate that local bodies, the primary funding agencies of most New Zealand museums, will almost certainly require museums to demonstrate how they are developing more effective relationships with local Māori.

The Local Electoral Amendment Act 2002 makes provision for any territorial authority to divide its district into one or more Māori wards for electoral purposes. This has been done in response to the very low proportion of Māori participating in local body elections and the small proportion of Māori elected to local authorities. Where these provisions are enacted by local authorities or as a result of successful public polls, the nature of local body politics could change significantly. This form of indigenous recognition in the local

body electoral process could also create an expectation amongst hapū and iwi for similar recognition in the constitutional arrangements of public institutions such as museums.

While significant changes have occurred in museum practice relating to the care and interpretation of taonga Māori in New Zealand museums, the level of tangata whenua representation has not increased to a significant proportion of the total membership of the trust boards in most institutions. This slow evolution in the power structures of New Zealand museums holding collections of taonga Māori means that, although museum professionals are increasingly conscious of indigenous peoples' rights and the rights of Māori in particular in relation to their cultural property, and the number of Māori museum professionals is increasing, the institutions continue to be governed primarily by Pākehā trustees within a mainstream museological paradigm. Notwithstanding an abundance of goodwill, there is an increasing expectation from Māori that Māori should represent Māori interests, and that Māori representation should reflect the complexity of regional or local Māori society.

Tairāwhiti Museum Trust and the Whanganui Regional Museum Trust, both constituted during the late 1990s, stand out as fundamentally different from the governing bodies of most other regional charitable trust museums. The constitutions of both of these institutions recognise and make provision for the representation of the iwi in their region directly on to their trust boards. Before the new trust deeds were constituted Tairāwhiti Museum had two tangata whenua representatives appointed by a Māori Advisory Committee and Whanganui Museum had two tangata whenua representatives elected by the museum society. The new constitution of Tairāwhiti ensures that five of the eleven board members are iwi representatives. At Whanganui Regional Museum six of the twelve board members are iwi representatives.

Why have these two institutions chosen to reform their governance arrangements in this way and at this time? How have the relationships between tangata whenua and Pākehā changed within the context of these museums as a result of these constitutional changes? Do these constitutional innovations mean that tangata whenua in these regions will form

significantly different types of partnerships with Pākehā in the governance of these institutions? What changes are likely to happen in the way these museums develop their strategic plans and policy frameworks as a result of these fundamental constitutional changes? What are the implications of these changes for the way in which we think about democratic processes, inclusion and the notion of partnership both locally and nationally? The remaining four chapters of this thesis are concerned with exploring the history of tangata whenua participation in the development and governance of these two institutions and considering the significance of the new governance structures in the context of evolving relationships between Māori and museums in New Zealand and within the broader context of mutual recognition of indigenous peoples in colonial societies.

CHAPTER SIX

WHANGANUI REGIONAL MUSEUM:

MĀORI PARTICIPATION 1895-2002

6.0 Introduction

In Aotearoa New Zealand museums remain complex symbols of the evolving relationships between Māori and Pākehā in the wider society. While museums contain the spoils of colonial appropriation, they also contain significant whānau, hapū and iwi taonga tuku iho that have been placed there by Māori for safe-keeping. Almost every institution has maintained connections, however tenuous or tumultuous, with Māori families who have assumed the responsibility, to the extent each museum would allow, of providing advice and protection for the taonga held in museum collections. However, the majority of Māori have remained estranged from museums because of the way in which kōiwi tangata and taonga tuku iho have been acquired, as well as the restrictive means employed to care for and interpret Māori cultural treasures in public exhibitions. Therefore, except in cases where Māori families have initiated and maintained relationships with museums, Māori have had limited knowledge of museum collections and have not found these institutions very accessible, nor have they always placed high value on museums as important national or regional cultural institutions.

Towards the end of the twentieth century museums in New Zealand moved progressively towards recognition of the cultural and intellectual property rights of tangata whenua. Whanganui Regional Museum and Tairāwhiti Museum have been chosen as the case study institutions for this thesis because they have both adopted innovative new governance models. In particular, both institutions have renegotiated their relationships with tangata whenua. These two institutions have begun to explore the challenge of creating a 'common ground' based on the principles of mutual recognition, continuity and consent. The notion of a 'common ground', as defined by Tully, is one that allows for the recognition of more

than one tikanga (set of cultural rules and protocols): the creation of a context within which tikanga Māori and tikanga Pākehā can operate side by side on an equal basis. While retaining the robust nature of the 'contact zone' as defined by Clifford, the 'common ground' establishes a set of principles that recognise the mana (authority) and rangatiratanga (sovereignty) of the peoples engaging in the partnership.

This chapter provides an historical analysis of the relationships between Whanganui Regional Museum and local Māori from 1895 to 2002, with particular emphasis on Māori participation in museum governance. Chapter Seven examines certain aspects of these relationships in more detail, drawing on a series of interviews undertaken with museum trustees.

6.1   Early Developments 1891-1938[1]

6.1.1   Establishment of the Museum

The first public meeting to discuss the establishment of a public museum in Wanganui was held in February 1892 after it had become known that Samuel Drew wanted to sell his large private collection of natural history specimens and taonga Māori (Alexander Museum 1933: 8).[2] A group of citizens decided that it would be a significant loss to the district if Drew's collection were to be sold to museums outside the district or to private collectors in another part of the country or overseas. Although Drew's natural history collection was larger than his collection of taonga Māori, it has been stated that Drew was "greatly interested in the Māori, and specimens of Māori art were prized above all other exhibits" (ibid.: 7).

Wanganui Public Museum Society was incorporated under the Public Libraries Powers Act (1875) in 1893.The purposes of the society were: to acquire a museum site in Queens

---

[1] The writer has adopted the convention of placing all references to archival material (minute books and other archival sources) and museum annual reports and newsletters in footnotes. All archival sources used in this chapter are housed at the Whanganui Regional Museum Archives, Whanganui. Wanganui Public Museum changed its name to Wanganui Regional Museum in 1973 and changed its name again in 1992 to Whanganui Regional Museum. Note the inclusion of the 'h' in Whanganui in 1992.

[2] For a general overview of S. H Drew's collecting practice see McKergow 1997.

Park (in the centre of the town); to erect a building for the purposes of a public museum; "to purchase from Mr Samuel Henry Drew of Wanganui his private museum and fixtures" and to "thereafter … purchase or otherwise acquire … further specimens, exhibits and works of art with a view to enlarging and extending such museum."[3] This institution was to be governed by fourteen trustees.[4] The inaugural board of trustees listed in the deed of incorporation did not include any Māori members.[5]

At the time Drew's collection was purchased, it included 1438 Māori and foreign ethnological items.[6] When the museum opened to the public in 1894, Samuel Drew was appointed honorary curator and retained this position until he died in 1901. Drew's motivation for collecting taonga Māori was driven by the knowledge that these objects were a finite resource and were still being exported in large numbers.[7] From the time the museum was established local Māori contributed to the collection:

> Our store of treasures has been increased by many additions of value and interest, particularly so is this the case with our new specimens of Māori work, … some of these valuable acquisitions have been presented by our Māori friends, who take the deepest interest in the welfare of our museum. It is gratifying to all that this is so; that the Māori feel they can safely deposit the few treasures that are still left to them under our charge, or, what is better to us, present them to the institution, with the full belief they will be treasured and taken care of, so that for all time the Māori whenever he visits our buildings will view with pride the clever work of his ancestors and the skill of their handcrafts, when long forgotten. I am sure it will be pleasing to you to know we have gained this confidence with the Māori. The pity of it is that we are so late in the field. The museum

---

[3] Declaration of Incorporation, Wanganui Public Museum, 1893, Clause 3.

[4] Declaration of Incorporation, Wanganui Public Museum, 1893, Clause 7.

[5] Members of the first Board of Trustees included: G. Carson (President), H. Sarjeant and W. Empson (Vice-presidents), J. H. Nixon (Treasurer), W. E. Andrews (Secretary), S. H. Drew (Hon. Director), Trustees - Marshall, Atkins, Jackson, Barnicoat, Turner, Spurdle, and Blair. *Wanganui Chronicle* August 1896. Cutting located inside the cover of Minute Book 1892-1912.

[6] For example, in 1891 Drew had sent 17 Māori items and casts of hei tiki to the Colonial Museum of Tasmania and in exchange had been sent a number of "Tasmanian native stone implements". (*Wanganui Yeoman,* 11 April 1891).

[7] In 1901 the museum trustees asked their member of parliament to support the development of antiquities legislation to prevent the export of taonga Māori from New Zealand. (Wanganui Public Museum Trustees Meeting 31 May 1901, Minute Book 1892-1912).

should have started years ago when the natives were rich in the exhibits we now prize so much.[8]

This statement provides insight into both Drew's understanding of Māori attitudes to the museum and his attitude towards Māori, particularly the museum's "Māori friends". It is apparent from the above statement that Wanganui Māori who placed taonga in the museum often did so in the form of deposit rather than gift. Pākehā museum staff and museum trustees tended to think of both deposits and gifts as having entered the museum to stay and there are examples in the record of trustees making considerable effort to retain items that have been deposited when the owner sought to have them returned.

There is evidence from the statements recorded in the annual reports that museum trustees and others actively pursued the presentation of taonga. There are also indications that there were Māori families who wanted to preserve the taonga they held and that they considered the museum an appropriate place for the preservation of some of these. However, it is not possible to deduce either the extent to which deposits of taonga were initiated by Māori or were encouraged by people associated with the museum.

Analysis of the language in these accounts provides an insight into the relationships between Tupoho (the lower river iwi) and the Pākehā residents of the Wanganui district. The term 'Māori friends' is more than a reference to those Māori families who were supportive of the museum: it refers to the Tupoho people who repelled the Pai Marire[9] force that was advancing down the Whanganui River in 1864 with the supposed intention of attacking the Pākehā settlement at Whanganui. In May 1864, Tupoho, along with other hapū from the lower and middle reaches of the river, defeated the Pai Marire force at Moutoa Island. This incident reinforced the relationships that had developed between the peoples of the lower river and the Pākehā settlers. The Pākehā residents of Wanganui continued to develop their relationships with the Tupoho peoples and, in particular, with certain prominent families at Pūtiki. Constant reference to the significance of the Battle of Moutoa and continued celebration of the event into the 1930s (even into the 1960s on

---

[8] *Wanganui Public Museum Annual Report 1900*. p. 7.
[9] Pai Marire were usually referred to as the Hauhau during the period under discussion.

special occasions) emphasises the sense of vulnerability to Māori attack among the Pākehā settlers in the early decades of the Wanganui settlement. However, the European settlers may have misread the reasons why the lower river people did not allow the Pai Marire to continue down the river. It is more probable that the lower Whanganui hapū were acting "in their traditional role of protecting the mana of the river" (Praat 1998: 64).

In his monthly report for March 1900 the curator noted that Wiki Kemp, resident of Ranana and daughter of Major Kemp, Te Rangihiwinui, who had previously deposited taonga in the museum, had deposited a large carving.[10] Two other donors, listed in the 1900 annual report, are of particular note because their families were to maintain a long association with the museum: a carving was presented by Waata Hipango and two kete were presented by Mrs Hoani Mete Kingi.[11]

In the curator's reports he refers to "our Māoris" and "the natives". These terms indicate an attitude of assumed superiority derived from the ideas of racial and cultural hierarchy common at the time. The assumption was made that Māori were abandoning all of their customary practices in favour of European culture and technology. It is apparent that while there was a bond between the Pākehā settlers and Tupoho during this period, there was also a cultural distance that would remain throughout the twentieth century.

In 1902 Henry Drew replaced his father as honorary curator. From 1902 until the early 1920s the museum struggled to survive because of a shortage of funds and declining public membership (Alexander Museum 1933:13-14). When the Waitotara and Wanganui District Councils agreed to provide some funding each council was given a seat on the board of trustees. By 1914 the buildings were clearly inadequate for the collections, but the outbreak of the First World War delayed planning for a new facility. In 1928 the new building was completed, providing an adequate facility for what had become the fifth largest museum collection in New Zealand.

---

[10] *Wanganui Chronicle*, 6 March, 1900.
[11] *Wanganui Public Museum Annual Report 1900*. p. 9.

There were no Māori trustees from 1895 to 1928. However, three of the Pākehā trustees during this period spoke te reo Māori, had considerable knowledge of Māori history and culture and maintained close relationships with Māori in the Wanganui region.[12] Most notable of these was Thomas Downes who had settled in Wanganui in 1898 and eventually established a national reputation as a historian and ethnologist.[13] These Pākehā 'experts' advised the other trustees and the honorary directors about the development, care and interpretation of the taonga Māori collection.

During this period the taonga Māori were displayed in the 'ethnological room' in association with material from other parts of the world.[14] Collecting taonga Māori continued during this period and sometimes took the form of organised fieldtrips.[15] Collections of taonga Māori continued to be deposited, gifted, exchanged and purchased, including items received directly from Māori families. Waata Wiremu Hipango deposited a number of taonga Māori at this time as well as a series of photographs of local Māori,[16] and in 1917 he also presented a river canoe from Parinui.[17] During the 1920s the taonga Māori collection continued to grow at a steady rate. In 1920 a large collection of taonga Māori (40 items) was bequeathed to the museum by Gregor McGregor and in 1925 the J. H. Burnet collection, including taonga Māori, was purchased.[18]

6.1.2   Te Mata o Hoturoa and Teremoe

In 1917 discussions had been initiated with Waata Wiremu Hipango regarding the placement of the waka taua, Te Mata o Hoturoa and Teremoe, in the museum. These canoes were eventually presented to the museum by Ema Hipango in 1924. In 1925, the museum trustees made a presentation to Ema Hipango at the museum in recognition of her

---

[12] Rev. A. Williams (1896-1920), T. Downes (1909-1918, 1923-1938) and H. Bates (1920-22, 23-29).
[13] His most notable publication is *Old Whanganui* (1915).
[14] *Wanganui Public Museum Fourteenth Annual Report 1909* p. 10.
[15] Honorary Curator's Report. *Wanganui Public Museum Annual Report 1909* p. 6.
[16] Wanganui Public Museum Annual Meeting 1913. *Whanganui Chronicle* account in Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1912-1931.
[17] Trustees Meeting Minutes, 21 February 1917. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1912-1931.
[18] *Wanganui Public Museum Annual Report 1920*.

support.[19] The waka had been used during the battle at Moutoa in 1864 and at Ohoutahi in 1865, on both occasions enabling the resistance of the advance of the Pai Marire into the lower reaches of the river. Consequently, the waka had symbolic significance for both Māori and Pākehā of the Whanganui region. Te Mata o Hoturoa had been presented to Hoani Wiremu Hipango who had passed it on to Waata Wiremu Hipango, who had passed it to his wife Ema Hipango (Alexander Museum 1933). Once it had entered the museum collection Te Mata o Hoturoa became symbolic of the relationship between Tupoho (the lower river iwi) and the Pākehā residents of the Wanganui region. Ema Hipango and her uncle and advisor, Hori Pukehika, were made life members of the museum in 1930.[20] In that year, Ema Hipango agreed to present the waka Teremoe to the Dominion Museum in Wellington. The account of the meeting held at the museum to discuss this transaction provides a useful insight into the relationship between the Hipango family and the museum. Ema Hipango, Hori Pukehika and Ernest Barns, the latter acting as interpreter, attended. Hori Pukehika spoke on behalf of Emma Hipango:

> Greetings from Ema Hipango and myself to your committee. We wish first of all to say how glad we are to see the great success you are making of the museum, and carrying on the fine work so well started by the late Mr Drew, who was to us as a friend and a brother. The Hipangos have always been interested in the museum and anything that appertained to Wanganui.
>
> Mrs Ema Hipango deposited the war canoes in the same spirit. When the trustees applied to Mrs Hipango to be allowed to transfer the smaller canoe [Teremoe] to the Dominion Museum she could not consent until she had considered the matter very deliberately, but she has now decided, and, to go into the question more fully, is the purpose in meeting your trustees today. She now consents to the transfer of the canoe on the condition that the final arrangement is approved of between herself, myself, Mr Barns and the representatives of the museum.[21]

In 1934 local wood carvers were asked to tender for the work of carving the rauawa (top-sides) for Te Mata o Hoturoa. The contract was awarded to a local Pākehā carver, T. A.

---

[19] Trustees Meeting Minutes, 5 June 1925. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1912-1931.
[20] Trustees Meeting, 11 February 1930. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1912-1931.
[21] *Wanganui Chronicle* 8 February 1930.

Dewson.[22] The carvings were eventually attached to the canoe in 1936.[23] In 1968, Hori Hipango, son of Waata Hipango, recalled the reason for the deposit of the waka and remarked on its central position in the newly opened Māori Court:

> There was some dispute about this canoe with various families, however, Ema Hipango felt there was only one place that it could really rest in peace, that was to present it to the museum, so there you see it, resting here quite peacefully and I feel that it has significance because it is the focal point of the Māori Court.[24]

6.1.3 Māori Representation on the Board of Trustees

The issue of Māori representation on the museum board first arose at the Annual General Meeting in 1925. The president moved a notice of motion that would authorise the trustees to approach "a native representative" to join the board. During the debate that followed, H. D. Bates emphasised:

> the importance of cultivating the interest of the natives in the museum pointing out that it was particularly useful to them to have an institution such as the museum where all articles associated with their early history could be placed and preserved and at the same time be readily inspected. … It was because he knew the native mind so well that he considered it desirable that a special representative of the race should have a seat on the board of Trustees. He also explained that a small pamphlet had been distributed amongst the natives pointing out the advantages of preserving relics by depositing them in the museum and inviting co-operation.[25]

There is no record of the motion having been acted on in the following year. It was not until 1939 that the first Māori associate was appointed to the board of trustees. Rather, the trustees seemed to want to ensure that there were Pākehā trustees who were "in touch with Māori interests".[26] When H. D. Bates died in 1929, he was replaced by Ernest Barns.

---

[22] Letter from T. A. Dewson to T. W. Downes, 16 May 1934. Wanganui Regional Museum Archives.
[23] Trustees Meeting, 14 July 1936. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1931-1942.
[24] Interview with Hori Hipango by Erin Sinclair, July, 1968. Radio New Zealand Sound Archives
[25] Wanganui Public Museum Annual Meeting Minutes, 20 July 1925. Minute Book 1912-1931.
[26] Trustees Meeting Minutes, 10 December 1929. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1912-1931.

Before settling in the Wanganui district Barns had been a public trustee, natives reserves agent and licensed interpreter for the Native Land Court in Taranaki. At his first trustees' meeting, the president noted that he had been appointed to assist the board "in dealing with any matters affecting the native race".[27]

In 1933, the rapidly growing collection was already filling the facility into which it had been relocated only five years before. In that same year, Dr and Mrs Wall purchased Dr A. K. Newman's collection of taonga Māori as a memorial to their son.[28] This was a large and significant addition to the Māori collection. Two years later the trustees began to discuss the need to add a Māori Court to the museum.[29]

In 1938, after several years of attempting to involve local Māori in the development of the taonga Māori collection, the AGM that year recommended that the incoming trustees "be empowered to appoint associate trustees".[30] With the death of W. T. Downes and the appointment of associate members (Māori) to the board of trustees in 1938 the museum moved into a new phase in its relationships with local Māori.

6.2   Māori Associate Board Members 1938-1967

At the trustees' meeting in November 1938 Barns reported that Te Hekenui Whakarake had completed the first instalment of a history of the waka Te Mata o Hoturoa and Barns recommended that he be appointed an associate member of the board. Te Hekenui was in attendance and responded to this offer by thanking the trustees.[31] Te Hekenui was the first of a number of associate trustees to be appointed by the museum society between 1938 and 1967.

---

[27] Trustees Meeting Minutes, 11 February 1930. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1912-1931.
[28] *Wanganui Public Museum Annual Report* 1933.
[29] Wanganui Museum: Additions to the building. *Wanganui Herald* 1 August 1935.
[30] Minutes of Annual Meeting 9 August 1938. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1931-1942.
[31] Trustees Meeting, 13 November 1938. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1931-1942.

6.2.1　Te Wehi o Te Rangi

The first major addition to the taonga Māori collection in this period was the waka taua Te Wehi o Te Rangi. This waka was deposited by the members of the Te Wehi o Te Rangi Trust. The waka had been housed at Pungarehu in the care of Hori Pukehika, who was married to Pango Tukia of Ngāti Pamoana. Ngāti Pamoana are the customary owners of the waka in association with the Potaka family of Ngāti Hauiti at Rātā.[32] Following the death of Pukehika in 1932 the future care of the waka had to be determined.

The waka taua had first belonged to Paraone, who passed it to Roka Tihore, who then passed it to her foster child Rora Te Oiroa, who married Utiku Potaka of Rātā in the Rangitīkei. Te Wehi o Te Rangi had been used at the battles of Moutoa and Ohoutahi in the 1860s and had subsequently been seen on the river at regattas until the 1880s, after which it lay on the riverbank at Koriniti. Permission had been granted in 1923 for the waka to be taken to the museum for safekeeping but a delay had meant that it fell into disrepair and had eventually been housed by Hori Pukehika.

Although it is not possible to be certain when discussions resumed between the owners of the waka and the museum for the waka to be deposited in the museum, it is known that Ria Gilchrist of Rātā wrote to the trustees in October 1937, advising them that "the native owners would like to see it deposited in the museum where it would be preserved".[33] In February 1938 Rangi Pokiha wrote to Barns advising him that the owners of Te Wehi o Te Rangi and Ngati Pamoana wished to deposit the waka with the museum trustees.[34] The *Wanganui Herald* recorded the handing over ceremony:

> 'This canoe, which has been handed to us by our ancestors, we value very much, and it is with mixed feelings that we give it over,' said Mr Rangi Pokiha of Ngāti Pamoana tribe in formally depositing the craft in the museum. 'This action on our part took long to decide, for it meant much to us. Some of the people would sooner see it rot in the river than part

---

[32] A history of Te Wehi o Te Rangi is provided in Barns and Chapple *Te Wehi o Te Rangi* (1938).
[33] Letter from Ria Gilchrist, Utiku, to Museum Trustees, 8-10-37. Wanganui Regional Museum Correspondence Files.
[34] Trustees Meeting, 8 February 1938. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1931-1942.

with it, but we realise that to be preserved for other generations it must be cared for. It gives us great pleasure to hand it over to your safe-keeping.'[35]

Barns and Chapple (1933: 7) provide another account of the discussions that led to the decision to deposit the waka in the museum:

For some days and nights prior to this journey the Māori at Koriniti and Parikino held meetings to discuss the question of handing over Te Wehi. It was no light decision they had to make. The older Māori felt as if they were about to part with some trusty friend. 'Rather let her go to dust than hand her over to the Pākehā! Let her die with us! She is part of us! ' So said some of the older Māoris. The canoe they felt belonged to the tribe; it was remembered in their tribal traditions; it was a sacred heritage not to be lightly alienated.

Given the debate over the deposit of the waka it is not surprising that the Agreement for Deposit of Te Wehi o Te Rangi is a detailed document clearly stating the terms of the deposit. The agreement makes it clear that the trustees of the waka can remove it at any time for regatta or any other purpose as long as the museum trustees are given two weeks notice and any costs involved in moving the waka are covered by the waka trustees. The museum trustees for their part agreed to house the canoe, keep it in good repair, insure the canoe and make it available for public viewing.[36] The deposit of the waka in the museum may have been facilitated by the fact that one of the waka trustees, Mrs Toia Barns (Toia Ngarangi), was the wife of museum trustee, Ernest Barns. Toia Barns was a daughter of Rora Te Oiroa, Mrs Utiku Potaka, who had inherited Te Wehi o Te Rangi from Roka Tihore of Ngāti Pamoana. It appears that the Potaka whānau were supportive of depositing the waka in the museum, even in the face of the recorded opposition from some of Ngāti Pamoana. Although the archival records are seldom explicit on such matters,[37] it may not have been uncommon for trustees to have brought pressure to bear on owners to persuade them to place taonga in the museum. However, as mentioned previously some Māori families saw in the museum an institution that would provide safe-keeping for certain

---

[35] 'Its Last Journey: Historic War Canoe Deposited at Museum.' *Wanganui Herald,* 21 February 1938.
[36] *Agreement for Deposit of Te Wehi O Te Rangi* 19 February 1938. Wanganui Museum Archives: File Box: Te Wehi o Te Rangi.
[37] Oral history may well provide further understanding of why some of these decisions were made.

taonga for the short term at least. The fact that they deposited these taonga rather than gifted them, is also an indication that they were keeping their options open in terms of the future disposition of their taonga.

6.2.2   A Representative Collection

During 1939-41 Te Hekenui Whakarake attended board meetings as an associate member and worked closely with Barns in preparing a history of Te Mata o Hoturoa for publication.[38] Te Hekenui Whakarake also assisted the curator in making model eel-weirs to include in the museum displays.[39] However, the death of Ernest Barns in 1941, and of M. W. Smith[40] in 1943, marks the end of an era. Until this time, the board had relied heavily on the advice of Pākehā members with an extensive knowledge of Māori culture and close connections to Māori communities. After the death of Barns, the board turned to certain Māori families for that advice and in the process drew those families into the activities of the board. In 1941 Alex Takarangi joined Te Hekenui Whakarake as an associate member of the board. He was replaced in 1942 by Hauparoa Hiroti. Te Hekenui Whakarake remained as an associate member until 1949 and Hauparoa Hiroti until 1951.[41] Mr W. Emia was also an associate member from 1944-47.

At the same time as these changes were occurring at the board level, there were also changes occurring in the presentation of the taonga Māori collection in the museum: a much more selective approach was introduced and many taonga were placed in storage.[42] This rearrangement of the collection heralds a significant change in the presentation of the collections. Until this time the board had tried to display as much of the taonga Māori collection as possible, resisting the notion of placing a significant portion of the collection in storage. However, given the continuing growth of the collection and the limited

---

[38] Trustees Meeting, 14 March 1939. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1931-1942.
Trustees Meeting, 9 May 1939. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1931-1942.
[39] Trustees Meeting, 13 February 1940. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1931-1942.
[40] Trustees Meeting, 9 February 1943. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1942- 1953. "…his intimate knowledge of Māori artefacts and Māori custom made him an invaluable member of the board."
[41] "Mr Hiroti was for many years an esteemed and valued member of our board. His knowledge of Māori people and their history and customs was of great assistance to the board." Letter from Board of Trustees, Wanganui Museum, to Mrs Maui (daughter of H. Hiroti) 23 April 1951.
[42] *Wanganui Public Museum Annual Report* 1940, pp. 4 and 6

exhibition space, it was no longer realistic to display the entire collection. From this time on the museum not only developed a much more selective approach to exhibitions, but also developed the notion of a reserve or research collection as one of the strengths of the institution, particularly for visiting scholars.

The trustees continued to collect from the river settlements, now with the assistance of the Māori associate trustees. In 1943 Te Hekenui led a delegation of trustees to Matahiwi to negotiate the deposit of a set of carvings held by the community.[43] In 1945 Hori Takarangi of Pūtiki gifted two small waka, named Titahi and Kiekie, to the museum. There was no room to display the waka and they were stored in the basement with Te Wehi o Te Rangi.[44] The museum could only accommodate one of the large canoes, Te Mata o Hoturoa, in the public galleries. Appropriate accommodation of the waka was to become a matter of contention between the museum and local iwi from the 1980s.

Between 1950 and 1968 the collection continued to grow by acquisition, gifts and deposits each year. Although it would appear that the overall rate of collecting declined during this period,[45] there were still a number of significant collections added to the museum collection, including items loaned by the National Museum from the Oldman Collection, which had been purchased by the government. In 1957, the director advised the trustees that the Māori collections were primarily responsible for the national reputation of the museum and that they were responsible for ensuring that the collections were maintained in appropriate conditions.[46]

6.2.3   Associate Members and Māori Associate Members

The list of Māori board members from the 1950s onwards reflects the connection with Pūtiki. Most significantly the record reveals that some Tupoho families, such as the Mete Kingi, Hipango and Takarangi families, which had earlier deposited taonga in the museum

---

[43] Trustees Meeting, 9 February 1943. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1942- 1953.
[44] *Wanganui Public Museum Annual Report* 1945, p. 9.
[45] This is an impression gained from reading annual reports and other records and not based on a systematic analysis of collection records.
[46] Director's Report, February 1957.

and advised trustees from time to time, maintained their connections with the museum through these forms of representation. In the late 1950s T. H. Takarangi (1949-1959) was the longest serving associate member[47], initially joined by C. Larkin (1950-56). In 1953 the term Associate Member was replaced by Māori Associate Member. In the same year Colonel A. Awatere (1953-6) and Reverend K. M. Ihaka (1953-7) were elected as Māori Associate Members. Awatere worked for the Department of Māori Affairs in Wanganui and Reverend Ihaka was an Anglican minister at Pūtiki. T. Manawaroa (Rangitāne) was also an Associate Member from 1955-57. Reverend Ihaka's replacement at the church at Pūtiki, Canon H. Taepa, was a Māori Associate Member during 1958-63, alongside K. W. Puohotaua (1960-69) and T. R. Takarangi. Puohotaua worked for the Department of Māori Affairs as a district welfare officer. His involvement with the museum was probably part of his work for the Māori community. H. R. Mete Kingi served as Māori associate member from 1963-1970. John Grace (1960-63) was the first Māori elected to the board as a full member, followed by Hori K. Hipango, who served as a board member from 1967-87, and as vice-president from 1972-87.

After M. J. Smart was appointed director in 1952, the museum took a more active interest in the recording and investigation of archaeological sites. A Māori Historical Research Committee was formed in 1954 to ensure the preservation of archival records held by Māori families and organisations.[48] The committee's activities were based at the museum. There is little evidence in the archives of the activities undertaken by this committee, although it should be noted that Wanganui Museum has accumulated a nationally significant archival collection, focused primarily on the Wanganui region.

Rev. Ihaka was an active member of the board from 1953-7. He encouraged it to reflect on the nature of Māori representation, though with little success. He raised the issue of revision of the museum constitution with particular reference to the non-voting rights of Māori associate members at board meetings.[49] There is no record of whether or not this

---

[47] This information about the terms served by Associate Members and Māori Associate Members is taken from a list provided by the Wanganui Regional Museum.
[48] Trustees Meeting, 9 March 1954. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1942-1954
[49] Trustees Meeting, 12 November 1957. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1954-1960.

issue, or the broader discussion, was resolved to Rev. Ihaka's satisfaction and the matter was not pursued after his departure. Despite this unwillingness on the part of the board to enter into debate about the nature of Māori representation, the Māori associate members continued to take an active role in the institution through until 1969. However, many members left after relatively short periods of involvement, perhaps finding the routine nature of board business of little interest.[50]

Māori participation in the governance of Whanganui Museum now entered another period of transition that continued until the opening of the Māori Court in 1968. The first step in this transition was the election of J. H. Grace to the board although he remained for only a short period. Much more significant in confirming the change was the election of Hori Hipango to the board. Hipango remained on the board for twenty years.

Hori Hipango was elected to the board in 1967 and made a significant contribution to the final stages of the preparation and opening of Atihaunui-a-Pāpārangi, the Māori Court in 1968, advising the board on Māori protocol, the name for the gallery and Māori sources of funding for the project, and worked closely with the Māori Women's Welfare League members who made the tukutuku panels that were placed at the entrance to the gallery.[51]

In July 1968 the museum extension was opened by Hon. J. R. Hanan, Minister of Māori Affairs. This extension included the Māori Court on the ground floor, basement storage, and natural history exhibitions on the first floor. Rangi Metekingi, a senior member of the Pūtiki community, made the following comments at the opening ceremony:

> Mr Mayor, Mr Hanan, Mr McDouall[52] and distinguished guests, my clansmen of the river, my friends of the Pākehā world, I am privileged indeed on behalf of my clan to extend to the trustees of the museum our heartfelt thanks on this day, the day on which we meet together to open the Māori Court of this museums. I am glad to have had this opportunity

---

[50] Trustees Meeting, 20 October 1969. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1966-1971.

[51] Trustees Meeting, 20 November 1967, Trustees Meeting, 15 January 1968, Trustees Meeting, 8 February 1968. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1966-1971.

[52] Chairman of the museum trust board and later to be actively involved in the opposition to the proposed changes in the museum's governance arrangements.

to be present … I trust that we all appreciate the significance of this occasion. We are doing this together, there are many things we don't do together, but this at least is one, and may it be the beginning of much more togetherness in the future.[53]

With these words Rangi Mete Kingi both conveyed his support for the museum and acknowledged the distance that existed between the Māori and Pākehā communities in Whanganui at that time. Given the nature of the occasion, with the Minister of Māori Affairs present, it is significant that such a comment should have been made. Mete Kingi's comments suggest that the Māori and Pākehā communities were not well integrated and that one of the reasons why some Whanganui Māori leaders supported the museum, in addition to its role in caring for taonga tuku iho, was because they saw it as a potential 'contact zone', a meeting place between the two cultures.

Tangata whenua had played a major role in creating the Māori Court which contained new exhibitions of taonga Māori, including the Lindauer portraits of Māori held in the museum collection. Its opening heralded the beginning of a new phase in the life of the museum. A new generation of tangata whenua had been involved in its creation and new relationships emerged as a result, though they were still mainly with people from Pūtiki. In 1971, while speaking at an event in the museum, Mrs W. Waitere (of Pūtiki) told those present that the Māori Court was a "wonderful and sacred space".[54]

Hori Hipango made the following comments when asked at the time of the opening about the significance of the new exhibitions in the Māori Court for the hapū of Whanganui:

> My feelings are these. It's the atmosphere. Here you find our Māori artefacts, our treasures. It has a peacefulness that surrounds each one as you can see. There's that feeling of security. Here they are nestled in the various show cases .. how peaceful they are.
> Our elders that came through here during the official opening of the court, they went around and viewed each artefact, and when they spoke to me about it they felt, well, here is a most fitting resting place for these gifts, they were more than happy, not only because

---

[53] Taken from a recording of the Opening Ceremony of the Whanganui Museum extension 1968. Radio New Zealand Sound Archive.
[54] Director's Report May-June 1971, Whanganui Regional Museum Archive.

they are displayed in this manner, but because of the whole structure that enclosed these artefacts. They look upon it as a treasure house.[55]

He traced the Māori connection with the museum from its beginnings:

> Going back through the years, when the old museum which was in the Savage Club, there were quite a number of our Māori artefacts that were stored there, that not only came from the Māori people but also from Pākehā settlers, and I think from that beginning it was a sort of momentum, a realisation, well, here is a sort of a treasure house where things can be cared for and of course, with the present museum and this new extension, it gave a more significant approach, that our people realised, it gave them a better feeling of being able to give without feeling suspicious.[56]

Asked if Māori families felt sad when their taonga went into the museum he responded:

> There may be sadness, in this way, that each family feels they have released something that had been handed down to them from generation to generation. They may have this feeling, but at the same time, when they realise … it must be put into somewhere where there is more safe-keeping, not into any foreign hand, or any other hand taking them.[57]

A new phase had begun in the relationship between the museum and tangata whenua, building on past developments. At the same time public exhibition space within the museum had been significantly increased and exhibitions continued to be developed especially in the area of natural history.

---

[55] Interview with Hori Hipango by Erin Sinclair, July 1968. Radio New Zealand Sound Archives
[56] Ibid.
[57] Ibid.

6.3   Māori Board Members 1968-1993
6.3.1   Transition

In 1969 the board decided to replace the Māori Associate Members with Honorary Māori Advisors. This occurred following the election of the first Māori trustee the year before. The following people were appointed: Mrs R. Takarangi, Mrs W. Waitere, Mr J. Mete Kingi, and Mr K. Puohotaua.[58] Mrs Takarangi and Mr Puohotaua wrote to the board concerning this impending change, expressing disappointment that the Honorary Māori Advisors would no longer be able to participate in the administration of the institution. Then in 1972 the position of Honorary Māori Advisor was discontinued. Communications between the board and local Māori were to be channelled through one elected trustee.

In 1973 the museum adopted the new name of Wanganui Regional Museum. In the same year Hori Hipango was asked to stand as chairman of the board, but declined, stating that his present commitments precluded him from accepting the nomination, although he would reconsider standing in twelve months' time.[59] Hipango was never elected to the position of chairman of the board although he continued to serve on the board until 1987. It is possible that he drew a line between representing the interests of Māori on the museum board and representing the interests of the museum to the wider community.

6.3.2   Te Wehi o Te Rangi

The recent history surrounding Te Wehi o Te Rangi and the other waka held in the museum is briefly outlined in order to demonstrate the ongoing concern of the museum and the trustees since 1973 and their frustration at being unable to find a satisfactory solution for the housing of these waka. At a number of points during the last thirty years the waka have provided a focus for Māori discontent with the museum's ability to provide satisfactory care and exhibition facilities for these taonga.

---

[58] Trustees Meeting 20 October 1969. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1966-1971
[59] Trustees Meeting 20 August 1973. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1971-1976

Tangata whenua maintained a continuing interest in the waka deposited in the museum. In 1972 the museum trustees were advised that there was concern in the community that most of the waka were not on public display. The new extension to the museum had not been large enough to accommodate both Te Mata o Hoturoa and Te Wehi o Te Rangi in the Māori Court if the rest of the Māori collection was to be effectively represented. The trustees noted the difficulties of finding suitable space to display the waka but confirmed their commitment to preserving these taonga that may otherwise have been lost.[60]

An approach was made to the museum in 1973 by Rangi Pokiha of Ngāti Pamoana, asking for the return of Te Wehi o Te Rangi to Koriniti to be placed in a museum facility that was being planned at the marae there. The museum board expressed concern for the future well-being of this waka that had been under the care of the museum for the previous thirty years.[61] This was a typical response by the museum board to proposals to remove both deposited and acquired taonga from the museum. The museum declined the request on the basis that there would not be sufficient security for the waka at Koriniti.[62] This matter remained on the agenda through into 1974 when the board became involved in discussions with the Māori Waitangi Day Committee about the use of canoes on the river during the 1975 celebrations of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi.[63] By this time Pokiha had located the original agreement between the owners of Te Wehi o Te Rangi and the museum board, which made it clear that while the board could express an opinion, it could not refuse to act in accord with the wishes of the owners. Te Wehi o Te Rangi participated in the Waitangi Day celebrations in February 1975 and then returned to the museum.[64]

In 1975 the Māori Action Committee was formed of people in the community connected with Te Wehi, with the purpose of removing the canoe from the museum to a purpose-built building. Although there were meetings held with the museum to discuss the planned new facility, little progress was made. It was not until 1979 that Te Wehi o Te Rangi and

---

[60] Trustees Meeting 21 February 1972. Wanganui Public Museum Minute Book 1971-1976
[61] Trustees Meeting 16 October 1973. Wanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1971-1976
[62] Trustees Meeting 19 November 1973. Wanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1971-1976
[63] Trustees Meeting 24 June 1974. Wanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1971-1976
[64] Trustees Meeting February 1975. Wanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1971-1976

Mangaone were removed from the museum to Henry Bennett's workshop[65] and later to Te Ao Hou Marae, but there was little progress with the building of the canoe sheds. The removal of the canoes from the museum demonstrates the frustration of local Māori at their inability to act collectively to reassert their control of taonga that had been in the museum for many years.

In 1987 Mina McKenzie, descendant of Rora Te Oiroa Potaka and a Te Wehi o Te Rangi trustee, wrote to the museum board on behalf of the Te Wehi o Te Rangi trustees expressing their concern that the canoe was not in the museum and asking the museum to have a professional conservator prepare a conservation report on the canoe.[66] The trustees were particularly concerned that the waka was exposed to the weather at Te Ao Hou Marae. The conservator confirmed the need to provide better protection for the waka from the ravages of the local climate.[67] In August 1987 the Te Wehi o Te Rangi trustees and representatives of the museum board met to discuss the situation and the board agreed to cover the costs of erecting temporary cover for the waka. However, this did not eventuate and in 1991 Te Wehi o Te Rangi was taken from Te Ao Hou Marae to Pūtiki Wharanui Marae. Although some members of the local community had been concerned about the canoes since 1973, little progress had been made in re-housing the canoes over the following twenty years. Frustrated by the lack of progress and concerned about the long-term preservation of Te Wehi o Te Rangi, the trustees agreed to return the waka to the museum in 1995.[68]

The Museum curator Michelle Horwood worked closely with Henry Bennett and the Māori trustees during this period to find an appropriate solution for housing the waka within the museum. The Collection Redevelopment Project enabled the museum to improve the housing of the Māori collections. The waka were shifted into the new storage facilities and a conservation project was undertaken. Descendants of the families who had

---

[65] Minutes of Meeting of the Canoe Investigation Committee 29 July 1979. Wanganui Museum Minute Book 1976-1982.
[66] Letter from M. McKenzie to Wanganui Regional Museum Board, 6 July 1987. File Box: Te Wehi o Te Rangi, Whanganui Regional Museum Archive.
[67] Fry, J. 1987 Condition Report on Te Wehi o Te Rangi. National Museum Conservation Report 82, pp.1-2.
[68] Letter from H. Bennett to Chairman, Wanganui Museum Board 27 February 1995. File Box: Te Wehi o Te Rangi, Whanganui Regional Museum Archive.

placed the waka in the museum participated in the conservation project. The type of consultation with the Māori community undertaken in this project signalled a significant change in the way the museum was operating and contributed to a more positive perception of the institution as it engaged in the governance reform process.

6.3.3   *Te Māori*

When a request was sent to the museum in 1980 asking the board to approve loans from the collection for inclusion in *Te Māori*, the board declined the request.[69] This action was taken on the advice of Hori Hipango after he had consulted local iwi (Murchie 1995: 25-26). The Wanganui Regional Museum did not change its stance on loaning material for *Te Māori* exhibition and was the only institution to decline all requests for loans. Taranaki Museum refused to loan a particular taonga at the request of tangata whenua, but agreed to loan other taonga.

While the museum did not loan taonga for inclusion in *Te Māori,* the changing attitudes to Māori cultural issues during this time did have some impact on the trustees and staff of the museum. For example, a toi moko (preserved head) was removed from public display in 1986 "for conservation and cultural reasons".[70]

6.3.4   **Tangata Whenua Representation**

At the same time as the museum board was attempting to find accommodation for the waka during the last quarter of the twentieth century, it was also increasingly aware of the need to further develop its governance relationships with tangata whenua. In 1973, in recognition of increased funding, two Wanganui City Council representatives were added to the board. The following year the Annual General Meeting asked the board to examine the question of Māori representation. While Hori Hipango had been re-elected at that meeting, a second Māori candidate had been defeated.[71] Hori Hipango was asked to advise

---

[69] Trustees Meeting 17 March 1980. Wanganui Museum Minute Book 1976-1982
[70] 'Wanganui head not displayed.' Whanganui Chronicle 12 May, 1986
[71] Trustees Meeting 25 September 1974. Wanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1971-1976

the board on the most appropriate means of increasing Māori representation.[72] There is no record of the advice given. The following year Hipango was once again the only Māori elected to the board and he continued to act as the only Māori member of the board for some years. When the secretary of the Pūtiki Marae Committee wrote to the museum trustees in 1980 regarding Māori representation on the board, the trustees foresaw problems with granting representation to each of the twenty marae in the district.[73] Although the matter was referred to Hori Hipango for advice and he agreed to discuss the matter with the Pūtiki Marae Committee, there was no increase in Māori representation.[74]

In 1982 Don Cimino, who had been director since 1967, retired. The appointment of his replacement, Brian Henderson, a former secondary teacher, marked a significant change for the institution.[75] A full-time professional archivist was also appointed at this time bringing the total staff at the museum to five. In 1986, an assistant director was employed. Other staff at this time included a senior assistant, an education officer, a museum assistant and weekend assistants.[76] Within a period of five years, the museum had made the transition to modern museum practice.[77]

In 1987 the director signalled the need for a significant realignment of the museum's activities. In particular, he anticipated a shift of focus from permanent exhibitions designed for the tourist market to public programmes for the people of the region.[78] While, in part, this change of emphasis had been forced on the museum due to the declining number of tourist buses coming through the city and stopping at the museum, it also reflects a growing awareness that if the city was expected to increase its level of funding for the museum, the museum would need to service the region more effectively. This change also reflects developments in museum education and temporary exhibitions.

---

[72] Trustees Meeting 21 October 1974. Wanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1971-1976
[73] Trustees Meeting 21 April 1980. Wanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1976-1982
[74] Trustees Meeting 19 May 1980. Wanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1976-1982
[75] *Wanganui Regional Museum Annual Report* 1982. He was the first director with a university degree.
[76] *Wanganui Regional Museum Annual Report* 1986.
[77] *Wanganui Regional Museum Annual Report* 1992. The first collection manager was appointed in 1996
[78] *Wanganui Regional Museum Annual Report* 1987.

In 1985 the museum society AGM requested that the board "seek means of increasing Māori members on the board by changing the rules if necessary".[79] Mrs Ani Davenport met with the trustees to discuss ways of improving the relationships between the museum and Māori people in the region. She advocated increasing the number of Māori members of the museum society and using the election process to increase the number of Māori on the board. It was decided to approach the Whanganui Kaumātua Kaunihera and ask them to encourage local Māori to become members of the museum society, either as individuals or on a marae basis.[80] In 1986 a second Māori member, Mr G. H. Takarangi, was elected to the board. In the following year, when Hori Hipango[81] left the board at the age of eighty, Ani Davenport (nee Takarangi) was elected.

In May 1986 a delegation of tangata whenua advised the trustees that they were concerned about the storage conditions in which the taonga Māori collection was held and the limited number of taonga Māori on display.[82] It was also at this time that two paintings of Māori tūpuna by Lindauer were loaned by the museum to descendants and not returned. The trustees attempted unsuccessfully to negotiate the return of the paintings and then sought legal advice as to how they should proceed. The trustees also met with the Kaumātua Kaunihera to discuss the matter. The negotiations took several years to resolve and it was not until 1988 that the outstanding items were returned to the museum. Mrs Davenport took an active part in these negotiations.[83] When Ani Davenport died in 1991[84], Rangipo Mete Kingi accepted an invitation to replace her [85].

---

[79] Minutes of the AGM 17 September 1985. Wanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1982-1989
[80] Trustees Meeting 21 October 1985. Wanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1982-1989
[81] When Hori Hipango died in 1989 the trustees recorded the following: "All associated with the museum were saddened in March by the death of Hori Hipango. He served as Board Member and Vice-president for many years and his unfailing courtesy and quietly given practical advice were greatly missed when he ceased to be a member. We knew, however, that his knowledge and expertise were still available and it was with great sadness that we paid our tribute to him at Pūtiki Marae and his funeral service in St Paul's Church." *Wanganui Regional Museum Annual Report* 1989
[82] Trustees Meeting 19 May 1986. Wanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1982-1989
[83] Trustees Meeting 20 June 1988. Wanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1982-1989
[84] *Whanganui Regional Museum Annual Report* 1991: "The board lost a valued and popular member with the death early in the year of Ani Davenport. Board members paid tribute to her memory at Pūtiki Marae and were honored to be asked to provide the six pallbearers at her funeral."
[85] Trustees Meeting 18 March 1991. Wanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1989-1995

The issue of kōiwi tangata held by the museum also arose in 1988 and the director recommended that the kōiwi in the museum be documented and a policy be developed.[86] This initiative would appear to have arisen in response to a request from the Whanganui Kaumātua Kaunihera for kōiwi held by the museum to be buried.[87] The director reported back to the trustees on this issue in August 1989 and the trustees decided, in the face of anticipated problems with the disposal of the kōiwi, to take no action.[88] Rangipo Mete Kingi raised this matter again in 1992,[89] but once again, no resolution was reached and the kōiwi tangata remained in the museum. Failure to resolve issues such as this caused resentment within the Māori community. Throughout the period from 1968 to 1993, there were a number of issues relating to the ownership and management of taonga Māori held in the museum (such as the waka) that continued to bring the museum board into close contact with tangata whenua. Māori advisors and board members took an active role in acting as intermediaries and negotiators.

Murchie (1995: 26-7) noted that former trustees he interviewed suggested that:

> relationships with Māori had been cordial. Their experience spans thirty-five years from 1965 to 1995, and during that time only two significant disputes have arisen. However, this view of a cosy relationship may have been derived from contact limited mainly over this period to the sole Māori member of the board , H. K. Hipango, and other Māori of Pūtiki.

One trustee he interviewed stated that the attitude of the river Māori he knew toward the museum could best be described as 'ambivalent':

> They visit the museum to see their taonga but find the display cold. Some resent having to pay in order to show children and grandchildren material presented by forebears. At times there is disappointment that items are not on display. (Murchie 1995: 33)

---

[86] Trustees Meeting 21 November 1988. Wanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1982-1989
[87] *Wanganui Chronicle* 20 February, 1989
[88] Trustees Meeting 21 August 1989. Wanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1989-1995
[89] Trustees Meeting 16 November 1992. Whanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1989-1995

6.4   Governance Reform 1993-2001

By 1993 the director, Brian Henderson, was fully engaged in modernising the museum's storage facilities. The museum had developed into a professional institution operating with the basic range of professional staff, including curator, archivist, collection manager, exhibitions officer and educator. The composition of the board was also evolving and both trustees and professional museum staff were engaging with tangata whenua on a regular basis about a wide range of matters including the waka, redevelopment of exhibitions and storage facilities, and tangata whenua representation on the museum board. Henderson died in November 1994 and Sharon Dell assumed the position of director in April 1995. When Dell came to the museum she was well aware that it had entered a period of significant change and that she would need to continue that process.[90]

6.4.1   Governance Reform Initiated

At the museum society AGM, September 1993, Malcolm Murchie, a Pākehā trustee, proposed "that the Board of Trustees establish a partnership with regional iwi which will delegate to them kaitiakitanga of taonga Māori".[91] Rangipo Mete Kingi supported the motion, asserting that the partnership inherent in the Treaty of Waitangi was not limited to central government but should also be established at the local level. He referred both to *Te Māori* and the way in which it reconnected many Māori with taonga tuku iho held by museums, and to the bicultural policies being implemented by Te Papa Tongarewa. Mete Kingi also referred to the international movement for the recognition of indigenous peoples' rights.[92] Murchie reminded those present that 1993 was the United Nations Year of Indigenous Peoples, the year in which the Draft Declaration of Indigenous Rights had been launched. In response, some members raised concerns about the implications of the motion and the possibility of the collections being repatriated was also mentioned.

---

[90] 'New museum director welcomed' *Wanganui Chronicle* 9 May, 1995.
[91] Minutes of A G M 20 September 1993. Whanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1989-1995.
[92] Minutes of A G M 20 September 1993. Whanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1989-1995.

The new board formed a Partnership Issues Sub-committee and asked it to report back to the board with "a concrete proposal for partnership". The sub-committee met several times early in 1994 but made no progress. Iwi had been invited to send representatives to participate in the discussions but few had attended. The museum curator and Rangipo Mete Kingi had formed a consultative committee (also known as the Māori Advisory Committee) to assist with the redevelopment of the Māori Court. Eventually the Māori Advisory Committee took over the task of developing the partnership proposal, but it also made little progress.[93] Neither committee was able to bring together a group of iwi representatives to engage in a meaningful discussion about partnership issues.

Although the board was preoccupied with a number of other issues during 1994,[94] the partnership issue was bought back into focus with the formation of an Iwi Partnership Committee at the AGM.[95] At this meeting Mina McKenzie (Ngāti Hauiti, Te Wehi o Te Rangi Trustee and former Director of Manawatū Museum) was elected to the board. McKenzie became a member of the Iwi Partnership Committee[96] and took an active interest in this issue until she died in 1997.

McKenzie bought considerable experience of museological issues to the board. She had been on the Te Māori Management Committee and had been the Chairperson of the Cultural Conservation Advisory Council. McKenzie's main contribution to the partnership discussions was giving advice about an appropriate process for engaging tangata whenua in a dialogue about museum governance. Rangipo Mete Kingi who had been asked by the board to "act as liaison with tangata whenua with the purpose of establishing an equitable

---

[93] Minutes of Meeting of Māori Trusteeship Sub-committee 23 March 1994. Whanganui Regional Museum Archives, Box: Whare Taonga Waka.

[94] These issues included negotiating a management contract with the Wanganui District Council, extending museum storage into the underground car park areas at the rear of the museum building, building an extension to house the waka, planning for the centennial celebrations in 1995, structural strengthening for the museum building, long term development of the museum, establishing a museum foundation, and revision of the museum's constitution. Minutes of Trustees Meeting 17 October 1994. Whanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1989-1995.

[95] Minutes of Annual General Meeting 19 September 1994. Whanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1989-1995.

[96] Minutes of Annual General Meeting 17 October 1994. Whanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1989-1995.

partnership",[97] continued to take the lead role in terms of communicating with iwi. But the occupation of Moutoa Gardens by local Māori was to impact significantly on the future relationship between the museum and local iwi.

6.4.2   Moutoa Gardens - Pakaitore Marae

On February 28 1995 more than 150 members of the Whanganui River iwi took possession of Moutoa Gardens in Wanganui and identified this area as Pakaitore Marae. The reason for the occupation of Pakaitore was a government proposal for settling Treaty grievances and a growing level of frustration at the lack of progress with Treaty of Waitangi claims, in particular, claims to Whanganui National Park and the Waimarino Block. The occupiers claimed ownership of Pakaitore and requested its return from the Wanganui District Council. They claimed that they had returned to Pakaitore under their own tikanga and that they were asserting their Whanganuitanga: the right to manage and control their own resources and affairs as guaranteed under Article Two of the Treaty of Waitangi (Moon 1998: 65).

Moutoa Gardens was chosen as the site for the occupation because it was identified by the occupiers as a place customarily visited seasonally by people who had come to the coast to fish and trade. It was part of a block of land purchased by the crown in 1848. By the 1850s it was known to the people of Wanganui as 'Market Place'. In 1865 the citizens of Wanganui erected the Moutoa monument in 'Market Place' to commemorate the 'friendly Māoris who died defending law and order against fanaticism and barbarism'.[98] In 1900 a statue was erected in what was by then known as Moutoa Gardens in memory of John Balance, who had been the local Member of Parliament, local newspaper proprietor and Prime Minister (1890-93). A monument to commemorate Keepa Te Rangihiwinui (Major Kemp) was erected in 1912 and in 1925 a memorial was erected to the Pioneer Māori Battalion (Praat 1988: 65). During the occupation, the head was removed from the statue of John Balance. It has not been replaced.

---

[97] Minutes of AGM 20 April 1995. Whanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1989-1995.
[98] These are the words used on the monument.

The occupation caused confusion and resentment amongst many in the Pākehā population of Wanganui (Moon 1998: 64). The Wanganui District Council was "disappointed that the usual channels of communication between iwi and council had been bypassed" (Praat 1998: 73). The fact that these established lines of communication had not worked in this case was indicative of significant changes in the balance of power within Whanganui iwi. It was also indicative of the lack of understanding of these changing dynamics within the local authority.

Wanganui District Council attempted to evict the occupiers but on the day they were to be evicted, 1500 people had gathered at Pakaitore and the council decided not to proceed. There were public gatherings both in support of and expressing opposition to the occupiers. Members of 'One Wanganui' organised a march against the occupation attended by over 600 people. The occupation ended on May 18, 1995. When the district council transferred the land back to the government in 2001, a trust was established to manage Moutoa Gardens/Pakaitore. The occupation had polarised factions within the city and heightened racial tensions. When the museum eventually decided on a governance model, which seemed to some in the community to be transferring too much power to iwi, these tensions were once again brought to the surface.

6.4.3   District Council Request for Governance Reform

In April 1995, R. McGowan, the director of operations, Wanganui City Council, wrote a memorandum to his chief executive recommending that "urgent action … be taken to put the future governance of the Museum on a sounder footing than it is currently".'[99] McGowan had formed this opinion through his dealings with the trustees and staff during his involvement in the appointment process for the new director. The paper goes on to note that the board had no real sense of direction and the staff was working in substandard

---

[99] Memorandum from R. McGowan, Director of Operations, Wanganui City Council to Colin Whitlock, Chief Executive Officer, 4 April 1995. 'Review of Governance and Management of the Museum'. p.1.

conditions. In comparative terms, the museum was falling behind other regional museums. McGowan also noted that tangata whenua had serious concerns about the museum:

> It also became clear at this time, that iwi were extremely concerned about management of the very considerable items of Māori taonga held in the Museum. The Māori collection is said to be one of the most extensive and comprehensive in NZ. This concern is so strong that Māori are considering whether their taonga should be removed from the Museum, and placed in a separate facility managed by themselves.[100]

These comments reflect the frustration that had been growing within the Māori community at the failure of the museum to provide adequate housing for the waka held at the museum and over some issues relating to taonga Māori in the collection.

In March 1995, the Wanganui District Council had agreed to a request for extra funding for the museum, subject to a review of governance and management of the museum. McGowan's memorandum proposed the review process should proceed, recommending that the parties to the review should include tangata whenua, the Wanganui District Council and the Whanganui Regional Museum Society. He also outlined his own view of an appropriate governance structure: four board members appointed by tangata whenua and four board members appointed by the mayor.[101]

In 1995, Mina McKenzie was elected Vice-President, Mete Kingi was re-elected and Matiu Mareikura[102] was elected for the first time as a board member. The AGM once again urged the board to "review and evaluate options for future governance of the Whanganui Regional Museum". At the museum's centennial celebrations in November 1995, director Sharon Dell referred to the evolving relationship with tangata whenua:

---

[100] Ibid. At a seminar at the museum to discuss strategic planning, Mark Southcombe, a local architect who had worked closely with iwi on several projects, warned that the relationship between the museum and some parts of the local Māori community was "uncertain" and that "one possible outcome of governance negotiations was that the taonga would be removed to a separate iwi-controlled institution." (Author's notes)

[101] Ibid.: 4.

[102] Matiu Mareikura was highly regarded for his knowledge of Whanganuitanga.

Your museum takes its role as guardian of objects and stories very seriously. So at the start of the second century it is embarked on a process of revising its management structure to ensure that the major interest groups within the community are represented in the management of the museum and that its governing policies and practices encompass both good professional museum principles as well as the principles of kaitiakitanga and rangatiratanga. This will ensure that Māori owners of collections are more involved with the care of their taonga and in the ways in which Māori culture is presented to the public.[103]

Ngāti Ruaka approached the museum with a proposal to develop an integrity agreement between Ngāti Ruaka and the museum for the care and use of their taonga held in the museum collection, including the establishment of a database of Ngāti Ruaka taonga held in the museum. The trustees were supportive of this proposal and asked the director to continue discussions on an integrity agreement.[104] However, while discussions continued well into 1997, no agreement eventuated. Both Ngāti Ruaka and the museum found they had to withdraw from the discussions because of other commitments.[105]

In December, the museum opened *Great Expectations: Whanganui 1839-1848*, an exhibition about Whanganui during the early years of European settlement.[106] Museum staff were assisted in the development of the exhibition by a bicultural advisory committee.[107] Their challenge was to create an exhibition that dealt honestly with some of the difficult issues associated with European settlement in the region. Museum staff worked closely with members of the Māori and Pākehā communities in planning and mounting this exhibition. It was also during this period that Tania Templeton was appointed as a redevelopment project officer, with special responsibilities for Māori

---

[103] *Whanganui Regional Museum Newsletter* September and December 1995 Volume 9 (2/3). p. 3.
[104] Trustees Meeting 25 November 1996. Whanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1995-2001
[105] Esther Tinirau, Ngāti Ruaka, indicated that although Ngāti Ruaka still wanted to complete direct negotiations with the museum regarding the care and use of Ngāti Ruaka taonga, the new governance arrangements at the museum have removed any sense of urgency (pers. comm. 2002).
[106] Whanganui Regional Museum Newsletter December 1997 Volume 11 (4). p.1.
[107] The Advisory Committee included: Don Robinson, Randall Springer, Julian Witchell, David James, Rii Templeton, Matiu Mareikura, Morvin Simon, Chris Shenton and David Young.

aspects of the project. She later took an active part in Kaitiaki Māori[108] and represented that organisation on the board of the Museums Association of Aotearoa New Zealand.

Discussions about governance reform continued at the board meetings and Māori board members initiated discussions with iwi groups during the first half of 1997. A grant was received from Trustbank Wanganui Community Trust to assist with the cost of the governance review and strategic planning. By August a Governance Working Party and a Strategic Planning Working Party had been formed by the board and Richard Thompson had been contracted to facilitate the working parties. At the AGM in October 1997 Don McGregor was elected chairperson of the board. He assured those members of the museum society who expressed some disquiet at the governance review process that any changes would be made according to a democratic process.[109]

6.4.4   Te Roopū Mahi mo Ngā Taonga and the Raukawa Model

After several meetings of the Governance Working Party it was apparent that Māori participation was limited. There were problems with the consultation process from a tangata whenua perspective, although these were difficult to define. In part, these problems can be explained by the fact that, although there were Māori members on the museum board who tried to facilitate the consultation process, they were there as individuals; they did not have a mandate from iwi to represent their interests, and they did not appear to want to take a high profile role in promoting the process. However, it was the guidance of these individual kaumātua that was essential in planning and initiating the broadly based consultation process that was eventually undertaken. It was decided that a Māori facilitator should be contracted to initiate and facilitate a process through which tangata whenua could collectively participate in the governance review process.

Grant Huwyler (Ngāti Apa, Ngāti Hauiti), a participant in the Governance Working Party and a professional consultant working primarily with iwi in the Whanganui region, was

---

[108] Kaitiaki Māori is the national collective of Māori heritage practitioners and associated individuals.
[109] Minutes of AGM 20 October 1997. Whanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1995-2001

contracted to facilitate the iwi consultation process. Under the guidance of Matiu Mareikura and Manu Mete Kingi, in particular, and working closely with Richard Thompson and Sharon Dell, Huwyler organised a hui-ā-iwi in March 1998 to begin the consultation process with iwi in the region. The hui was addressed by Professor Whatarangi Winiata (Ngāti Raukawa), Te Tiwha Puketapu (Ngāti Ruaka), Sharon Dell and Richard Thompson. Professor Winiata, Tumuaki of Te Wānanga o Raukawa, outlined a Treaty of Waitangi based bi-cameral model of governance similar to that adopted by the Anglican Church in New Zealand in 1992. This model, known as the Raukawa or Mihinare Model, was developed by the Raukawa Trustees for a national conference on the Treaty of Waitangi at Ngaruawahia in 1984.

The Raukawa model is based on the principles of partnership and two peoples' development and consists of two houses: a Tikanga Māori House and a Tikanga Pākehā House, each providing members for a Joint Council that is ultimately responsible for governance. Decisions in the Joint Council are normally made by consensus. When consensus cannot be achieved, for a motion to be passed a majority of the representatives of both houses must support a proposal. The Tikanga Māori House operates according to tikanga Māori and would have its own electoral system. The Tikanga Pākehā House would develop its own tikanga and electoral system to ensure representation of the community and museum stakeholder groups.

Te Tiwha Puketapu discussed "issues, ideas, attitudes and behaviour of tangata whenua with respect to taonga Māori" and ways in which the museum's strategic planning process and the governance review process in particular needed to respond to "the contemporary circumstances of Māori communities". He raised issues of access, participation, ownership and management of taonga Māori for tangata whenua and asked "what kind of relationship does the Whanganui Regional Museum need to formalise tangata whenua participation and authority with respect to taonga Māori?" He went on to provide his perception of the state of relationships between tangata whenua and the museum:

> Current relationships between tangata whenua and the Museum appear to be mixed. It
> would be fair to say that some individual Māori and collectives are satisfied with what the
> museum does. While others have deliberately challenged the Museum and reclaimed
> taonga. In the main, questions of ownership and management have fuelled these conflicts.
> These words are used advisedly as ownership is often used as a verbal stake in the ground,
> to reinforce a tangata whenua relationship with taonga Māori. Whereas, management
> tends to be about the extent of participation and inclusion of tangata whenua in decision
> making. (Puketapu 1998: 3)

Puketapu indicated that those Māori who placed taonga in the museum in the past did not
do so with the intention of transferring property rights in these taonga to the museum and
that there were a number of options for tangata whenua who wanted to regain greater
control over their taonga: taonga in the museum collection could be repatriated to whānau,
hapū and iwi as appropriate, perhaps resulting in the formation of a whare pupuri taonga
under tangata whenua control, or tangata whenua could negotiate effective participation in
the governance of the museum. If the latter option was to be implemented this might lead
eventually to the establishment of a Māori unit within the museum to care for taonga
Māori. Even if the latter option was implemented, Puketapu indicated that some hapū
might still opt to have their taonga repatriated to their marae (ibid.: 5).

Participants in the hui-ā-iwi identified a number of issues essential to establishing an
effective consultation between iwi and the museum on the issue of governance: the
purpose, process and anticipated outcomes of consultation would need to be clearly
articulated; Māori representation in the consultation process would need to reflect the
diversity of interests at iwi, hapū, whānau and other levels in forming a collective to
negotiate with the museum; in particular, the museum must work at establishing and
maintaining ongoing relationships with iwi and hapū, while elements of the Māori
collective would also need "to begin talking to each other and re-establishing these
relationships so that a degree of unity [could] be reached in addressing issues that [were]
relevant to all".[110] Related to the latter was a tikanga issue raised by iwi from beyond the

---

[110] Summary of Proceedings for the Hui-ā-Iwi held at Whanganui Regional Museum, Monday 16 March,
1998, p. 2.

Whanganui river. They sought recognition and assent from tangata whenua (Whanganui river iwi) to come into Whanganui and participate in the consultation process. It was recognised that the consultation process with the museum would be a context for wider Māori development in that the process would encourage whānau, hapū and iwi to develop and maintain relationships with one another and strategise toward the future.[111]

Participants at the hui-ā-iwi indicated a strong sense of urgency that the consultation should proceed and be successful. However, they were also determined that they should develop their own process parallel to that being undertaken by the museum so that they could "clearly establish a tangata whenua position". The question of resources to facilitate this process was also a matter of concern, given observations that few iwi had the ability to respond effectively to approaches from public institutions such as the museum because of the number of commitments of iwi to a range of issues at that time and the small number of people within iwi who had the time, resources and skills required to participate.[112]

Participants at the hui decided to mandate their own group, Te Roopū Mahi mō Ngā Taonga[113], to negotiate a new museum governance arrangement that would ensure appropriate iwi participation. The hui also gave Te Roopū the mandate to pursue the Raukawa model as an appropriate governance model for the Whanganui Regional Museum. Te Roopū Mahi mō Ngā Taonga took this mandate to mean that this was the only model they were mandated to bring to their negotiations with the museum's Governance Working Party.[114] Therefore in April 1998 Professor Winiata made a second presentation on the Raukawa model to a joint meeting of the Governance Working Party and Te Roopū Mahi mō Ngā Taonga in an attempt to clarify the components of the model and provide an opportunity for members of the Governance Working Party, in particular,

---

[111] Ibid.: 2.
[112] Ibid.: 2.
[113] Members of Te Roopū Mahi mo Ngā Taonga: Julian Broughton (Chairperson), Ruka Broughton, Ken Clarke, Piripi Haami, Miriama Hawira, Te Rangianganoa Hawira, Grant Huwyler, Joe Huwyler, Ngahape Lomax, John Maihi, Michelle Marino, Piripi Menehira, Utiku Potaka, Brendon Puketapu, Neil Ranginui, Heemi Takarangi, Ned Tapa, Enoka Waitai, Rangi Wills. *Whanganui Regional Museum Annual Report* 1998, p. 19.
[114] From this point in the process no other models were seriously considered by either group.

to ask questions. Following this presentation, the Governance Working Party continued to meet both separately and jointly with Te Roopū Mahi mō Ngā Taonga to debate issues arising from their consideration of the model.[115]

By August 1998 the museum director was expressing concern that the process was taking longer than expected and that the resources available to fund the facilitators, meeting expenses, secretarial support, printing, legal advice, and postage had been spent. Some members of the Governance Working Party were concerned about the high level of iwi representation and the right of veto that was inherent in the proposed model. There were also concerns voiced about the complexity of the model and the effect this would have on the decision-making processes within the museum.[116] Finally, by September 1998 the Joint Governance Working Party[117] had agreed to recommend the Raukawa Model to the museum board and the museum society members. This recommendation was accepted by the board; however, the chairperson, Don McGregor, remained opposed to the proposal.

At the AGM on 16 November 1998 Pam Erni[118] and Don McGregor were both nominated as chairperson of the museum society. Erni was elected. Manu Mete Kingi was re-elected to the board and was joined by Ruka Broughton and Grant Huwyler, who were both members of Te Roopū Mahi mō Ngā Taonga. The election of Broughton and Huwyler was significant both because it was the first time that there had been Māori on the board from Ngāti Apa and Ngā Rauru and because it was the first time that such young Māori members had been appointed or elected to the board. The proposed governance model was endorsed by the museum society members and the museum board was authorised to prepare a new constitution for presentation to members.[119]

---

[115] When the Governance Working Party and Te Roopū Mahi mō Ngā Taonga met together they were referred to as the Joint Governance Working Party.

[116] Minutes of Trustees Meeting 10 August 1998. Whanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1995-2001.

[117] Membership of Joint Governance Working Party: Sharon Dell (Museum Director- Chairperson) Ian McGowan, David Butts, Julian Broughton, Elizabeth Sharpe (museum staff), Michelle Horwood (museum staff), Beryl Warnock, Neil Ranginui, Malcolm Murchie, Pam Erni, Rangi Wills, Michelle Marino, Ngahape Lomax, Enoka Waitai, Grant Huwyler, Joe Huwyler.

[118] Pam Erni was Deputy Mayor of Wanganui District Council at the time of this election. Erni supported the proposed change to the museum's governance model.

[119] Don McGregor voted against these motions. Minutes of Whanganui Regional Museum Annual General Meeting 16 November 1998. Whanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1995-2001.

6.4.5   Public Opposition to the Proposed Governance Model

At a meeting of the Community Services Committee of the Wanganui District Council in November 1998, the committee was advised of the endorsement of the new governance proposals at the museum society AGM.[120] Dell and Thompson made a presentation to the members of the committee outlining the proposed new governance model. Some opposition was expressed by Councillor Gerald McDouall, a former chairman of the museum board, who stated that he was concerned by the reference to the notion of "two cultures" and suggested that this was contrary to the notion of a multicultural society. Councillor Don McGregor suggested that the model did not address issues of efficiency and accountability that were an essential aspect of the governance reform agenda. While he recognised the significance of the collection of taonga Māori to the museum and to iwi and the need to address the concerns of tangata whenua, he opposed the "50/50 partnership" being proposed in the new governance model: he thought that the model could lead to confrontation and divide the community.

When the Report of the Meeting of the Community Services Committee was considered for adoption at the Ordinary Council Meeting on 7 December 1998, the mayor, in response to debate in the local newspaper, expressed concern "that the significant level of public concern about the Museum's governance proposals had created a very controversial issue."[121] He suggested that the council should recommend to the museum society that the governance proposal "be further reviewed and the outcome reported to Council". The council was cautious in formulating its opposition to the museum's governance proposal because it had no power to stop the museum society revising its constitution, but the council did have the ability to reduce or remove its operational grant to the museum.

---

[120] Minutes of Wanganui District Council Ordinary Meeting 7 December 1998. Community Services Committee Meeting, 25 November 1998, Item 3: Whanganui Regional Museum Governance, p. 2.
[121] Ibid.: 3

Following this meeting McGregor and McDouall made a number of public statements in opposition to the proposed new governance structure.[122] Another former museum society president, Darrell Grace, also began a letter writing campaign to the local newspaper expressing his opposition to the proposal.[123] The opposition expressed in these newspaper articles and letters focused on the level of Māori representation as being undemocratic and racially divisive. Such an undemocratic structure was seen to create a dangerous precedent that might spread to other public bodies. The proposal was represented as contrary to the healthy development of a multicultural community and the structure was characterised as clumsy and complicated.

The museum board entered 1999 frustrated at having to undertake another round of working party meetings and public consultation after having worked for so long to develop and refine the governance proposal. Te Papa National Services provided funding to allow the two facilitators to continue their work through this period. In June two forums were held to present the model to museum society members and the general public and to answer questions in an attempt to dispel any remaining concerns. Both forums supported the proposal and asked the museum board to proceed with the introduction of the new governance model.[124] However, these forums and continuing public debate indicated that a number of issues remained of concern to some members of the public. In recognition of these reservations the museum trustees included in the draft constitution a provision for a review of the new structure after it had been in operation for two years. Manu Mete Kingi publicly expressed his frustration at the continuing opposition to the proposed governance structure, stating that there was discussion in the Māori community about removing their taonga from the museum.[125]

---

[122] 'Māori to have say in museum' *Wanganui Chronicle* 17 November, 1998; 'Councillors split over proposed museum governance structure' *Wanganui Chronicle* 26 November, 1998; 'Dangerous precedent seen with new museum structure' *Wanganui Chronicle* 5-12-1998; 'Council urges rethink on museum plan' *Wanganui Chronicle* 8 December, 1998.

[123] D. Grace, Letter to *Wanganui Chronicle* 10-12-98; D. Grace,. Letter to *Wanganui Chronicle* 22 December, 98.

[124] Minutes of Trustees Meeting 20 June 1999. Whanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1995-2001.

[125] 'Museum governance opinions aired' *Wanganui Chronicle* 22 June, 1999.

When the museum's proposed governance model was again considered by the council in September 1999, Councillor McGregor moved the following motion:

> THAT the information be noted
>
> AND THAT the Council supports the requirement for a review clause in any new constitution, but recommends that any review be undertaken by a person or organisation independent of the Museum as approved by the Council
>
> AND FURTHER THAT the Council accepts the Museum Board's right to change the governance structure, but does not accept the Tikanga group representation and voting system as described in the draft constitution as being in the best interests of all the cultural groups that make up the Wanganui District community
>
> AND FURTHER THAT before any major changes are made to the Museum governance structure it is recommended that the present constitution be amended to provide for a postal ballot of all Museum Society members
>
> AND FURTHER THAT in any ballot to change the museum governance structure, it is recommended that alternatives to the Mihinare model should be included as an option.[126]

McGregor said that the proposed governance model was "unfair, racist and unlikely to lead to a trust board which could capably manage the museum".[127] He said that it was "patronising and racist to give one racial group a privilege over other racial groups so taking away the rights of the other groups". He also noted that the rights of individuals should be respected and he was opposed to tribalism. He claimed that hapū would elect people without requiring any particular qualifications and that "self interest will rule".[128] McGregor commented that he would be in support of three Māori representatives on the museum trust board because this would be closer to the proportion of Māori in the population.

Three other councillors spoke against the proposed changes to the museum constitution. Councillor Lithgow advised the meeting that a prominent Māori member of the museum society had told him that Māori were not asking for this proposed new constitution. He

---

[126] Minutes of Wanganui District Council Ordinary Meeting 27 September 1999. Community Services Committee Meeting - 15 September 1999, Item 9: Whanganui Regional Museum Governance, p. 7
[127] Ibid.: 5
[128] Whanganui District Council Meeting 17 September, 1999. From author's notes, p. 1.

stated that the museum was being controlled by an elite group who depended on all ratepayers to fund their activities and concluded that the governance review process was not democratic.[129] Councillor McDouall, stated that New Zealanders were living in a multicultural society not a bi-cultural society and spoke specifically against the notion of two peoples' development, stating that he would not accept such a notion as a basic principle within the constitution.[130]

In supporting the proposed changes to the museum constitution, Councillor Erni stated that she believed there was a willingness in the community to move forward. Erni also felt that the proposed model was a step towards proper acknowledgement of the role iwi should play in the life of the city.[131] She reminded the council that it could influence the museum's management through its service agreement each year. Four other councillors spoke in support of the new governance proposal.

McGregor's motion was carried by six votes to five. In effect the council had rejected the new governance proposal and by recommending a postal ballot was interfering in the affairs of the museum society. This placed considerable pressure on the museum board, but the trustees determined that they should proceed with the proposal.

In early October Darrell Grace stepped up his opposition to the museum plans by not only criticising the proposed governance model but suggesting that the museum trustees and management had allowed the museum operation to decline since the halcyon days of the 1960s when the museum attracted record numbers of visitors.[132] In response to this criticism the museum director acknowledged that visitor numbers were not as high as in the 1960s and 1970s but argued that the reason for this was that the number of tourists visiting Wanganui had declined significantly since then. She also outlined the cost of

[129] Whanganui District Council Meeting 17 September, 1999. From author's notes, p. 1.
[130] Ibid.: 3.
[131] Ibid.: 2.
[132] 'Museum fails to pull crowds' *Wanganui Chronicle* 7 October, 1999.

advances in museological practices and the work that had been done recently to improve the museum facilities, particularly collection storage.[133]

Don McGregor followed McDouall's letter with his own outlining in some detail the reasons for his opposition to the museum's governance proposal:

> For the museum board to propose that Māori as a minority group should be given 50 percent control of this ratepayer-funded institution is viewed by many as an extreme step, more likely to divide than unite. It would place Māori in a position of privilege with regard to the rest of the population.
>
> To do this would limit the democratic rights of others, making the rest of us in effect 'less equal' and sowing the seeds of racial ill-will and resentment. To presume that as a multicultural society we can not recognise Māori values is patronising and untrue.
>
> There is already strong Māori involvement in the governance of the museum. Board members and staff are culturally sensitive. What then should be done? I believe the answer is to simply allow the museum society to elect to the board the best available people in the district rather than just from within its own membership, regardless of race. This should result in a board with the necessary financial and managerial skills and level of cultural awareness to properly govern our museum.
>
> Involvement of hapū and other stakeholders in the care and display of treasures vested in the museum could be encouraged through direct negotiation and agreement between the director and the people concerned.[134]

In this statement, McGregor constructs a complex argument beginning with the assertion that individual rights should have primacy over collective rights and that individual rights are the foundation of any democratic society. Failure to recognise this, he suggests, will create perceived inequalities that will lead to social and political discontent. The second component of the argument is that Whanganui is a multicultural community capable of recognising Māori values. However, as already noted, tolerant multiculturalism allows for the recognition of cultural values of any culture only to the extent that this does not challenge the dominant culture. As such, it is a denial of indigeneity. The third argument,

---

[133] 'Period of great change and growth for museum' *Wanganui Chronicle* 28 October, 1999.
[134] 'Reality Check' Letter (D. McGregor) in *Wanganui Chronicle* 13 Otober, 1999.

that the museum should elect a skills-based board rather than one that represents the communities of interest in the region, is another form of the argument for individual rights over collective rights, and the denial of indigenous status.

Councillors McGregor, McDouall and Grace, all former museum society presidents, provided the public focus for those opposed to the museum's proposed governance structure through their opposition at council meetings, letters to the newspaper and interviews with newspaper journalists. It is not possible to assess what proportion of the Wanganui community agreed with their opposition but the small number of letters supporting their view in the local newspaper suggests that there were few who were prepared to be identified publicly. McGregor and McDouall stated that they had members of the community expressing their opposition directly to them and that they were representing these people. The fact that these two councillors were able to lead a majority of councillors in opposition to the museum's proposals suggests that the councillors who supported them also sensed that community opposition to the proposals was widespread.

There is evidence that the public opposition of the Wanganui District Council to the museum governance proposals was of concern to Whanganui iwi. At the October 1999 meeting of the Wanganui District Council Community Development Committee, Rosemary Hovey, Community Development Manager, reporting on iwi-council relationships noted that because of the council's attitude to the museum's governance proposals there had been indications from a number of Tupoho hapū that they would not now sign the intended relationship document with the district council.[135]

6.4.6   New Governance Model Approved by Museum Society

After taking legal advice, the museum trustees rejected the idea of a postal ballot of all members[136], even though four former museum society chairmen made a public statement

---

[135] Minutes of Wanganui District Council Ordinary Meeting 8 November 1999. Community Development Committee Meeting - 20 October 1999, Item 4: Iwi Liaison, p. 1; see also 'Museum row puts breaks on document signing' *Wanganui Chronicle* 9 November, 1999.
[136] There was no provision for taking a postal ballot in the museum society's constitution.

supporting the idea.[137] At the AGM of the museum society in November 1999, members considered a recommendation to endorse the new governance proposals. After some discussion for and against the motion, it was carried 83 for and 59 against.[138] The fact that 59 members voted against the proposal is an indication that there was significant opposition within the museum society. There were accusations made from both sides that new members were being signed up simply to vote at the AGM. The society members approved the incoming board members being named as interim trustees of the new legal entity in order to establish the new trust.[139] The existing museum society was to be wound up and the museum's assets (primarily the collection) transferred to the new trust.

While 1999 had been a difficult year in terms of the governance project, the museum continued to improve the care and documentation of the collection and the development of innovative public programmes. The major exhibition for the year was *Tapa: Heart Beat of the Pacific*. This exhibition of the museum's Pacific Island tapa collection provided the vehicle for the museum to work closely with the Pacific Island communities in Whanganui. The exhibition was opened with a festival day called *Taste of the Pacific*.

During the year the museum had employed two Māori educators.[140] Dean Flavell, former Director of Māori Arts and Crafts at Manaakitanga Trust, came to work part-time as an education officer at the museum replacing Ruka Broughton, who was the first Māori educator to have been employed by the museum. Mitch Jacques, a bi-lingual teacher, was also employed by the museum.

---

[137] 'Museum men want postal vote' *Wanganui Chronicle* 2 November, 1999.
[138] Minutes of Whanganui Regional Museum Annual General Meeting 15 November 1999. Whanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1995-2001, p. 4.
[139] The museum board members elected at the AGM included: Pam Erni (President), Malcolm Murchie (Vice-President), Rangi Wills (Vice-President), David Foster (Treasurer) Manu Mete Kingi, David Butts, Ailsa Stewart, Grant Huwyler, Don Robinson, Annette Main, Marie McKay and Julian Broughton. The outcome of the election had been that five Māori had been elected to museum board. This was the largest number of Māori to have been elected to the museum board under the original constitution. Three members of Te Roopū Mahi mō Ngā Taonga had been elected and the long link between the museum and the Mete Kingi family had been maintained with the re-election of Manu Mete Kingi. Ngāti Apa and Ngā Rauru were also represented.
[140] *Whanganui Regional Museum Newsletter* September 1999, Volume 13 (3), p. 3.

The transition to the new governance structure took longer than anticipated. Planning continued through 2000 for the Tikanga Māori House and Civic House to elect their members of the Joint Council in anticipation of the establishment of the Whanganui Regional Museum Trust in February 2001. A hui was held in April to mandate iwi representatives and to establish the Tikanga Māori House Board, representatives of which met in May to confirm the Tikanga Māori House Rules.[141] Although there was only intermittent public opposition to the museum's governance proposal during 2000[142], when the Wanganui District Council was asked in December to nominate two community representatives for the Civic House Electoral College it declined to do so.[143]

The members of the Joint Council met for the first time on 27 February 2001.[144] Tikanga Māori House and Civic House had each elected six members to the Joint Council.[145] It was decided that members of the Joint Council would attend meetings of the Museum Society Board until the hand-over to the new trust on June 30. At the AGM in March 2001 the Wanganui Public Museum (known as the Whanganui Regional Museum[146] since 1968) transferred "all of its right, title, interest or control in the Museum Collection both owned or held on deposit or upon trust" and all its other assets and liabilities to the Whanganui Regional Museum Trust.[147] An interim board was elected for the period through to the first of July 2001.[148] Only forty members attended this meeting compared with the one hundred and forty-two members who had attended the AGM in 1999 when the proposed governance changes had been debated. There was little comment on the issue

---

[141] *Whanganui Regional Museum Annual Report* 2000.
[142] For example: 'Funding Share' *Wanganui Chronicle* 16-6-2000, a letter from Don McGregor suggesting that if Māori were to have fifty percent control of the museum they should provide fifty percent of museum funding.
[143] Minutes of Wanganui District Council ordinary Meeting 18 December 2000. Item 6. Invitation for Nominations for Whanganui Regional Museum Trust, p. 2.
[144] Minutes of Preliminary Meeting of the Joint Council (Trustees) of the Whanganui Regional Museum Trust 27 February 2001.
[145] Tikanga Māori House representatives on Joint Council were Rangi Wills (Whanganui Iwi), Kenneth Clarke (Ngā Paerangi), Grant Huwyler (Ngāti Apa), Harete Hipango (Mokai Parea, Ngāti Tamakopiri, Ngāti Whitikaupeka), Sydney Taiaroa (Tamahaki), and Karanga Morgan (Ngā Rauru). Civic House representatives on Joint Council were Pamela Erni, Marie McKay, Ann McNamara, Rachel Stewart, Michael Payne and David Butts.
[146] The 'h' was added in 1992.
[147] Minutes of Whanganui Regional Museum Annual General Meeting 5 March 2001. Whanganui Regional Museum Minute Book 1995-2001
[148] Trustees elected included Pam Erni, Rangi Wills, Ailsa Stewart, David Foster, Manu Mete Kingi, David Butts, Grant Huwyler, Don Robinson, Marie McKay, Julian Broughton, Ann McNamara, Michael Payne.

of museum governance in the *Wanganui Chronicle* during 2001 until immediately prior to and following the transfer to the new trust on July 1 2001, at which point the protagonists repeated their objections to the model.[149] In response to the critics, the director noted that Whanganui Regional Museum was one of a number of museums throughout New Zealand making changes to their governance arrangements.[150]

6.5   New Governance Model in Operation

Tikanga Māori House, Civic House and the Joint Council began operating from February 2001, although the Whanganui Regional Museum Trust did not assume the governance of the museum until 1 July 2001. In the meetings leading up to July the two houses and the Joint Council appointed officers and began to discuss the way in which the tikanga of the two houses would impact on the proceedings and procedures of the Joint Council. For example, Joint Council agreed that, although the rules of the trust state that the chairperson must be from alternate houses each three-year term, it would be preferable if the chairpersonship could be rotated on a shorter time cycle. The chairperson was to come from one house and the deputy chairperson from the other house. Consultation between the houses was to be facilitated by the chairperson and the deputy chairperson meeting to discuss issues raised in the house meetings before they were tabled at the Joint Council.[151] It was agreed that Tikanga Māori House and Civic House would meet monthly and the minutes from each of the house meetings would be circulated to all members of the Joint Council. Each house would also be able to bring issues forward to the monthly meeting of the Joint Council for consideration.

The transition from the Wanganui Regional Museum Society to the Whanganui Regional Museum Trust was complete when the Whanganui Regional Museum Trust Joint Council convened its meeting on 19 July 2001 and assumed the governance of the museum. By this time the two houses had had several meetings, as had the Joint Council and a number

---

[149] 'New museum set up not appropriate' *Wanganui Chronicle* 5 June 2001; 'Racism charges dog new museum regime' *Wanganui Chronicle* 21 June 2001; 'False premise' Letter from Darrell Grace. *Wanganui Chronicle* 2-7-2001.
[150] 'Other museum changing too' *Whanganui Chronicle* 20-6-2001.
[151] Minutes of Joint Council Whanganui Regional Museum Trust 14 May 2001.

of initiatives were ready to proceed. Most significant of these was an application from Tikanga Māori House to Te Papa National Services to form a partnership agreement to fund a taonga Māori database project.[152]

The Joint Council held a planning meeting in August 2001 in an attempt to identify strategic priorities and directions for the museum for the next five to ten years.[153] This led to a wide-ranging discussion about the strategic development of the institution. Members of Tikanga Māori House wanted to ensure that the new governance structure was working effectively. Ideas raised, but not discussed in any depth, included establishment of a Māori unit[154] and a living cultural arts centre within the museum, and providing support for small satellite museums managed by smaller communities (for example, hapū) in the region. Important concepts were identified in relation to the care and use of taonga Māori, including mana whenua, mana taonga, kaitiakitanga, rangatiratanga, and manaakitanga. Members of Civic House wanted the museum to become a safe, accessible, non-intimidating, neutral, common ground, where all cultures are respected. They also advocated a broad notion of cultural heritage embracing both tangible and intangible heritage. Members of both houses saw the museum as an educational institution working closely with other educational facilities in the region. While this meeting did not prove to be productive in the development of a medium or long term strategic plan, it gave members of the Joint Council an opportunity to share their ideas about how the museum could be developed.

Early in 2002 the museum director engaged the Joint Council in discussion about the annual plan for 2002-2003. A planning meeting, which included the Joint Council and museum staff, was held in March, which identified the wide-ranging responsibilities of the

---

[152] Minutes of Whanganui Regional Museum Joint Council 19 July 2001. p. 2.

[153] Notes from the Planning Meeting of the Whanganui Regional Museum Joint Council 19 August 2001 in the possession of the author.

[154] The notion of the Māori unit within the museum seems to have originated with Tiwha Puketapu's presentation at the hui-ā-iwi in March 1998. He had concluded his presentation by suggesting that there were at least three options for future development of the museum: (1) A Whanganui Regional Museum with tangata whenua representation as a constitutional requirement complemented at the management level with a taonga Māori unit; (2) A Whanganui Regional Museum Board with tangata whenua representation a constitutional requirement. A taonga Māori facility for exhibition and possible storage with a management committee responsible to the Board; (3) A Tangata Whenua Museum with a marae facility.

museum. [155] The director distinguished between priority projects, such as the redevelopment of the historical exhibitions (a project known as Whanganui Stories), the redevelopment or replacement of the building, and the range of core services offered by the museum (including collection development and maintenance, research and advisory services, exhibitions and education). It was apparent from the discussions that the museum would face challenges on a number of fronts if it was to continue to develop both its facilities and programmes: the museum did not have the income required to sustain the level of activity projected in the proposed annual plan for 2002-3, nor was it an easy matter to identify elements of the plan that could be deleted to save money. Consistent with recent history, the museum entered the 2002-2003 financial year with a projected deficit of expenditure over income, prepared to use reserve funds to sustain priority programmes.

The planning meeting was not conclusive in terms of rethinking the annual plan; however, a number of projects emerging from this meeting and from subsequent discussions at the two houses and the Joint Council were identified as central to the strategic development of the institution, including collection policy and collection database projects, exhibition redevelopment, and in the longer term building redevelopment.

At the same time as the Joint Council considered the short, medium and long term strategic direction of the museum, the director and staff maintained a full programme of collection care, access and interpretation through exhibitions and public programmes during 2002. Temporary exhibitions included *Flax Magic: New Zealand Harakeke*, *New Acquisitions 1998-2002*, *Partington Collection* and *St Mary's Church*. Work also continued on long-term exhibitions such as *Our People* and *Curiosity Shop*. In 2001 museum staff had made a significant contribution to the innovative Ngāti Hauiti exhibition *Ngā Taonga Tūhono: Treasures that Unite People* held in the whare puni Hauiti at Rātā Marae (Potaka and Butts 2003). This project continued to build the relationship between Ngāti Hauiti and the museum.

---

[155] Notes from a Planning Meeting of the Whanganui Regional Museum Joint Council and Staff, 17 March 2002. In the possession of the author.

On Sunday 21 July 2002 the Whanganui Regional Museum Trust and the Whanganui River Māori Trust Board invited the people of the Whanganui region to participate in a ceremony to welcome back the Partington Collection to Whanganui. The Partington Collection includes 560 photographs and 250 glass plate negatives by Wanganui photographer, W. H. T. Partington. The images are mainly of Whanganui Māori and Māori settlements in the Whanganui region, taken between the early1890s and 1907. When Webbs Auctions in Auckland attempted to auction this collection in September 2001, a group of Whanganui Māori protested at the auction and the sale did not proceed.[156]

The museum had identified the Partington Collection as one that should be returned to Whanganui and had been working with the Whanganui River Māori Trust Board and the Whanganui Community Trust to purchase a significant part of the collection at the sale. Following the withdrawal of the material from the sale the museum director and the Whanganui Māori River Trust Board Chairman, Archie Taiaroa, continued to negotiate with the vendor for the purchase of the collection. Eventually, a sale price of $135,000 (plus GST) was agreed for the sale of the collection to Whanganui Museum. The Whanganui Community Trust contributed $35,000 to the cost of the collection. The remaining cost of the acquisition came from Māori sources including land incorporations and trusts. The major underwriter of the purchase was the Whanganui Māori River Trust Board. This acquisition clearly demonstrates that Whanganui Māori are not just interested in the governance of the existing collection in the museum but also in ensuring the retention and return of other Whanganui taonga as a resource for the people of the region.

---

[156] See for example: 'Māori Photo Storm' *Dominion* 21 September 2001.

CHAPTER SEVEN

WHANGANUI REGIONAL MUSEUM: GOVERNANCE TRANSFORMATIONS

7.0 Introduction

Chapter Seven is organised into three sections. The first section, Symbols of Mana, focuses on the waka taua Te Wehi o Te Rangi and its significance. Taonga tuku iho in the museum such as Te Wehi o Te Rangi are the foundation of the relationship between tangata whenua and the Whanganui Regional Museum. Section Two examines the nature of the evolving relationship between the museum and a number of Pūtiki whānau who have supported the museum throughout its history. Section Three examines the nature and significance of the recent changes in the museum's governance arrangements. The principles underpinning the new governance arrangements: partnership and two peoples development, give expression to the notion of mutual recognition. The analysis presented in this chapter draws on interviews with Māori and Pākehā trustees and others who participated in the governance review process.[1] The research participants are identified by their real names with their permission.

---

[1] Each individual was selected because of their ability to discuss both key relationships between the museum and tangata whenua of Whanganui and their own perspective on the governance reform process. The people interviewed included Manu Mete Kingi (Pūtiki kaumatua and former museum trustee), Rangi Wills (member of the Takarangi whānau of Pūtiki, Pūtiki Marae Chairperson, member of Te Roopū Mahi mō Ngā Taonga, member of Tikanga Māori House and inaugural Chairperson of the Whanganui Regional Museum Trust Joint Council), Utiku Potaka (member of the Potaka whānau of Ngāti Hauiti, member of the Mete Kingi whānau of Pūtiki, Iwi Development Consultant, consultant to the Whanganui Regional Museum for the Ngā Pae Tata Project), Grant Huwyler (Iwi Development Consultant, Ngāti Apa member of Te Roopū Mahi mō Ngā Taonga, inaugural Ngāti Apa and Ngāti Hauiti member of Tikanga Māori House and Joint Council), Karanga Morgan (Iwi Development Consultant, inaugural Ngā Rauru member of Tikanga Māori House and Joint Council), Pam Erni (former Deputy Mayor of Whanganui District Council, former Chairperson of Whanganui Regional Museum Trust Board, member of Civic House and Joint Council), Michael Payne (member of Civic House and Joint Council) and Sharon Dell (Director of Whanganui Regional Museum).

7.1 Symbols of Mana

The fundamental relationship local iwi have with the Whanganui Regional Museum is through their taonga tuku iho that are cared for in the museum's collection. The primary motivation for iwi participation in the governance of the museum is to ensure the appropriate care and use of their taonga. The new governance partnership enables iwi to participate in the strategic development of the museum and the development and monitoring of an appropriate policy framework that will guarantee the rights of the customary tangata tiaki of the taonga held by the museum, whether the taonga are on deposit or legally owned by the museum.

The waka Te Mata o Hoturoa and Te Wehi o Te Rangi illustrate the significance of the taonga tuku iho held in the museum to the people of the Whanganui River. Discussion about these two large waka recurs throughout the records of the museum trust board as the trustees sought to provide appropriate care for them. The museum trustees have always been aware of the significance of these waka to the Whanganui iwi; moreover, because they were used at the Battle of Moutoa, the Pākehā settlers and their descendants have acknowledged these taonga as symbols of their relationship with the lower river hapū.

Manu Mete Kingi, Pūtiki kaumatua and former museum trustee, made the following observation about the significance of the waka held in the museum collection:

> I think you have to look back into the Māori existence with the river. The river is treated not just as a life force but a way of life. … The canoe, like the river became part of a man's fibre. … The mana is in the fact that they have existed for so long, hence cometh the word taonga. The fact that they were actually used in warfare … They were not the only canoes used but they are the ones that have been kept. … the canoes that ended up in the museum were representative of the people … the signatories who put them in there represented the people of ngā hapū o Whanganui. [2]

---

[2] Interview with Manu Mete Kingi, 19 November 2002.

Karanga Morgan, the Ngā Rauru representative on the trust board, also has a connection to Te Wehi o Te Rangi. Morgan's connection to the waka is through her grandfather, who had been a captain of Te Wehi o Te Rangi. For her the waka are symbolic of the movement of people on the river, which is a source of spiritual and material sustenance. The Polynesian origins of the hapū of Whanganui are symbolically represented in the keel of the waka, which, in the Whanganui tradition, is the equivalent to the tāhuhu (central roof beam) of a meeting house. Therefore, the waka symbolise the history of the people as both a voyaging people and a river people; symbols of movement through both time and space. Karanga Morgan also compared the museum itself to a waka which is carrying aspects of the material heritage of the people through time.[3]

Utiku Potaka is an advisor to the Te Wehi o Te Rangi Trust and a descendant of Rora Te Oiroa Potaka. Rora Te Oiroa's daughter, Toia Barns, was primarily responsible for the waka being deposited in the museum. The Potaka whānau also has other taonga tuku iho on deposit in the museum. Potaka's comments about the significance of Te Wehi o Te Rangi began with reference as to why Toia Barns deposited the waka in the museum:

> We don't know exactly what took place but what we do know is that members of the Rora Te Oiroa family … desired Te Wehi to be taken care of in the museum. Now we suspect that was actually as a result of one of … Rora's daughter's, Toia, and her marriage to Ernest Barns [a museum trustee]. … We suspect that she, as the elder sibling, had quite a bit of influence over her younger brother and sister to such a degree that they decided to bring Te Wehi down from Koriniti and place it in the museum. Now we're not too sure what Ngāti Pamoana had to say about the decision; no doubt, some weren't too happy, because in terms of traditional beliefs it should have been just left to return back to either the awa or Papa-tū-ā-nuku. However, at the end of the day the decision was made to keep and relocate it.[4]

---

[3] Interview with Karanga Morgan. 13 January, 2002, pp.50-53.
[4] Interview with Utiku Potaka at Rātā Marae, 25 September 2002 p. 3.

The descendants of Rora Te Oiroa recognise the rights of Ngāti Pamoana in the future management of the waka. However, Potaka also emphasised the significance of the waka to all the people of the river and described his family's role in the following way:

> Our role is to ensure its care and protection for future generations of not only Ngāti Pamoana but also the whole of the River. Atihaunui-a-Pāpārangi acknowledge that it has special significance to the River because of the part it played in numerous battles, in particular at Moutoa. The meaning that it has to the Whanganui people is such that it holds so much mana that no-one can actually ever own something like that; it's impossible for that to happen because it is its own entity. … Those are the beliefs that we collectively share as the descendants of Rora.[5]

On whether or not the museum had made appropriate provision for Te Wehi o Te Rangi, Potaka commented:

> Yes and no: yes in terms of providing a secure and safe place for Te Wehi, but no in terms of providing a suitable area for it to be stored. We believe it not only embodies mana but is a symbol of mana that requires freedom of space to give itself being, and in a cooped up area, that is not allowed to happen. In fact, one comment made to me was that Te Wehi felt it was being suffocated; it is not allowed to release its mana for the benefit of everyone.[6]

The descendants of Rora Te Oiroa had considered the question of whether or not the museum is the most appropriate location for the waka; the family were content to see the waka housed in the museum, but other options might be considered:

> Now that things have changed in terms of our hapū society, there aren't any new waka being built, there are only a handful of symbols of the mana of the River remaining and we believe it's going to be more beneficial for the people for us to hold on to it now, rather than sinking it to the bottom of the Whanganui River, which is one of the suggestions. We had to talk about that too and realise, well, why are we holding on to this taonga? And,

---

[5] Transcript of interview with Utiku Potaka, 25 September 2002. p. 3.
[6] Transcript of interview with Utiku Potaka, 25 September 2002. p. 5.

that's the way we see it: a symbol for the river and an integral part of our River history. We must, therefore, take care of it the best we can.[7]

Taonga exist at the centre of complex interconnected webs of relationships in the same way that individuals are positioned within interconnecting webs of whakapapa. An important factor in the ability of taonga to remain active within these webs of relationships, perhaps even to re-activate them, is the retention of their kōrero: the knowledge of their history and their whakapapa. These webs of relationships surrounding taonga held in museums include links to those who created the taonga, those who are customary kaitiaki, the wider group of people who have used the taonga or who can whakapapa to the taonga, those who care for the taonga in the museum context, and those visitors who see/experience the taonga when they visit the museum. By placing the waka on deposit in the museum, the kaitiaki must have been conscious of binding the museum, and hence the wider community, into this complex web of relationships.

It is clear from the historical record and contemporary perspectives that Te Mata o Hoturoa and Te Wehi o Te Rangi are symbols of mana:[8] symbols of the mana of the river and of the place of the river in the life of the people.[9] It is also clear from Potaka's comments that the waka are symbols of the maintenance of mana and that one aspect of this is the ongoing maintenance of cultural heritage.

The kaitiaki who placed these taonga in the museum decided at that time that this was a better heritage maintenance strategy than the customary practice of allowing the taonga to return to Papa-tū-ā-nuku. Whatever their reasons for following this path, the outcome has been to ensure the survival of these taonga for future generations. The fact that the waka were often deposited in the museum, not gifted, confirms their intention to maintain their kaitiaki relationship with the taonga, both in their own and future generations. This has

---

[7] Interview with Utiku Potaka, 25 September 2002, p. 4-5
[8] Mana is often translated as 'power', 'authority' and 'prestige'. "In modern times the term mana has taken on various meanings, including the power of the gods, the power of ancestors, the power of the land, and the power of the individual" (Barlow 1991: 61).
[9] The importance of the river is expressed in the Atihaunui-ā-Pāpārangi whakataukī: E rere kau mai te awa nui nei, Mai te kahui mauma ki Tangaroa, Ko au te awa; ko te awa ko au: The river flows from the mountain to the sea, I am the river and the river is me.

been the case with both Te Mata o Hoturoa and Te Wehi o Te Rangi. Beyond this, there is also a sense in which the waka have the potential to act as a unifying focus for all the peoples of the river. Although certain groups are now acknowledged as the tangata tiaki of the waka, many others can also trace ancestral connections to these taonga tuku iho.

The waka, as symbols of the mana of the hapū of Whanganui, have been placed at the heart of the Whanganui Regional Museum, dominating the display space and occupying a significant proportion of the storage area. Te Mata o Hoturoa dominates Atihaunui-ā-Pāpārangi, the Māori Court, requiring the other exhibits to be organised around it and therefore it is less likely to be seen by visitors as captured within the framework of classification the museum imposes on smaller taonga arranged around the walls and in the glass cases.[10] Te Wehi o Te Rangi is in storage and this remains a matter of contention with the trustees and others who want the waka to be more accessible.

The recognition of mana is important in the context of this thesis. Indigeneity is largely about the recognition of a people's mana. For the hapū of Whanganui, museum governance reform was about the recognition of their mana as tangata whenua and within the museum were housed two of the most potent symbols of their mana.

7.2   Relationships between the Museum and Pūtiki Whānau

Chapter Six provided an overview of the changing relationships between the Whanganui Regional Museum and the people of Pūtiki. Interviews were undertaken with members of two Pūtiki whānau that have been involved in these relationships, the Mete Kingi and the Takarangi whānau, in order to explore this relationship further. Manu Mete Kingi, a Pūtiki kaumatua, spoke about the status of Pūtiki in relation to other hapū and to the city, and the historical relationship between Pūtiki and the museum:

---

[10] The waka, Teremoe, another symbol of Whanganui mana, occupies a central position at Te Papa Tongarewa The Museum of New Zealand. Another Whanganui waka, Paranihi, renamed as such after carrying Premier Balance up the Whanganui River, also occupies a central position in the Otago Museum, Dunedin, and has probably assumed an even larger presence since the repatriation of Te Whare Mataatua to Ngāti Awa.

> Pūtiki Marae was considered to be the front door to Māoridom of Whanganui and all the hapū … had a trustee status for the marae at Pūtiki which enabled them to sit [on the paepae] at the various public functions held at Pūtiki. … if you look at … photographs of the paepae arrangements at Pūtiki, it'll show you the history of our people being represented as one, by the quality of those represented on the paepae. Pūtiki was always looked at as the guiding light on behalf of the hapū of Whanganui to places like the museum. So, the tangata whenua of Whanganui always became a major player in what happened at the museum if they desired it.[11]

In this way certain members of the Pūtiki community acted as intermediaries in the relationship between the hapū of Whanganui and the city, including the public institutions established in the city. However, this role was maintained by particular families, not by representatives of a marae committee or rūnanga. Another level of relationships exists between these Pūtiki whānau and the museum, based on the deposit or gifting of taonga tuku iho to the museum. Rangi Wills is a member of the Takarangi whānau resident at Pūtiki. He recalled the relationship that has existed for generations between his whānau and the museum and the reason why taonga were deposited:

> My mother always supported the museum, as did my grandfather and I never heard … anything against the museum. I know the museum was looked upon as a place where taonga were kept and protected from those of the family who would let them go …
>
> We've still got all the forms for some of the things that are in there and they're kept in a safe and they're treasured, those things. Where I'm living at the present moment was where my grandfather's original house existed, and that burnt down and my grandfather lost everything. Now that may have influenced his view of where you keep taonga .[12]

Utiku Potaka, a member of the Mete Kingi family of Pūtiki, reflected on the changing nature of tribal leadership and the role undertaken by Pūtiki kaumātua in relation to the city and the governance of the museum in earlier times:

---

[11] Interview with Manu Mete Kingi 19 November 2002, p. 17-18.
[12] Interview with Rangi Wills December 2002, p. 2-3.

It was based on representation by members of certain families and those representatives had the authority to go ahead and do whatever was necessary for the betterment of their respective whānau, hapū, or iwi. In that period I believe it was very much dominated by traditionally based leadership.[13]

Potaka suggested that during the last quarter of the twentieth century the nature of tribal leadership changed: whānau and hapū were no longer involved to the same extent in Māori development, many people having moved away from the area to gain employment or pursue their careers and in this environment leaders may not have been as accountable to whānau and hapū as they had been in earlier times. As a consequence some leaders became more autocratic in their behaviour and decision-making. The occupation of Pakaitore in 1995 was in part a reaction against this type of leadership and ushered in a period when the power base moved to the tribal rūnanga. Potaka believed that the changes in museum governance reflect the changes that had occurred in tribal leadership:

I believe that you can probably see the changes in the museum representation from … associate members or advisors of that period through to representatives on the trust, which was the last leadership phase, to now the new phase where we have democratically elected members from the iwi onto the Māori House, which of course is extremely different leadership to what it would have been right at the beginning where you had the authority of the rangatira of the time. That's the way I see it; it's changed in parallel if you like.[14]

Potaka reflected on the role of the Māori trustees in earlier times:

I see their intention was actually two-fold: one is accepting the responsibility for the relationship between Pūtiki and the city, and one of those responsibilities was and I guess still is the museum; the other is ensuring that to their best ability, the taonga were treated with as much respect as possible. Having said that, of course, the taonga Māori were in a Pākehā organisation, so I don't know how much they were able to achieve, definitely not as much as we're able to achieve now, but they did the best that they could at the time with the available structure and resources. … there would have been access issues and the best

---

[13] Interview with Utiku Potaka 10 January 2003, p. 1
[14] Ibid.: 1-2.

people to help facilitate this would have been the representatives on the museum board. Actually, that would have been a very important role, particularly in those times. In seeing who some of those representatives were, they were from very prominent families who have an air of service, and I guess that's just one of the many jobs they had to perform.[15]

I asked Potaka what he thought his elders would have felt about the museum having kōiwi tangata in the museum collection:

I am sure many of them would have wanted to return the kōiwi to their proper resting places. But remember, the institution in those days was a Pākehā-based system. They [kaumātua] probably did as much as they could given the system that was in place. The institution would have said that it owned the kōiwi. … From the museum's perspective, kōiwi were just another object for display. I'd imagine it would have been very hard for the old people knowing there had been a continued transgression of tikanga, with no way of changing the situation. [16]

Potaka described these men who advised the museum as living in two worlds: they were knowledgeable, articulate, decisive, and dramatic leaders on the marae and within Māori society, yet, when it came to participation in Pākehā contexts they often took a more passive and conservative role, responding to requests for guidance rather than initiating changes in museum practices.[17] Potaka saw this reserved behaviour partly as the outcome of a lengthy colonisation process and a desire to adopt western values.[18] Members of minority groups often find it difficult to be proactive in contexts organised and operated according to cultural practices other than their own and in contexts in which their cultural practices are not necessarily recognised or valued. However, the presence and actions of these advisors can be identified as resistance: it is evident from the museum's own records that these Māori advisors and trustees at times supported local Māori who challenged museum practices and gave advice about the collections.

---

[15] Interview with Utiku Potaka 10 January, 2003, p. 6-8.
[16] Ibid.: 8-9.
[17] Ibid.: 11
[18] Ibid.: 9-10.

The younger generations who were trying to engage with public institutions in an entirely different way faced a new challenge. As they sought to achieve indigenous recognition with the government, the district council and public institutions such as the museum, there was a need for more assertive leadership and this caused some tensions both within the Māori community and between the Māori and Pākehā communities. The assertion of this new leadership had been demonstrated through such initiatives as the occupation of Moutoa Gardens/Pakaitore and in the negotiation of the new governance arrangements at the museum.

Karanga Morgan of Ngā Rauru acknowledged the role that Pūtiki families had fulfilled in relation to the museum and commented that Ngā Rauru did not necessarily feel as though they were outsiders in that relationship because they have whakapapa connections to these Pūtiki families.[19] The historical relationship between Pūtiki and the Pākehā population has, however, sometimes drawn comment from other hapū of Whanganui:

> It was deemed élite. It was deemed … kūpapa. … I remember being at a tangi and the people from the middle and upper reaches said to the folks at the lower reaches, You lot were sent away to be educated; we manned your marae. Now, you got educated and forgot to come home; you only wanted to be a part of the Pākehā things as Māori. And that was the big debate on the marae at the time. So that is why it was seen as being a very élite area: there were only certain families that could participate in those sorts of activities and it became exclusive, so doors were closed on other families becoming involved. … They settled their boards or committees all these sorts of things. They alone had the power to make those decisions for the others.[20]

These sentiments may help to explain, in part, the reasons behind changes in the political organisation of the hapū of Whanganui in recent times and why the museum has emerged from the recent governance review with a model that provides direct representation for all the iwi of the Whanganui region.

---

[19] Interview with Karanga Morgan 13 January, 2003. p. 16.
[20] Ibid.: 16.

7.3   Towards a New Governance Relationship

This section discusses the observations of five museum trustees and the director relating to their relationship with the museum and the recent changes in governance. Interviewees gave their opinions on why the governance changes were necessary, public opposition to the changes, priorities for the new trust board and issues that have arisen since the changes. The trustees also recorded their perceptions of the skills the director has brought to the change management process and the impact of this responsibility on her.

7.3.1   Civic House Trustees' Perspectives

Interviews were undertaken with two Civic House trustees who have lived in Wanganui most of their lives and who have been very actively involved in civic affairs. The purpose of these interviews was to document their insights into the governance reform process and the significance of the new governance model for the museum and the region.

Pam Erni

The museum did not play a big part in Erni's early life and even as an adult she visited the museum only infrequently. Her association began with the museum in 1992, when as a Wanganui District Councillor she was appointed to the museum trust board. Erni's first impression of the board was that it worked earnestly for the museum, although it lacked any real vision for museum development.[21]

At that time, she remembered, there was one Māori trustee on the board who was largely engaged in issues related to the housing of the waka and taonga Māori in general. Resolving these issues was not made any easier by the fact that most of the trustees were Pākehā and didn't appreciate the significance of these concerns. In Erni's opinion, it was Mina McKenzie (Ngāti Hauiti), elected to the board in 1994, who was really able to focus

---

[21] Transcript of Interview with Pam Erni 21 November 2002, p. 2.

the trust board on the significance of the taonga Māori collection and the need to progress the revision of the museum's governance relationship with tangata whenua:

> …she realised that unless we did something to recognise the very close way that Māori regard their taonga that are stored in the museum, unless we actually realised that in a way that could further protect it and protect their interests, well then, they may take that away and put it somewhere else.[22]

At the same time, in response to a request for more funding for the museum, the CEO of the district council was encouraging the museum to review its governance and management structure.[23] However, it was not until the arrival of Sharon Dell as director that any real progress was made with the governance review process and new models were discussed. Erni remembered her reaction when she realised that the Mihinare model was being seriously considered:

> I remember thinking, "Oh hell, there's going to be some people who are not going to like this one little bit." But I was excited by it because I thought, "This is really what we need. This sounds good to me. This is a true partnership." … my personal experience with Tamaupoko, because I was on the [district council] working party, and I learned another point of view, I learned that there are genuine things that need to be addressed. I thought that the governance, if we did go that way, would be a truly wonderful thing for Wanganui, because it would be the first step, the first public step to show that there are ways of working together. That was before Moutoa … was resolved, so these things were running in tandem and I was learning to respect and understand iwi and I think they were learning too that there was a willingness to listen and to resolve and to build different kinds of ways of doing things.[24]

There were many months of strenuous debate before the Raukawa/Mihinare governance model was adopted by first the museum board and then the museum society involving testing, arguments and counter-arguments. When it got to the board table, "There were

---

[22] Transcript of Interview with Pam Erni 21 November 2002, p. 7.
[23] Ibid.: 8.
[24] Ibid.: 9.

several resignations at that stage, because people, once the board decided to adopt it, felt that was just the beginning of the end and they went".[25]

Changes were made to the proposal, with a review clause added, to ensure that the model would not be entrenched if it did not function effectively:

> That was in response to people who felt they didn't want it fixed in stone. … it had to actually deliver something at the end of the day. They didn't define what that something was, but it had to deliver it. So we've got to define that now. That is something that we're still working on. … It's already delivered the something with the Partington Collection. So that's great; if that's what they're talking about, well then we're on the right road.[26]

Erni paid a high personal price for her support of the new governance model. When the model was adopted by the museum society she was Deputy Mayor of the Wanganui District Council. She spoke strongly in favour of the model when it was severely criticised by other district councillors, particularly at council meetings. In Erni's view the opposition to the proposal was significant in that it "nearly derailed the process". She described this opposition as "bitter, racist, biased, twisted, obsessed, personal … it was a really bad time". She considered the opposition racist, based on a fear that the new model would spread to other areas of society and result in a loss of power for those who currently hold power.

The issue was decided at the AGM of the museum society in 1999 where the final decision was made to adopt the model. Both sides had actively organised their support, encouraging existing members to attend the meeting and other supporters of their cause to join the society in order to participate in the final vote. For Erni, the outcome of that vote was a success: the new model was adopted. But at the next local body election she went from being the third-highest polling candidate and deputy mayor, to losing her seat:

---

[25] Transcript of Interview with Pam Erni 21 November 2002. p. 11
[26] Ibid.: 11-12. See Chapter Six, 6.4, re acquisition of the Partington Collection.

My political career I knew was on the line. I knew that when I decided to support it, because I knew the way council felt. I wouldn't have changed a thing, if that's the next question you're going to ask I wouldn't have changed a thing, because I could not support it on the one hand and then say something for the sake of getting elected on the other.[27]

Erni was also closely involved, as a district councillor, in the Moutoa Gardens/ Pakaitore occupation. She described this confrontation between the district council and the occupiers as "a defining point in our relationships with Māori".[28] Erni commented that prior to this, while there had been consultation between the district council and local iwi, this was merely tokenism and rarely involved the council shifting from its intended course of action.[29] The occupation of Moutoa Gardens/Pakaitore polarised attitudes within the Pākehā population in the Whanganui region:

The fear was very very great. Because these radicals, so-called radicals - we know some of them were radicals - but others were just fed up to the back teeth with no action over a period of years, and so they'd grown up, got educated, and finally decided that the older folk were never going to further things because they were happy to go along the way that they always had, without treading on anyone's toes. That's the way it was in their day and that's the way it was ever going to be I think, so it needed this group, … they came through and it made everyone wake up. … The threatening behaviour, the palisade around the park, the illegality of it all, just got up people's noses. I'm not saying all the people of course. There were a very large proportion of Wanganui that totally sympathised with what the Māori were about, perhaps not the way they went about it, but certainly with their points of view.[30]

As Erni noted, the Moutoa Gardens/Pakaitore occupation also highlighted leadership issues within the hapū of Whanganui. The role taken historically by the kaumātua at Pūtiki subsequently broadened to a wider grouping, formally recognised as Te Rūnanga o Tupoho in the lower river region and Te Rūnanga o Tamaupoko in the middle river region. The district council eventually negotiated formal relationships with both the

---

[27] Transcript of Interview with Pam Erni 21 November 2002, p. 13
[28] Ibid.: 3.
[29] Ibid.: 3.
[30] Ibid.: 6.

Tupoho and Tamaupoko rūnanga. Erni led the district council team that negotiated an agreement with Tamaupoko. Key issues in these negotiations were the implementation of the Treaty of Waitangi and Māori land rating. These evolving relationships between the district council and Whanganui iwi are part of the regional context within which the changes took place at the museum.

Erni continued her association with the museum when she was elected to the Civic House and Joint Council of the Whanganui Regional Museum Trust in 2001, and she became chairperson of the Joint Council in June 2003. Towards the end of 2002 she commented that since the change in governance had been instituted at the museum there had been a willingness to work together to continue the development of the museum.[31] Erni was still coming to terms with working within the new governance model. She noted that "the challenge is that it's learning to understand that you work at a slower pace". This is because of the "consultation that iwi undertake before they come to any decision". However, overall she had found the experience challenging and "hugely interesting".[32]

Later in the interview Erni turned her mind to the major issues she saw facing the museum in the next five to ten years, particularly the funding base for the museum. The museum still needed to do more to build its relationship with the community if it were to have a realistic chance of building a new or redeveloped facility. Erni also saw the museum as having a larger role in regional development in the future:

> … because of its emphasis on arts, culture and heritage as a driver towards economic development. Even our detractors recognise that the museum has a special place in amongst all that. Funny that they do not see the governance structure is a part of that, is an integral part of that, because that's what makes it special.[33]

---

[31] Transcript of Interview with Pam Erni 21 November 2002, p. 14
[32] Ibid.: 15.
[33] Ibid.: 19.

Michael Payne

Michael Payne had lived all his life in Wanganui apart from four years training to be an architect at Auckland University and seven years in Hong Kong practising architecture. He was the chairperson of the Community College Promotion Committee for seven years and after the establishment of Wanganui Polytechnic he was the inaugural chairperson for seven years. Payne had retired from his architectural practice, though he retained other business interests. He was living in the Quaker Settlement in Wanganui.

Payne had worked on a number of projects with Māori communities in the Whanganui region both in a voluntary and professional capacity. He worked voluntarily with Cliff Whiting on the conservation and restoration of a whare puni on the Whanganui River and was engaged professionally in the restoration of the whare nui at Pūtiki Marae and the reconstruction of Te Manawa, the large community building at Rātāna.

Payne, along with other Quakers, took an active interest in the occupation of Moutoa Gardens/Pakaitore. Along with other like-minded members of the community, they sought to understand why the occupation had occurred and considered that the response of the district council in threatening to have the police remove the occupiers was inappropriate and would not promote understanding nor resolve the grievance. He suggested that the public reaction reflected fear among some in the Pākehā community:

> That made us realise something significant about the nature of the town, and politics - talking about it as a Wakefield town - and that somehow some of those early values and understandings have been transmitted by whatever means through generation after generation, sort of an intolerance, a meanness, lack of understanding. I think, you know, there's still a huge gap. People somehow felt threatened.

Payne considered that influential figures in local government promoted intolerance:

> People like Don MacGregor and Chas Poynter and John Lithgow would be three public voices of this, but in large part they are able to say things because they're pretty sure

they've got a constituency behind it. They are a symptom of something going on. But there were some incredibly intolerant things said at the time of Pakaitore. …There's a small measure of interaction [between Māori and Pākehā], much smaller than would be really useful in terms of getting people understanding in both directions. It's probably too easy a solution, but I think that a different leadership in the community, and I'm thinking of the mayor and council, a different leadership sustained for long enough would root it out.

He reflected on the absence of an overt Māori presence in the city itself:

If you walk through the town, what evidence is there that Māori were ever here, let alone here as 18 percent of the population? … There's something that's kind of shut out. … During Pakaitore a guy came up here to do a job, a Māori fellow, and he said, "I don't agree with what's going on down there. You know, I'm on your side." And so, I tackled him and I said, "You think about the town, everywhere you see reflections of Pākehā culture. Where do you see yourself?" And he thought about it for quite a little while and then he said, "In the museum". And I wept. It's not how it's supposed to be.[34]

Payne had not had any strong associations with the museum until he took an active interest in the new governance proposals at the time when they were being considered by the museum society. Along with other members of the Quaker community, he attended the AGM's at which the key decisions were made by the society, in order to support the proposed changes. As a result of this involvement he accepted nomination and was elected to the Civic House and Joint Council when the new governance model was introduced in 2001. He was frank about his reasons for becoming involved:

I've always seen it as basically a Pākehā institution. … Prior to the beginning of this new governance system, I hadn't had an awful lot to do with the museum at all. Frankly, I haven't got into it basically for the museum, but it's for this interaction [the new governance model] and what can grow out of it that I'm interested in. I mean I'd like to see this like a disease; I'd like to see it infecting the council and a lot of the other institutions around the place and I think we'd make it possible for us to get a lot of this worked out.[35]

---

[34] Transcript of Interview with Michael Payne 15 October 2002, pp. 5-9.
[35] Ibid.: p 9.

Like Erni, Payne considered that public opposition to the museum's new governance arrangements centred on the significant increase in Māori representation and the power this gave local iwi in the museum's governance:

> I think it's something to do with rangatiratanga. They fear that their authority might be diminished by sharing it, which is the basis of saying, how can a fair system be set up if 18 percent of the population is controlling 50 percent of the vote? … I think the underlying thing, it may be partly racist, it's a word I don't like and don't use frequently, but I think there's an unwillingness to share, to see that in a circumstance like this that the sharing of power could only enrich the whole rather than diminish it.[36]

Through discussions with Henry Bennett, a Māori community worker, Payne was aware that tensions had risen from time to time between the museum and the Māori community, particularly over the care of the waka and that there were those in the Māori community who wanted to establish an iwi museum. He saw the change in governance as a kind of trial. If the partnership did not work, he thought the likely outcome would be that iwi would create their own museum and remove their taonga from the museum:

> At some levels I'd find it heartbreaking, I mean I could think of it like a kind of marriage break-up, because like custody battles over this and that, it would be really traumatic. So, I can see some real downsides to that. So that's why I put huge store on us doing the bicultural bit as well as we can do it. In a way, I see it as a kind of test. Can we really live together and work together?[37]

However, Payne was optimistic of success:

> If the governance system can make the difference in terms of Māori people feeling part of it and they're dealing with a respectable, intelligent partner, then I think the thing will fly.[38]

---

[36] Ibid.: 23-4
[37] Ibid.: 22.
[38] Ibid.: 10.

He saw the new model as providing a process that would allow issues to be resolved:

> My understanding is that when there are sensitive issues that need to be decided, that very often our perceptions of what's required is going to be different and to get to the point where we can articulate those differences across that gap needs each side, particularly on the Māori side, to have time to kind of collect all that thinking up and to find a level of agreement about how we proceed before it's brought to the Joint Council. … I feel very happy and comfortable with what has happened in the last twelve months.[39]

However, Payne also noted that it has taken time for the members of the two houses to get to know each other and that the formal meeting environment is not always conducive to this. Although the Joint Council had held two weekend retreat days, he felt there was a need to spend more time exploring important issues. [40] This intense level of communication and strategic development was necessary if the museum was to become an agent of change within the wider community. In the following words by Payne there was a sense that the new governance model was approaching a common ground:

> Potentially the museum is a point at which we can see each other as Pākehā and Māori and we can see the ways that our histories have been woven together over the time that we've lived here together, and where we can see ourselves.[41]

Pam Erni and Michael Payne were the senior Pākehā members of the Joint Council when it was first formed in 2001. They brought a life-long knowledge of Whanganui to the council and had been actively engaged in community affairs for many years. Both also brought a commitment to support the new governance model and had a clear understanding of the constraints within which the museum was operating at the time, because of the opposition to the new governance model within the community.

---

[39] Ibid.: 11.
[40] Ibid.: 13.
[41] Ibid.: 16.

7.3.2   Tikanga Māori House Trustees' Perspectives

Interviews were undertaken with three individuals, who were both members of Tikanga Māori House and the Joint Council, to gain insight into their understanding of the museum's new governance model, their role in Tikanga Māori House and the Joint Council, and their expectations of the museum.

Rangi Wills

Rangi Wills, a member of the Takarangi whānau of Pūtiki, retired to Whanganui, where he was born, after a career in the New Zealand Fire Service. After returning to Pūtiki he became chairperson of Pūtiki Marae and was actively involved in a wide range of iwi initiatives. Wills was also chairperson of the Joint Council of Whanganui Regional Museum Trust from July 2001 to July 2003 and continued as a member of the Joint Council, representing Whanganui iwi.

He was a regular visitor to the Whanganui Regional Museum as a young child going to school. Fascinated by the exhibits, he visited so often that the director let him in for free:

> My mother took me to the museum when I was quite young, probably five or six, and pointed out quite a few taonga that our family had gifted to the museum. A museum, for me, was a magical place. … I remember looking with fascination at the Egyptian mummies, mummified cats, and all those things and thinking to myself, how wonderful it would be to become an archaeologist and go and explore Egypt, so it was a world where you could use your imagination; that's why I thought it was a wonderful place.[42]

However, even as a young child he was cautious about the taonga Māori in the museum:

> Many of those things were quite frightening because I knew the power of the ancestry that was sort of ingrained in many of the taonga. … I always used to look at the things that

---

[42] Interview with Rangi Wills December 2002, p. 1.

were donated by our family to the museum. … There were some that you avoided because they were powerful in their own entity, so I would look at other things.[43]

Wills left Whanganui to go to secondary school and did not renew his relationship with the museum until he became involved in the process to review the governance arrangements. He became a member of Te Roopū Mahi mō Ngā Taonga and took an active part in developing the proposal to introduce the bicameral governance model. Wills was very aware of a feeling in the Māori community of the need for change in the way Māori interacted with the museum:

> They wanted a meaningful say, and it's only about taonga Māori. They wanted to be consulted and have their opinions listened to, considered and, in many cases, paid attention to I guess, incorporated into the decision-making process. I think in the past there was a sense that there might have been tokenism by some of the representation on the board. … there's no disrespect to those people who were appointed to carry out that role, because they were probably listened to about many issues.[44]

He was angered by the attitudes of those who publicly opposed the proposed new governance model and particularly by the role of the newspaper:

> Quite frankly, I was appalled actually, appalled, because to me, it was like a return to colonialism. I know best; it was unconstitutional, disproportionate representation having the most to say and all those other arguments. I don't think the people that supported that point of view actually understood very much at all, didn't understand about the issues, … the protections that were in there, still don't understand and never will. They've got totally closed minds. … What really saddens me, was the stance the paper took on it. They continued to print on and on and on the same things.[45]

Wills considered that Tikanga Māori House and Civic House were working well together:

---

[43] Interview with Rangi Wills December 2002, p. 2
[44] Ibid.: 6-7.
[45] Ibid.: 12.

> What's really surprised me is the open relationship between the two houses, Tikanga Māori House and Civic House, and probably surprised many of the members of Tikanga Māori House, that's the willingness on the part of Civic House and the Joint Council and those people personally to try and understand a Māori point of view to governance issues and to care and protect the taonga and I think that's been a pleasant surprise to everybody.[46]

For Wills, the priority for Tikanga Māori House was to document the taonga Māori collections, formalise the Taonga Māori Collection Management Policy and increase the number of Māori staff in the Museum.[47]

Karanga Morgan

Karanga Morgan, of Ngā Rauru, was a social worker, researcher and consultant living near Waitotara in South Taranaki. Her primary interests were in social and iwi development and wāhi tapu. She was a trustee of Te Oranganui Iwi Health Authority and Whanganui Regional Museum Trust.

There were families within Ngā Rauru, as with other iwi in the region, who maintained relationships with the museum because they had placed taonga on deposit or because they used the resources of the museum for research. Some preferred to use the interlocking whakapapa networks between the hapū in the Whanganui region to access the museum.[48] However, others avoided contact with the museum:

> I believe they would have seen it as a Pākehā institution. … The very negative view in terms of the museum was: Hold on, they take our stuff and we'll never get it back. So it was like an abyss: you take something in there and it's lost forever. Unless you knew someone, a whanaunga that was connected to the museum, the only relationship I believe our people had with the museum was when the children went on day trips and that was it. You never went there with your family; it wasn't a place that you would have visited.

---

[46] Ibid.: 8
[47] Ibid.: 13
[48] Transcript of Interview with Karanga Morgan 13 January 2003, p. 9-10

> Other than the Expo' 70, I actually don't ever really remember my parents taking us there.
> I think it was really more to do with not really being part of our reality. … In terms of my
> Mum, I know all her family never went there either.[49]

A number of Ngā Rauru families had placed taonga in the museum for safe-keeping or as a way of resolving disputes about the 'ownership' and use of taonga. Sometimes the deposit of such taonga had placed the museum in the middle of disputes and Morgan anticipated that the Tikanga Māori House would be able to assist the museum in the resolution of such difficulties. Ngā Rauru had been proactive in creating a register of their taonga held in the museum, to the extent that this was possible, from museum records. This research project had also identified photographs of Ngā Rauru people held in the museum collection and this had already had an impact on members of the iwi who had been given greater access to the collection.[50]

Ngā Rauru became involved in the governance review process at the museum through the interest taken by Julian Broughton. Broughton was involved in Pakaitore and the tino rangatiratanga movement in Whanganui. He participated in Te Roopū Mahi mo Ngā Taonga and then stepped aside when the Whanganui Regional Museum Trust was created. Morgan then became the first Ngā Rauru representative on the Tikanga Māori House and the Joint Council. The primary issue for Ngā Rauru, before the change in governance, was that they "had no say" in the governance of the museum. Morgan commented on the role of her people in Expo' 70:

> I remember my parents and all the families around Whanganui, their only role was to be
> kaimahi there: to be part of demonstrating things and stuff like that and I used to really
> moan and carry on to my parents and say, "Surely there's something more to life than this.
> Your role must be to be part of saying what's okay and what's not okay". But no, they just
> went along and did it, because they believed that it was more about them coming together

---

[49] Interview with Karanga Morgan 13 January 2003, p. 18.
[50] Ibid.: 12-13

to share these things than to get involved with that other stuff. So it was more the preservation of the whanaungatanga.[51]

It was important for Ngā Rauru to participate in the governance of the museum because of the sense of responsibility they felt for protecting and maintaining the Ngā Rauru taonga held in the museum.[52] Morgan also acknowledged that it has been a positive thing for Ngā Rauru to have been involved in the governance of the museum because it has demonstrated that Treaty partnerships can be effective:

> In terms of the Treaty, it's a true recognition of how partnership can work and that's why this model is a good model. It's a fair model for everybody and I think that the model is wonderful, but the effectiveness is determined by the people inside it. So it can only be as good as the people that sit at the table.[53]

Morgan described the notion of "two peoples development" that she considered to be at the heart of the model:

> It is that we would develop in a way that we would enhance one another rather than take away from one another, that I would still be able to retain who I am, without taking away from you who you are, but we still have the opportunity to grow and develop and work together, to have our alliances, and that the relationship works for both.[54]

Morgan became involved as a museum trustee because she had been undertaking research in the museum archives and debating the governance review issues with members of her iwi who were involved in the process. She felt that the model operated in the same way as customary decision-making processes used by her people:

> This is a good model because this model actually mirrors the way the old people made decisions anyway, because it was a collective approach: everyone had input. You had one

---

[51] Interview with Karanga Morgan 13-1-2003, p. 15
[52] Ibid.: 20.
[53] Ibid.: 21
[54] Ibid.: 21

person who was usually the kaumatua, the rangatira, or the tohunga, whichever, who put it out, but in actual fact it was the buy-in of all the families, otherwise we couldn't have the whānau to make the hapū and the hapū to make the iwi. … It's fair and it mirrors a lot of the collective thinking that doesn't exist in governance models, because it's always about the chair having the last say … and you can get bullied into different situations. That can't happen here. … If you agree to disagree, that's fine and if you agree to agree, that's fine, because it's actually a collective responsibility attached to those decisions.[55]

Morgan also emphasised that it was important that the chairperson of the trust board was able to recognise the abilities and responsibilities of each member and to ensure that they are given the appropriate opportunity to contribute to the discussions.[56]

Asked whether the model recognised the mana whenua of the place where the museum is located, Morgan said that she would prefer the use of the term tangata whenua rather than mana whenua and that she thought that the whole of the river people were the tangata whenua, not just the people of Pūtiki or Tupoho:

Because of the whakataukī that goes: The river cannot exist without both ends, so the Pūtiki end or Tupoho end, they are the last bastion before Tangaroa and the maunga; they initiate the movement, the flow, that exists between the river.[57]

Morgan commented that Tikanga Māori House was not yet operating as effectively as it could be because of the time taken to understand the role of the house and the most appropriate mode of operation. Membership fluctuated from meeting to meeting and leadership had also been an issue.[58] However, she acknowledged that Tikanga Māori House was providing a means of wider participation for iwi in the discussion of museum issues and it had been able to resolve issues for museum staff during a period when policy was still being developed. She found the Joint Council to be a forum in which she had no

---

[55] Interview with Karanga Morgan 13 January 2003, p. 27-29
[56] Ibid.: 29
[57] Ibid.: 23
[58] Ibid.: 29-30

fear of asking questions and that it was working well as a conduit for the transmission of information from one house to the other and for the resolution of issues.[59]

Grant Huwyler

Grant Huwyler, a member of Ngāti Apa, grew up in Whanganui, graduated with a degree in Business Studies and worked as an iwi consultant. Huwyler was the Māori facilitator involved in the governance review process, a member of Te Roopū Mahi mō Ngā Taonga and an inaugural member of Tikanga Māori House and the Joint Council. He resigned from Tikanga Māori House and the Joint Council because of work commitments beyond Whanganui. He later became manager of the Ngāti Apa Treaty Claim office.

Huwyler went to the museum many times with his class and on other occasions during his school years. Like Rangi Wills he took a particular interest in family taonga that had been deposited in the museum:

> I always knew that we owned several portraits in there and so always took special interest in those when I went in there. I knew they were my ancestors. … Our strong connection is through the items that we own that are in there. There's always been an ongoing association. My grandmother deposited several portraits there and every time we had tangihanga and that sort of thing we'd go in there and retrieve those and bring them out, so there was a kind of active connection. Usually they were pretty good about releasing them; sometimes they weren't, depending on who the director was at the time.

His family had been depositing taonga in the museum since several generations back:

> There were two older people in my family, two leading figures: my grandmother, Paeroa Hawea, and her sister, Wai Waitere, and they had a strongly held belief that Māori things, Māori knowledge and that sort of thing wasn't perhaps important for our generations anymore and they perhaps didn't even trust the next generation to look after these things and felt that they were far better off in the museum. They all held the museum in fairly

---

[59] Ibid.: 32.

high regard. I think they got on well with some of those early directors and had no qualms about depositing things in there … their grandmother deposited things in the museum, their grandmother's brother, he deposited things, so there's obviously a fairly long kind of association.

However, tensions arose between his family and the museum:

> When I started getting into my teens there was actually quite a bit of tension between the family and the museum because of some of the things that they were doing: at one stage, they put one of our tūpuna, took her image and put it on a tea towel, which was highly offensive to my grandmother and her sister, and they dealt to that. But subsequently they went ahead and printed postcards without any authority and this sort of thing. So there's been a lot of going back there and trying to resolve these issues as they arise. … There was quite often tension in getting these items out for tangihanga: they'd put up arguments like, oh you need to give us more notice, and this sort of thing, really rubbish. … more recent experience with Sharon Dell, there's no problems. She seems to have a pretty good empathy with Māori and tries to do her best to keep everyone happy and I don't think our ownership of those items is questioned.[60]

Huwyler became involved in the review of the museum's governance arrangements as a member of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Apa, which had been invited by the museum to participate in the review process. He was also motivated to participate because his whānau had deposited taonga in the museum. He quickly became aware that the museum was having difficulty getting iwi to engage with the review process:

> The museum basically didn't have too many clues on how to penetrate the Māori communities and how to engage them in discussion. … people perceived the museum quite badly, especially those who knew a bit about their taonga and perhaps they had a lot of stuff in there which they claim was stolen from them by different Pākehā collectors who subsequently put them in the museum; all these kind of issues going round in people's heads. So I think [the director] more or less struggled to really engage the communities, plus they were accustomed to just dealing with the kaumātua, who they could get to sort of

---

[60] Interview with Grant Huwyler 2 January 2003, p. 1-3.

sign off on some of their things, and I guess they reached a point where it wasn't really doing enough to capture the Māori community if you like; they actually weren't participating at all.

A process of consultation was initiated, beginning with pānui to marae committees and rūnanga followed by two hui-ā-iwi at which discussion focused on the Mihinare model. The creation of Te Roopū Mahi mo Ngā Taonga signalled a movement away from the practice of dependency on consultation with a select group of kaumātua:

> We created this committee which was more representative and which sort of catered to the new political movements. It allowed these marae and these new rūnanga to basically put their person forward and to expect their voice to be heard. I believe it was big step. … you had people coming from their traditional backgrounds, whether it be hapū, marae, or rūnanga, and basically forming a bit of a confederation to talk about these issues. [Te Roopū kept its own records] … because people generally didn't hold the museum in high regard … it was just important to maintain that independence, just so that we could keep our credibility in the eyes of the people we were representing.[61]

Te Roopū worked together with the museum's Governance Working Party to develop a constitution based on the Mihinare Model. Huwyler commented on the basic principles underpinning the model. His words convey an image of the museum as a common ground where the two partners can negotiate and develop side by side:

> I think partnership is a straight-forward term: it's two distinct groups cooperating, working together. I think the key to it is the next principle which is two cultures development, which says that, right we have partnership, but the expectation is that both groups will move forward; whereas in the past we've had this thing called partnership where, from a Māori perspective, one group still holds all the power and is pushing ahead; the other group has to do as it's told and follow along. So, the two principles can't be separated. … it's like Māori whānau, hapū and iwi basically forming their own strategies and their own visions for the future, for the non-Māori doing the same, and then somehow they come together, because there's only limited resources. We're all living in the same space, and

---

[61] Interview with Grant Huwyler 2 January 2003, p. 13-16

negotiating: How are we going to do this? How is each group going to reach a level of development that's acceptable to them?[62]

These two principles of partnership and two peoples development, combined with the principle of recognition of tikanga[63], are at the heart of the governance model introduced at the Whanganui Regional Museum.

While Huwyler acknowledged the mana whenua role of the people at Pūtiki, he recognised the merit in the representation of all the iwi of the region in the governance model. He argued that this breadth of representation would enable the museum to respond to issues raised by all local Māori more effectively.[64]

In Huwyler's opinion, public opposition to the proposed new model was motivated out of Pākehā self-interest and a desire on the part of some to ensure their own political power base. The opponents voiced their concern that democracy was being threatened:

> I think Don MacGregor [district councillor] made the point that, sure we're just talking about the museum now, but then we're going to take this model, we're going to put it here, we're going to put it there, we're going to put it everywhere. He was quite paranoid about the future implications, not understanding that if it did reach that level it would only be because people wanted it. Really, I just think he thought that his power base is being challenged. Well, it is![65]

Huwyler drew attention to the innovative nature of Te Roopū Mahi mō Ngā Taonga and the Tikanga Māori House in the sense that they represented rare collective initiatives among local Māori. Coming together in this way also presented a challenge to the participants because it would take some time to establish a mode of operation that allow for full participation and established clear strategic priorities. Each of the Māori trustees interviewed acknowledged that it had taken some time for Tikanga Māori House to find its

---

[62] Interview with Grant Huwyler 2 January 2003, p. 17
[63] Ibid.: 17.
[64] Ibid.: 12.
[65] Ibid.: 18-19.

feet and for the active membership to stabilise. However, despite these teething troubles they saw Tikanga Māori House as an important vehicle for the debate of issues and monitoring of the governance function. Huwyler considered that the first priority for Tikanga Māori House was to change the perception of the museum in Māori eyes and to instil cultural integrity within the museum. To achieve this he thought it important to develop the database of taonga Māori and to eventually be proactive in linking those taonga back to the people. He also considered a senior Māori appointment to the museum staff to be a priority in the maintenance of cultural integrity within the institution.

7.3.3   Director's Perspective

The governance review process was managed by the museum director. This section outlines Sharon Dell's account of the state of the institution when she arrived and her understanding of the need to review the governance arrangements and operational issues arising from the new governance model.

Moutoa Gardens/Pakaitore was occupied by Whanganui iwi during the months immediately prior to Dell's arrival in Whanganui to take up the position of director. She acknowledged the influence of the occupation on the governance review project at the museum:

> I think it [the occupation] had a profound effect on the community. It certainly influenced politics and still does, through the period that we subsequently were working on the [governance] project. … My understanding of what Pakaitore was about, was to do with difficulties within iwi and hapū of the area to sort their own relative positions out and the frustrations that people were feeling over the settlement of their claims. … But there was a lot of internal political stuff going on that they needed to resolve. … People have told me that one of the reasons that it took us a long time to get engagement [for the governance review] with Māori was because of the leadership difficulties that they were experiencing themselves and that our project was relatively low on the agenda of the other things that they were dealing with.

Dell was conscious of the way in which the Moutoa Gardens/Pakaitore occupation had influenced the way some district councillors responded to issues relating to the Māori community. When issues arose, such as the museum's proposed new governance model, the district councillors would divide down what she termed "the Moutoa Line". This division was also apparent in the wider community:

> The same sort of cross-section of people who have expressed their support and delight with the museum governance are the ones who were down at the gardens that day [28 February 2001] supporting the signing of the agreement and it's a very clear kind of split between those people and the other people in the community who are still adamantly opposed to what happened [at the museum] and adamantly opposed to the [Moutoa Gardens/Pakaitore] agreement.[66]

The state of the museum itself was of immediate concern to the new director. Relationships with the district council were problematic. However, some positive developments had occurred during this difficult period: the Collection Storage Redevelopment Project had been initiated by the previous director; the trust board had applied for and been granted an increase to the annual grant from the district council, which provided for an increase to the director's salary and two new staff positions.

The district council had agreed to increase funding but there were strings attached: Dell was told that she was expected to review the institution's governance arrangements to ensure that the whole community was represented. Implicit in this was the need to review the relationship with tangata whenua.[67] Although the trust board had already identified the need to review governance, little progress had been made and the new director found this lack of progress frustrating. The Māori members of the board seemed unable to engage Whanganui iwi in the review process, despite the historical relationship between the museum and Pūtiki. Dell commented on the significance of this relationship with a number of Pūtiki families who had always supported the museum:

---

[66] Interview with Sharon Dell 29 August 2001, pp. 4-5
[67] Ibid.: 15.

… there was a strong relationship with Pūtiki, and there's no doubt that they've supported the museum throughout … over things like the extension [opened in 1968], an incredibly important time in terms of that relationship because of the people who had gathered to do the tukutuku and the kōwhaiwhai. And the fact that they did see it as a marae - whether or not there were active things happening in subsequent years, that was a really solid foundation for a relationship. People like Maudie Reweti, who have been involved in that work, are still the people who come every time you ask them; they come and they support and they are an integral part of everything that we ever do in that respect.[68]

Museum staff had been working closely with the Māori community to improve the care and housing of the taonga Māori collection. The expectation had been that a waka house would be built as an addition to the museum. While staff had developed good working relationships with some individuals and whānau, for some in the Māori community these initiatives were too little and too late. This attitude may have been influenced by the events at Moutoa Gardens/Pakaitore. When a meeting was held at the museum to discuss the proposed developments with tangata whenua, those who attended gave expression to their discontent with the museum. Moreover, Henry Bennett, a local kaumatua and community worker, was working on developing an iwi museum at this time.[69]

However, Grant Huwyler was engaged as a project consultant, a hui-ā-iwi was organised, Te Roopū Mahi mō Ngā Taonga was established and iwi began to take an active part in the governance review process. When the two working parties proposed the Mihinare/Raukawa bicameral model to the museum trustees, the chairperson of the trustees, district councillor Don McGregor, declared his opposition to the model and sought support for his stance in the council and the public forum of the newspaper. Dell commented on the nature of the opposition that developed:

I think they had a broad constituency of people who are concerned about the level of power given to Māori. I don't think that people generally had any idea about what the model meant or whether it was good or bad for the museum; but the way the opposition

---

[68] Ibid.: 11.
[69] Ibid.: 10.

was articulated it just seemed like the museum giving power to Māori, and for people who are worried about that generally, they were opposed to the model.[70]

However, subsequent to the decision to implement the new model, the opposition had been confined to a few letters to the local newspaper and a small number of members who had not renewed their membership. Business sponsorship and visitor numbers had not decreased.[71]

The director considered that the new model had resulted in the election of Joint Council members who were very clear about their role, and very committed to the model of governance and the objectives of the museum. There was also a sense of a wider mandate from the community as Joint Council members were no longer drawn only from the museum society, and could consequently bring a range of experiences and the understanding of a wider group of society.[72]

The change had not been without its challenges. For the director there were the additional meetings of the two houses to prepare for and attend as well as meetings of the Joint Council. Her job had become more complex, involving "a set of three different relationships with different groups and coming to grips with the inter-related agendas and the communication". The Joint Council, Tikanga Māori House and Civic House all met with slightly different agendas, purposes and discussions and the director had the administrative role of ensuring "that they are all serviced equally and supported equally and that the issues that come up in any of the meetings are rolled over to the others".

The need to develop a new policy framework for the institution was of prime importance for the director. Priority had been given to developing a policy framework for the care and use of the taonga Māori collections. Until such a policy was endorsed by the Joint Council, Tikanga Māori house was in the position of having to make decisions as issues arose. This led to situations where the lines between governance and operations were

---

[70] Interview with Sharon Dell 17 January 2003, p. 1
[71] Ibid.: 1-2
[72] Ibid.: 3-4

blurred, although this had been instructive for both Tikanga Māori House members and museum staff:

> It's really encouraging and good to have that group of people so interested and involved in the museum and what we're doing. So, yes there is sometimes frustration about how hands-on they seem to want to be, but that's a result of them actually being involved and interested, which is what we do want certainly. The purpose of the whole exercise has been to get that closer relationship, so I think if there's a challenge, it's just sorting out how to manage that relationship and how it's going to work, for the staff and for them.[73]

The director suggested that the members of each house were working hard to come to terms with their roles. She commented on the role of Civic House:

> I think Civic House has been very conscious of process and the model and very conscientious about looking at issues that have come from the Joint Council, considering them, being very careful about the language they use in making recommendations either to Tikanga Māori House or to the Joint Council. They will recommend to the Joint Council, rather than demand or state a position, and they also look at Tikanga Māori House minutes and comment on things that have come up, and ask for clarification, and sometimes give support to something that's come through from those minutes.

While Dell considered that Tikanga Māori House was operating as a forum within which joint council and other iwi members could debate museum-related issues, she was concerned that Tikanga Māori House was confining its interest to the Māori collections and iwi issues and not engaging with the wider concerns of the institution:

> A potential problem I'm seeing is Civic House managing the museum and Tikanga Māori House only managing the Māori collection and I don't think that's how the model is supposed to run.[74]

---

[73] Interview with Sharon Dell 17 January 2003, p. 2-3
[74] Ibid.: p. 4-5

Dell considered that, while the relationships between the museum and the hapū of Whanganui had broadened under the new governance arrangements, the relationship between the museum and Pūtiki had also been actively maintained:

> In some ways you could say that it is stronger, because of Rangi [Wills] being Chair of the [Pūtiki] Marae Committee and Daadi Mete Kingi being on Tikanga Māori House. They are two strong people within Pūtiki and strong within the museum. Then we have also continued to have the relationship with Manu [Mete Kingi], and with people like Maudie Reweti and George Waretini, the people who we go to for tikanga reasons, Hemi Takarangi before he was ill, John Mahi; they are the people that we still make the first approach to over welcoming or visitors or tikanga requirements for exhibitions or other issues that are happening.[75]

The director was of the opinion that the Joint Council had not developed a strong sense of strategic direction and as a consequence that she was leading the council rather than guiding it. Asked about the strategic priorities for the museum in the next five to ten years, Dell identified the development of a clear sense of purpose through a community consultation process; the establishment of a comprehensive policy framework which had already begun with the taonga Māori Collection Policy; a new museum facility; and a secure resource base.[76] She also advocated the development of strategic alliances and taking over the management of functions such as the Information Centre and heritage functions such as the Waimarie steamer, in order to create connections between the leisure and heritage activities in the region. Connections could also be forged with Māori commercial and heritage activities.[77] Dell was strongly of the view that the trust board should now turn its attention to developing a strategic development plan for the next five to ten years. The new governance model in itself did not guarantee the future of the museum; it was a foundation upon which the museum could continue to develop.[78]

---

[75] Ibid.: 8
[76] Ibid. 11
[77] Ibid.: 14
[78] Ibid.: 15

7.3.4   Trustees' Perceptions of the Director as Change Manager

The director was required to take a leadership role in the governance review process and the implementation of the new governance model. While the trust board sanctioned the review process, it was the director who managed this process on a day-to-day basis. Although Dell delegated much of the facilitation process for the review to the two contract consultants, Richard Thompson and Grant Huwyler, she was ultimately responsible for the process. Former and current trustees were asked to identify the skills the director brought to this process, particularly those that enabled her to work effectively with the Māori community.

Manu Mete Kingi, Pūtiki kaumatua and former museum trustee, had seen significant change in the way the museum operated in the time Dell had been director. He attributed this partly to Dell's understanding of tikanga Māori:

> We're fortunate in that with Sharon there is something there in her abilities to understand, not just her professional status, but a deeper understanding of tikanga Māori and how it will be effected, before and after something is presented to the general public.[79]

This view of Dell's empathy with Māori was reiterated by others. Asked about the role of the director in the recent changes, Rangi Wills, Chairperson of the Joint Council, indicated that she had played "a pivotal role". He also commented that the director was very sympathetic to Māori issues and she gave Māori "a good hearing". Huwyler, who worked closely with the director during the governance review period, noted Dell's:

> great understanding of what people were trying to achieve for Māori representation. She talked to the council about it and they were a very important stakeholder. She put up a really good fight for the model … I think she has a good manner when it comes to dealing with people. Experience with past directors, they were quite arrogant, almost dismissive of

---

[79] Interview with Manu Mete Kingi 19 November 2002. pp. 24-25.

people, especially Māori, whereas Sharon is respectful; that's the key characteristic which makes her able to deal with people one on one.[80]

Civic House Trustee Pam Erni claimed that until Dell's appointment little progress had been made with the review process. In her view Dell was responsible for initiating an effective review process. Erni recognised the importance of the director's professional experience and knowledge, her non-confrontational way of working with people in the community and her honesty in the face of challenge or disagreement.[81] Morgan made similar observations about the director' role in the review and implementation processes, but she also raised the issue of the impact of this work on the director.[82]

It was clear to the trustees interviewed that Dell had been carrying much of the responsibility during the review and the transition period from one governance model to another, as well as managing an institution that was under-resourced and that this had taken its toll on the director. In part, the stress of the situation derived from external pressures, but equally important were the internal pressures, including the challenge of being the primary line of communication between the two houses and between the Joint Council and the museum staff.[83] Trustees recognised the continuing tension between their desire to extend the change process into the organisational structure (for example, by increasing the number of Māori staff) and the desire of director and staff to return to a normal operational mode. The director advised the Joint Council that progress with some priority projects, such as the return of kōiwi tangata, would be dependent on upgrading the level of information in the collection database.

---

[80] Interview with Grant Huwyler 2 January 2003, p. 25.
[81] Interview with Pam Erni 21 November 2002, pp. 9-10
[82] Interview with Grant Huwyler 2 January 2003, p. 25.
[83] Interview with Karanga Morgan 13 January 2003, p. 34, 38-39; Interview with Michael Payne 15 October 2002, p. 14.

7.4   Whanganui Case Study Discussion

7.4.1   Historical Relationships

The relationship between Whanganui Regional Museum and the hapū of the Whanganui region evolved through five distinct phases between 1895 and 2002. During the first period, 1895 to 1938, all museum trustees were Pākehā and they determined how the museum developed. A few individual Pākehā members of the museum board had close relationships with the Māori community, spoke te reo Māori, and considered themselves authorities on Māori culture and history. A number of prominent Pūtiki Māori families had established close relationships with the Pākehā settlers of Wanganui. These relationships were partly founded in the history of Christianity in the region, reaching back to the relationships formed with missionaries such as Richard Taylor and the conversion of influential Māori leaders, and the mana whenua relationship between Pūtiki and the city, which extended to the museum and was strengthened because of the significance of the taonga tuku iho held in the museum collection, some of which had been deposited or gifted by Māori families. These influential Pūtiki families had deposited major taonga belonging to hapū, such as the waka Te Mata o Hoturoa and Te Wehi o Te Rangi, and taonga belonging to whānau, into the collection and had maintained their relationships with the museum throughout its history, particularly through their participation as advisors and board members.

During the second period of the museum's history from 1938 until 1968, the museum board appointed Māori Associate Members whose role was to advise the board and museum staff about Māori history and tikanga Māori as well as the care and use of the taonga tuku iho in the museum collection. The Māori Associate Members also kept the Māori community informed about developments at the museum and facilitated communications between the museum and the Māori community when difficulties arose. A number of these Māori advisors served lengthy terms and made substantial contributions to the development of the museum. The museum's archival record suggests that these advisors seldom openly challenged Pākehā control of the taonga tuku iho in the museum collection, at least formally, although their relationships with the museum

directors and trustees gave them some influence in the development of museum policy and practice and in the resolution of disputes. For their part, the Pākehā directors and trustees appear to have been comfortable dealing with the senior members of these families, many of whom had been successful in the Pākehā education system, were active members of Christian churches, and were engaged in professional or agricultural businesses.

The third period began with the election of the first Māori board member in 1967 and the opening of the Māori Court Te Atihaunui-ā-Pāpārangi in 1968. Elected Māori board members continued in the role of advisors to the board and museum staff on matters of tikanga Māori and Māori history. The longest serving Māori board member during this period was Hori Hipango (1967-87), who maintained the link between the museum and the Māori community at Pūtiki. This link with Pūtiki was maintained through the 1990s by members of the Mete Kingi family. As Manu Mete Kingi stated, these trustees considered the relationship between the museum and Pūtiki as a gateway for the museum to the tangata whenua of the region.

During the period from 1895 to the mid-1980s the Pākehā museum trustees developed relationships with the Māori community, sanctioned the establishment of advisory positions and elected Māori trustees primarily in order to facilitate the development of the museum in accordance with their own vision for the institution. The Māori advisors and Māori trustees had to depend on their personal influence with other trustees and the directors in resolving tensions that arose with local Māori from time to time and in ensuring that some aspects of Whanganuitanga were observed. While there were a small number of families who formed ongoing relationships with the museum, most Māori in the Whanganui district had little if any contact with the museum. What contact there was related to particular events such as cultural demonstrations and exhibition openings. There is evidence to suggest that even those Māori families who placed taonga in the museum on deposit had disagreements from time to time with the museum trustees or museum staff because of their proprietorial attitude to the taonga deposited in the collection and their limited regard for Māori cultural practices.

A distinction should be made between the relationships the museum developed with Māori families and a formal governance relationship with the hapū of Whanganui. This latter type of relationship was only to emerge from the governance review process in the 1990s. Although the way the museum had been working with iwi at an operational level had been changing through the early 1990s to take account of the need for closer relationships with whānau and hapū, as is evident from the way museum staff were engaging whānau and hapū in exhibition and other museum projects, there had been little movement in the formal relationships between the museum and Whanganui iwi at the governance level. The number of Māori trustees had increased to three during the early 1990s and these people came from hapū beyond the lower river; however, their appointment was still as members of the museum society. There was no process that allowed hapū or iwi to elect their own representatives to the trust board and monitor their performance. During this period Māori trustees and some Pākehā trustees began to advocate the need to recognise local iwi as tangata whenua in the museum's governance structure and the cultural significance of the taonga tuku iho in the museum collection. In 1993 the museum trustees decided to review the governance structure of the museum, and the governance model was changed in 2001.

The evolving relationships between the Whanganui Regional Museum and the hapū of Whanganui in the later part of the twentieth century operate at three levels. The first and most well developed relationships are those with a small number of influential families at Pūtiki who have acted as advisors and trustees over a number of generations. There were other individuals, some local and some from other iwi in the region, who, from time to time, acted as advisors and trustees, but the Pūtiki families provided continuity and leadership. This relationship between Pūtiki families and the museum can be seen as one dimension of the relationship between Pūtiki and the city of Wanganui. However, these families also had significant relationships with the museum because of taonga tuku iho they had placed on deposit or gifted to the museum. For example, this chapter has outlined the significance of the network of relationships that are connected through the waka taua placed in the museum for safe-keeping by earlier generations.

The relationship between Pūtiki and the museum has evolved rapidly in the last quarter of the twentieth century and the early years of the twenty-first century. In part, this has resulted from changes in the balance of power, and in particular leadership, within and among the hapū of Whanganui. Challenges to customary leadership have resulted from dissatisfaction, particularly among some younger emerging leaders, with the relationship between the hapū of Whanganui and the city, as well as frustration with slow progress in the recognition and resolution of Treaty claims. This dissatisfaction resulted in the occupation of Moutoa Gardens/Pakaitore. One consequence of this occupation was to initiate negotiations for agreements between the district council and both Te Rūnanga o Tupoho and Te Rūnanga o Tamaupoko, shifting the emphasis in the city's focus from Pūtiki and a few families, to two tribal rūnanga. Within this wider environment the museum was negotiating a new governance model with Whanganui iwi and the non-Māori communities in the region.

7.4.2 Governance Relationships: Continuity and Change

The new governance model, adopted in 2001 by the museum, broadened Māori representation to all iwi in the region, though it is evident that the relationships between the museum and those Pūtiki families who have advised the museum in the past remained very important. The principles of the new governance model align closely with the principles of the tino rangatiratanga movement. In the same way that the agreements signed between the city and the tribal rūnanga established protocols to formalise those relationships, the new governance model at the museum formalises the relationships between the museum and the hapū of Whanganui. For the first time the museum had recognised the indigenous status of the hapū o Whanganui in a way that provided for their effective participation in museum governance. This participation is potentially more effective than in the past because of the breadth of representation and the three principles central to the model: partnership, two peoples development and recognition of ngā tikanga o ngā hapū o Whanganui (the cultural practices of the hapū of the Whanganui region). These principles align with the principles of mutual recognition, continuity and consent identified by Tully as essential for the recognition of indigeneity in governance.

The Mihinare model of governance challenged Pākehā notions of democratic representation as currently practised in national and local body politics and the recognition of individual rights fundamental to that system. Public opposition to the Mihinare model focused on the fact that a minority within the community were being given fifty percent of the positions on the new trust board and the right of veto. This was seen to be contrary to natural justice and the principles of democracy based on the rights of individuals, rather than peoples, to determine the governance of a public organisation. Supporters of the proposed governance model argued that the democratic system should provide recognition and active protection of the rights of tangata whenua in order to ensure the individual and collective rights.

Opponents were also concerned that this model could eventually be adopted in other organisations and even in local government. This situation was exacerbated by the response of the local news media which was to engage in the politics of opposition rather than providing a reasoned examination of the proposal and canvassing a range of opinion within the community. Therefore, a small but vocal group of opponents, using their positions within the local body power structure, were able to create the impression that opposition was deeply felt within the community. On closer examination it is not possible to gauge with any certainty just how widespread community concern was, although the fact that the museum society proceeded to adopt the new model in the face of an organised opposition attempt to defeat the motion suggests that, if such opposition was widely felt, it was also difficult to mobilise.

The notion of ambivalence, as discussed in Chapter Three, is useful in understanding the relationships between local Māori and the museum. Ambivalence is almost inevitable for Māori who have relationships with mainstream institutions that provide a contact zone between the two cultures. Local Māori families have long recognised the utility of the museum as an institution where taonga tuku iho can be preserved for future generations. However, the way in which the trustees and staff assumed control of taonga placed in the museum has been the cause of disagreements, to the point where taonga have sometimes

been removed from the museum. Māori advisors and trustees have always operated inside the contact zone. They have been required to be chameleon-like, proactively working to further the objectives of the museum, while at the same time facilitating access and resolving disputes for local Māori. It is likely that the Pākehā members of the museum society made the assumption that, because the senior members of these prominent Māori families conformed to their notions of educated Christian individuals, they shared the Pākehā world view. In reality, for these individuals to maintain the relationships between the Māori and Pākehā communities, they effectively lived in two worlds.

Ambivalence can also be seen in relation to the place of Tikanga Māori House within the new governance structure. Tikanga Māori House seems to want to be able to operate as though it is both inside and outside the museum's governance structure. It has itself become a contact zone between the hapū of Whanganui and the museum and as such is placed in a complex position. This can be explained by examining the difference between the understanding of the mandate of representation held by members of Tikanga Māori House on the Joint Council and that held by members of Civic House on the Joint Council. Members of Tikanga Māori House on the Joint Council have a mandate to represent the interests of the hapū that elected them to the position, but they are required to report back to the hapū on a regular basis. They are also required to consult with their hapū when contentious matters are being considered by the house or the Joint Council and to represent the view of the hapū and not their own view to the Joint Council. Members of Civic House on the Joint Council do not feel they have the same obligation to report or to consult and it is a personal decision whether to represent a personal or collective view in the joint council. The Pākehā tradition of trusteeship is that the trustee's first obligation is to the organisation, not to their extended family or a particular part of the community. For most Māori trustees their first obligation is to their hapū and iwi. However, the Māori trustees interviewed also acknowledged a strong sense of obligation to the museum. This sense of dual accountabilities explains why Tikanga Māori House is ambivalent about its place in the structure. Balancing these dual accountabilities is an indication of the leadership challenge facing the Māori members of the Joint Council.

7.4.3   Governance Reform Process

The need for governance reform was recognised by the museum trustees in the early 1990s, but the process did not gain any real momentum until, with the arrival of Sharon Dell as director, the museum was able to act upon the request from the district council for the museum to develop a governance model that was more representative of the whole community. While some wanted the development of a skills-based board others recognised the need to balance this need with a board that represented the various communities who had an interest in the museum's collections and the future development of the institution and its programmes. It is clearly apparent from the historical record that the museum trustees had recognised the need for both types of change and were prepared to engage in a robust governance review process. None, however, anticipated the extent to which the governance review process would challenge the whole of the Wanganui community.

The governance reform process was expensive, complex and stressful. It would have been very difficult for the museum to resource the extensive change process without the financial support of the Wanganui Community Trust and Te Papa National Services. Managing, coordinating and maintaining the momentum of Te Roopū Mahi mō Ngā Taonga, the Governance Working Party and the trust board was a complex task undertaken by the contracted facilitators and the museum director, who had the ultimate responsibility of ensuring the process was both robust and transparent to all parties, both within the organisation and throughout the wider communities of interest. The director chose to use professional facilitators to work directly with the negotiating parties thus allowing her to maintain an overview, without being engaged in the day-to-day management of the process. Engaging a Māori facilitator from within Whanganui iwi meant that it was possible for Te Roopū to operate with a considerable degree of autonomy while still being resourced by the project.

It is apparent that this change process was stressful for all parties involved, including those who opposed the changes. Those who were involved in the process recognised the

stress caused for the museum director and staff, both in terms of managing and servicing the process, and the fact that the opposition at times focused on the performance of the director and staff. At times the director and staff felt as though they were under siege. The director in particular became the focus of some public debate for her supposed role in orchestrating the adoption of the new model. Therefore, it is not surprising that the director has placed considerable importance on moving through the transition period as quickly as possible in order to re-establish a sense of 'normal' operational mode. However, the museum faces further challenges of significant under-resourcing, inadequate facilities and the identification of clear strategic development priorities.

Trustees also found the process stressful; however, there is also a sense amongst the trustees interviewed that they learned a great deal from participating in the process and that it gave them the determination to see through the change in governance. Some of the understandings and relationships that emerged from this change process have been important in sustaining the trustees, Māori and Pākehā, through the initial period of operation under the new model. Patience, understanding and respect for cultural differences, generally referred to as 'good-will', has been apparent during the transition period as the two houses have taken time to define their roles and practices.

Those who opposed the change to the new governance model did so because it challenged their understanding of liberal democracy based on the equal rights of individuals and the perceived dangers of the recognition of group rights. The trustees interviewed interpreted this opposition as indicative of an underlying racism that had deep historical roots in the Wanganui community. Expressing a preference for multiculturalism rather than biculturalism is consistent with liberal democratic resistance to group rights, and indigenous rights in particular, in national and local politics. While the museum trustees expressed some uncertainty as to the extent of racist attitudes towards Māori within the community it was not unreasonable to assume that the outspoken critics of the governance proposals reflect the prejudice of a significant proportion of the population. This is because there is evidence that prejudice is a group process, generally shared amongst large social groupings, that is, prejudice arises from the social dynamics of inter-group relations.

The racist behaviour of individuals needs to be understood in the context of the individual's group memberships and the nature of the relationships, both historical and contemporary, between the groups involved (Reynolds and Turner 2001: 159-160).

Most of the active opponents had long personal and family associations with and commitment to the museum and were reluctant to accept the need for this type of change. However, those opponents who are local body representatives had not subsequently sought to stop or reduce the level of funding granted to the museum by the district council. They continued to acknowledge the importance of the museum to Wanganui and to attend events at the museum, though they continued to oppose the new governance arrangements.

Whanganui Regional Museum has been through a very difficult period of constitution change, made possible because of the good-will of the individuals who have participated in the process. The new governance model became operational and the trustees and director were exploring the potential benefits and challenges of these arrangements. While the principles and structures of the new model may be sound, making them work effectively for all the museum's communities of interest will depend on the commitment and skills of the trustees, individually and collectively. During the first two years, half the membership of the Joint Council had changed because of resignation or death. There was seldom a full attendance of members at Joint Council meetings, although there had been only one occasion when a quorum was not present. Joint Council meetings seldom moved beyond a consideration of routine monthly business to consider larger strategic issues. These problems, common to many museum trust boards, are unlikely to be solved by the new model.

But of greater concern to the trustees, and a far greater challenge to the new governance arrangements, was the difficulty of pursuing new initiatives when the museum was seriously under-funded, under-staffed and facing serious museological and facility deficiencies. Of particular concern to trustees was the museum's inability to fund a new position for a senior Māori museum practitioner. Trustees were of the view that such an appointment was a priority if the governance principles were to be translated into the

operations of the museum. The museum was also trying to create a modern collection documentation database using museum records that were seriously deficient. However, while these were major challenges for a museum that was exploring new ways of working with tangata whenua and other local communities, their resolution would also create opportunities for innovation. A new building, for example, would respond to the cultural needs of tangata whenua in the storage and exhibition of taonga tuku iho and contemporary Māori society in ways that would be very difficult in the existing facility.

CHAPTER EIGHT
TAIRĀWHITI MUSEUM:
MĀORI PARTICIPATION 1954-2002

8.0   Introduction

This chapter provides an account of the history of Māori participation in the governance, staffing and programmes of Tairāwhiti Museum and of the relationships between the museum and the iwi of Tairāwhiti.[1] Formerly known as the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Inc., the institution changed its name to The Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Trust (commonly known as Tairāwhiti Museum) in 2000. Particular significance is identified in the role of successive Māori advisory committees and ongoing relationships with a number of Māori families living in the Gisborne area. From the 1970s the museum developed important connections with Ngā Puna Waihanga (Māori Artists and Writers), particularly with local Māori artists. In the 1990s this connection with Māori arts was consolidated in the relationship with Toihoukura, an art programme at Tairāwhiti Polytechnic in Gisborne. In the 1990s the relationship with the iwi of Tairāwhiti broadened as the museum's relationship with C Company developed. Finally, in the late 1990s the museum made the transition from an incorporated society, representing a narrow membership base, to a charitable trust with a governance structure that provided representation for iwi and the wider community. The region known as Tairāwhiti on the east coast of the North Island stretches from Tarakeha in the north to Paritu in the South. Within this region there are five major iwi: Ngāti Porou, Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti, Te Aitanga-ā-Mahaki, Ngāi Tā Manuhiri, and Rongowhakaata.[2]

---

[1] Unless otherwise stated, all minute books, letters and other archival material referred to in the footnotes of this chapter are located in the Tairāwhiti Museum Archives, Tairāwhiti Museum, Gisborne. The writer has adopted the convention of referencing all archival sources in footnotes.
[2] Some consider Tairāwhiti to include Ngāi Tai and Whānau-ā-Apanui and to reach south to Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairoa.

Surviving records of the operations of the Tairāwhiti Museum have provided the basis for this account. The focus is on articulating Māori agency in the development of the institution, based on the evidence that much of the change that has occurred in the relationships between the museum and the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti has been facilitated by the presence and actions of Māori participants. It has also become clear during this research that two Pākehā museum directors, Leo Fowler and Michael Spedding, were instrumental in facilitating Māori participation in the museum's governance. Their roles are documented in this and the following chapter. However, it should not be inferred that other directors have not been constructive in developing relationships with local Māori, although for them it may not have been a priority.

Māori participation in the museum's development came essentially in five forms: the contribution of a small number of Māori families, from the 1950s through to the present day, as advisors and trustees; the participation of Māori artists in the museum's exhibition activities from the 1970s; the contribution of the Māori Advisory Committee; the evolving relationship between the museum and C Company (28th Māori Battalion); and the first draft of the new constitutional model proposed by Kiki Smiler. An emphasis on Māori agency is balanced by an examination of the role of the museum director, executive committee and trustees, throughout the history of the institution.

8.1   The Māori Museum Committee 1954-59

The first public museum in Gisborne of any consequence had its origins in the establishment of the Gisborne Branch of the Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society in 1948.[3] The Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society was based in Napier and had operated an art gallery and museum there since 1936. During the period 1936 to the early 1950s, in the absence of a public museum in Gisborne, several important collections of taonga Māori from the Tairāwhiti region had been acquired by the museum in Napier (Fea and Pishief 1996: 26-9). In December 1953 the Gisborne branch decided to separate from

---

[3] Minute Book of the Gisborne Branch, Hawkes Bay and East Coast Art Society Gisborne Branch 1948 - 1955.

the Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society and form the Gisborne Arts Society.[4] The first evidence of museum activity occurring within the Gisborne Arts Society is the appointment of Leo Fowler as convenor of the Sub-Committee for the Historic and Museum Section in February 1954.[5] Later that year Fowler was appointed Honorary Director of the Museum.[6] The fact that Mr E. Black deposited his father's (J.G. Black) collection of Māori artefacts in the museum soon after its establishment is an indication that it was seen as a credible local alternative to the established institutions in the metropolitan centres. The Black collection had previously been on deposit in the Canterbury Museum, Christchurch.

In 1954 Winifred Lysnar gifted to the city of Gisborne a house and property by the river, close to the city. On June 11, 1955, the society opened its new art gallery and museum in this house and it was not long before the society was planning extensions and modifications to the facility, including a new Māori Wing which was opened in 1959.

The Minute Book of the Gisborne Branch of the Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society (1948-55) does not record any Māori participation in the establishment of the branch or its governance. However, in the absence of a membership list for this period it is not possible to comment on the extent to which Māori were members. The first record of Māori involvement is in 1954 when, after the establishment of the museum, the Honorary Director, Leo Fowler,[7] actively encouraged Māori to contribute to its development. After discussions with his acquaintances in the Māori community he placed a set of resolutions before the society:

---

[4] Minutes of a Meeting of the Gisborne Branch of the Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society, 2 December, 1953. Minute Book of the Gisborne Branch, Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society 1948 - 1955.

[5] Minutes of a Meeting of the Gisborne Branch of the Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society, 15 February, 1954. Minute Book of the Gisborne Branch, Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society 1948 - 1955.

[6] Minutes of a Meeting of the Gisborne Branch of the Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society, 4 August, 1954. Minute Book of the Gisborne Branch, Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society 1948 - 1955, Tairāwhiti Museum Archives.

[7] Leo Fowler was manager of the Gisborne radio station. He developed an interest in the Māori history and culture of Tairāwhiti and published a book on the whare nui Te Mana o Tūranga at Manutuke. Sir Henare Ngata referred to him as a "friend of the local Māori people" (Interview with Sir Henare Ngata, Gisborne, May 2002).

1. That the Society approves of the establishment of a Māori section as a part of the museum activities, such section is to be housed in the meeting house, Hau Te Ananui o Tangaroa, which is to be purchased from Christchurch Museum at a cost of 250 [pound], plus demolition, transport and re-erection costs.

2. It is further approved that, if the Māori section is established from funds raised by the Māori community of the East Coast district, it shall be administered by a special Māori committee, provided that such a committee shall be directly responsible to the Director of the Museum, who, with the President and Secretary, shall be ex-officio members of such a committee.

3. Any policy agreed upon by the Māori committee shall be subject to the endorsement of the Council and the Council will agree to take no action in respect of the Māori section without consultation with, and agreement, by the Māori Committee.

4. The Society further agrees that any money raised by the Māori people, or contributed by the Māori Purposes Fund Board or other Trust, for purposes of establishing the Māori section, will be used specifically for that section, and not used for general purposes.[8]

During discussion of these resolutions:

Mr Fowler explained that the Māori people would be more willing to part with valuable relics if they had some guarantee that these would be preserved in the local museum and in the event of a dissolution of the Arts Society that these articles would not be sold or sent to other museums.

It was suggested that as the Arts Council membership is by election and open to all members of the society, the Māori section could effectively be represented by a Māori member of the Council. The principle of a Māori sub-committee to act in an advisory capacity was approved.[9]

---

[8] These resolutions were probably developed in consultation with Rongowhakaata Halbert as he seems to have been the leading figure in the work of the Māori Museum Committee. Minutes of a Meeting of the Gisborne Branch of the Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society, 4 August, 1954. Minute Book of the Gisborne Branch, Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society 1948 - 1955.

[9] Minutes of a Meeting of the Gisborne Branch of the Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society, 4 August, 1954. Minute Book of the Gisborne Branch, Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society 1948 - 1955, Tairāwhiti Museum Archives.

However, Fowler's resolutions were not formally passed by the council until November 1955.[10]

At its first meeting in September 1954, the Museum Committee established a Māori Museum Committee. It is unlikely that such a committee would have become a reality had Leo Fowler not been highly regarded by Rongowhakaata Halbert and the other Māori members for his interest in Māori culture. Kahu Te Hau and Rongowhakaata Halbert are recorded as the Māori membership.[11] In February 1955, in his role as chairperson of the Māori Museum Committee, Halbert inspected the whare Hau Te Ananui o Tangaroa at the Canterbury Museum and thought that it would make "a valuable contribution to our museum".[12]

In April an *Appeal to the Māori Community* was circulated to tribal committees[13] under the signatures of Rongowhakaata Halbert and Leo Fowler.[14] The appeal indicated that a Māori museum was to be established as part of the Gisborne Art Gallery and Museum, under the control of the Council of the Gisborne Arts Society. The committee was collecting money for the purchase of the whare nui Hau Te Ananui o Tangaroa. Canterbury Museum purchased the house in 1873. It is clear from the *Appeal* that the opportunity of returning this house provided strong motivation for the members of the Māori Museum Committee to collect funds. Seven hundred pounds were received in donations. The *Appeal* outlined the need for a Māori museum, noting that the museum would be: a safe place for the care and access to taonga tuku iho; controlled by Māori

---

[10] Minutes of a Meeting of the Gisborne Branch of the Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society, 9 November, 1955. Minute Book of the Gisborne Branch, Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society 1948 - 1955. In a letter to Victor Fisher, Auckland Museum, 30 March 1955 Fowler had written: "The Art Council has consented to have amendments made to its constitution at the Annual Meeting next month to ensure that the director of the Museum and a Māori member be added to the governing council of the society and also to insert a special amendment giving the Māori Committee a demonstrative voice in the control of the Māori Museum which is to be set up as a separate branch in the Māori house when it is secured."

[11] Minutes of a Meeting of the Museum Committee, Gisborne Arts Society, 6 September, 1954.

[12] Minutes of a Meeting of the Museum Committee, Gisborne Arts Society 14 February, 1955.

[13] These were the district committees of the National Māori Council.

[14] It is possible that Leo Fowler drafted the whole of the appeal. In a letter to Roger Duff, Director of Canterbury Museum, 8 February 1955, Fowler stated: "We have set up a special committee comprising the leading Māori representatives on the East Coast, and this committee is circulating every Marae committee on the East Coast, outlining the story of the Māori House and asking for funds. This is another way of saying that I am writing the combined report and appeal and the committee are lending their mana…".

elders; ensure that the history of the taonga would be retained at a time when Māori society was subject to considerable change; a collective resource for all the Māori of the East Coast region; and be a focal point for cultural renaissance.[15] The *Appeal* also stated that Māori who placed taonga in the Māori Museum could do so without relinquishing their ownership of the item(s).[16] The appeal is a rare statement from this period affirming the significance of taonga Māori to hapū and whānau and articulating rights and responsibilities of control and access to taonga Māori placed in public museums.

It appears that by May 1955 the proposal to purchase Hau Te Ananui o Tangaroa from Canterbury Museum was under review by the honorary director.[17] Mr R. J. Wills, a Gisborne builder who had an extensive knowledge of Māori meeting houses, had visited Canterbury Museum and advised against the purchase of the whare nui. In June 1955 it was decided not to proceed with the purchase and Fowler wrote to the director of Canterbury Museum advising him of the decision.[18] Duff's reply indicates that Wills' report was critical of the quality of the carving and of the treatment the house had received at Canterbury Museum:

> I agree generally that the relief of the carving suffers from the lack of depth of the timber available to the original carvers and that it has been rather sadly hacked about in its two shifts since it's been at the museum.[19]

Although this must have been a significant issue for the Māori Museum Committee, there is no account in the surviving meeting minutes of any discussion not to purchase the house by the arts society council.[20] Hau Te Ananui o Tangaroa remains, at the time of writing, in the collection of Canterbury Museum.

---

[15] R. Halbert, and L. Fowler, (13-4-55) *Appeal to the Māori Community* Typescript, pp. 1-3.
[16] Ibid.: p. 2.
[17] Minutes of a Meeting of the Gisborne Branch of the Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society, 30 May, 1955. Minute Book of the Gisborne Branch, Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society 1948 - 1955.
[18] Minutes of a Meeting of the Gisborne Branch of the Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society, 26 June, 1955. Minute Book of the Gisborne Branch, Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society 1948 - 1955, Tairāwhiti Museum Archives. Letter from Leo Fowler to Roger Duff 12 July 1955.
[19] Letter from R. Duff to L. Fowler 2 August 1955.
[20] Sir Henare Ngata, in an interview in Gisborne in May 2002, said that he could not remember why the committee decided not to repatriate the whare nui, but he noted that the committee would only have returned the house if there had been strong support for such a repatriation from the Whānau-ā-Rua at Tokomaru Bay.

An incomplete set of minutes for the Māori Museum Committee has survived and been preserved in the Tairāwhiti Museum Archive. The first meeting with minutes was held on 9 September 1955.[21] The establishment of this committee was a significant development in the history of New Zealand museums. It was the first such Māori committee established by a museum organisation to manage the development of the Māori component of a museum. The resolutions submitted to the arts society council are evidence of Fowler's understanding of issues surrounding the ownership of taonga Māori and the importance of Māori participation in the development of the Māori component of the museum. Fowler's relationships with Māori in the Gisborne area are probably a key to understanding the establishment and activity of the Māori Museum Committee.[22] The potential for innovative museological practice is seen in the suggestion by members of the committee that "a selection of the rarer Māori artefacts to be taken to outlying marae to let those interested, especially Youth Clubs, obtain some idea of the type of exhibit the museum possessed. It was suggested that a travelling showcase be designed for such displays".[23] Although the council approved the building of the case there is no surviving evidence that taonga Māori were taken to marae during this period. The Māori Museum Committee also acted as an advisory committee for the Māori language programmes broadcast by Broadway Radio Station 2XG.[24]

In a report written by Fowler to the Museum Committee in June 1955 on his retirement as honorary museum curator, he noted that the establishment of the Māori Museum Committee had been an effective way of establishing the credibility of the museum with

---

[21] Those present included: Rongowhakaata Halbert (Chairman), Pahau Milner, Tawhai Tamepo, Moana Ngata, Hira Paenga, Judge Carr, Dr Singer, R. Wills, Leo Fowler. Singer, Wills and Fowler were Pākehā members appointed to the committee by the art society's council. Māori members not present for this meeting were Eru Ruru, Peter Kaua, Kahu te Hau Reta Keha, Te Tane Tukaki, Te Kani te Ua and Hiwi Maynard. Additional members were appointed by tribal committees throughout the region: Tipi Kaa (Waiapu North), Enoka Mokena Potae (Kawakawa), Wiremu Poutu (Wharekahika), Dick George (Waiapu South) and H. K. Ngata (Hikurangi South). These tribal committee appointees were not expected to attend meetings regularly in Gisborne, according to the Minutes of a Meeting of the Māori Museum Committee, 9 September, 1955.

[22] Sir Henare Ngata made the following observation: "Māori cultural issues are treacherous territory for 'outsiders', Māori or Pākehā. Leo had a wise guide in R. W. Halbert." Notes provided by Sir Henare Ngata in response to the first draft of this chapter.

[23] Minutes of a Meeting of the Māori Museum Committee, 9 September, 1955.

[24] As mentioned previously, Leo Fowler was manager of the radio station.

Māori. In particular, he noted the depositing of the Tupurupuru stone, a family heirloom, by Te Kani Te Ua and the Hine Matioro monument from Whangara, "one of the most famous and sacred Māori relics on the East Coast", as evidence that the museum was seen as an appropriate place to deposit taonga Māori.[25]

Once it had been decided not to proceed with the purchase of the whare nui from Canterbury Museum, the Māori Museum Committee focused on raising 2000 pounds for building an extension to the existing building, to be known as the Māori Wing. Leo Fowler was aware of the significance of this development. He stated that:

> when the new project was completed it could and should be one of the finest Māori museums in the country. As the only one which had been promoted entirely by the Māori community, and also the only one with a Māori Advisory Committee.[26]

The Māori Museum Committee met in May, July and October 1956. When the committee had raised 1000 pounds, the Māori Purposes Trust Board made a grant of 1000 pounds, thus enabling the arts society to proceed with the building of the extension.[27] Committee meetings in 1957 focused on the plans for the new extension, which was eventually opened in November 1958.

Waioeka Paraone (Brown) deposited an important collection of taonga tuku iho in 1959. This collection was notable because of the recorded histories of each of the taonga. In acknowledging this deposit Pahau Milner, a member of the Māori Museum Committee, said it was:

> the first collection of its kind to be handed over by a Māori family. Its handing over showed the confidence of the Māori people in the East Coast in the Museum and its Māori

---

[25] L. Fowler, Report and Suggestions on the Organisation and Policy of the Gisborne Museum, 30 June 55.
[26] Minutes of a Meeting of the Māori Museum Committee, 7 October, 1955.
[27] Minutes of a Meeting of the Māori Museum Committee, 5 October, 1956. Rongowhakaata Halbert was a member of the Māori Purposes Fund Board.

Committee. He thought that in time to come more and more valuable collections would be kept intact and would retain their known histories.[28]

Once the Māori Wing had opened, the Māori Museum Committee appears to have met infrequently and by July 1959 Leo Fowler was writing to the members of the committee about poor attendance at meetings.[29] There are no surviving minutes for meetings of the Māori Museum Committee after this letter was sent to the members, nor is there any further recorded explanation for the demise of the committee. The members may have considered that with the building of the Māori Wing their primary purpose had been fulfilled, or the key members of the committee may have had their interests diverted to other matters. Another possible cause for the loss of interest could have been the disappointment at not being able to establish the museum in the whare nui. Had that been possible the Māori Museum would have been more autonomous and this may have suited the Māori Museum Committee. There is a suggestion in the tone of Fowler's letter quoted above that he is very frustrated by the lack of attendance and that his relationships with the members of the committee have deteriorated. However, in the absence of other sources it is impossible to confirm any of this speculation. It is possible that the interests of key members of the Māori Museum Committee had turned by this time to other priorities such as Māori land issues.[30]

8.2   The Interregnum 1960-1988

At the next AGM of the Gisborne Arts Society in June 1960 Rongowhakaata Halbert was appointed Māori representative on the council.[31] However, the minutes show, that he did not attend any meetings during that year. He was reappointed Māori representative in 1961 and 1962 and again did not attend any meetings of the council.[32] No appointment of a Māori Representative was made in 1963 or in any subsequent year. Although tangata

---

[28] Minutes of a Meeting of the Māori Museum Committee, 5 June, 1959.

[29] Letter from Leo Fowler To Members of the Māori Museum Committee, 17 July, 1959.

[30] Sir Henare Ngata suggested that "the Māori Committee centred very largely around Rongowhakaata Halbert, and during this period the affairs of the Mangatu Blocks commanded much of his attention." Notes provided December 2002 in response to the first draft of this chapter.

[31] Minutes of the Annual General Meeting of the Gisborne Arts Society, 21 June, 1960.

[32] Minutes of the Annual General Meetings of the Gisborne Arts Society 1961 and 1962, Minutes Book 1961-1968.

whenua were no longer directly involved in the governance of the museum, the minutes of the council meetings record a number of significant deposits of taonga Māori during the 1960s. In 1965 artist Muru Walters (Ngā Puhi) was elected to the Arts Society and Museum Council; however, this did not seem to open the door of the art gallery for Māori artists to have their work exhibited.

Elizabeth Shaw was appointed the first professional director of the museum in 1970. During this year a member of the council resigned and it was suggested that a replacement be sought from the Māori community. Mrs Lorna Ngata was consulted but no appointment was made and no reason for this is recorded in council minutes. There was also an interest in having a Māori representative on the museum committee "to help arrange working displays".[33] No appointment appears to have been made, but Māori families continued to deposit taonga in the museum for safekeeping. For example, Mrs Huia Chrisp and Mrs Heni Eade deposited important collections of taonga in the museum in 1971.[34] Huia Chrisp had been a member of the museum society since 1955.[35] During this period the Māori Women's Welfare League also assisted the museum with exhibition openings and art and craft demonstrations.[36]

The museum director was an archaeologist and was instrumental in developing the Archaeology Group within the Gisborne Historical Society. Taonga Māori recovered during the group's fieldwork were added to the museum collection. No doubt through the director's influence, in 1971 the museum council wrote to the Minister of Internal Affairs:

> suggesting the formation of a policy which would determine who would own artefacts which were discovered. This policy would stop the flow of valuable artefacts overseas and of course enable museums to borrow or purchase local finds.[37]

---

[33] Director's Report, December 5, 1970-February 8, 1971, Museum Minutes Book 1969-1978.
[34] Director's Report, June 15-July 5, 1971, Museum Minutes Book 1969-1978. Margaret Mettner, museum curator at the time of this deposit, stated that the reason for the deposit was that Mrs Chrisp's children were marrying and moving away from Gisborne (Mettner, pers. comm., 2002).
[35] List of Art Society Members at May 24, 1955.
[36] Interview with Ingrid Searancke, 1 December, 1999, Gisborne, p.15
[37] Minutes of the Meeting of the Gisborne Arts Society and Museum Council, 8 November, 1971, Museum Minutes Book 1969-1978.

The Māori Wing displays were redesigned early in 1971 by Muru Walters and Sandy Adsett (Ngāti Pahauwera), art teachers based in Gisborne. Late in the year an exhibition about Te Kooti, on loan from Waikato Museum, was shown in the Māori Wing. This was the first museum exhibition of its kind to be held at the museum. The Māori Wing display was reinstated after the removal of the Te Kooti exhibition.[38]

Warner Haldane, an English museum practitioner, was appointed museum director in 1974 following the resignation of Elizabeth Shaw. In 1976 the name of the organisation was changed to the Gisborne Museum and Art Gallery. In 1977 a new facility was opened that incorporated the original Māori Museum Wing, a contemporary Māori art exhibition was held and the museum purchased Sandy Adsett's painting 'Awhiowhio'. This purchase, along with the new taonga Māori exhibits, signalled significant changes in the operation of the institution. The museum had 34,180 general visitors and 7842 student visitors in school groups between 1 July 1976 and 1 July 1977.[39] The number of affiliated groups had grown to twelve.[40] However, there were no Māori involved in the governance of the institution. Rongowhakaata Halbert's vision in the 1950s of Māori management of the taonga Māori and the development of a Māori museum had not eventuated. In fact by this time, Māori involvement in museum governance at any level was only a distant memory. There is no evidence to suggest that the directors during this period saw the inclusion of Māori in the museum's staff or governance as a significant issue.

The Māori collection at the museum continued to grow with objects donated or deposited by families and obtained from archaeological and chance finds. One such deposit was the whare Te Poho o Materoa in 1980 by the Keiha family on behalf of the hapū Ngāi Tawhiri.[41] The most active involvement of the museum with the Māori communities in the Gisborne area towards the end of the 1970s appears to have been through the museum's education programmes. In 1979, for example, the education officer reported to the

---

[38] Director's Report, May 9-June 12, 1972, Museum Minutes Book 1969-1978.
[39] These visitor numbers were higher than the museum achieved in the early 1990s. (Spedding pers. comm. December, 2002)
[40] Artists Society, Pottery Group, Camera Club, Vintage Car Club, Movie Club, Historic Places Trust Gisborne Regional Committee, Folk Museum Club, Antique Society, Collectors' Club, Tairāwhiti Historical Society, Film Society, Transport and Technology Group
[41] *Gisborne Museum and Art Centre Annual Report* 1981, Minute Book 1979-89.

museum council about a very successful four-day field programme involving Muriwai School.[42] The programme theme was the interaction of Māori and Pākehā and involved two days in the 'field' at Muriwai and two days at the museum. Day One was based at the whare Tāmanuhiri and Day Two involved a visit to Tapui's Pā and other sites. A number of kaumātua were involved in the programme. An oral history programme also resulted in the beginnings of an important oral history archive that has continued to develop to the present time.

During the early 1980s this museum, along with others throughout the country, worked with the *Te Māori* Management Committee and tangata whenua to arrange the loan of taonga for *Te Māori*. In 1983 tangata whenua agreed that the museum could loan five taonga for the exhibition.[43] It may have been this planning for *Te Māori* that once again drew the attention of the society to the need for Māori representation on the council. In 1982 Heni Sunderland, a respected Gisborne elder from Manutuke, was elected to the council[44] and she remained actively involved with the museum until she retired in 1988. The record also shows an increasing emphasis on the provision of appropriate storage facilities for the taonga Māori collection in the wake of *Te Māori*. In 1984, for example, the museum developed an innovative set of large storage drawers for the cloak collection.[45]

The historical record of the time also suggests that there were Māori throughout the region who were supportive of the role of the museum. This was acknowledged, for example, when Ngoi Pewhairangi of Tokomaru Bay died in 1985:

> Over many years Ngoi was a source of guidance on matters Māori and she and her husband Ben encouraged the depositing of Māori taonga in the museum. She will be sadly missed by us as well as hundreds and hundreds of people up and down the country who

---

[42] Education Officer's Annual report 1979, Minute Book 1979-89e.
[43] *Gisborne Museum and Art Centre Annual Report* 1983, Minute Book 1979-89.
[44] Minutes of the Annual General Meeting 1982, Minute Book 1979-89.
[45] Director's Quarterly Report November 1984-January 1985, Minute Book 1979-89.

held her in great respect. The Museum was honoured to have been invited to join the tangata whenua to welcome her body into Te Poho o Rawiri marae.[46]

In the mid-1980s the art museum side of the institution became more actively involved with Māori artists, particularly through its relationship with Ngā Puna Waihanga (Māori Writers and Artists). The Ngā Puna Waihanga exhibition at the museum in 1984 was the beginning of a tradition that continues into the twenty-first century. In 1985 the exhibition *Te Wairua o Te Whenua* brought another innovation with the combination of paintings by Haare Williams (Te Aitanga a Mahaki), taonga Māori from the Waioeka Brown collection and "modern craft work by craftswomen of Rongowhakaata, Ngāi Tāmanuhiri and Te Aitanga-ā-Mahaki".[47] In the same year Māori musical instruments from the museum collection were sent to a hui on kōauau and nguru at Te Araroa.

In 1985, following a resolution at the AGM, the director was asked to discuss the matter of increasing Māori representation on the council with Mrs Sunderland. As a result of discussions with Mrs Sunderland, the director approached Mr Rutene Irwin, Chairman of the Tākitimu Executive, a component body of the Tairāwhiti District Māori Council. A paper outlining the proposal to increase the size of the council to allow for Māori representation was written by the director, vetted by Mrs Sunderland and sent to Mr Rutene.[48] No progress was made with this matter through to 1987. In part this may be explained by the resignation of the incumbent director and the appointment of Dr Wayne Orchiston[49] as director in November of that year. It was not until June 1988 that the matter was raised again at the executive committee of the council and a member was delegated the task of talking to Sir Henare Ngata about Māori representation on the museum council. In July 1988 Mr W. (Bill) Kerekere (Rongowhakaata) was elected to the council.[50]

---

[46] Director's Quarterly Report November 1984-January 1985, Minute Book 1979-89.
[47] Director's Report May-July 1985, Minute Book 1979-89.
[48] Director's Report February to April 1986, Minute Book 1979-89.
[49] Dr Wayne Orchiston had a PhD in archaeology and had taught Museum Studies at Deakin University, Melbourne until his appointment to Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre.
[50] Minutes of the Annual General Meeting of the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre, 25 July, 1988, Minute Book 1979-1989. See also a letter from R. Bell to H. Sunderland, August 1998.

8.3   The Māori Advisory Committee and Māori Wing Exhibition Planning Group 1989-1994

In March 1989 a new exhibition of taonga Māori was opened in the Māori Wing for the first time since the new facility opened in 1977. A hui had been held for Māori representatives from throughout the district to advise on this project.[51] Following the success of this initiative the director established the Māori Advisory Committee (Orchiston 1991:11). These developments reflected the increasing recognition within the museum sector at the time of growing Māori aspirations to manage the care and use of their taonga held in public museums. This movement was itself related to the increasing recognition of Māori Treaty of Waitangi rights in legislation, and by the courts, during the late 1980s, and the approaching 'celebration' of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1990.

The Māori Advisory Committee met under the chairmanship of Sir Henare Ngata, confirmed its membership (including two members of the original Māori Museum Committee in the 1950s),[52] recommended to the executive committee that four members of the Māori Advisory Committee be seconded to the Museum Council, and that two of these representatives be placed on the executive committee with full voting rights.

Although these recommendations were endorsed by council it was not until the 1990 AGM that a formal recommendation was put to the membership that in the revision of the constitution the Council should include four members, appointed by the Māori Advisory

---

[51] Director's Quarterly Report, December 1988 - February 1989, Minute Book 1979-1989.
[52] Membership of the Māori Advisory Committee in November 1989: Sandy Adsett (Education Department/Artist), Philip Aspinall (Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou), Jules Ferris (District Māori Council), Trevor Galvin (Wairoa-Waikaremoana Region) Nona Haronga (Te Rūnanga o Tūranganui-a-Kiwa), Pare Irwin (Nuhaka Region), Rutene Irwin (Te Rūnanga o Tūranganui-a-Kiwa), Peggy Kaua (Te Rūnanga o Tūranganui-a-Kiwa), Pita Kaua (original member), Pane Kawhia (Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou), Blondie Keelan (Tolaga Bay Region), Apirana Mahuika (Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou), Sir Henare Ngata (original member) George Niania (Te Reinga region), Dr Wayne Orchiston (Museum Director), T. Paenga (Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou), Cambridge Pani (Nuhaka region), Ben Pewhairangi (meeting house restoration), Tu Ratapu (Rongomaiwahine region), John Scott (Wairoa-Waikaremoana region), Ingrid Searancke (Paikea region), Kiki Smiler (Paikea region), Manu Stainton (Hicks Bay region), Hooki Solomon (Whakaki region), Heni Sunderland (Te Rūnanga o Tūranganui-a-Kiwa), Paul Weka (craftsman), John Whangaparita (Ruatoria region). In the absence of minutes of the Māori Advisory Committee it is not possible to assess how many of these members were active participants in committee meetings.

Committee, to represent the principle tribes within the Gisborne District.[53] This is the first mention in the records of the principle that tribes should be represented on the society's council. It signalled a significant shift in the basis for Māori representation in museum governance. Before this, the museum had maintained relationships with certain Māori families in the Gisborne area who had maintained an interest in the museum. However, until the constitution could be changed the Māori Advisory Committee appointed four members to the council[54] and one of these was appointed to the executive[55].

The Māori Advisory Committee also appears to have made an effective contribution to exhibition development during this period through the Māori Wing Exhibition Planning Group that consisted of four staff members and four members of the Advisory Committee.[56] During this period the museum also began to employ Māori museum practitioners. During 1989-90 John Walsh[57] was employed as Exhibitions Officer, Jolene Douglas[58] as Assistant Exhibitions Officer and Harae Smith was appointed as Māori Trainee, although she remained in the position only few months and was not replaced.[59] It appears that the director had managed to create a new momentum in the relationship between the museum and the Māori community. By September 1990 the museum was considering making an appointment under a subsidy scheme offered by Te Rūnanga o Tūranganui-ā-Kiwa. It was also suggested that meetings be planned with marae committees to discuss the repatriation of Tairāwhiti taonga held by other institutions.[60] In the same month the Māori Wing Planning Group formally opened their first exhibition *Te Taonga a Ruatepupuke: Carvings of the East Coast,* which generated a good public response particularly from the Māori community.[61] It was planned to change these exhibitions after ten to twelve months. This was a relatively short duration given the more

---

[53] Minutes of the Annual General Meeting of the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre, 23 August, 1990, Minute Book 1990-1995.
[54] B. Pewhairangi, I. Searancke, N. Haronga and S. Adsett.
[55] I. Searancke
[56] The four members of the Māori Advisory Committee on the Planning Group were N. Haronga, I. Searancke, S. Adsett and D. Ladelli.
[57] Artist, Te Aitanga a Hauiti, later appointed first Curator of Māori Art at Te Papa Tongarewa, Wellington.
[58] Artist, later appointed Art Curator at Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre.
[59] *Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Annual Report,* April 1989-March 1990.
[60] Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting 12 September 1990, Minute Book 1990-1995.
[61] Director's Monthly Report, October 1990, Minute Book 1990-1995.

'permanent' installations of previous periods and this engaged the community in a way that had rarely happened previously:

> The Māori Wing developments at the Museum demonstrate the enormous value of a bicultural partnership, and the response to the changing exhibitions programme from the local Māori communities has been heartening (Orchiston 1991: 12).

Peter Gordon[62] (Rongowhakaata) joined the Māori Advisory Committee in 1992 and was elected chairman following the resignation of Sir Henare Ngata.[63] Peter Gordon also became a member of the Māori Wing Exhibition Planning Group. His presence seems to have initiated a wide range of discussions within the Māori Advisory Committee, resulting in recommendations to the museum council relating to repatriation of Tairāwhiti taonga tuku iho, the development of a purchase fund for taonga tuku iho, the establishment of a database for Tairāwhiti Māori taonga, and investigation of the development of a more appropriate facility in which to house and display taonga.[64]

These recommendations continued themes that had been present in the deliberations of the Māori Advisory Committee in the 1950s. It is also interesting that this set of recommendations should occur in the same year as the United States Government passed the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. Perhaps more directly influential was the presence of Peter Gordon whose interest and advocacy of iwi issues is evident in the historical record. The visit of Momi Naughton, a Delaware Native American, who was in New Zealand to study New Zealand museums may also have stimulated some discussion of these issues in the wider community. She gave a public lecture at the museum about appropriation and repatriation of cultural property.[65]

The Māori Advisory Committee seems to have been actively involved in supporting museum programmes during the latter half of 1992. Peter Gordon, Sandy Adsett, Nona Haronga and Ingrid Searancke were appointed by the committee to the council. The

---

[62] Former public servant, graduate in history, editor of R. W. Halbert's book *Horouta*.
[63] *Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Annual Report* July 1991-June 1992, p. 1. Minute Book 1990-1995.
[64] Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting 14 October 1992, Minute Book 1990-1995.
[65] *Gisborne Herald*, 4 April 90.

committee gave advice on proposed exchanges with Canterbury Museum and the proposed return of the whaleboat to Te Kaha. Members of the committee also arranged two weaving displays at the museum and a week of activities focusing on Māori medicines and their uses.[66] The Māori Wing Exhibition Planning Group opened its second exhibition *Ngā Mahi a Rehia - Māori Games and Past-times* which was widely acclaimed as an innovative approach to the exhibition of taonga Māori.[67]

Unfortunately, in December 1992, just as the level of Māori activity associated with the museum seemed to be gaining momentum, Dr Orchiston resigned to take up the post of Manager of the New Zealand Astronomy Centre in Wellington. At the same time John Walsh, Exhibitions Officer, resigned to become the first Curator of Māori Art at the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa.[68] Dr Orchiston had led the museum through a period of considerable re-adjustment: he had initiated significant organisational restructuring, facility development, exhibition development and historical research in addition to his success in establishing an effective Māori Advisory Committee (Orchiston 1991). Peter Gordon's active participation in the life of the society (as secretary) and in supporting the museum's programmes, along with the other members of the Māori Advisory Committee, had ensured a period of innovation.

Early in 1993 Priscilla Thompson was appointed director and Michael Spedding was appointed archivist/librarian. Thompson came from Auckland City Art Gallery and was the first and only director, up till the time of writing, of Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre whose primary training had been in the fine arts. It is evident from the remaining records of the period that Thompson did not actively develop the role of the Māori Advisory Committee or develop other relationships with individuals or organisations in the Māori communities of the district, nor did she wish to continue to put the same energy into creating exhibitions in the Māori Wing as her predecessor. Her assessment was that the

---

[66] Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting 11 November 1992, Minute Book 1990-1995.
[67] *Gisborne Herald*, 27-3-92. The exhibition consisted of three 'environments' in one gallery. The exhibition was opened by Waimarama Taumanu and Rutene Irwin.
[68] Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting 8 December 1992, Minute Book 1990-1995.

museum needed to rationalise its resources and she recommended that the Māori Wing be changed every three to four years.[69]

In October 1993 the Māori Advisory Committee facilitated the return of the whaleboat Greyhound to Te Whānau ā Kaiaio at Maungaroa Marae, Te Kaha. This whaleboat had been deposited in the 1950s. Peter Gordon stated that the Māori Advisory Committee strongly supported the policy of returning taonga to other areas and the repatriation of Tairāwhiti taonga from other places. To this end the museum had created a small fund to enable taonga to be taken back to the district.[70]

8.4   Gisborne Museum and C Company (28th Māori Battalion) 1995-2002

Thompson resigned in late 1994 and Greg McManus,[71] Curator at the Manawatū Museum, Palmerston North, was appointed director in early 1995. Within weeks of his arrival the museum was approached by a delegation from C Company of the 28th Māori Battalion to discuss the role the museum might take in a major project to record and document the experiences of C Company members in World War Two and the experiences of their families who remained at home. On the advice of Sir Henare Ngata, and with the support of some of the veterans, the project committee approached the museum to determine if it could provide an appropriate base for the project.[72]

C Company was one of five companies of the 28th Māori Battalion that served in the Second World War. The members of C Company were drawn from the East Coast region, from Tarakeha near Tōrere in the Bay of Plenty to Paritu south of Muriwai near Gisborne. The members of C Company came from the following iwi: Ngāi Tai, Whānau-ā-Apanui, Ngāti Porou, Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti, Rongowhakaata, Te Aitanga-ā-Māhaki, and Ngāi

[69] Director's Report July 1993, Minute Book 1990-1995.
[70] *Gisborne Herald*, 15-1-93 Whaler returning to Te Kaha
[71] Greg McManus had completed an undergraduate degree in Archaeology at Auckland University, an MA in Museum Studies at Leicester University in England and had completed course work for a PhD in Anthropology at the University of British Columbia, studying under the supervision of Professor Michael Ames.
[72] Director's Report 15 May-14 June 1995, Minute Book 1995-1998. Soutar and Spedding 2000. *Improving Bicultural Relationships - a Case Study (The C Company 28 Māori Battalion collection and exhibition at Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre*. Wellington: Te Papa National Services, pp 4-5.

Tāmanuhiri (hereafter referred to as the C Company region). In 1994 a research team of academics and students from Te Pūtahi-ā-Toi, the School of Māori Studies, Massey University, and members of veterans' families began to gather materials relating to the history of C Company.

Inspired by the discovery of a letter written by Sir Apirana Ngata that foresaw a written history of C Company, and further motivated by the declining number of surviving C Company living veterans, the research team had begun to systematically videotape interviews with the veterans and their wives and families. The contribution of C Company is seen by the soldiers' descendants as the price Māori were willing to pay for equality in New Zealand. Sir Apirana Ngata portrayed the opportunity to enlist for the battalion as an opportunity for Māori to meet their obligations as New Zealand citizens. "By offering the ultimate sacrifice as the price of their citizenship, they felt that the Crown would be compelled to meet their obligations as partners to the Treaty of Waitangi" (Soutar and Spedding 2000: 5).[73]

Seventy percent of the one thousand men who enlisted from the C Company region were killed, wounded or made prisoners of war. As a result most Māori families in the East Coast region lost young men and the consequences of this are still felt today. Those men who returned had to adapt to civilian life again and suppress their war time experiences as best they could. Some of these men had hardly spoken of these experiences until they agreed to speak to their own young people who were working for the C Company Project.

The approach to the museum was not made without some reservations on the part of the veterans and the researchers. In their account of the history of this relationship Soutar and Spedding outline these reservations (Ibid.: 7-8). Many of the people associated with the C Company project had previously had little contact with museums. They were uncertain how to negotiate the custody of such a collection with a public institution in such a way

---

[73] Sir Henare Ngata noted that it was his view that Sir Apirana Ngata related the price of citizenship to Article Three of the Treaty of Waitangi: "The third article of the Treaty of Waitangi imparted to Māori the rights of British citizenship. Such rights, however, according to our elders, require on our part an acknowledgement that we in return have obligations. … I believe my view accurately reflects my father's view". Response to the first draft of this chapter, November 2002.

that they would maintain control and ensure appropriate care, access and use. There were also issues relating to the cost and management of the proposed exhibition. However, there were no other institutions at that time in the Tairāwhiti district where the collection could be deposited and exhibited with the care and expertise offered by the museum.

Museum staff were also faced with a number of issues as they embarked on this relationship with C Company. They needed to understand the significance of C Company to the people of Tairāwhiti. It was important that the museum clarify who could represent C Company in negotiations with the museum and what resources the project had to contribute to the care and exhibition of the collection while it was in the museum (Ibid.: 9).

The director was supportive of the project and offered to provide a home for the collection and the notion of an exhibition about C Company emerged from these early discussions. The Project Committee was receptive to this suggestion and indicated they would contribute to the cost. The director saw the opportunity for this exhibition to become an important element of the larger redevelopment strategy being considered by the museum at that time.[74] He reported to the museum council that, in order to participate effectively in such relationships and to develop such exhibitions, the museum would need to develop additional professional staff capacity:

> Of…serious concern is the lack of curatorial expertise particularly with reference to taonga Māori. As we progress further with plans for the possible redevelopment of a new Māori Wing, and as local iwi press ahead with demands for repatriation of taonga from other museums, it will be essential to have staff with curatorial expertise in dealing with taonga Māori, with the necessary skills and knowledge to consult and liaise with representatives of local iwi at a senior level, and with the knowledge of taonga in other museums that originated from Tairāwhiti. It would also be highly desirable, and probably essential, to have staff with fluency in Te Reo Māori.

---

[74] Director's Report 15 May-14 June 1995, p 2. Minute Book 1995-1998.

> It appears to me that, with the recent and swift developments involving the Māori Battalion project, the time to think about bringing these skills and knowledge on board is now.
>
> We would be sending a clear message to local iwi, and to other museums, that we intend to be proactive in the consultative processes leading to the proposed future development of the museum in collaboration with iwi.[75]

McManus recommended the appointment of Nick Tupara, then employed as a cultural property conservator, to the position of Manager of Conservation and Liaison Services/ Curator of Taonga Māori and Anthropology.[76] Tupara took on much of the responsibility for maintaining the relationship between the museum and C Company.

After a meeting with representatives of the C Company project committee, the Māori Advisory Committee approved the director's recommendation that the C Company Project be based at the museum.[77] This was the beginning of one of the most important relationships that has ever existed between the museum and the Māori communities of Tairāwhiti in so far as it provided a foundation upon which negotiations could begin with iwi about their representation in the museum's governance structure.

The C Company collection was deposited in the museum in August 1996. At the AGM in October the director noted the potential of the anticipated exhibition opening as an opportunity to introduce people to the proposed plans for the redevelopment of the museum's facilities.[78] While the redevelopment plans were on display in the museum when the C Company Exhibition *The Price of Citizenship* opened on 28 October 1996, this occasion was more memorable as the consummation of the museum's relationship with C Company. The relationship would go through difficult patches but it was one from which neither party could easily depart.

---

[75] Ibid.: 5
[76] Director's Report 10 August - 13 September 1995, Minute Book 1995-1998.
[77] Director's Report 15 June-12 July1995, Minute Book 1995-1998.
[78] Director's Report 22 August-11 September 1996, Minute Book 1995-1998.

Because of the focus on developing the exhibition there had been little time for the museum and C Company to reach a formal agreement about the care, access and use of the collection of videotapes, photographs, memorabilia and objects such as medals and other personal items from the veterans and their families. Soutar and Spedding (2000: 10-15_ outlined the issues of concern to the C Company group and the process followed to resolve them. The issues that arose included poor lines of communication, lack of consultation by the museum with C Company representatives about a grant application to the lottery board, the status of the exhibition at the museum, and control over access to the C Company collection.

In February 1997 the C Company group formed Ngā Taonga ā Ngā Tama Toa Trust. The purpose of the trust was:

> To provide the sole stewardship, preservation, revival and maintenance of the collection of oral history, photographs, memorabilia, videotapes, computer database, publications, books, written material, maps and history generally of the C Company and their descendants, to otherwise inform the world of the achievements of the members of C Company; and, inter alia, to promote and enhance Māori achievement and social wellbeing now and for the future generations of Māori.[79]

The trust commissioned a feasibility study to consult with C Company whānau throughout Tairāwhiti as to the most appropriate location for the C Company collection and to make recommendations about the future location, care, access and use of the collection. The study recommended that the trust should sign a five year agreement with the museum if appropriate conditions could be agreed (Butts and Soutar 1997).

After McManus took up the position of director of Rotorua Museum of Art and History, Michael Spedding was appointed director of Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre in May 1997. He immediately made it a priority to resolve the issues that had arisen between Ngā

---

[79] Ngā Taonga ā Ngā Tama Toa Trust Deed 1997.

Taonga ā Ngā Tama Toa Trust and the museum.[80] Both parties were determined to address the issues and to come to an agreement about the control, care, access and use of the collection. Some changes were made immediately within the museum: C Company photographs were no longer copied without the permission of Ngā Taonga ā Ngā Tama Toa Trust and the admission charge at the entrance to the museum was replaced with a koha system so that C Company families did not have to pay to see *The Price of Citizenship* (Soutar and Spedding 2000:14). A disputed debt for venue hire at the time of the exhibition opening was paid by the museum; and importantly, the museum director also apologised to C Company for any problems caused by the museum. These actions on the part of the director and trustees paved the way towards a more equitable relationship.

Over the next two years the museum and the trust worked towards a formal agreement. During this period the collection remained in the museum and the size of the exhibition was reduced to allow other exhibition projects to proceed. When the museum prepared an exhibition of C Company material and accompanied it to Tukaki Marae at Te Kaha for ANZAC Day 1998, Robert (Bob) Maru, Chairman of Ngā Taonga ā Ngā Tama Toa Trust wrote to thank the museum for this support:

> It was great to see your staff working in with the research team and the local people to make the effort one which will long be remembered. While some verbal thanks was delivered publicly, rest assured that the eyes have seen, the ears have heard and your efforts have been appreciated. In Māori circles it is often those comments that are made out of the public eye which make the stronger impression amongst our communities.[81]

The museum provided similar support for a C Company presentation at Auckland War Memorial Museum in November 1998. In June 1999 the museum signed a formal agreement with the trust for the deposit of the collection in the museum until 2003. Specific provisions ensured the respective rights and responsibilities of the museum and

---

[80] In response to the first draft of this chapter Sir Henare Ngata provided the following written comment: "Mike Spedding's involvement is a vital factor in the good relationship between the Museum and C Company, as well, of course, as Michael Chrisp's involvement and support. Without this goodwill a written agreement would not necessarily guarantee success." November 2002.
[81] Letter from Robert (Bob) Maru to Mike Spedding 3 May 1998, Minute Book 1995-1998, Tairāwhiti Museum Archive.

the trust relating to design and display of the collection, promotion and sponsorship, intellectual property, deposit, access and retrieval, delivery back of the collection, as well as the resolution of disputes and the termination of the agreement (Soutar and Spedding 2000: 21-32). Attached to the agreement is a kaitiaki agreement, the purpose of which is to ensure that authorised agents of the trust will be available as kaitiaki for the collection and information surrounding the collection for as long as it is in the museum (ibid.: 28).

The evolving relationship between the museum and the trust is part of the context within which the new governance model, the subject of the next section, developed. C Company reached across the tribal boundaries within Tairāwhiti and bound the C Company whānau together through their common experience of war, both abroad and at home. This common experience extended to the impact of the deaths of many men from the settlements of the region and the difficulties faced by many families as returned soldiers adapted to life after the war. The commitment made by the museum to C Company and Ngā Taonga ā Ngā Tama Toa Trust was increasingly acknowledged by the iwi of Tairāwhiti. The museum had demonstrated its goodwill towards the trust by developing exhibitions, travelling with the trust to make presentations in other centres and in the quality of care given to the collection deposited in the museum. From early 1998 the director was reporting regularly to the museum executive committee and council about the relationship with C Company and he was invited to attend the meetings of the trust. Trust members were also regularly visiting the museum to document the collection and maintain a dialogue with the director. The development of this relationship with C Company demonstrated the potential for a stronger relationship with iwi and at the same time gave the museum credibility when it proposed such a relationship in the form of a new governance model.

8.5   A New Governance Model 1999-2002
8.5.1   Towards a New Model

At the AGM of the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre in 1995 the number of Māori Advisory Committee members on the society's executive committee was increased from

one to two.[82] Early in 1996 the director initiated a process designed to modernise the Gisborne Museum and Arts Society's constitution in response to the need to achieve wider community representation on the council and to take account of the increasing complexity of the organisation. The first decision made by the core group established to guide the review process was to change from an incorporated society to a charitable trust. In a communication to members the president of the society outlined the reasons for the proposed changes to the constitution:

> As members are aware, the business and accountabilities of the museum have grown in scope to the extent that the current governance structure is unable to cope efficiently and effectively with all that is expected of it. The existing constitution of the Incorporated Society, dating back to 1953 and altered several times since, is now so out of date that it has ceased to be a useful basis upon which to govern the organisation and severely hinders the ability of the museum to actively pursue a range of new activities.[83]

The communication also reports that a workshop had been held at which the representatives of all interested groups were present, including all member groups, the Gisborne District Council, staff of the museum, and the council and executive of the society. The extent to which the Māori Advisory Committee or other iwi Māori organisations were consulted as part of this process is unclear from the records. While McManus had done much to improve staff conditions of employment, employ additional Māori staff and improve the standard of exhibitions and education programmes, little progress had been made in exploring governance models that would ensure a greater role for tangata whenua. For his replacement, Michael Spedding, this issue was seen as a high priority.

During this period of transition members of the Māori Advisory Committee took the initiative to call their own hui at Te Poho o Rawiri Marae. The hui discussed the review of the museum's governance arrangements and passed the following motions:

---

[82] Minutes of the Annual general Meeting of the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre 18 October 1995, Minute Book 1995-1998, Tairāwhiti Museum Archive.
[83] An Important Note to Members to Accompany the Agenda for the 1996 AGM of Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre, 9 October, 1996, Margaret Mettner, President.

Moved L. Tenahi./P. Gordon: that the Māori Advisory Committee supports the change from an Incorporated Society to a Charitable Trust. Carried.

Moved K. Walker[84]/ N Haronga: that there be 10 board members, 5 of them Māori as a true demonstration of partnership. Carried.[85]

These motions gave unequivocal support to the proposed change to a charitable trust but sent a clear signal about Māori expectation of equal representation on the new board. It is notable that Kate Walker (Ngāti Porou), a member of the Waitangi Tribunal, moved the second of these motions. Walker is an articulate advocate of the application of Treaty principles in public institutions. However, the motions did not provide a mechanism for appointing the Māori members of the board and it was not until Kiki Smiler wrote to Spedding in September that a model for Māori representation began to emerge. Smiler, a noted tribal historian of Ngāti Oneone hapū, had been a member of the Māori Advisory Committee for several years. His letter to the director provides insight into the critical situation facing the museum.[86]

---

[84] Kate Walker was a member of the Waitangi Tribunal and of Ngā Taonga a Ngā Tamatoa Trust.

[85] Minutes of the Executive Meeting 16 July 1997, Minute Book 1995-1998.

[86] 25/7/97

As a person interested in the operation of the museum, I believe the present Museum Trustees have within their power, the opportunity to create a new Museum Trust for the Tairāwhiti in which all peoples and cultures of this district will be satisfied.

Being familiar with current Māori rationale, I know for a fact they will not settle for anything less than equal representation on the Museum Trust Board, and firmly believe that unless this is realised, support for any future museum events will for the most part be at a minimum or not at all.

There is currently a major movement by some influential Māori to dis-associate themselves from the present museum, along with plans to establish an alternative centre to house Tairāwhiti *iwi, hapū* and *whānau taonga,* to be recovered from museums around the country including of course our local one.

I have personally been approached more than once by members of local Iwi Authorities and *hapū* groups advocating dis-association. Concern over what this would do to our district prompted me to intervene thus far discouraging any further advancement in this matter.

Understanding the concept of equal representation would settle this matter once and for all, I believe it is imperative the present trustees carefully consider the following comments and suggestions before the Trust Deed is finalised.

The Māori Advisory Committee is disbanded.

The new executive come under the new Constitution of Trust as:

The Trust shall consist of the following members who shall exercise the control and management of the Trust;

-	GDC	1	ex officio
-	Director	1	ex officio
-	One representative from each of the tribes: Te Aitanga-A-Mahaki, Ngāi Tamanuhiri, Rongowhakaata, Te Aitanga-A-Hauiti, Ngāti Porou,		

Following discussions with interested parties, the director proposed the following governance model:

     5 Iwi Representatives -   Te Aitanga-ā-Māhaki
                                     Ngāi Tamanuhiri
                                     Rongowhakaata
                                     Te Aitanga-a-Hauiti
                                     Ngāti Porou
     5 Friends of GMAC
     1 Gisborne District Council
     1 Director[1]

In support of this proposal he argued that it would meet the need for equitable representation for the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti and the wider community and it would satisfy the Gisborne District Council's request for broad representation of the community. He also recorded the support of the Māori Advisory Committee for the proposal. The only disadvantage of the proposal that he noted would be the large size of the board.[87]

Smiler's letter and the director's own proposal provide valuable insight into the key issues facing the museum in developing its relationship with tangata whenua. Those in the Māori community who continued to support the museum, generally in the older age group, were indicating that in creating the new trust the museum should take the opportunity to progress from having an advisory group to direct iwi representation on the board. It was clear that this representation needed to reflect the new political realities and that the major iwi of Te Tairāwhiti should have direct representation on the board. There was also the possibility of iwi organisations initiating their own cultural centres/museums and seeking the return of their cultural treasures, although there were divided opinions about the possibility of such developments among Tairāwhiti Māori. The museum council acknowledged the need to explore governance models that would build effective relationships with iwi and ensure the museum was able to provide appropriate care and

---

               -          the other five positions to be taken by appointees from District organisations
The Trustees appointed from time to time pursuant to this clause are hereinafter collectively referred to as "the trustees".
K. Smiler.

[87] Director's Monthly Report September 1997, Minute Book 1995-1997.

interpretations of taonga Māori. Subsequently, at the AGM in October 1997 the council placed before the membership a draft constitution for discussion proposing a board of five iwi representatives, four representatives of the Friends of the Museum and two appointments from the Gisborne District Council.[88]

At this point the constitutional review process at Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre connected with the Bicultural Programme of Te Papa National Services. Hinehaea Murphy had been contracted by Te Papa National Services to facilitate a series of hui designed to encourage dialogue between regional museums and tangata whenua (Murphy 1999). Murphy approached the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre offering to facilitate a hui at the museum, a timely offer given the need to seek a response from iwi to the proposed charitable trust and governance arrangements. A series of planning meetings were held with members of the Māori Advisory Committee taking a leading role.[89] Toko Te Kani, a local kaumatua who was involved in these meetings, stated very clearly that the time had come for Māori to have full participation, not just as "advisors".[90]

8.5.2   Governance Review Hui, February 5, 1998[91]

The hui, held on 5 February 1998, had two objectives: to discuss the proposed governance model for the new museum trust and to present a proposal for the further development of the museum facilities. The meeting began with an outline of the proposed constitutional changes, including the governance structure, by Margaret Mettner, Chairperson of the Museum Council. Ingrid Searancke, a member of the Māori Advisory Committee, then outlined the consultation that had occurred to date, noting in particular the motions passed at the hui held at Te Poho o Rawiri in May 1997. Questions from participants were wide-ranging, including clarification of current museum practices in relation to taonga Māori; the role of the Gisborne District Council as primary funder; and the issue of repatriation of

---

[88] Minutes of the Annual General Meeting of the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre 29 October 1997, Minute Book 1995-1998.
[89] Director's Report, November 1997; Director's Report, December 1997, Minute Book 1995-1998.
[90] Spedding (pers. comm. 2002)
[91] The observations in this section are taken from the typescript prepared by the Author from notes taken at the hui 'Mā Wai a Tātou Taonga e Tiaki? 5 February 1998, Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre.

Tairāwhiti taonga, especially in relation to the collections at Te Papa Tongarewa. Sir Henare Ngata spoke in favour of fifty percent Māori representation on the board although he questioned whether iwi representation included all relevant Māori groupings and suggested that if five places were allocated to iwi, then iwi should come together and decide collectively how these were to be allocated.

Kate Walker, who had been an active participant in the hui at Te Poho o Rawiri Marae the year before, spoke passionately of her dream to gather Ngāti Porou taonga within the tribal rohe and to establish a whare taonga under tribal control. She also spoke of the significance of the C Company project and the importance of this to the whole of Tairāwhiti. Selwyn Parata (Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou) supported her and also asked whether Rongomaiwahine (Māhia) and Ngāti Kahungunu (Hawkes Bay) should be represented. He noted that "the museum has obsolete connotations" and he wanted to see the development of a Ngāti Porou facility that exhibited the living culture. However, there were also speakers, generally of the older generation, who did not support the development of tribal cultural centres; some of these were individuals, such as Peter Gordon (former Secretary of the Museum Council and member of the Māori Advisory Committee), who had maintained a relationship with the museum over many years and who advocated the benefits of the museum as a resource for the whole community. Speakers were also cautionary about the funding required to sustain a tribal cultural centre. The hui decided to support the proposed governance relationship between iwi and the museum, though the details were to be considered by each iwi. It was also clear that the Ngāti Porou speakers would continue to explore the potential for their own whare taonga at Ruatoria, a vision that included the relocation of the C Company collection from the museum.

Apryll Parata (Ngāti Porou) summarised the main themes of the morning discussion: there had been general support for a review of the museum's governance arrangements; the proposed structure should be taken to iwi rūnanga for consideration; iwi had expressed a desire to control their own taonga; the museum should be able to help iwi develop their own facilities; further clarification was required of museum practices; repatriation was an

important issue for iwi. The following questions were also raised: how do museum trust boards communicate with the grass roots; how does a member of an iwi ensure that his/her point of view is heard by the museum trust board and should Rongomaiwahine and Kahungunu ki Wairoa be included?

During the afternoon the museum staff presented a proposal for facility development. Comments on the proposal reflected the type of museum Māori participants anticipated for the future. Sandy Adsett (Ngāti Pahauwera, Museum Executive Member, Director of Toihoukura, Tairāwhiti Polytechnic) and Ngapine Allen (Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti, artist and teacher) stressed the need for a flexible facility that could accommodate visitors and be used for a wide range of activities beyond the traditional limitations of museum gallery spaces.

Sir Henare Ngata skilfully drew the link between the morning and afternoon sessions when he said that Māori people would want to participate in the institution in a new way in the future. He suggested that Māori were a conservative people and that it would take some time for iwi to work together to use the museum as a site for the expression of the cultures of the different tribes and that although such expressions are normally to be found on the marae, the C Company exhibition provided a timely example of the potential of multi-tribal initiatives. Ngata cautioned that "creating the space is only the first step". The redevelopment must be built on a strong foundation such as that proposed in the constitutional review. He considered it too early for iwi to participate in any serious consideration of the facility development proposals outlined at the hui.

It was clear that the proposed governance structure for the new charitable trust largely met the requirements of the iwi representatives at the hui, although the Ngāti Porou representatives found the distribution of seats on the board problematic. In their view the distribution did not reflect the relative sizes of the respective iwi. They were also of the view that Te Aitanga a Hauiti is part of Ngāti Porou. These were issues that would require further consideration. Other issues for consideration were how Māori groups other than iwi could be represented and the rights and responsibilities of trustees. The council of the

Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre made the commitment to provide detailed information on the proposals to each iwi and to follow this with individual consultation.

8.5.3   Further Developments

In July 1998 Joseph Pihema was appointed curator of collections.[92] Pihema was soon appointed assistant director and became actively involved in policy development, exhibition development and maintaining relationships with Māori communities. Planning was underway for a new C Company exhibition and links with Toihoukura and Ngā Puna Waihanga were continuing to strengthen. A new relationship had begun with Kauwae, a collective of Māori women artists. Their first exhibition was held at the museum in July 1998. The director considered this an appropriate time to formalise the emphasis that was being placed on the collection of contemporary Māori art, particularly that of Te Tairāwhiti.[93] Planning had also begun for the Ruamano Symposium of Māori Culture to be held in January 2000. This was to be a major festival of Māori arts and performance developed under the leadership of the assistant director. The institution was engaging with the Māori community and Māori organisations on a broad front: for example, museum staff accompanied C Company for their presentations at the National Library and Auckland War Memorial Museum. By the end of the year the museum had introduced free admission and the number of visitors during the year had doubled.[94] Perhaps most significant of all, fifty percent of the staff positions were now filled by Māori.[95] This enabled a range of new initiatives to be offered. For example, the museum education programme (funded by a LEOTC contract) was able to offer a bi-lingual component drawing on both education staff and the assistant director (formerly a Māori language teacher).

---

[92] Director's Report June 1998, Minute Book 1995-1998.
[93] Director's Report, July 1998, Minute Book 1995-1998.
[94] Minutes of the AGM of the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre 7 December, 1998, Minute Book 1995-1998.
[95] The museum staff at this time included: Michael Spedding (Director), Joseph Pihema (Curator of Collections, soon to be appointed Assistant Director), Jolene Douglas (Curator of Art), Toni Lloyd (Visitor Services Officer), Naomi Maurirere (Administration Officer), Anne Milton-Tee (Collections Manager), Cynthia McCann (Education Officer), Gaynor Rogers (Education Officer), Dudley Meadows (Photographer), Noel Dunn (Facilities, Security, Maintenance Officer), Amber Cresswell (Weekend Supervisor), George Glover (Weekend Supervisor), Dommi Carrington (Weekend Supervisor).

It is important to recognise that this institution had been through a period of significant development in its relationships with iwi in Te Tairāwhiti before the transition to the charitable trust and the new governance structure, resulting in the following factors: the museum council and the director had been effective in building relationships with Māori organisations, educational programmes, and artists groups; long standing Māori members of the museum council had taken a proactive role; the museum had engaged in a number of positive and mutually beneficial projects that had provided a platform of trust and good will; and moreover, the museum had been pro-active in developing over a number of years a group of Māori museum practitioners who had been instrumental in maintaining relationships and developing innovative museum programmes. At the same time there was an awareness of the need for the organisation to continue to evolve and to re-examine the purpose and functions of the museum. The Pākehā members of the executive committee were especially supportive of the need for change and the chairperson, in particular, supported the director in his advocacy of the change to the new governance model. Although the need to develop more formal relationships with iwi, particularly through the tribal authorities, had not been resolved, the new governance model would facilitate this process.

One event was symbolic of the changing attitudes within the museum that characterise this period of transition. In May 1999 Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre returned a patu pounamu to Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti at Tolaga Bay. The patu had been found at an eroded urupā in Karaka Bay in 1977 by a local school teacher who subsequently moved to another area. In 1984 the patu was given to the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre. Because the patu was found after 1975 it is subject to the provisions of the Antiquities Act 1975 and therefore is prima facie the property of the Crown. In the 1990s members of Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti learned that the patu was being held at the museum on behalf of the Crown and asked for it to be returned. The museum director and council agreed that it was most appropriate that the patu should be returned but Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti Trust had to become a registered collector under the Antiquities Act (1975) before it could be returned to them. In May 1999, only one month before the new museum trust was formed,

kaumātua, museum council members, the director, and staff, formally returned the patu to Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti in a ceremony at Puketawai Marae (Akuhata-Brown 1999). The willingness of the museum to facilitate the return of the patu strengthened the relationship between the museum and Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti.

8.5.4   A New Governance Structure

In June 1999 the museum became a charitable trust.[96] Four trustees were appointed by iwi, Ngāti Porou initially declining to make an appointment to the trust board stating that they should have been allocated more than one position in recognition of their size relative to the other iwi. This was the first public museum trust board in New Zealand to provide this level of representation for iwi at governance level. Moreover, the district council and the members of the museum society also appointed Māori representatives, resulting in a Māori majority on the trust board. The ready acceptance of the new model by the major stakeholders in the institution is largely explained by the fact that Māori make up nearly 50% of the population of Te Tairāwhiti. Consequently, the proposed level of Māori representation on the trust board was seen to be consistent with the composition of the population in Gisborne City and the wider Tairāwhiti region.

The significance of the trust board composition is apparent when placed in the context of the history of the relationships between iwi and museums. Few institutions have progressed beyond appointing one or two Māori members to their governance body, and while some governance structures, such as the Taumata-ā-Iwi at Auckland War Memorial Museum, have strengthened the advisory capacity of tangata whenua, Whanganui Regional Museum has the only other trust deed that has resulted in the type of partnership

---

[96] The governance provisions of the constitution are discussed in detail in Chapter Five. The Gisborne District Council appointed Alan de Latour (accountant, former Treasurer of the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Society) and Sandy Adsett to the trust board. Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Inc. Society appointed Pam Bain (Department of Conservation Archaeologist, former museum council member), Michael Chrisp (lawyer, former museum council member), Ingrid Searancke (former museum council member and member of the Māori Advisory Committee), and Sheryl Smail (CEO Tairāwhiti Hospital Board). Trustees appointed by iwi included Anne McGuire (Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti, Tairāwhiti Polytechnic Tutor), Erena Nepe (Rongowhakaata), Libby Kerr (Te Aitanga-ā-Mahaki), and Temple Isaacs (Ngāi Tamanuhiri).

that has been created in the Gisborne Museum of Art and History Trust Constitution (Tairāwhiti Museum).

Once the trust was established, the question arose of a new name for the museum. A number of criteria were established. It was thought that the new name should encapsulate the museum philosophy, be inclusive of the whole community, be easy to say for both Māori and Pākehā, and lend itself to incorporation in a logo and other graphic design elements associated with the museum.[97] When Apirana Mahuika joined the board as the Ngāti Porou representative in June 2000, the topic was still on the agenda. Mahuika put forward the name, Te Whare Taonga o Te Tairāwhiti, which was embraced by the board.[98] Mahuika stressed the importance of given names to the Māori. He sought a name that bound the iwi of the region together, listing the links that existed between the iwi of Tairāwhiti including waka links, whakapapa links and C Company (28th Māori Battalion) links. The offering of this name can also be seen as a symbolic embracing of the museum by the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti. The trust board was concerned about the potential abuse of a name given with a meaning and it was decided that Te Whare Taonga o Te Tairāwhiti should not be used for commercial purposes; therefore, it was decided to use 'Tairāwhiti Museum' as the brand name for the museum.

The next issue for the board was to develop a statement of purpose, or mission statement. To begin this process a wānanga for board members and museum staff was held at the museum in September 1999. Māori staff and board members met separately at the beginning of the meeting and reported back on three issues that had arisen in their discussions. The first was the level of access Māori staff should have to Māori trustees to discuss issues relating to the museum. Normal practice within such institutions is for staff to communicate with trustees through the director. The Māori trustees suggested that they considered direct communication with Māori staff appropriate because of their whakapapa links and to ensure cultural safety within the institution. The second issue related to the role of the Māori trustees in representing hapū and iwi interests: the view was expressed

---

[97] Director's Report July 1999, Minute Book 1999-2002.
[98] Minutes of the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Trust Board Meeting 14 September 2000, Minute Book 1999-2002.

that on certain issues they had responsibilities beyond the museum. The Māori trustees acknowledged that they needed to work together to find their common ground as iwi representatives.[99] Although the Māori trustees have met by themselves to discuss a range of issues, such meetings are held irregularly. However, in June 2000 the board determined to add Iwi Issues as a standard item on the agenda.[100]

Participants in the wānanga also raised issues relating to the use of Māori language and cultural concepts. Should the statement of purpose be written in both Māori and English and did one need to be a translation of the other? In conceptualising the purpose of the institution could English and Māori conceptual terms be treated as equivalents? Although both Māori and English statements of purpose were proposed to the board, in November 1999 the board approved only the following English version: "To be the cultural centre where the life and times of the Tairāwhiti region and its history, art and culture are recognised and nurtured".[101]

The board approved a new collection management policy, and began to develop specific policies for repatriation, kōiwi and kaitiakitanga. Draft policies were proposed to the board in June 2000 and were then discussed at length, particularly by the Māori trustees.[102] The fact that the museum had Māori staff who could undertake a drafting process was an important factor in generating documents that captured the essential elements of such a policy. As a matter of immediate concern the museum was committed to working closely with hapū and iwi to return the small number of kōiwi Māori in the care of the museum to descendants; the Kōiwi Tangata Policy was designed to facilitate this process. The policy approved by the board in July 2000 applies to kōiwi tangata of all ethnic origins: the museum will not collect kōiwi tangata and those that are held in the museum are not considered as part of the museum collection, and a wāhi tapu will be

---

[99] Director's Report September 1999, Minute Book 1999-2002.
[100] Minutes of the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Trust Board Meeting 8 June 2000, Minute Book 1999-2002.
[101] Minutes of the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Trust Board, 11 November 1999, Minute Book 1999-2002. It is unclear the extent to which the trustees had the notion of an indigenous cultural centre in mind when endorsing this statement.
[102] I refer to Māori trustees rather than iwi representatives because there are Māori trustees who are not iwi representatives but who made a significant contribution to the consideration of these issues.

maintained by the museum for storage, care and protection of kōiwi tangata and waka kōiwi. The wāhi tapu is afforded the same degree of respect as any urupā/burial site. The policy provides guidelines for the registration and documentation of the kōiwi tangata: access to kōiwi tangata and to records relating to them is subject to permission from the relevant hapū or iwi authority, or in the case of unprovenanced kōiwi tangata, permission from the director (in consultation with the iwi representatives). The news media will not be given access to the kōiwi tangata held by the museum, nor will such kōiwi tangata be used by the museum for the purpose of museum display.

The Kaitiakitanga (Guardianship) Policy was considered at some length at the August 2000 meeting of the trust board. The policy began by acknowledging "the considerable change that has taken place, nationally and internationally, regarding cultural appropriateness in the treatment, storage and display of items currently cared for by museums". This policy protected the rights of tangata whenua in the management of their taonga held in the museum.

The Repatriation Policy acknowledged national and international developments in recent years. The museum also acknowledged the rights and aspirations of claimants to taonga held in the museum and provided a process for the consideration of those claims:

> The museum recognises that the spiritual ownership of taonga Māori resides with hapū and iwi and, as such, the repatriation of taonga will be facilitated if it is an appropriate action, within the context of a partnership with hapū and iwi, subject to any acquisition conditions.

Those making a claim for the repatriation of taonga would need to provide evidence of a clear relationship to the taonga, evidence that there were no counter-claims from other interested parties, and evidence of a clear case for the return of the taonga. The museum would, where appropriate, provide assistance to hapū and iwi making claims for items

residing in other regions. The three policies - Kōiwi Tangata, Kaitiakitanga and Repatriation, were finally approved in October 2000.[103]

Another priority for the board was to consolidate its relationship with the Gisborne District Council, the primary funder of the museum. By November 1999 the director was beginning to receive feedback from district councillors that there was an increasing appreciation of recent developments at the museum.[104] This may have reflected an appreciation of the visible changes in exhibitions and public programmes and increasing visitor numbers as much as any real appreciation for the significance of the governance changes.[105] Despite this positive response, in June 2000 the district council indicated that it would reduce the annual grant to the museum by ten percent.[106] The chairperson and the director began negotiations with the Gisborne District Council for a long term agreement for the museum's occupancy and maintenance of the site and buildings and for operational funding. Support for the museum came from the local Māori newspaper *Pipiwharauroa*:

> *Pipiwharauroa* is concerned about recent publicity attacking the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre. The museum is a major attraction for tourist and local alike and recent exhibitions and events such as Wānanga 2000 show the museum to be worth every dollar allocated. *Pipiwharauroa* is concerned at the Gisborne District Council's Community Development Committee questioning the validity of the museum's level of funding. The museum plays an integral part in the promotion of Gisborne and as such requires a level of funding better than currently being allocated in order to continue its excellent service to Māori, tourism and the community of Te Tairāwhiti.[107]

The museum needed a longer term agreement if the annual funding uncertainty was to be avoided or at least minimised. Removing this uncertainty would allow for more specific strategic planning and development. In November 2000 the trust board signed an agreement with the Gisborne District Council that ensured the current level of operational

---

[103] Minutes of the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Trust Board, 12 October 2000, Minute Book 1999-2002.
[104] Director's Report November 1999, Minute Book 1999-2002.
[105] Spedding (pers. comm., 25-04-02).
[106] Director's Report June 1999, Minute Book 1999-2002.
[107] *Pipiwharauroa* Vol. 8 No. 2, Hui-tanguru, 2000.

funding would be assured for the next twenty-one years with the right to renegotiate the level of funding every three years.[108] The museum was also part way through a major LEOTC (Learning Experiences Outside the Classroom) contract with the Ministry of Education. This contract provided the funding for the museum's education programme and it was a significant proportion of the museum's budget. Unfortunately the LEOTC funding could not be guaranteed beyond the term of the contract.

While the public record demonstrates that the new trust board was managing the museum very effectively, discussions with the director and trust board members identified some issues that arose during the transition period. These issues range from a lack of regular attendance on the part of some trustees to finding an appropriate mode of operating meetings to ensure that all members could feel confident to participate in the full range of the business of the board. It was a challenge to ensure that the appointment processes for the trust board members, for both iwi and the wider community, identified people who have the skills, interest and commitment to participate fully in the governance of the museum. Beyond the operations of the board there had also been some criticism from a small number of Pākehā members of the community about a perceived increase in the proportion of Māori exhibitions at the museum. There was also criticism of the new name. The extent of the perceived 'backlash' to the changes at the museum was minor in comparison to the level of public criticism experienced after the changes to the governance structure at Whanganui Regional Museum.

Having decided on a new name, approved a policy framework for the management of collections and negotiated a secure relationship with the primary funders, the Gisborne District Council and the Ministry of Education, the trust board and the professional staff were in a position to begin to look both forward and outward. During 2001 the museum began to develop a number of initiatives that came to fruition in 2002. The LEOTC programme, after initially being reduced by the ministry, was renegotiated and was eventually extended to include an out-reach facility, known as Ruakaka[109], at Tolaga Bay

---

[108] Minutes of the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Trust Board, 9 November 2000, Minute Book 1999-2002.

[109] Ruakaka is named after a former whare wānanga at Tolaga Bay.

Area School. Cynthia McCann (Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti/Tolaga Bay), Museum Education Officer, provided a museum education programme at Ruakaka three days each week. The school had made a classroom available for the museum to use and this had been turned into a museum gallery with three concurrent exhibitions including *C Company, Nanny and Papa's Day* and a small art exhibition. The patu pounamu the museum returned to Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti in 1999, it was also on display at Ruakaka from time to time .

Although Ruakaka was designed primarily to provide museum education programmes for students at primary and secondary schools on the East Coast, there had been considerable interest in the exhibits from the East Coast communities, especially because of the inclusion of the display about C Company. On ANZAC Day 2002 the dawn service at Tolaga Bay was held at the gates to the Tolaga Bay Area School and Ruakaka was opened so that people could visit the C Company display. Although Tolaga Bay Area School made regular use of Ruakaka, by the end of the year it had become apparent that other schools on the East Coast were not using the facility to the extent that had been anticipated. Consequently, the museum board had begun to explore options of developing a mobile education vehicle that would make it possible to take the programme to schools around the coast.

In 2001 a representative group from Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti approached the museum to cooperatively plan an exhibition of their taonga.[110] The exhibition was to draw on taonga held by Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti and taonga currently held in public collections. Unfortunately the costs associated with loaning taonga from the major metropolitan collections, including Te Papa Tongarewa, meant that these taonga were not available for the exhibition. The exhibition opened in May 2002 at the museum. Subsequently, the museum decided to embark on a series of exhibitions with the five iwi represented on the trust board. The new series of exhibitions would each be on display for an extended period, possibly up to two years.[111] The first of this series was to be with Te Aitanga-ā-Māhaki, with planning beginning in mid-2002. The project was to include creating a database of Te

---

[110] Director's Report February and March 2001, Minute Book 1999-2002.
[111] Director's Report August and September 2001, Minute Book 1999-2002.

Aitanga-ā-Māhaki taonga in New Zealand museums and eventually taonga held in public collections in other countries. However, by the end of 2002 it had become apparent that Te Aitanga-ā-Māhaki were not yet ready to move forward with these projects and the museum was exploring other options.

Two further initiatives demonstrated the willingness of the trust board and the staff to work on projects that reach beyond the traditional core business of the museum. The trust board agreed to the director acting as facilitator of a project that would bring together all interested parties to redevelop the Cook Landing Site Memorial and the surrounding historic precinct.[112] The Cook landing site was also the landing site of the voyaging waka Horouta. The museum director worked full-time on initiating the project for six weeks in May-June 2002, believing that the site was of regional and national significance to Māori and Pākehā and that because of the composition of the museum's governance body it was well placed to guide a project of this nature.[113]

The second initiative was to hold wānanga in partnership with Te Papa National Services to consider ways in which iwi could develop a capacity to provide their own museum and archive services and to explore ways in which the museum might assist in this process. The first wānanga was held in June 2002.

Understanding the broad patterns of change in museums depends on knowledge of the wider international and national context within which they are operating. Understanding the patterns of change in particular institutions depends on knowledge of the historical and contemporary context and the demographic characteristics of the community within which each institution operates. Within each institution there were individuals, groups of people and public agencies who had been critical to the evolution of the institution and to the evolution of relationships with particular parts of the community. In this chapter the evolving relationships with the Māori community and the individuals, groups and agencies who were influential in the recent changes at Tairāwhiti Museum have been identified.

---

[112] Director's Report October and November 2001, Minute Book 1999-2002.
[113] Move to end the cone conflict: Museum to act as facilitator. *Gisborne Herald,* 8-2-2001.

The key public agencies were the Gisborne District Council and the Ministry of Education. Important groups of people were the museum staff, museum council and executive, the affiliated groups, the Māori Advisory Committee, and C Company. Important individuals were those who had been circuit breakers, those who had taken a key role in resolving difficult issues, initiating innovations and building relationships. Many individuals made significant contributions to the transition from the incorporated society to the charitable trust and the new governance structure. One person who was pivotal in all accounts of the transition was the museum director. His role is considered in more detail in Chapter Nine.

Tairāwhiti Museum made the transition from a museum that was governed by the narrow membership base of an incorporated society to an institution that was governed by representatives of the tangata whenua of the region and representatives of the wider community. While there was a strong sense of continuity through this transition, building on a foundation that had been created in the period leading to the constitutional change, the museum also opened the door to a new set of challenges and opportunities. The board and the director recognised the realities involved in creating a 'common ground' where tangata whenua could operate according to their own tikanga, as well as negotiate and accommodate relationships with the wider community.

In order to reach beneath the historical narrative outlined in this chapter through the medium of interviews, Chapter Nine explores the significance of the historical associations between the museum and iwi, the museum's relationship with C Company, the constitutional changes, and the role of the director.

CHAPTER NINE
TAIRĀWHITI MUSEUM:
GOVERNANCE TRANSFORMATION

9.0   Introduction

This chapter is based on interviews that were carried out with individuals involved in the governance and management of the Tairāwhiti museum. A former Māori Advisory Committee chairperson, members of the museum trust board (1999-2002), Māori and Pākehā, and the museum director, were interviewed in order to explore their understanding of historical and contemporary relationships between tangata whenua and the museum and the recent changes in the governance of the museum.

The politics of indigenous recognition in the museum context emerge at different levels: in relationships that have been developed with the indigenous community throughout the history of the institution; in contemporary relationships between individuals in the museum and individuals in the indigenous community; in relationships between the museum and special interest groups within the indigenous community; and in formal governance relationships between the museum and the representative body of the indigenous community. It is argued that in order to facilitate indigenous recognition, museum trustees, managers and staff should recognise the importance of building relationships at all these levels. Governance reform may mean that the formal relationships between museums and tangata whenua may change from relationships with individuals and whānau to relationships with hapū or iwi organisations such as rūnanga. However, if museums are to engage effectively with Māori they will need to maintain their relationships at all levels.

This chapter explores a complex set of historical and contemporary relationships between Tairāwhiti Museum and local Māori. It is argued that these relationships provided a

foundation for the development of a new museum governance model. There is evidence that iwi may have attempted to remove their taonga tuku iho from the museum in the late 1990s had it not been for the intervention of senior Māori who had had a long association with the museum. The same kaumatua who drew this possibility to the attention of the museum also offered a solution that required a significant reform of the museum's governance arrangements to enable the recognition of iwi in Te Tairāwhiti. This chapter explores the nature and significance of the museum's new governance arrangements and the relationships that emerged. The insight provided by the research participants enables the analysis to reach beneath the historical narrative presented in Chapter Eight to further elucidate the changes that have taken place.

The first section of the chapter analyses the nature of the evolving relationships between Māori and Tairāwhiti Museum during the period 1954 to the mid-1990s, focusing on the Māori Museum Committee in the 1950s, the Māori Advisory Committee established in 1989, and relationships maintained with a small number of Māori families, mainly living in the Gisborne area.

Section 9.2 of this chapter documents the significance of the relationship between the museum and C Company from the perspective of the director, the museum trustees and a member of Ngā Taonga ā Ngā Tama Toa Trust. It is argued that this relationship has been fundamental to the successful transition to the museum's new governance model. It is a complex relationship that is continues to evolve and that is likely to play an important role in the future development of the museum.

Section 9.3 records the significance the trustees attach to the museum's new governance structure. Sub-themes in this section include indigenous recognition, Māori trustees' attitudes to museums, the nature of taonga, kaitiakitanga, and mandate. Section 9.4 explores the significance of leadership in change management. While undertaking the interviews for this case study it became apparent that the museum director had played a pivotal role in facilitating the museum's transition from an incorporated society to a charitable trust. His motivation to initiate change and his management of the transition are

examined. The section also provides insight into the director's museum management style and his ability to build and maintain relationships.

9.1 Historical Relationships

The historical relationships between Tairāwhiti Museum and the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti developed from the participation by individuals in the 1950s Māori Museum Committee, the ongoing relationships with certain Māori families from the Gisborne area and the Māori Advisory Committee that operated from the late 1980s.

As has been outlined in Chapter Eight, soon after the Gisborne Arts Society was established in the mid-1950s the society established its own museum. When the museum committee sought to involve Māori in the development of the museum an approach was made to one of the leading authorities on tribal history and whakapapa in Tairāwhiti. During this period the relationship between the museum and the Māori community was through such individuals and not based on iwi representation. Relationships also began to develop with families who deposited their taonga in the museum.

In an interview with Sir Henare Ngata, the only surviving member of the Māori Museum Committee established in 1954, he indicated that Rongowhakaata Halbert, the chairman, was the driving force behind the committee.[1] Halbert was an authority on the Māori history of Tairāwhiti and the descendants of the Horouta canoe in particular. The other individual who took an active role in the work of the committee was Kahu Te Hau, a welfare officer with the Department of Māori Affairs in Gisborne. Part of his role as a welfare officer was to represent Māori in community initiatives. These two men were drawn into the museum through Rongowhakaata Halbert's friendship with Leo Fowler, Manager of the Gisborne Radio Station. Fowler was "a friend of the Māori people" of the Gisborne area who had an interest in the Māori history of Tairāwhiti and published a book on the whare nui Te Mana o Tūranga at Manutuke. Fowler asked Halbert to become chairman of the Māori Museum Committee, of which he was secretary.

---

[1] The information in this section is derived from an interview with Sir Henare Ngata, Gisborne, May 2002.

Sir Henare Ngata had the following thoughts on why Rongowhakaata Halbert and the other members of the committee would have been so supportive of the development of a Māori collection at the museum:

> The time really was past for families to retain the possession of valuable articles, not only artefacts, but manuscripts and so on, … they should be deposited in a place offering security and safety. I imagine that would have been the thinking behind the plea to our people that, while these things existed, they should be deposited in a safe place.[2]

Ingrid Searancke (Māori Trustee appointed by Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Society Inc.), who has had a long association with the museum, made a similar observation:

> They are mainly things that we knew we shouldn't throw away, and families were bringing in things here. They knew that home wasn't the place to hide them in case somebody didn't know how to look after them. And some of the things that were put here, it's just marvellous that they are here, for instance the cloaks, the collections from the Chrisp families: they became the guardians of the cloaks … and they wouldn't have them anywhere else.[3]

Although there was an appeal for taonga Māori by the Māori Advisory Committee, this did not mean that the committee was recommending that Māori families transfer ownership of such taonga to the museum. As far as Sir Henare was aware, it had been the practice of Māori families in Tairāwhiti, who had placed taonga in museums, that they were doing so only on loan to ensure that such items were accessible for future generations. He also suggested that it may have been the limited response to this appeal for taonga that caused the committee to feel that there was not much further purpose in meeting. The response that did occur came mainly from families in Gisborne or from the surrounding area, and Sir Henare commented that: "the more distant they are from Gisborne, the less regard they have for Gisborne and for the museum as a place they can

---

[2] Interview with Sir Henare Ngata, May 2002.
[3] Interview with Ingrid Searancke, December 1, 1999, p. 16.

look to".[4] In the 1950s the movement of Māori to the urban areas was only beginning. In 1956 Māori comprised only 7 percent of the Gisborne population compared with nearly 50 percent in 2002. Naturally, Māori families in the outlying settlements of Tairāwhiti were much less likely than families living in the city and surrounding districts to deposit their taonga in a museum in Gisborne.[5]

Ingrid Searancke's family has had a long association with the museum. Searancke, who has lived in the Gisborne area most of her life, noted that her grandfather and parents were "great supporters at the beginning of the museum". This association with the museum seems to have resulted, in part, from the relationship between Mrs Searancke's family and the Lysnar family who donated the building and land for the museum. As a young adult Mrs Searancke had assisted Winifred Lysnar in collecting material for the museum and she and her parents participated when the Gisborne Māori Women's Welfare League came to the museum to assist with exhibitions and other activities. Ingrid Searancke remembered a number of older members of the Māori community being associated with the early development of the museum.[6] She left Gisborne for a period but re-established her association with the museum when she returned, eventually becoming a council member, member of the executive and member of the Māori Advisory Committee from the early 1990s.

There are a small number of Māori families in the Gisborne area that have maintained such long term relationships with the museum. These relationships may have been through taonga deposited in the collection or through association with the museum society. Such associations have been maintained from one generation to the next by a small number of individuals who have had a particular interest in tribal history, whakapapa, and other aspects of Māori heritage. Orwell Halbert, Nona Haronga and Peter Gordon, for example, maintained the association with the museum that had been initiated by Rongowhakaata Halbert (Nona Haronga's father) in the 1950s. These relationships were of a different

---

[4] Interview with Sir Henare Ngata, May 2002. Changing the name of the museum from Gisborne Museum to Tairāwhiti Museum was a subtle way of beginning to change the way people in the region perceive the museum. The emphasis is increasingly on the museum as a regional facility.
[5] Interview with Sir Henare Ngata, May 2002
[6] Interview with Ingrid Searancke, 1 December 1999, p.14-16

nature to the relationships being initiated between the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti and the Tairāwhiti Museum through iwi representation on the museum trust board; however, a number of those who were museum trustees at the time of writing had close connections to individuals and families that have had a long association with the museum. The earlier relationships were motivated by personal interest, the care of whānau taonga and the association of whānau with the museum, in some cases since its inception, and by relationships with some of the early Pākehā members of the museum society. However, it was not until the relationship between C Company, 28th Māori Battalion and the Tairāwhiti Museum was established that the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti focused once again on the museum with the same level of interest that had been evident in the Māori Museum Committee in the 1950s.

9.2   The C Company (28th Māori Battalion) Relationship

This section examines three aspects of the significance of the relationship between C Company and the museum: the significance of the relationship between the museum and C Company as a precursor of the new governance model; the significance of the C Company exhibition (exhibition or memorial, celebration or challenge); and the significance the relationship with C Company will have on the future development of the museum.

9.2.1   C Company and the Transition to the New Governance Model.

The evolving relationship between C Company and Tairāwhiti Museum has been outlined in detail by Soutar and Spedding (2000) and a brief account of the development of the relationship is given in Chapter Eight as part of the historical narrative. Further elucidation is required to explain the significance of this relationship in the period leading to the new governance arrangements at the Tairāwhiti Museum. At the signing of the agreement between Tairāwhiti Museum and C Company the chairman of Ngā Taonga a Ngā Tama Toa Trust, Robert Maru, himself a member of C Company, stated that every Māori family

throughout Tairāwhiti had some relationship with C Company.[7] In this observation Maru captured the significance of C Company to both the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti and to the Tairāwhiti Museum.

By establishing a formal relationship with C Company the museum was, in a sense, establishing a relationship with all Māori within Tairāwhiti, and even beyond to iwi such as Whānau-ā-Apanui. The museum demonstrated its goodwill and commitment to a project that was of significance to the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti by resolving outstanding grievances and reaching a contractual agreement with C Company. Through this process the museum council and the director in particular had also begun to build relationships with individuals and families throughout Tairāwhiti. Sir Henare Ngata, the 'settlor' of Ngā Taonga a Ngā Tama Toa Trust, confirmed the sound relationship that has developed between the trust and the museum:

> Mike [museum director] arrived at a critical time in the development of the C Company relationship. Mike was looked to to provide the answers. … He is very understanding of C Company and it's an attitude that he has imparted to his staff. … It's been a very happy relationship. We enjoy the freedom we asked for and the collection is well housed and the staff are very attentive to the collection. No complaints whatever about the way the staff deal with the collection.[8]

Also important from a political perspective was the recognition of the significance of the relationship between C Company and the museum by the various iwi rūnanga in Tairāwhiti. The fact that this recognition was established in the period prior to the development and proposal of the new museum governance model provided a foundation that gave the museum greater credibility in its discussions with rūnanga. The existing relationship between the museum and C Company meant that the people who were considering the proposed new governance arrangement involving iwi representation already had an important relationship with the museum that had formally recognised

---

[7] K. Walsh, Battalion taonga finds home: C Company Trust and museum sign agreement. *Gisborne Herald.* June 1999.
[8] Interview with Sir Henare Ngata, May 2002.

issues of ownership and kaitiakitanga. The museum had shown its willingness to change position and recognise that the ownership and therefore the control of the collection lay with C Company and that therefore nothing would be done in relation to the collection or the exhibition of the collection without consultation with and approval by Ngā Taonga a Nga Tama Toa Trust. The museum acknowledged and supported the right of the families of C Company to maintain easy access to the collection, both in storage and in the form of an exhibition, and it was recognised there would be times when the museum could work with the families to make the collection available on marae and at other events organised by the trust.

Initially C Company had wanted the museum to employ someone whose whakapapa connected them to C Company to work with the C Company archive and create the second C Company exhibition. However, this requirement was met in part by the fact that during this period the museum increased the number of Māori staff and two of these staff, a receptionist and an education officer, did have connections with C Company. Although they were not employed specifically to work with C Company, these staff members and other Māori staff worked closely with the C Company research team and Ngā Taonga ā Ngā Tama Toa Trust trustees in documenting the collection, naming photographs and creating a new exhibition. As a result of this team approach, by the end of 1999 the researchers and the trustees had written most of the labels for the exhibition:

> The C Company trust are having a considerable degree of say over the nature of their display. They indicated over a series of meetings to us what's important to them to display and how to display it. They have basically written the labels. We have combinations where some of the veterans and some of the researchers have written most of the labels for the exhibition, because I think from my point of view it's more important that they present to the community: to their community and also to the broader community, what it means to a young [Māori] person. It's much more important that that get embodied in the exhibition than it is the museum putting its interpretation on it.[9]

---

[9] Interview with Michael Spedding, 2 December 1999, p. 14.

The director acknowledged that the experience of working so closely with C Company has influenced his thinking about the role of the museum in the wider community; not only in terms of facilitating a greater level of participation in-house, especially with exhibitions and of seeing " the value of doing things other than the way we might want to do them", but also in developing "a greater level of participation in decision making inside the museum" and taking the collection to the community:

> The C Company collection relates to however many marae there are on the coast and all the people associated with them and we've had the absolute pleasure of taking parts of the exhibition to places like Te Kaha and places on the coast … for me, it's starting to give me a real sense of the excitement and almost urgency that we've got to really look at our role outside of these four walls.[10]

All of the museum trustees interviewed, Māori and Pākehā, recognised the significance for the museum of the relationship with C Company. Anne McGuire (Museum Trustee for Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti) had seen a transformation as the research was undertaken and the archive created and the veterans of C Company realised that after they had gone they would have passed on their legacy to the families of C Company:

> It's become a taonga, that collection as a whole, and it belongs, not to C Company, but to the families of C Company. And I think that is really important, that's the important thing that's come out of it. It doesn't belong to the army, it doesn't belong to the soldiers of the 28th, it belongs to the families, because it's the families who gave up those taonga to form that exhibition.[11]

For Anne McGuire there was a direct connection between involvement in the relationship between the museum and C Company and participation on the new trust board both personally and for her iwi:

---

[10] Interview with Michael Spedding, 2 December 1999, p. 16.
[11] Transcript of interview with Anne McGuire, 29 November 1999, p. 23. Anne McGuire taught at Tairāwhiti Polytechnic, Gisborne and was actively involved in a range of heritage initiatives being advanced by Aitanga-ā-Hauiti at Tolaga Bay.

> And so in terms of my own iwi, I have to say that since my involvement … through the C Company ownership, and the museum working through that, and then the forming of the new board, that the involvement that my iwi now has is a very active one.[12]

Pam Bain (Pākehā Museum Trustee appointed by Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Society Inc.) articulated the unique opportunity that the relationship with C Company had created for the museum to involve iwi in the life of the museum and to reach out to the Māori communities of Tairāwhiti:

> It was an amazing opportunity to start hearing what they wanted and being involved in things they wanted to be involved in, about bringing them in, about working together on the archive, about education, about outreach, about having all those people who'd never been inside the place or come near it, about listening to their personal stories, it was just an incredible opportunity…[13]

9.2.2 *The Price of Citizenship*: Exhibition or Memorial, Celebration or Challenge?

The second C Company exhibition, installed in the Tairāwhiti Museum in 1999, was entitled *The Price of Citizenship*. The exhibition consisted of two parts. At the entrance to the exhibition was an acknowledgement of Sir Apirana Ngata as the father of the 28th Māori Battalion. A set of small rectangular glass-faced wall cases were arranged on one side of the entrance area, all set at the same height, each case containing the photograph of a member of C Company and their medals or some other small personal item. Among those men commemorated in this way was Moananui a Kiwa Ngarimu, the only Māori soldier to be awarded the Victoria Cross during World War Two. The Ngarimu family made the Victoria Cross medal available for the exhibition. These cases led towards the main gallery of the exhibition that consisted of a koru-shaped wall that had the names of all the men (circa 1000), who served in C Company arranged on the wall in alphabetical order. With each name was a space for the soldier's photograph. There were photographs of most of the soldiers and Ngā Taonga ā Nga Tama Toa Trust was actively seeking

---

[12] Interview with Anne McGuire, Gisborne, 29 November 1999. p. 24.
[13] Interview with Pam Bain, 2 December 1999, p. 14. Pam Bain worked as an archaeologist for the Department of Conservation, Gisborne.

photographs of the remaining soldiers. At the entrance to this gallery of photographs was a television screen playing excerpts from the videotapes of interviews that had been made with the surviving veterans and their families, relating war-time experiences.

This exhibition was not a traditional historic account of C Company; it was more in the form of a C Company memorial, although circa 50 C Company veterans were still alive in 2002 when they were included in the memorial display. It is unusual for museums in New Zealand to contain public war memorials. The only exception to this is the Auckland War Memorial Museum, which contains a major war memorial on the third floor of the museum and on the forecourt at the front of the museum. When the National Museum in Wellington was located in Buckle Street, before the move to the waterfront, there was also a strong association between the museum and the National War Memorial. Traditionally, the implication of a war memorial is that it will be permanent and largely unchanging in its essential elements. While there had been some discussion about featuring different soldiers in the entrance hall wall-cases from time to time, there appeared to be an assumption growing that the exhibition would remain in its current form as long as Ngā Taonga ā Ngā Tama Toa Trust maintained its relationship with the museum.

However, the title of the exhibition, *The Price of Citizenship*, signalled another dimension of the exhibition. Although many of the men who went overseas would have seen the opportunity to travel overseas as essentially one of adventure, there were those among the Māori leaders of the time, particularly Sir Apirana Ngata, who considered enlistment as "a duty and an obligation arising from Article Three of the Treaty of Waitangi which imparted to Māori the rights of British citizenship. The war extracted a high price, and Māori paid their share: the price of citizenship."[14] Implicit in the naming of the exhibition was the question of whether or not Māori have been granted full citizenship and the rights guaranteed in the Treaty of Waitangi. Some commentators have pointed to the gap between Māori and Pākehā health, education and imprisonment statistics and suggest that Māori are still not enjoying the benefits of full citizenship. While successive governments since 1975 have sought to address Treaty of Waitangi grievances, and some claims have

---

[14] Sir Henare Ngata. Notes provided in response to the first draft of this chapter, November 2002.

been settled, there has been only limited acceptance by governments and the community at large that the Treaty of Waitangi provides the basis for building future relationships between iwi/hapū and the Crown. Thus the title of the exhibition can be seen to make reference to both the historical and contemporary realities of the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti.

The C Company exhibition became a multifunctional space within the museum. It was a space where the C Company families came to spend time remembering those who gave their lives during the war. It also became an exhibition that drew comment from visitors to the museum. For some it raised an awareness of the Māori war effort, for others it raised the issue of the futility of war. The exhibition also raised the possibility of the museum providing recognition for all soldiers, Māori and Pākehā, who served during World War Two. Ngā Taonga ā Ngā Tama Toa Trust held some of their meetings in the exhibition space and the museum education service used the exhibition to introduce students to a range of subjects including ANZAC Day, C Company, and aspects of the history of the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti.

There was considerable potential for the exhibition to be further developed though this would have required a larger space. The history of C Company can be seen as a turning point in the history of the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti. The exhibition could provide a window on the history of these people both prior to and following World War Two. Many of the young men from the small communities of Tairāwhiti who joined C Company were killed during the war and their loss had a tremendous impact on their families at home. Among the returning soldiers there were also those who were badly wounded and others who found it difficult to integrate back into civilian life. This, combined with the migration of Māori families from Tairāwhiti to larger cities and regional service centres, meant that many families in the smaller settlements throughout Tairāwhiti struggled to adjust to post-war life. While *The Price of Citizenship* remembered the sacrifice the men and their families made during the war it did not go as far as it might to investigate the fate of the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti following the war.

This is the challenge raised when a museum creates a memorial. Is it appropriate to reach beyond the memorial to examine the outcome for the families that made the sacrifice? Is it appropriate to deal explicitly with the question that is implicit in the exhibition? Are the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti, and by implication all Māori, recognised and treated in a manner consistent with the provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi? The museum took the view that it should engage with these issues but it could have done so more explicitly. For Māori, the price of citizenship was not just about Article Three, it was also about Article Two of the Treaty, their recognition as tangata whenua and the active protection of their Treaty rights. By exhibiting *The Price of Citizenship* the museum became actively involved in the politics of cultural recognition at a regional and national level. It was an exhibition that attracted national attention, including a visit from the New Zealand Prime Minister in 2000.

9.2.3   C Company and the Future Development of Tairāwhiti Museum

As the Tairāwhiti Museum trustees considered the future role of the museum and the development of the facility the C Company exhibition was already providing inspiration for the trustees. The relationship with the families of C Company opened the door to some creative thinking about outreach programmes. For example, C Company was a central component of Ruakaka, the museum education programme based at Tolaga Bay Area School. The exhibition also inspired Apirana Mahuika (Museum Trustee for Ngāti Porou) to consider the way in which the exhibition might evolve within the museum facility:

> If you look at a meeting house and all the carved pillars in a meeting house they symbolise who we are, they're part of our whakapapa, they're part of our ancestry. The photographs of C Company in the museum, from my perspective, is the beginning of a new house, symbolically taking shape, so that in due course my grandchildren, for example, would look at my brothers and say, "Those are our tīpuna".
>
> They become poupou, in the same way that poupou for us in contemporary society are like those photographs, except that they are stylised differently. But they're still poupou, they still represent us. And so the C Company thing, for the next generation, for my children

and my grandchildren, that's what it's going to be and that is the beginning of a new house. The sacredness of it, those things will become more sacred as they are viewed. They are the fountain filled with the tears of our people continuously. Every time I go there, I become tearful for my brothers and others and so we're building this fountain of tears that our descendants will see in their spiritual selves and relate to it, so that they will talk about the exploits of their ancestors in the same way that we do in the meeting house. So that is the significance of the taonga C Company. The presence of that there relates the museum that much closer to the different tribal groupings here, not only Tairāwhiti, but around the Whānau-a-Apanui and Kahungunu as well.

The museum has a kaitiakitanga role of keeping those sacred things there and looking after them. And we the family members are the kaitiaki of that taonga. Just as we can speak to other things, we can speak to those guys in our way. So it's a contemporary house if you like, if one were to perceive that in that way. But as I see it, it's a symbol of the new house that we are building.[15]

When I discussed this vision with Anne McGuire she acknowledged the inherent challenge. The question was whether the relationship with C Company was yet at the point where the exhibition could develop on a larger scale and in the way that Mahuika had envisioned. The C Company exhibition was about whakapapa and whanaungatanga, acknowledging relationships and binding people together, and as such it provided a focal point for learning about the past and defining the challenges of the future. However, there was a dimension to the exhibition that has not yet been considered in this discussion: if in the future the families of C Company were to decide that the museum, rather than a marae or a tribal cultural centre, should be the long-term home for the C Company collection and exhibition, this could have two implications: First, the C Company exhibition would increasingly become the spiritual heart of the museum; and I had a sense when talking to the museum trustees and staff that this status was already in existence; second, the presence of this taonga in the museum committed the families of C Company and the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti to working with the Pākehā community in this 'common ground' we call the museum.

---

[15] Interview with Apirana Mahuika, 15 May 2001, p. 11-12. Apirana Mahuika was Chairperson of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou.

9.3   Governance Relationships
9.3.1   A New Governance Model

In 1999 Tairāwhiti Museum made the transition from an incorporated society to a charitable trust, for reasons that are discussed below. In the trust deed provision was made for the representation of the major iwi in Te Tairāwhiti. These iwi include: Ngāti Porou, Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti, Te Aitanga-ā-Māhaki, Ngāi Tāmanuhiri and Rongowhakaata. Each of these iwi had one seat on the trust board. Although Ngāti Porou initially delayed taking their place on the trust board because they felt that the one seat allocated to them did not reflect the size of their membership or their rohe (tribal territory) compared to the other iwi represented on the board, eventually Ngāti Porou rūnanga accepted that iwi representation on the trust board was not based on a democratic or population based formula, rather it provided for the recognition and representation of peoples. Moreover, the relationship that developed between C Company whānau and the museum drew Ngāti Porou into participation in the museum's new governance arrangements.

Change in the governance structure of the museum was initiated by the former museum director, Greg McManus, for two reasons: the Gisborne District Council had indicated that because of the level of funding being granted to the museum it was no longer appropriate for the museum to be governed by an incorporated society whose membership did not represent the people of Tairāwhiti; the director was also dissatisfied with the existing arrangements and was determined to change the governance structure from a museum council made up of elected society members and representatives of affiliated groups, the Māori Advisory Committee and the Gisborne District Council, to a much smaller skills-based board. He wanted to ensure that the new trust board had members who were able to facilitate the strategic development of the institution. However, McManus left before the transition to the charitable trust was completed. While Spedding, the new director, recognised the merits of making the transition to a charitable trust and the need to appoint skilled trustees, he brought a different set of priorities to developing the new governance model. He wanted appropriate representation of the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti on the trust board

and he wanted to maintain the links with the Gisborne Art Gallery and Museum Society
membership by having them make appointments to the trust board. The fundamental
difference in the approach of the two directors was the priority given by Spedding to
building and maintaining relationships with key constituencies, rather than the desire for a
small skills-based board. The strength of the Tairāwhiti Museum governance model was
its ability to combine the indigenous representation (the representation of the iwi of Te
Tairāwhiti), the representation of all communities within Tairāwhiti through the
representatives of the democratically elected district council, and the representation of
those in the community who demonstrated a particular interest in supporting the institution
through their membership of the Friends of the Tairāwhiti Museum.

This is a more complex governance model than it appeared on the surface. It was not a
model that simply divided the trust board seats equally between Māori and Pākehā. It
identifies the three distinct constituencies of interest, or stakeholder communities,
described above and from these three constituencies individuals were drawn who brought
with them the range of cultural and professional skills necessary to form an effective
board. For example, this was demonstrated by the first trust board in both the way in
which the trustees have ensured that the systems of financial management and reporting
had improved since the establishment of the new board[16], and in the development and
approval of new elements of museum policy. There was still one outstanding issue of
representation that could require further consideration. This was the representation of
particular groups in the community with whom the museum has developed important
relationships and that have significant collections deposited in the museum. One such
group is Ngā Taonga o Ngā Tama Toa Trust. However, some argued that the C Company
families were represented by the existing iwi representatives.

9.3.2   Recognition of Indigeneity

My understanding of governance in the Gisborne Museum is that there is now a greater
involvement of Māori people in looking after the taonga tuku iho. Gone are the days when

[16] Interview with Michael Chrisp, 5 November 2000. p. 12.

another culture determines what should be done to this culture. We are working closely now. I feel we have a real partnership now.[17]

The Māori members of the Tairāwhiti Museum Trust Board placed considerable significance on the fact that the Tairāwhiti Museum governance model recognised the right of each iwi to maintain their own heritage. Control of heritage consists not only of control of the artefacts in the museum, it also includes control of the interpretation of whānau, hapū and iwi history and culture. The recognition of the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti through their representation on the Tairāwhiti Museum Trust Board created the foundation for a relationship between tangata whenua and the museum.

When asked about the role of those Māori who had served on the earlier Māori Advisory Committee Anne McGuire stated:

> Advisory, that's not decision making, that's not being part and parcel of it, you're only advising and quite frankly I'm tired of Māori advisors, where they have no voting rights. They're just there in an advisory capacity and that's not good enough and I'm glad to see that disappearing fast.[18]

However, McGuire recognised the importance of Māori participation on the museum council and executive committee during the 1990s:

> There has always been a relationship there because our Aunty's been on the board, she's from Aitanga-ā-Hauiti. And we've always known that Aunty's there, but our people never took a really active role in either visiting the museum or even using the museum, one or two individuals, but not the iwi. [19]

Apirana Mahuika outlined the significance of the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti representation on the Tairāwhiti Museum Trust Board and of the new museum name:

---

[17] Interview with Apirana Mahuika, 15 May 2001. p. 6.
[18] Interview with Anne McGuire, 29 December 1999, p. 19
[19] Ibid.: 22.

In the future, whoever may come in, they cannot take away the ownership of that responsibility from us, in the same way that we can't take it away from others. So it's real empowerment, by saying to us, you own, you belong, you make decisions. … So that ultimately within a generation or two people will say, "Yep, we own this museum, we are a part of it". And maybe the hurts that I feel about the alienation of taonga will become more acceptable with this ownership. And the key to this governance is the enhancement and retention of the mana of each of the groups and nobody rides slipshod over one another's mana. For us here in Tairāwhiti, it is a recognition of mana, the understanding of mana and what it means to the people who own the mana and what it means for us to share our mana with other people and vice versa. And that's real governance. The name also provides a sense of governance. … If you get the name right, you get the whakapapa right. Tairāwhiti has been around for a long time. It's an ancient name. Our people say it's the eastern border, but within this eastern seacoast are iwi, hapū and whānau representatives. It's their rohe potae; it's the hat that embraces us as a region, but within this are their individual hairs, there are individual people with individual mana. And this is the significance of the term Tairāwhiti. … But it's also making the term Tairāwhiti an acceptable term, not only for Māori, but for non-Māori as well. It's becoming like 'kia ora'. Tairāwhiti now is the symbol of who we are, not only as Māori, but also as non-Māori. So it's inclusive.[20]

When asked about the significance of the new governance model Anne McGuire echoed the comments made by Mahuika and emphasised the mutual understanding that had resulted:

There's been some really positive comments and understandings and I think that's a huge issue that has come out, the understandings of what each culture expects and wants from the museum and a lot of understanding of how taonga should be treated.[21]

There was a reluctance on the part of a number of the museum trustees to talk about the new governance model in terms of biculturalism. This word was treated with some

[20] Interview with Apirana Mahuika, 15 May 2001 p. 6-7.
[21] Interview with Anne McGuire, 29 November 1999, p. 18

scepticism, because it was seen as a term that had been captured by government and public institutions to describe a wide range of relationships:

> The museum … has a model set-up which allows for equal participation of two cultures rather than bicultural and I wouldn't call it bicultural at all. But I would say that this is making a genuine attempt and a successful attempt at bringing about a partnership and an equity of participation.[22]

9.3.3   Mandate

Members of a museum board were seen by some to receive their mandate from the people who place them on the board, that is, the people whom they represent.[23] A board member's mandate is the authority, derived from the appointing body, to make decisions or give advice on behalf of that body. Some trust board members saw their responsibility as being essentially to the whole community. The extent of a mandate may range from complete autonomy to the requirement to consult with the appointing body on a regular basis before being able to speak with authority. In general terms, Pākehā trustees assumed greater freedom to act autonomously than hapū or iwi representatives on public trusts.

Public museum trustees are expected to act in the best interests of the museum and it is assumed that if they do so they are acting in the best interests of the community. However, a question for consideration is whether acting in the interest of the majority of the Tairāwhiti community would always mean that trustees would be acting in the interests of the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti and their own iwi in particular. Iwi trustees see their primary responsibility being to their iwi.

The Tairāwhiti Museum Trust Board had a total membership of eleven: five iwi representatives, two Gisborne District Council representatives, and four representatives of the Friends of Tairāwhiti Museum. This partnership between the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti and

---

[22] Interview with Anne McGuire, 29 November 1999. p. 27.

[23] Note that the constitution of the Gisborne Museum of Art and History Trust (commonly known as Tairāwhiti Museum) makes no mention of the concept of mandate. Therefore each trustee must decide for him/herself the nature of their mandate.

the wider community of Te Tairāwhiti was considered by iwi representatives to be an effective power-sharing arrangement, even though in numerical terms iwi representatives were in the minority. It is important to note that the Gisborne District Council appointed one Māori representative, Sandy Adsett (Ngāti Pahauwera), and one Pākehā representative to the trust board. Following the resignation of Sandy Adsett when he moved out of the district, the district council appointed Keri Kaa (Ngāti Porou) to maintain this balance and to reflect the composition of the population in the district. The appointment of Sandy Adsett and Keri Kaa by the district council also recognised the significant role the institution had had in fostering the contemporary arts and, in particular, contemporary Māori art.

The Friends of Tairāwhiti Museum also appointed one Māori representative (Ingrid Searancke, Ngāti Porou) among their four representatives on the trust board. In doing this the Friends maintained an important thread of continuity in Māori representation from the former museum council to the new trust board. The institutional knowledge carried forward by such individuals is important in maintaining the continuity of the institution. Mrs Searancke's appointment to the trust board was also an indication of the significance attached by the museum society to the relationships between the museum and a number of Māori families in the Gisborne area that reach back, in some cases, to the founding of the museum in the 1950s. An example is the relationship between the museum and the family of Rongowhakaata Halbert (Rongowhakaata), chairman of the Māori Museum Committee in the 1950s, which was maintained through the subsequent participation of Nona Haronga (Rongowhakaata Halbert's daughter) and Peter Gordon (Rongowhakaata Halbert's nephew) on the museum council. Without knowing the role taken by each of these individuals in museum affairs one could be excused for assuming that they had acted as token Māori in an essentially Pākehā organisation. An examination of the historical record has shown that this was not the case. Rongowhakaata Halbert and Peter Gordon both actively asserted Māori rights in relation to the ownership and repatriation of taonga tuku iho, laying a foundation for the formal recognition of these issues by the newly established museum trust.

Some Māori leaders were cautious about the extent to which Māori interests should be represented on public bodies through contemporary iwi organisations (e.g. iwi rūnanga). Sir Henare Ngata, for example, expressed reservations about the rise of iwi organisations in recent decades and reiterated the importance of hapū as the basic political entity in Māori society.[24] Hapū were guaranteed rights in the Treaty of Waitangi and hapū retain rangatiratanga over their own lands and other taonga tuku iho. Sir Henare drew attention to the challenges facing iwi representatives who must try to represent the interests of all the hapū in their iwi and endeavour to consult with these hapū when sitting on the trust board of a public institution.[25] He also accepted the reality that iwi representation on the trust boards of public institutions is a modern solution to a modern problem. It is in fact an adaptive strategy of contemporary Māori development, resulting from the reluctance of central government to deal with small hapū separately. Understanding the nature of the mandate given to iwi representatives from whānau and hapū is the key to having those representatives effectively representing their interests.

Māori representatives on the trust boards of public bodies are most likely to be appointed by a process that reflects the contemporary political reality in a particular area at any given time. Such appointments will reflect the significance of the public body to the particular political structure. This may mean that requirements of the trust board may or may not be met in the appointments made. Thus there is a potential gap between the politics of representation and the kaupapa of the particular body. Where there is a meaningful dialogue maintained between the museum and the iwi organisation making the appointment the outcome is likely to be most effective for both parties.

Iwi representatives cannot assume the right to speak on behalf of the kaitiaki of particular taonga deposited in the museum collection. Ingrid Searancke talked about her memories of taonga tuku iho that were part of her life as she was growing up.[26] Taonga tuku iho were cared for by individuals, whānau, and hapū. Some taonga were handed down through

---

[24] "Rūnanga profess to act for Māori, but as they are organisations set up by government policy, and which receive government funds to do so, it is highly questionable as to how much rūnanga can keep faith with both Crown and Māori". (Ngata, 2002. p. ix).
[25] Interview with Sir Henare Ngata, May 2002.
[26] Interview with Ingrid Searancke, 1 December 1999.

families, while other taonga were held on marae. She stated that when a whānau member places whānau taonga on deposit in the museum the kaitiaki role over these taonga remains with the family, unless the taonga are specifically placed in the museum on behalf of a marae committee or a particular hapū. This suggests that iwi representatives need to work closely with whānau and hapū kaitiaki on matters relating to the care and use of taonga. When the provenance of taonga tuku iho in the museum collection has been lost, the iwi representatives and other Māori members of the trust board have a special responsibility to work with the director and staff to ensure appropriate care and use of these taonga is observed.

Therefore, the concept of mandate is of prime importance for the iwi representatives: How are the iwi representatives selected and what mandate are they given by their people to act on their behalf? Anne McGuire outlined the process for her appointment:

> [The] Trust received a letter from the museum outlining the new board and that they wished to have an iwi partnership and they wanted representation from our iwi. So the letter went to a hui-ā-iwi and I was nominated and elected by my iwi, and the name went forward to the museum. I must also add that because I'm also a member of the local Historic Places Trust committee, along with the museum director, that he had run the idea by me first and had asked if we would be interested in being represented. And so I said to him, "Yes, I'm sure we will be, but you write to the trust though, and let them decide who they want."[27]

This description of the process highlights the importance of the informal relationship that already existed between the director and McGuire. By consulting with her the director ensured that the approach to the iwi was made in the appropriate manner. Because she knew the director and had worked successfully with him on the Historic Place Trust Regional Committee she was also prepared to consider being an iwi representative on the museum trust board. Anne McGuire was also known to her own people as someone who had an interest in heritage management issues. The informal communication at the

---

[27] Interview with Anne McGuire, 29 November 1999, p. 16.

beginning of the process, dependant on an existing relationship, ensured that there would be a constructive outcome to the formal approach to the tribal trust.

McGuire outlined her understanding of the mandate she had from her iwi as a member of the museum trust board:

> They leave it up to me, totally actually, but one thing that I must do and that's every six weeks is I have to report back to hui-ā-iwi. I have to let them know what's happened at meetings - are there any issues that I need support on - and of course the repatriation came out of all that. The other thing is the importance of the new name for the museum. I went back to them for suggestions, and some suggestions were forthcoming. [I] came back to the meeting with it and we eventually decided on the name and I went back to the hui-ā-iwi and said, "Well, this is the new name for the museum". "Did you vote for it?" "Yes I did." "Kei te pai." So, yeah, I have a very strong mandate.[28]

There were some issues, such as the return of kōiwi tangata and taonga tuku iho, that McGuire would always refer back to the elders for consideration and advice before advocating a particular course of action to the museum trust board. However, on most issues she felt that the mandate given to her by the hui-ā-iwi was broad and that she was trusted to deal with a wide range of issues at the museum trust board. Her iwi expected her to be well informed about the issues she was dealing with in that context. For example, she would not have beeen expected to take matters of museum administration back to hui-ā-iwi on a regular basis. These were matters that the members of the trust board were expected to deal with in the context of the meetings. It was Anne McGuire's responsibility to report back from time to time on the decisions that were made by the trust board.

Anne McGuire made the following general observations about her role and responsibilities as a museum trustee:

---

[28] Interview with Anne McGuire, 29 November 1999, p. 16.

First and foremost it has to be being there to service my iwi because they are the people who put me there. But right beside that is the responsibility to the museum as an institution that represents the cultures of the region and therefore there is an equal responsibility to serve that board as well as the needs of my iwi, because I know from my many many visits that a lot of what does belong to my iwi is in that museum. We're not saying that we want everything back at this stage, but it's ensuring that it's properly cared for, properly handled, properly displayed and that has to be my first duty and function. It also means that if there are things going on at the museum that I'm there, that I'm seen to be there as a representative of my iwi in the first instance and as a trustee in the second instance. If it wasn't for my iwi, I wouldn't be there, so that always has to take precedence.[29]

Apirana Mahuika stated that his mandate was founded on three guiding principles: "never sell, never lose ownership, never violate or breach [tikanga]."[30]

In contrast to this understanding of mandate, Michael Chrisp (Pākehā Chairperson of Museum Trust Board, nominated to the trust board by the museum society), when asked about the issue of mandate, stated:

I don't feel responsible to anybody. I've been appointed by … and if they don't like what I do they can fire me next time. That's fine. I don't believe that it is a representational position in that way, but the Māori representatives don't think that way. They actually need to feel that they are representing their iwi and quite often they will want to take things back to iwi before they can make a decision on it. … I don't think I need a mandate from the appointing body. That's very different from saying I don't need a mandate from the community. … I think I'm responsible to the vision that we create together and that the vision is that the community will see the Tairāwhiti Museum as a place that expresses their past and they're comfortable to be here, and a place that is relevant to them in their heritage appreciation.[31]

---

[29] Interview with Anne McGuire, 29 November 1999. p. 19-20.
[30] Interview with Apirana Mahuika, Gisborne, 15 May 2001, p. 8
[31] Interview with Michael Chrisp, Gisborne, 5 November, 2000. p. 1-2.

Chrisp did not feel a responsibility to consult with or to report regularly to the body that made his appointment. However, he and the other Pākehā and Māori museum trustees interviewed all thought that they had a responsibility to the wider community to ensure that the museum was making appropriate use of the funding being provided by the district council and other funders and that the institution was accessible to the whole community.

9.4 Leadership and Relationships
9.4.1 Introduction

This thesis is about the recognition of indigeneity in the museum context and exploring the notion of the museum as a 'common ground' where cultural tikanga (customary practices) are recognised and the power of governance is shared. Institutional change occurs at a number of levels and involves a number of processes. Change can occur at the constitutional level, policy level, management level, and the staffing and programme levels within an institution. The processes of constitutional change are both formal (e.g. negotiation and settlement of grievances, constitutional change) and informal (e.g. relationship building and maintenance). Constitutional change is facilitated through the existence and maintenance of historical relationships and, equally importantly, through the development of relationships between the contemporary parties. Meaningful relationships emerge from a growing sense of trust, goodwill and understanding. In the absence of meaningful relationships it would be difficult to reach a consensus about the nature of the 'common ground'.

Members of the Tairāwhiti Museum Trust Board and others involved in the change from an incorporated society to a charitable trust and the development of the new governance model all acknowledged the pivotal role of the director in facilitating this transition. In order to elucidate the director's role I interviewed the director, Michael Spedding, and six trustees about the role of the director in the transition process. This section begins with the director's own observations and is followed by the observations of the trustees on the skills and attributes that enabled the director to take an important role in the relationship building between Tairāwhiti Museum and the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti. This focus on the role

of the director does not imply any diminution of the role of the chairperson of the board of trustees. All those interviewed confirmed that the role of the chairperson, Michael Crisp, in the transition from the incorporated society to the charitable trust had been very significant. He was selected as chairperson because of his historical associations with the museum and his skills as a lawyer, mediator and chairperson. These skills, combined with his experience in local body politics, meant that the museum had been able to negotiate a satisfactory long-term funding arrangement with the district council that has assured the continuing viability of the core programmes of the institution. It is also evident from the interviews that the chairperson had made a significant contribution to ensuring that the new governance arrangements worked effectively. It was also apparent from the comments of the research participants that the relationship between the director and the chairperson had been sound and that this was important in the effective introduction of the new governance arrangements.

9.4.2 Director's Perspective

By the time he became director of Tairāwhiti Museum, Spedding was aware that there were more fundamental changes needed at the museum than the appearance and content of some exhibits. The incorporated society that controlled the museum had a council of 26 members who represented the members of the incorporated society, a number of affiliated groups, the Māori Advisory Committee, and the Gisborne District Council. This council met only every quarter and it was the executive committee at its monthly meetings that really controlled the museum. At a practical level this structure had begun to prove cumbersome. At its quarterly meetings the council had to approve expenditure and policy changes that had already been approved by the executive. The council was also limited in terms of community representation:

> In terms of an organisation that was there to serve the needs of the whole community, it was limited in that it only represented a small part of that community. They represented a range of practising artists mainly and even within those parameters there were lots of artists who didn't have anything to do with those practising groups. That's the fundamental

limitation of that model … it only represented a small part of the community and it got to a point that even the local authority became aware that that was the case.[32]

For the director the nature of Māori representation was also an issue that required urgent` attention.[33] He traced the history of the relationships between the museum and local Māori families, demonstrating that this was an important part of the institutional history and that it had bearing on the contemporary situation. The director was very much aware of the significance of the continuity that had been achieved in the new trust board membership in maintaining these historical relationships.[34]

Spedding gained an appreciation of the importance of these historical relationships soon after he was appointed director. Kiki Smiler, a member of the Māori Advisory Committee, advised Spedding that the governance review process would provide an opportunity to forestall growing discontent with the museum in the local Māori community:

I received a letter from Kiki Smiler … he was aware the museum was talking about making some structural changes to its governance model. Basically, it was a warning. He just said, "I'm aware that the museum is starting to talk about these things. For several years … tangata whenua have talked, at various times … quite seriously about setting up an alternative centre to the museum." And he said that the talk has been no stronger than at the present. This would have been '97. He went on from that to say that he had been, and still continued to be, a supporter of the museum. And I know one of Kiki's views was that he didn't believe, whether it be the rūnanga or the local iwi, that the emphasis should be toward the development of a cultural centre … his argument was that the marae are their cultural centres and that's where they should be putting their focus and there was still a place for a museum such as ours. So he continued to be a supporter and then he suggested a governance model in his letter, and that's basically what we ended up with.[35]

At the same time the local authority was quietly reminding the museum director and the museum council that they were anticipating the establishment of a trust that would allow

---

[32] Interview with Michael Spedding, 12 April 2000, p. 2
[33] Ibid.: 4-5
[34] Ibid.: 5-6
[35] Ibid.: p. 7

for wider community representation. The museum director began to hold intensive discussions with members of the museum executive and other interested parties about the options for constitutional change:

> Now the really interesting thing here also was that the old museum executive was really supportive. The museum council … really didn't understand what was going on but you could not say that about the executive. They understood what was going on all right. They accepted the argument that the local authority was making about the need for change, the need for structural change to be more representative of the community. I take my hat off to them for actually accepting that change, because they basically agreed to their own demise. So it all happened so easily in some ways … it was just a matter of a few meetings.[36]

When asked about his own role in the process Spedding replied, "I was the facilitator, really, of pretty much everything. I facilitated the meetings we had, the hui that we had."[37] However, the process also had its own momentum:

> I mean I did have to lead it. I was the one who physically did the work. I was the one who wrote the papers, who sent things out, who organised the meetings, who fronted the meetings. It was me who was standing up there and explaining things … But having said that, a lot of it happened easily. It was quite straightforward.[38]

Ingrid Searancke called a hui-ā-iwi at Te Poho o Rawiri marae to discuss the proposal to establish a museum trust. The hui supported the proposed change to a museum trust and recommended a trust board of ten members, five members to be appointed by iwi. This recommendation was similar to that made by Kiki Smiler in his letter to Spedding and together these recommendations provided Spedding with a useful basis for advocating substantial iwi representation in the new governance arrangements.

---

[36] Ibid.: 10
[37] Ibid.
[38] Ibid.

There was debate about the composition of the trust board in the proposed governance model. Special meetings were held with a range of interest groups to explain the model and to seek feedback. Other groups were considered for representation including C Company and Toihoukura. Given the number of Ngāti Kahungunu in the region, and the possibility of the museum's programmes extending south to Wairoa, the question was raised as to whether it would be appropriate to have Ngāti Kahungunu representation on the trust board and, as previously noted, members of Ngāti Porou argued that they should have more than one place on the trust board because of their numbers relative to the other iwi represented. However, there was broad Māori support for the proposed changes.

The new constitution provided a power sharing arrangement between iwi and the wider community in Te Tairāwhiti. There were eleven seats on the trust board, five of which were iwi seats. This meant that the wider community representatives could outvote the iwi representatives. The director acknowledged this possibility but suggested that the priority was not to create a mathematical balance of power, rather to ensure that all the iwi in Te Tairāwhiti were represented. Although the iwi representatives did not constitute fifty percent of the board, they did constitute a substantial proportion of the board and as such would take an effective part in the governance of the institution. Moreover, the constitution required that Māori interests were recognised. Having five iwi representatives on the trust board means that if one or two of these members were unable to attend (because of other commitments) there would always be iwi representatives at the meetings. Museum trust boards with only one or two Māori representatives sometimes suffer from the problem of being unable to ensure that there will always be tangata whenua in attendance because of the multiple commitments assumed by many such individuals.[39]

The museum executive had no objections to the model. There were some members of the public who requested copies of the proposed new constitution when they heard of the proposed changes, but none of this led to serious objections. The one aspect of this stage

---

[39] The author is aware of this issue from personal experience as a board member and from discussions with a number of museum directors and museum trustees.

of the process that was completely different to the transition at the Whanganui Regional Museum was that the issue did not become a matter for debate in the local newspaper. Why were there no objections in Te Tairāwhiti?

> One of the obvious things that a lot of people would think: Okay, 50 percent of this community are Māori - that seems to make sense. I mean it would just make sense to a lot of people, it would just seem to be the right thing to do … Even if people didn't like it, or they didn't think it was the right thing to do, it would be a damned hard thing for them to have a go at it.[40]

This discrepancy suggests that where constitutional change is seen to be broadly consistent with democratic principles, that is, proportionate representation, there will be less public Pākehā resistance to the recognition of tangata whenua in the governance of public institutions. In addition there had been no major public dispute in Gisborne of the type seen at Moutoa Gardens/Pakaitore in Wanganui that had served to heighten racial tensions. This does not mean that there had been no opposition to the changes that had occurred at Tairāwhiti Museum. Rather, the opposition had taken the form of complaints by individual Pākehā (usually members of the museum society) to the director, staff and trustees (particularly the Pākehā trustees) that the museum programme had too many Māori exhibitions and events and that the change of name was inappropriate. As the Māori Wing had always been part of the museum, the objections must have related to the temporary exhibition programme (primarily art exhibitions) and the inclusion of substantial Māori components in other exhibitions such as the new Maritime Gallery. Spedding had two responses to these objections: first, he demonstrated to the complainants that much less than fifty percent of the museum's temporary exhibition programme could be characterised as Māori exhibitions; and second, he was pleased to note that the recognition of iwi that is inherent in the governance arrangements was beginning to have some impact on the inclusion of Māori in all aspects of the museum's activities. He also noted that most of the objections came from older members of the

---

[40] Interview with Michael Spedding, 12 April 2000, p. 13

museum society who did not want the museum to change from the way it had always been.

Spedding had noticed a difference in Māori attitudes to the museum since the changes in governance had taken place. However, these changes had not occurred solely because the form of governance had changed; the changes had also come about because of some of the projects that the museum had undertaken. These projects had demonstrated that the principles driving the governance changes had also been applied to the museum's policy, professional practice and programmes:

> The repatriation of the patu back to Hauiti … received quite a bit of media coverage at the time and often people have mentioned that to me, and more than just the physical actual repatriation of the patu, but more in the context of a feeling of easier access to the collections. So it's less about the actual repatriation and more about, "Hey, that place is okay, you know we can go in there", and people will talk about often seeing a Māori face. I'm talking about it in Māori terms now, the Māori community, they often talk about being confronted with a Māori face here, that things are more accessible, that things are out on display. So it might not be specifically the notion of repatriation that's widely known, but it's not a big leap from that access and that feeling of ownership.[41]

9.4.3   Trustees' Perspectives

Several of the museum trustees who were interviewed confirmed that the director had played a critical part in the transition from incorporated society to charitable trust and to the successful working of the new trust board. They also emphasised the strengths the director brought to his work in his wider relationships with the community, both at the trust board level and in the management of the staff.

Michael Chrisp outlined some of the prerequisites required to be director:

---

[41] Interview with Michael Spedding, 16 May 2001, p. 13

> It is essential that we have a director who is reasonably comfortable in Māori culture … It does not matter whether the director is Pākehā or Māori as long as they are able to stand with a foot in both camps reasonably easily. That's just because of the sort of community we are and the sort of collections we have… You want a director with experience of museums if possible, certainly a person who is passionate about the development of the institution as a cultural and heritage centre. … You need a director who is good with staff … good people skills.[42]

Pam Bain identified some skills that had been important in developing and maintaining relationships in an institutional context, some of which can be taught and others which are difficult to learn:

> There's the basic stuff like listening skills and about reframing, about paraphrasing, about giving back information, about how you give it back and how you give information. And … empathic stuff and I'm not sure you can learn that stuff quite honestly. … paraphrasing is important with iwi people, feeding back what they've just given you to make sure you've got it clearly.[43]

Although Pam Bain was aware that there was a Māori Advisory Committee at an earlier time, when she joined the museum council in the mid-1990s this committee was no longer active. There were individual Māori members on the museum executive and council who provided important linkages but they were not functioning as iwi representatives. She had observed the evolving relationship between the museum and C Company and was concerned by its deterioration after the opening of the first exhibition in 1996.[44] Bain gave much of the credit for resuscitating this relationship to the director, because of his determination to make it work and the skill he had in gaining people's trust:

> I think his awareness of those opportunities and his … determination to find a better way to make it work and to do that he pulled on people, on the executive and on the staff to start developing that. … It's always going to be a slightly wary relationship and I think

---

[42] Interview with Michael Chrisp, 5 November 2000, p. 11.
[43] Interview with Pam Bain, 2 December 1999. p. 8
[44] Ibid.: p. 14

that's the way it should be. I think they're always going to challenge us and that's good really because what they're offering us in terms of the archive and our relationship with them is fairly special. But I think having gone through the process of meeting after meeting and hui after hui and developed a sort of legal document, at a legal level I think it's fine and at a personal level I think it's improving enormously. And the thing that's done it is Mike's commitment to them having their say and because he was listening. They've then said things like, "We want free entrance and some of the things that will make it okay for this archive to be here." … But it's like the first step has to be someone who's prepared to listen and that they're going to trust and then get some sort of level of information that's required to make the relationship go on. … It's always going to be a bit dicky, but it's the way museums and Māori people are always going to be really and that's quite good … We can't get too complacent.[45]

Of particular interest in this comment is Bain's assertion that there would always be an uneasy tension between Māori and museums. This is just one instance of Māori ambivalence that is present in many relationships between Māori and museums. In this instance Ngā Taonga ā Ngā Tamatoa Trust had taken the precaution of signing a memorandum of understanding with the museum to ensure that the rights of the families of C Company were protected. This ambivalence was also present in the nature of iwi representation. Iwi had agreed to participate in museum governance, but their primary concern was with the protection of their taonga and the interests of their iwi, and the interests of the museum as an institution were secondary. Examples of ambivalence have also been identified in the Whanganui Museum case study. Bain's comment that this is a healthy aspect of the relationship is perceptive. Perhaps this ambivalence is one mechanism that ensures the maintenance of tikanga-ā-rua on the common ground.

Pam Bain then outlined the personal qualities that had enabled the director to take such an effective role in the recent developments at the museum:

You have someone who is empathetic, who accepts difference and who encourages it. Someone who … is not just self-contained, but confident in their own ability, basically

---

[45] Interview with Pam Bain, 2 December 1999, p. 14-15

they're not threatened. I think it's about threat and control and power. … I think it's his absolute honesty. It's complete integrity. He's absolutely clear about where he's at … he is absolutely up-front with people and if he commits to something, he will follow it through and if he can't, well, you know.[46]

Bain also referred to Spedding's commitment to the delivery of professional museological standards and to making the museum a facility that was accessible to the community.[47]

Other trustees identified the same skills. Sandy Adsett credited the director with taking the initiative to build relationships with trustees:

> Mike not only listens to you, he seeks your opinion by coming out of the museum. He rings me up and say's "I'll come over and see you at such and such", and he does and it's quite a regular occurrence. And it may be small things, but it makes you feel as though he's prepared to look for the best way for things to happen. And he shows appreciation, but his ideas are always strong too. You respect the fact that he's not going to accept things unless it sits comfortably with him. He will listen.[48]

Anne McGuire identified the director's leadership as an essential element in moving forward with the governance review process, commenting that Spedding was respected as a strong leader, but one who kept the lines of communication open both formally and informally. He had the trust of the board:

> We trust him to do the right thing and I think that goes for all the board. They're happy, I know I certainly am. But we keep those relationships going outside the board meetings and that is all the members. We're constantly in there and running into one another and running ideas past one another, checking, and if it is outside the plan, if it's outside the budgetary constraints, the director has no hesitation in ringing around the board to see how we can cope with this.[49]

---

[46] Interview with Pam Bain, 2 December 1999, p. 20-22
[47] Ibid.: 20-22
[48] Interview with Sandy Adsett, 1 December 1999, p. 9-10
[49] Interview with Anne McGuire, 15 May 2001, p. 8.

9.5   Discussion

9.5.1   Historical relationships

This case study has documented and analysed the evolving relationships between the Tairāwhiti Museum and local Māori families. During the 1950s, under the leadership of Leo Fowler and Rongowhakaata Halbert, the Māori Museum Committee developed the Māori Wing of the museum. Because of the decision not to return the whare nui from Canterbury Museum, the limited response from Māori wanting to deposit taonga in the museum, and members of the committee being occupied with other matters, such as the management of Māori lands, local Māori participation in museum activities declined.

The activities of the Māori Museum Committee were based on clearly articulated objectives, including the desire to provide a safe place for the storage and display of taonga that were increasing perceived as unsafe in peoples' homes and on marae; recognition of the importance of taonga tuku iho to the renaissance of Māori cultural practices; recognition of the need for Māori governance of the Māori Museum; acknowledgement that taonga placed in the museum by whānau and hapū remained their property; and the desire to repatriate significant taonga that had left the district.

The Māori Museum Wing was established as an extension to the house in which the museum was based, with most of the taonga Māori collection on display. Though significant collections were deposited by a small number of local Māori families, the collection remained relatively small compared with the major regional collections in Hawkes Bay Museum and Whanganui Regional Museum. From the early 1960s through to the late 1980s there was no Māori participation in the museum's governance, though there was a continuing interest taken in the museum by a small number of local Māori families. This pattern is distinctly different from the pattern of Māori Associate Board Members (1938-1967) and Māori Board Members (from 1968) at Whanganui Regional Museum. The participation of local Māori in the governance of Whanganui Regional

Museum was based primarily on the relationship between certain Māori families at Pūtiki and the city of Wanganui, although these families also had strong associations through taonga that had been deposited in the museum. In Gisborne, after the initial period during which the Māori Museum Committee was active, the museum did little to involve local Māori in more than an informal advisory capacity until 1989. Because these relationships were informal there is little record of their frequency and significance.

The arrival of Dr Wayne Orchiston as director in 1987 signalled a change in momentum for the museum. He initiated changes in organisational structure and public programming. In 1989 he appointed two Māori staff who were responsible for innovative developments in the interpretation of the taonga Māori collection and a greater emphasis on Māori art in the exhibition programme. The Māori Advisory Committee was established drawing its core membership from those local Māori families that had long associations with the institution. This committee continued to emphasise the same themes that had been the basis of the programme of the Māori Museum Committee in the 1950s.

While this momentum was briefly lost during the tenure of the next director, Priscilla Thomson, her replacement, Greg McManus, embarked on another period of intense institutional development, including initiating a governance review process. Initially the need to review the museum's governance arrangements had arisen from a recognition that the museum society membership did not provide the broad community mandate required by an institution that was being substantially funded by the district council. In addition, the director and museum council were aware that the museum needed a smaller and highly skilled trust board to meet the fiscal challenges facing the museum.

By the 1990s, the relationships between the museum and local Māori families were operating on a number of levels, including, participation in the Māori Advisory Committee, Museum Council and Museum Executive, as owners of taonga tuku iho deposited in the museum and as tangata whenua joining and supporting the museum in hosting Māori art and other exhibitions. It is clear from the records that Māori Advisory

Committee members, such as Peter Gordon and Kiki Smiler, played an active, articulate and influential role in advocating the recognition of tangata whenua within the museum.

The circumstances leading to the governance review at Tairāwhiti Museum bear considerable similarity to those that initiated the governance review at Whanganui Regional Museum: first, the desire by the local body to see the transition from an incorporated society to a charitable trust; second, the acknowledgement of the need for a smaller skills-based board to meet the fiscal and organisational challenges facing the museums; third, a growing awareness of the need to review the basis of Māori participation in museum governance; and fourth, a growing awareness of discontent with the museum in the local Māori community that could result in the removal of taonga from the museum to one or more cultural centres.

In 1995 the museum entered into an arrangement with C Company 28th Māori Battalion to care for their collection and create an exhibition about C Company. The evolving relationship between the museum and C Company formed a backdrop to the governance review process. Initially this relationship suffered from miscommunication and misunderstandings. With the appointment of Michael Spedding as director in 1997 these problems were quickly resolved and Ngā Taonga a Ngā Tamatoa Trust signed an agreement with the museum in 1999 for the care and exhibition of their collection until 2003. Within this broader context of the developing relationship with C Company, the cautionary advice by Kiki Smiler, and the motions passed by tangata whenua at a hui at Te Poho o Rawiri Marae, Spedding and the museum executive were of the view that the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti should be represented in the new governance arrangements and that this was as important as the objective to create a small skills-based board.

While Tairāwhiti Museum was developing a positive relationship with C Company that was to form an important backdrop to the transition to a new governance model, in Wanganui the museum inherited the consequences of the local Māori occupation of Moutoa Gardens/Pakaitore. The implications of this were two-fold: first, the Māori community entered the negotiation of a new governance model at the museum in highly

politicised way, seeking a model that made explicit provision for the recognition of Whanganui iwi; and second, the members of the district council who had actively opposed the claims made at Moutoa Gardens/Pakaitore continued to express their opposition to the recognition of iwi in their response to the proposed new model for museum governance.

9.5.2 New Governance Relationships: Continuity and Change

While new museum governance arrangements made provision for the representation of all the iwi in Te Tairāwhiti, continuity was also maintained with the inclusion of members of the former Māori Advisory Committee on the new trust board. The representation of iwi on the museum trust board was described by the Māori trustees as the recognition of their status as tangata whenua (the indigenous people of the region) and their rights in relation to the taonga tuku iho held in the collection. While the museum had a special relationship with the hapū upon whose land the museum was located, the governance arrangements made equal provision for all the iwi of Te Tairāwhiti. The change in the governance structure reflects the changes that have occurred in iwi politics in the last quarter of the twentieth century with the rise of iwi rūnanga as the focus of Māori development and the settlement of Treaty of Waitangi grievances.

By making provision in the constitution for the appointment of iwi representatives to the museum trust board, the museum was not primarily motivated by the desire to forestall the development of hapū or iwi cultural centres. In fact, the museum had worked collaboratively with several iwi to assist them to develop their own heritage initiatives that could in time result in the establishment of iwi cultural centres. This was particularly true of the collaborations between the museum and Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti at Uawa (Tolaga Bay), which included an exhibition of Te Aitanga-ā-Hauiti taonga tuku iho in the museum, the development of the Ruakaka educational facility at Tolaga Bay Area School and the planning for a range of cultural and heritage events based in Uawa.

There is a lesson here for all museums engaging in governance reform. Museums would be unwise to think that provision for iwi representation in museum governance will

forestall the development of iwi cultural centres or the removal of taonga for other reasons. In all probability, increased participation in museum governance will, in some instances, increase iwi interest in the development of their own cultural centres. There will remain an ambivalence in Māori participation in museums and some iwi will eventually determine that they have the resources and motivation to create their own facilities where they can manage their own taonga without having to work within the context of a public museum. This will not necessarily mean that these iwi will withdraw completely from the public museum context, especially if the partnership has proven productive in terms of enhancing cross-cultural relationships and understanding. Hence, the development of the museum as common ground should not be envisaged as a substitute or alternative for the development of separate Māori cultural centres. Those museums that take a constructive and supportive approach towards the development of iwi initiatives within the museum context and towards tribal heritage initiatives beyond the museum context, whatever form they may take, will create a sound basis for lasting relationships.

CHAPTER TEN

CONCLUSION:
TOWARDS COMMON GROUND

In his analysis of the politics of cultural recognition, James Tully (1995) proposes the reconceptualisation of the 'common ground', the sites within which different cultures negotiate their social and political relationships in the modern nation-state. Tully (ibid: 14) characterises this 'common ground' as a "labyrinth composed of overlap, interaction and negotiation of cultures". As a result of internal colonialism indigenous peoples have been marginalised within their own customary territories and Tully argues that it is within these sites of 'common ground' that the politics of indigeneity, that is, the recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples, can be realised.

The apparatus of internal colonialism includes the practices of the scientific, education, legal and religious systems, including museums, which have been imposed on colonised peoples. These colonising institutions, along with the systems of local and central government, are the sites that Tully argues should be reconceptualised. The challenge for nation-states and their public institutions that sustain internal colonialism is to move from a relationship of assimilation to one of reconciliation with indigenous peoples based on the principles of mutual recognition, continuity and consent. However, challenges to the power base of the dominant culture have often resulted in resistance to changes in the structures of power in the form of a shift from intolerant racism to tolerant racism (Hage 1994: 33-34). In the New Zealand context, central and local government, along with most public institutions that sustain the dominant culture, have officially endorsed policies of tolerant biculturalism and tolerant multiculturalism without engaging in any fundamental recognition of the rights of Māori within their governance structures. This pattern of dominant culture resistance has been moderated by an increasing recognition of Māori rights guaranteed in the Treaty of Waitangi, particularly in the settlement of historic grievances and in a limited range of legislation. These changes have not extended to the

recognition of mana motuhake Māori (Māori self-determination) in a national constitutional sense.

This thesis has examined the extent to which indigenous peoples, particularly Māori, have been able to engage museums in the politics of indigeneity and the extent to which two regional charitable trust museums have been able to reconceptualise their governance structures to create a 'common ground' within which tangata whenua are recognised in accord with the principles of mutual recognition, continuity and consent. The analysis has been structured around three interconnected propositions: (1) that indigenous peoples have developed strategies of resistance to the colonial practices of museums at the international, national and local levels, within the wider movement of elucidating and advocating the rights of indigenous peoples; (2) that New Zealand museums have responded to Māori strategies of resistance to museum practices by implementing changes in policy and practice relating to collections of taonga Māori within a framework of tolerant biculturalism; and (3) that during the 1990s some New Zealand museums realised, in response to Māori strategies of resistance, that without the reform of inherited museum governance models, which would enable appropriate recognition and participation of Māori in museum governance, they would continue to perpetuate colonial structures of power.

In order to elucidate the agency of indigenous peoples in the changing relationships between indigenous peoples and museums, three major strategies of indigenous resistance to museum practices at the international, national and local levels have been outlined: (1) the development of international declarations and the negotiation of national policy statements with national museum organisations; (2) strategies for the repatriation of cultural property (domestic legislation, treaty negotiations and moral suasion); and (3) the development of indigenous peoples' cultural centres. These strategies have expanded the focus from direct confrontation and negotiation with individual museums to wider political forums where indigenous peoples' rights are being increasingly recognised. Prior to the development of these strategies individual museums had been reluctant to recognise the collective cultural property rights of indigenous peoples.

Advocacy of the cultural property rights of indigenous peoples within international and national forums impacts directly on the changing relationships between indigenous peoples and museums at the local level. For example, when the trustees of Whanganui Regional Museum first began to discuss the need to review Whanganui iwi participation in the museum's governance in 1993 they made direct reference to the Draft Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the Treaty of Waitangi.

While indigenous peoples have consistently resisted the collection and display of the remains of their ancestors and appropriated cultural property in museums, resistance to these practices has intensified since the Second World War. Because of the reluctance of museums in the United States to negotiate the return of human remains and sacred cultural property, this resistance eventually led to the passing of the Native American Graves Repatriation Act (1990). While such legislation has not been enacted in New Zealand, Māori have successfully used moral suasion and direct negotiation with museums and the Treaty settlement process to negotiate the return of kōiwi and taonga tuku iho that had been appropriated from their customary guardians. With some recent exceptions, New Zealand museums have been slow to produce inventories, for hapū and iwi, of taonga tuku iho in their collections. When these inventories are made available they will lead to further negotiations between the customary guardians and the institutions for the co-management or return of significant taonga.

Māori strategies of resistance to the colonial practices of New Zealand museums increased significantly during the 1970s, during the same period as the emergence of the rangatiratanga movement, which was concerned with the resolution of Treaty of Waitangi grievances, greater Māori autonomy and the active protection of Māori Treaty rights by future governments. While the confiscation and alienation of Māori land was the primary concern of this movement, there were some for whom the appropriation of Māori cultural property was an important issue and this placed them in conflict with museums. A generation of largely urban, tertiary educated, articulate Māori academics, professionals, civil servants, artists, and others put museums on notice that they had to progress from being colonial storehouses of appropriated artefacts to institutions that made it possible for

Māori to determine the appropriate disposition, use, interpretation, and exhibition of their own cultural heritage. In the 1980s, *Te Māori* provided the ideal opportunity for Māori to demonstrate to museum practitioners and to the New Zealand public that taonga Māori remain a vital part of Māori culture. Concurrent with this pattern of Māori resistance were museological developments in areas such as preventive conservation, storage facilities and collection documentation that led to significant changes in museum practice in New Zealand. These developments increased the ability of museums to respond to the challenges being made by Māori about the care and use of their taonga tuku iho.

Five major changes in museum practice relating to taonga Māori emerged during and following *Te Māori*. First, taonga Māori collections were reconceptualised and revalued, not as ethnological curiosities, but as taonga tuku iho and as art. Second, the link between those works and the people for whom they had particular significance was acknowledged. Third, the manner in which Māori collections were exhibited shifted from an emphasis on typological and static displays to a stronger focus on the nature and meaning of taonga tuku iho as part of a wider, ongoing context. Fourth, Māori participation moved from a donor/subject focus to one of participation in all aspects of the museum. Fifth, there was a significant growth in the number of Māori museum practitioners, although this growth was not evenly spread throughout the museum sector. These changes in museum practice at the operational level have increased Māori access to taonga Māori collections, Māori participation in collection management and the development, design and installation of museum exhibitions.

While there was significant change in museum policy and practice during the last quarter of the twentieth century, museums have not become bicultural at all levels in the sense that Māori might have anticipated. Gerard O'Regan's (1997, see also Tapsell 1998 and Whaanga 1999) review of biculturalism in New Zealand museums was a timely reminder that beneath the dressing of biculturalism there remained elements of the museum sector whose customary practices were resistant to change. The introduction of bicultural policy and practice, even in an institution as committed as the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, was not without its challenges (Tramposch 1998: 344).

With the balance of power changing between Māori and museums it was evident that strategies of resistance were being adopted by some trustees and practitioners at various levels within individual institutions. Such resistance strategies characteristically develop to counter attempts to challenge the structures of power in dominant culture institutions. Tully (1995: 54) observes that "the customary ways of speaking and acting in public institutions of modern societies have for centuries sustained dominant cultures which served to enslave, exclude, denigrate, dispossess and assimilate peoples of non-European cultures". He argues that indigenous peoples have always been sceptical of policies, such as biculturalism, that attempt to "stretch the dominant traditions and institutions to comprehend their demands", when such policies generally "skip over the first step of questioning the sovereignty of the authoritative traditions and institutions they serve to legitimate" (ibid.: 53).

Tully (ibid: 34, 41-45, 53) argues that to move beyond relationships constrained by colonial power structures towards the creation of a 'common ground', negotiations must be conducted in a dialogue in which different ways of participating in the dialogue are mutually recognised. Often the processes of negotiation between indigenous peoples and the power culture result in the restating (or even the silencing) of the indigenous peoples' claims so that they conform to liberal democratic norms. The claim of self-determination is seen as a threat and the characteristic response is to seek a solution that will assimilate or accommodate the indigenous culture within the dominant culture power structure. The challenge for public institutions negotiating with indigenous peoples is to create forms of association that accommodate difference, not to enforce conformity (ibid.: 151-3). The realisation of such accommodation only emerges from the "volley of practical dialogue". Indigenous peoples are seeking "to participate in existing institutions of the dominant society … in ways that recognise and affirm, rather than exclude, assimilate, and denigrate, their culturally diverse ways of thinking, speaking and acting" (ibid.: 4). In seeking to reconceptualise the constitutions of museums, and other public institutions, to take account of the rights of indigenous peoples to be self-determining and to observe

their own cultural practices, the process of negotiation must be such that the voices of both parties are clearly heard and respected.

Indigenous peoples, including Māori, have long advocated the need for museums to move beyond changes in policy and practice to negotiate appropriate participation of indigenous peoples in museum governance. Without effective participation in museum governance indigenous peoples remain at the margins of museum power structures with their influence largely confined to advisory functions. Effective participation within museum governance ensures a role in the medium and long-term strategic development of the institution, the establishment of short-term strategic priorities, budgetary decisions, policy endorsement and monitoring the performance of the museum director. Effective participation is facilitated by the entrenchment of the principles of mutual recognition, continuity and consent in the constitution and the presence of a significant number of indigenous peoples' representatives on the trust board. There is clear evidence that the presence of a critical number of representatives enables this group to be culturally safe, to take account of issues of skills, gender and age, to make allowances for absenteeism and to work collectively and cooperatively in the interests of both the people they represent and the institution. The representation of complex and widely distributed communities is often beyond the personal resources and skills of one or two people. Moreover, the power that a small minority on a trust board has is limited and is dependent on the goodwill of the other members of the board. While this goodwill has increased in recent times concerning issues relating directly to the use or even repatriation of indigenous peoples' cultural property, questions of the larger strategic priorities of an institution, budgetary priorities, or the assessment of the director's performance, may challenge the extent of this good-will.

The major metropolitan museums that hold the largest collections of taonga Māori have been challenged by Māori to modify their policies and practices. To date these institutions have not undertaken the fundamental revision of their governance arrangements that would move them significantly towards the reconceptualised 'common ground'. During the early and mid-1990s the major metropolitan museums in Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin revised their legislation. While Māori participation in governance was confirmed

at a minimal level for tangata whenua in the two South Island institutions, the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa Act guaranteed neither Māori nor tangata whenua participation in the governance of that institution. Since the establishment of Te Papa Tongarewa there have always been two Māori members on the trust board which consists of eight members. But perhaps of more significance is the absence of any reference to the Treaty of Waitangi in these revised acts. The limited provisions for Māori participation in the governance of these three institutions in the revision of these acts in the early 1990s may reflect the failure to engage in robust negotiations with tangata whenua about governance issues. Te Papa Tongarewa has made a commitment to become a bicultural institution and has been assiduous in adopting and implementing bicultural policies and practices within the organisation, but this is constrained by the absence in its legislation of any recognition of mana whenua or wider Māori participation in determining Māori representation on the trust board. However, Te Papa Tongarewa, to a greater extent than any other museum in New Zealand, has employed Māori museum practitioners in all aspects of its operations, has been proactive in taking a role in issues such as the repatriation of toi moko, and has had a high calibre Māori presence on the board. Legislating for Māori participation in governance may not be critical if a commitment is evident at policy and strategic levels.

The Auckland War Memorial Museum Act (1996) represents a significant advance in the recognition of Māori rights within the governance provisions of this institution. Although Māori representation on the trust board is limited to one member, and this is a significant constraint on effective Māori participation in the governance of the institution, the act establishes the Taumata-ā-Iwi and requires the trust board to act in accord with the Treaty of Waitangi and to recognise the status of mana whenua (see Kawharu, M. 2002 and Kawharu, H. 2002). Whaanga (1999) has documented the active involvement of Māori, particularly mana whenua, in the development and critique of this legislation. The trust board and management of Auckland War Memorial Museum have been proactive in developing policies (the Taumata-ā-Iwi Kaupapa and The Guiding Principles for the Auckland War Memorial Museum Trust Board's Relationship with the Taumata-ā-Iwi) and practices that maximise the potential inherent in the legislation.

In contrast the two regional charitable trust museums selected for case studies have taken major steps toward the reconceptualised 'common ground'. This thesis investigates factors that have enabled that process to occur. Both Whanganui Regional Museum and Tairāwhiti Museum have concluded a review of tangata whenua participation in their governance arrangements. An analysis of the history of Māori participation in the governance of each institution revealed a different pattern of engagement in each case. In Whanganui Regional Museum the relationship with tangata whenua was confined largely to senior members of influential families from Pūtiki whose role evolved from being advisors to associate board members and, finally, to full members of the board. These and other Māori families in the Whanganui region had also maintained relationships with the museum because of taonga they had deposited in the museum collection. In Gisborne the relationship with tangata whenua began with the formation of the Māori Museum Committee. Following the demise of this committee, there was a period from 1960 to 1988 when tangata whenua did not participate in the governance of the institution at all. However, during this period there were also members of influential Māori families in the Gisborne area who continued to maintain relationships with the museum. Some families had also deposited taonga in the museum collection and maintained the kaitiakitanga over these treasures. A Māori Advisory Committee was established in 1988 and in 1990 members of this committee were nominated to the governance body.

An analysis of the historical record of these relationships in the two institutions demonstrates that there was an enduring ambivalence in the attitudes of local Māori to these regional museums. There was recognition of the utility of the museum as an institution where taonga tuku iho could be preserved locally for future generations; however, the way in which some taonga had originally been appropriated by private collectors and the way in which trustees and staff exercised their control of taonga placed in the museum has been the cause of continuing discontent among tangata whenua. During the 1980s and 1990s, local Māori in both regions intensified their advocacy for change in museum policies and practices and even advocated the removal of museum collections to iwi cultural centres. At the same time there was a growing recognition by museum trustees

and management through the 1990s that there was a need to renegotiate tangata whenua participation in museum governance. In both institutions the number of local Māori board members increased to three, but these individuals did not have a mandate from tangata whenua to represent their interests, nor were they directly responsible to any particular constituency.

Various factors led to both institutions undertaking governance reviews. The renegotiation of tangata whenua participation in museum governance was only one issue facing them in the late 1990s. During the 1990s the level of local body funding available to these institutions increased significantly. As a consequence, the local bodies required the institutions to review their governance arrangements and make the transition from membership-based organisations to charitable trusts, drawing their representation from community stakeholders. Another motivation that had drawn both institutions into the governance review process was the perceived need to develop smaller skills-based boards that could deliver the additional revenue required to sustain the development of museum facilities and programmes. To some extent these issues were overshadowed in both institutions by the challenge of negotiating governance agreements with tangata whenua.

Tangata whenua effectively entered the Tairāwhiti Museum governance review process when a local kaumatua wrote to the director advising him that unless the museum provided representation for Tairāwhiti iwi in the new governance model it was likely that local iwi would eventually create their own cultural centre and remove significant taonga from the collection. A significant change in Māori participation in the museum's governance was needed, from a relationship with local families to a relationship with iwi rūnanga. A power-sharing model of the type proposed by the kaumatua, recommending that five iwi be given membership on the new trust board, was adopted by the museum trustees and recommended to a meeting of Tairāwhiti iwi, where the concept was also supported. The principles written into the new constitution to guide the relationship between the museum and Tairāwhiti iwi were the same as those contained in the Auckland War Memorial Museum Act. It is argued in this thesis that the new governance model was more easily negotiated with Tairāwhiti iwi because of the relationship the museum had

with the C Company trust and the clear recognition of the mana and rangatiratanga of Tairāwhiti iwi within the governance proposals. The lack of public opposition to the new arrangements was probably due to the fact that the 50/50 power-sharing arrangement with iwi was seen to reflect the composition of the population of the region and was therefore viewed by the community as consistent with democratic principles.

The Whanganui Regional Museum initiated the governance review process as an in-house process and invited tangata whenua to participate in the discussions. The initial response was minimal. The museum then employed a local Māori consultant to facilitate a process that would enable tangata whenua to engage in the review process as an equal partner in the dialogue. Through this process Māori were able to bring to the negotiations a governance model, based on the principles of partnership and 'two peoples' development, that was, after considerable debate, accepted by the trustees and the museum society membership. The new constitution also makes reference to both the Treaty of Waitangi and the Draft Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. This process observed the principles of negotiation and recognition that Tully identifies as essential if the voice of indigenous peoples is to be heard and respected. Opposition to the proposed governance model was led by three local body politicians (all of whom were former chairmen of the museum board) who characterised the model as racist and undemocratic because of the level of Māori representation and the 'right of veto' entrenched in the constitution. Opponents insisted that Whanganui was a multicultural, not a bicultural community, using the resistance strategy of tolerant multiculturalism to counter the recognition of indigeneity. They also used the argument that the model was undemocratic. However, the opposition was not sufficient to stop the museum board from creating the new charitable trust based on the model proposed by tangata whenua. Opponents also focused on references to the Treaty of Waitangi and it was evident that they objected to the Treaty being used as a basis for negotiating with tangata whenua. It was even suggested that the Treaty was no longer relevant in New Zealand's multicultural society. While there were some who opposed the new governance model because they feared similar models might spread to other institutions and even local government, others supported it because they

saw the potential for this model to contribute to improved relationships between Māori and Pākehā in the wider community.

Interviews with trustees and directors identified a number of constraints faced by each institution as they explored the implications of the constitutional changes for future development. Strategic development of both institutions was constrained by under-staffing, insufficient funding and inadequate facilities to sustain current levels of operation, irrespective of any new initiatives. With both local bodies indicating a reluctance to make significant increases in the level of the funding, the trust boards needed to determine whether they would operate within their current incomes or develop a strategy to generate additional revenue. The absence of Māori museum practitioners in management, curatorial and collection management positions was a significant constraint for Whanganui Regional Museum as it attempted to translate the governance principles into museum policy and practices. Given the financial constraints it is unlikely that this limitation will be easily overcome in the near future. Tairāwhiti Museum had given priority to the appointment of Māori staff in management, curatorial and other positions in the period preceding the governance review. Both trustees and the director acknowledged the important role played by Māori staff in the development of new policy and programmes since the new trust was established and in helping to create an institution that is increasingly accessible to tangata whenua.

Moving museums towards a 'common ground' has also been dependent on effective and committed leadership. In both case study institutions, the trustees, Māori and Pākehā, took a constructive leadership role in the governance review process and the trustees of both institutions indicated that both directors took a strong leadership role in the governance review process. In moving these relatively conservative museum societies towards such significant constitutional change the directors were required to demonstrate commitment and vision. Effective leadership also came from tangata whenua who indicated clearly to each of these institutions that it was time for fundamental change in the governance relationships with iwi. In both cases, tangata whenua proposed power-sharing governance models that were eventually adopted by the institutions. Tangata whenua of both

communities also exhibited strong agency in the governance review process in actively engaging the institutions in the politics of indigeneity.

Governance reform is only the beginning of a new phase in the development of these two institutions. Both governance models provide constitutional foundations for institutions that are working towards functioning as 'common ground' founded on the principles of mutual recognition, continuity and consent. The challenge for both institutions is to build a new structure on the constitutional foundation that has been provided, retaining the best existing elements of each institution and exploring the potential for future strategic development.

While the newly adopted governance arrangements in the two case study museums have been of considerable interest to the wider museum sector in New Zealand, there are many who are closely observing developments to determine whether increased Māori representation will eventuate in better public museums and greater satisfaction for tangata whenua. The trustees and directors of the two case study museums also have high expectations that the new governance structures, and the increased representation of tangata whenua in particular, will deliver tangible benefits for tangata whenua, the wider communities and the museums. The following are some of the anticipated benefits: (1) the iwi representatives will bring a range of governance skills and cultural knowledge to museum governance; (2) there will be more effective representation of hapū and iwi interests within museum governance and this will facilitate a stronger relationship between the museum and iwi development strategies; (3) there will be more effective communication between the museum and hapū and iwi; (4) the museum will become a culturally safe environment for museum trustees, museum staff and the community; (5) the museum trustees will engage in more effective medium and long-term strategic planning; (6) the trustees will ensure the development of appropriate policy in all areas of the museum's activities, particularly the care and use of taonga Māori; (7) museum practice will accord with the appropriate kawa and tikanga; (8) both physical and intellectual access to the taonga Māori collections will be significantly increased and the representations of tangata whenua in exhibitions and public programmes will include the

contemporary realities of Māori lives as well as customary practices; (9) tangata whenua will protect the interests of other iwi whose taonga are currently in the museum collection; (10) there will be greatly increased cross-cultural communication and understanding within the governing body, the museum and the wider community; (11) there will be more effective dispute resolution processes for people who have a grievance with the museum; (12) the new governance models will be seen to work effectively so that other public institutions and community organisations may consider adopting similar governance arrangements.

The trustees, Māori and non-Māori, of both Whanganui Regional Museum and Tairāwhiti Museum, have shown considerable goodwill in ensuring that there has been a strong sense of continuity with the past practices and objectives of each museum, while recognising the need to create new policy frameworks and to increase the accessibility of the institutions to the whole community, particularly tangata whenua. While some benefits have already been documented, it will take time for the new governance arrangements to deliver the anticipated benefits, primarily because significant change will only emerge from medium and long-term strategic planning, including increasing financial resources, facility development, and staffing development. However, there is reason for considerable optimism that both Whanganui Regional Museum and Tairāwhiti Museum will maximise the opportunities offered for innovative development as a result of the new governance arrangements.

References

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (September 2000). The other "bringing them home". ATSIC NEWS. Retrieved December 9, 2003, from http://www.atsic.gov.au/news_room/atsic_news/September_2000/bringing_them_home .asp.

Akuhata-Brown, K. (1999). Taonga Returns to Iwi. *Pipiwharauroa* 68, 1.

Alexander, E. (1983). *Museum Masters: Their Museums and their Influence.* Nashville: AASLH.

The Alexander Museum. (1933). *The Alexander Museum, Wanganui, NZ. Founded in 1892 by S.H. Drew, F.L.S.: Early History and Guide to Principal Exhibits, December 1ˢᵗ, 1933.* Wanganui: The Alexander Museum.

Ames, M. (1988). Boycott the Politics of Suppression! *Muse* 6(3), 15-16.

Ames, M. (1992). *Cannibal Tours and Glass Boxes: The Anthropology of Museums.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Ames, M., Harrison, J. and Nicks, T. (1988). Proposed Museum Policies for Ethnological Collections and the Peoples they Represent. *Muse* 6(3), 47-57.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. and Tiffin, H. (1998). *Key Concepts in Post-colonial Studies.* London: Routledge.

Assembly of First Nations and Canadian Museums Association. (1992). *Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships Between Museums and First Peoples.* Ottawa: Canadian Museums Association.

Assu, H. and Inglis, J. (1996). Renewal of the Potlatch at Cape Mudge. In K. Coates and R. Fisher (Eds), *Out of the Background: Readings on Canadian Native History* (pp. 353-366). Toronto: Copp Clark Ltd.

Barkan, E. (2002). Amending Historical Injustices: The Restitution of Cultural Property - An Overview. In E. Barkan and R. Bush (Eds). *Claiming the Stones / Naming the Bones: Cultural Property and the Negotiation of National and Ethnic Identity* (pp. 16-46). Los Angeles: Getty Publications.

Barlow, C. (1991). *Tikanga Whakaaro: Key Concepts in Māori Culture.* Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Barns, E. and Chapple, L. (1938). *Te Wehi o te Rangi.* Bulletin (Alexander Museum (Wanganui, N.Z.); No. 3. Wanganui.

Bell, C. (1992). Aboriginal Claims to Cultural Property in Canada: A Comparative Legal Analysis of the Repatriation Debate. *American Indian Law Review, 17*(2), 457-521.

Bennett, T. (1995). *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics.* London: Routledge.

Bharadia, S. (1999). The Return of Blackfoot Material by Museums of Southern Alberta [MA Thesis]. Calgary: University of Calgary.

Bishop, C. (1998). Kei Muri a Mua - The Past Determines the Future: The Relationship between Museums and Māori People in Aotearoa New Zealand (unpublished).

Bishop, R. (1994). Initiating Empowering Research? *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* 29(1).

Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative Research Stories: Whakawhanaungatanga*. Dunmore Press: Palmerston North.

Bishop, R. and Glynn, T. (1999). Researching in Māori Contexts: An interpretation of participatory consciousness. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*. 20(2), 167-182.

Board of Trustees, National Art Gallery and Dominion Museum. (1969). *Report of the Board of Trustees of the National Art Gallery and Dominion Museum.* Wellington: R.E. Owen, Government Printer.

Brownlie, I. (1992). *Treaties and Indigenous Peoples.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Broyles, J. (1989). The Politics of Heritage: Native American Museums and the Maintenance of Ethnic Boundaries on the Contemporary Northwest Coast [PhD Thesis]. Seattle: University of Washington.

Burcaw, G. (1983). A Museological View of the Repatriation of Museum Objects. *Museum Studies Journal, 1*(1), 8-11.

Butler, P. (1996). Te Māori Past and Present: Stories of Te Māori [MA Thesis]. Palmerston North: Massey University.

Butler, T. (2001a). Body of Evidence. *Museums Journal, 101*(8), 24-27.

Butler, T. (2001b). Government Announces Details of Working Party on Human Remains. *Museums Journal, 101*(6), 5.

Butts, D. (1984). Co-operative Re-development Planning: First Steps. *AGMANZ Journal,* 15(4), 23-4.

Butts, D. (1990a). Learning to Listen. In ICOM/ICTOP (Ed.), *Museum Training as Career-long Learning in a Changing World*. ICOM/ICTOP. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

Butts, D. (1990b). Ngā Tukemata: Ngā Taonga o Ngāti Kahungunu (The Awakening: The Treasures of Ngāti Kahungunu). In P. Gathercole and D. Lowenthal (Eds), *The Politics of the Past* (pp. 107-117). London: Unwin Hyman.

Butts, D. (1993). Institutional Arrangements for Cultural Heritage Management in New Zealand: Legislation, Management, and Protection. In M. Hall and S. McArthur (Eds), *Heritage Management in New Zealand and Australia: Visitor Management, Interpretation, and Marketing* (pp. 169-187). Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Butts, D. (1994). The Orthodoxy of Bi-culturalism. *New Zealand Museums Journal,* 24(2), 32-4.

Butts, D. and Soutar, M. (1997). Report on C Company Collection (unpublished).

Butts, D. (2002). Māori and Museums: The Politics of Indigenous Recognition. In R. Sandell (Ed.), *Museums, Society, Inequality* (pp. 225-243). London: Routledge.

Cameron, F. (2000). Shaping Māori Identities and Histories: Collecting and exhibiting Māori material culture at the Auckland and Canterbury Museums from the 1850s to the 1920s [PhD Thesis]. Palmerston North: Massey University.

Childs, P. and Williams, P. (1997). *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory.* London: Prentice Hall.

Clarke, C. (1998). Mai i te Pō ki te Ao Marama, Māori and Museums: Past, Present and Future Aspirations [MA Thesis]. Hamilton: University of Waikato.

Clarke, C. (2002). Te Ao Tūroa – a Māori view of the Natural World in Auckland Museum. *Te Ara* 17(1): 23-26.

Clavir, M. (2002). *Preserving What is Valued: Museums, Conservation and First Nations.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Clifford, J. (1988). *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-century Ethnography Literature and Art.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Clifford, J. (1990). Four Northwest Coast Museums. In I. Karp and S. Levine. (Eds), *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display* (pp. 2-54). Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Clifford, J. (1997). *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Coffin, A. (1999). *Ngā Taonga i Tuku Iho Mai Kuri a Wharei ki te Ihu o te Waka Arapohatu ki Tuhua i Waho: Research Report of Taonga Māori and Māori Material From Waihi Beach to Maketu, Kaimai to Offshore Islands, Bay of Plenty.* Tauranga: Tauranga Museum.

Cole, D. (1985). *Captured Heritage: The Scramble for Northwest Coast Artifacts.* University of Washington Press.

Colson, E. (1953). *The Makah Indians: A Study of an Indian Tribe in Modern American Society.* Westport: Greenwood Press.

Commission on Human Rights, United Nations (1993). *Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.* Retrieved December 7, 2003, from http://www.usask.ca/nativelaw/ddir.html.

Cooper, K. (1998). *Tribal Museum Directory.* Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

Coster, J. (1994). A Bicultural Museums Association for Aotearoa New Zealand. *New Zealand Museums Journal,* 24(2), 22-27.

Council of Australian Museum Associations. (1993). *Previous Possessions, New Obligations: Policies for Museums in Australia and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples.* Melbourne: Council of Australian Museum Associations.

Council of Australian Museum Associations. (1999). *Previous Possessions, New Obligations: Policies for Museums in Australia and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples.* Melbourne: Council of Australian Museum Associations.

Council of Australian Museum Associations. (2003). *Continuous Cultures Ongoing Responsibilities.* Retrieved June 19, 2003, from http://www.museumsaustralia.org.au/structure/policies/ppn/ccor.n.

Cranmer Webster, G. (1988). The "R" Word. *Muse,* 6(3), 43-6.

Cranmer Webster, G. (1995). The Potlatch Collection Repatriation. In J. Wong et al. (Eds), *Material Culture in Flux: Law and Policy of Repatriation of Cultural Property* (pp. 137-141). Vancouver: University of Columbia, Faculty of Law.

Cranmer-Webster, G. (1990). The U'mista Cultural Centre. *Massachusetts Review,* 31(1/2), 134.

Cunningham, C. (1998). A Framework for Addressing Māori Knowledge in Research, Science and Technology. In Durie, M. et al. *Te Oru Rangahau: Māori Research and Development Conference*. School of Māori Studies, Massey University: Palmerston North.

Daes, E. (1997). *Protection of the Heritage of Indigenous People*. New York: United Nations.

Dell, R. ([196-]). *The First Hundred Years of the Dominion Museum*. Wellington (unpublished).

Denzin, Z. and Y. Lincoln (Eds). (2003). *Strategies for Qualitative Enquiry*. 2nd edition. London: Sage.

Department of Internal Affairs. (2001). *Review of Local Government Act 1974: Synopsis of Submissions*. Wellington: Department of Internal Affairs.

Dirks, N. (1992). Introduction: Colonialism and Culture. In N. Dirks (Ed.), *Colonialism and Culture* (pp. 1-25). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Dirks, N., Eley, G., & Ortner, S. (1994). *Culture/Power/History: A Reader in Contemporary Social Theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Dolan, J. (2001). Previous Possessions New Obligations in Western Australian Community Museums. *Open Museum Journal,* 3. hrrp://amol.org.au/craft/omjournal/volume3/dolan.pdf

Downes, T. (1915). *Old Whanganui*. Hawera: W.A. Parkinson.

Doxtater, D. (1996). The Implications of Canadian Nationalism for Aboriginal Cultural Autonomy. In *Curatorship: Indigenous Perspectives in Post-Colonial Societies* (pp. 56-70). Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization.

Durie, M. (1994). *Whaiora: Māori Health Development*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Durie, M. (1998). *Te Mana Te Kāwanatanga: The Politics of Māori Self-Determination*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Durie, M. (1998a). Te Oru Rangahau: Concluding remarks. In Durie, M. et al. *Te Oru Rangahau: Māori Research and Development Conference*. School of Māori Studies, Massey University: Palmerston North.

Durie, M. (1999). Māori Development: Reflections and Strategic Directions. Address to Senior Māori Public Servants, Wellington, August 18, 1999 (unpublished).

Durie, M. (2000). Universal Provision, Indigeneity and the Treaty of Waitangi. *Victoria University of Wellington Law Review, 33,* 591-601.

Durie, M. (2002). Wai 262: Evidence prepared by Mason Durie to Waitangi Tribunal (unpublished).

Erikson, P. (1999). A-Whaling We Will Go: Encounters of Knowledge and Memory at the Makah Cultural and Research Center. *Cultural Anthropology,* 14(4), 556-583.

Erikson, P. (2002). *Voices of a Thousand People: The Makah Cultural and Research Center*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Fea, R. and Pishief, E. (1996). *Culture of Collecting: 60 Years of the Hawkes Bay Museum.* Napier: Hawkes Bay Cultural Trust.

Fleras, A. (1999). Politicising Indigeneity: Ethno-politics in White Settler Dominions. In P. Havemann (Ed.), *Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Australia, Canada and New Zealand* (pp. 187-234). Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Fleras, A. and Spoonley, P. (1999). *Recalling Aotearoa: Indigenous Politics and Ethnic Relations in New Zealand.* Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Frey, P. (2002). Museums get tough on 'trophy' returns. *The Age*, December 11, 2002.

Fuller, N. and Fabricius, S. (1992). Native American Museums and Cultural Centers: Historical Overview and Current Issues. *Zeitschrift fur Ethnologie* 117, 223-237.

Galla, A. (1997). Indigenous Peoples, Museums and Ethics. In G. Edson (Ed.), *Museum Ethics* (pp. 140-155). London: Routledge.

Gibbons, J. (1997). The Museum as Contested Terrain: The Canadian Case. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society,* 26(4), 309-314.

gii-dahl-guud-sliiaay. (1995). Cultural Perpetuation: Repatriation of First Nations Cultural Heritage. In J. Wong et al. (Eds), *Material Culture in Flux: Law and Policy of Repatriation of Cultural Property* (pp. 183-201). Vancouver: University of British Columbia, Faculty of Law.

Gorbey, K. (1982). The AGMANZ Māori Curator's Fellowship. *AGMANZ News,* 13(1), 15-16.

Government of Australia (1995). *Self-Determination: The Australian Position*. Retrieved December 7, 2003, from
http://www.cwis.org/fwdp/Oceania/aus_95.txt.

Greenfield, J. (1989). *The Return of Cultural Property*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Griffin, D. (1996). Previous Possessions, New Obligations: A commitment by Australian Museums. *Curator,* 39(1), 45-62.

Griffiths, T. (1996). *Hunters and Collectors: The Antiquarian Imagination in Australia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gulliford, A. (2000). *Sacred Objects and Sacred Places: Preserving Tribal Traditions.* Boulder, Colo.: University Press of Colorado.

Gutmann, A. (Ed.) (1994). *Multiculturalism: Framing the Politics of Cultural Recognition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hage, G. (1994). Locating Multiculturalism's 'Other': A Critique of Practical Tolerance. *New Foundations,* 24, 19-34.

Hakiwai, A. (1995). The Search for Legitimacy: Museums in Aotearoa, New Zealand - A Māori Viewpoint. In L. Tsong-yuan (Ed.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Anthropology and the Museum* (pp. 283-294). Taipei: Taiwan Museum.

Halbert, R. (1999). *Horouta: The History of the Horouta Canoe, Gisborne and East Coast.* Auckland: Reed.

Haldane, W. (1979). Art Galleries and Museums in the Community. *AGMANZ Newsletter,* 10(2), 2-3.

Halpin, M. (1988). [Exhibition Review]. *Culture, VIII*(1), 89-93.

Hanham, S. (2000). The Te Māori Exhibition: an examination of its origins and impacts as seen by those who developed the exhibition. [MA Thesis] Victoria University of Wellington.

Harrison, J. (1988a). Museums and Politics: The Spirit Sings and the Lubicon Boycott. Co-ordinating Curator's Statement. *Muse,* 12, 12-13.

Harrison, J. (1988b). 'The Spirit Sings' and the Future of Anthropology. *Anthropology Today,* 4(6), 6-9.

Harrison, J. (1997). Museums as Agencies of Neocolonialism in a Postmodern World. *Studies in Cultures, Organisations and Societies* 3, 41-65.

Havemann, P. (Ed.) (1999). *Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Australia, Canada and New Zealand.* Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Hayward, J. (1997). Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. In A. Ward (Ed.), *National Overview* (pp. 475-494). Wellington: GP Publications.

Hill, R. (1988). First Nations and Museums: Editorial. *Muse,* 6(3), 81-84.

Hill, R. (2001). Repatriation: An Opportunity for Cultural Exchange. In R. Adams (Ed.), *Implementing the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act* (p. 135). Washington D.C.: American Association of Museums.

Hill, T. (1994). Introduction: A Backward Glimpse Through the Museum Door. In T. Hill and R. Hill (Eds), *Creations Journey: Native American Identity and Belief* (pp. 14-19). Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Hill, T. and Nicks, T. (1992). The Task Force on Museums and First Peoples. *Muse* 10(2+3), 81-84.

Hutt, S. and McKeown. T. (2001). Control of Cultural Property as Human Rights Law. In R. Adams (Ed.), *Implementing the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act* (pp. 198-209). Washington D.C.: American Association of Museums.

Huwyler, G. (2001). Te Rangimarie Model (unpublished).

Ivison, D., Patton P. and Saunders. W. (2000). Introduction. In D. Ivison, P. Patton and W. Saunders (Eds), *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (pp. 1-21). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacknis, I. (1996). Repatriation as Social Drama: The Kwakiutl Indians of British Columbia, 1922-1980. *American Indian Quarterly,* 20(2), 274-286.

Jacknis, I. (2002). *The Storage Box of Tradition: Kwakiutl Art, Anthropologists, and Museums, 1881-1981.* Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Jackson, M. (2000). Where Does Sovereignty Lie? In C. James (Ed.), *Building the Constitution.* (pp. 196-200). Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies.

Jahnke, H. and J. Taiapa (2003). Māori Research In Davidson, C. and M. Tolich, *Social Science Research in New Zealand.* Pearson: Auckland.

Johnston D. (1995). Native Rights as Collective Rights. In Kymlicka (Ed.), *The Rights of Minority Cultures* (pp. 179-205). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jones, S. (1995). Treaty Issues and the Museum Sector. In *A Framework for Funding and Performance Measurement of Museums in New Zealand* (pp. 1-14). Wellington: New Zealand Museum Directors Federation.

Kaitiaki Māori and Museums Aotearoa. (1997). Kei Muri a Mua! The Past Determines the Future! Wellington (unpublished).

Kawharu, H. (2002). Land and Identity in Tamaki: A Ngati Whātua perspective. *Te Ara,* 27(1), 6-11.

Kawharu, M. (2002). Indigenous Governance in Museums: A Case Study, the Auckland War Memorial Museum. In Ffords, C., Hubert, J. and Turnbull, P. *The Dead and their Possessions: Repatriation in Principle, Policy and Practice.* (pp. 293-302). London: Routledge.

King, M. (1981). *The Collector: Andreas Reichek - A Biography.* Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton.

Kreps, C. (2003). *Liberating Culture: Cross-cultural Perspectives on Museums, Curation and Heritage Preservation.* London: Routledge.

Kymlicka, W. (2000). American Multiculturalism and the 'Nations Within'. In D. Ivison, P. Patton and W. Saunders (Eds), *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.* (pp. 216-236). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Legget, J. (2000). *Restitution and Repatriation: Guidelines for Good Practice.* London: Museums and Galleries Commission.

Maaka, R. and Fleras, A. (2000). Engaging With Indigeneity: Tino Rangatiratanga in Aotearoa. In D. Ivison, P. Patton and W. Sanders (Eds), *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.* (pp. 89-109). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacAskill, E. (2000). Britain Pressed to Return Aboriginal Bones. *Guardian Unlimited.* Wednesday July 5, 2000. Retrieved September 6, 2001, from http://www.guardian.co.uk/Archive/Article/0,4273,4036967,00.html.

Malaro, M. (1994). *Museum Governance, Mission Ethics, Policy.* Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Mane-Wheoki, J. (1993). *Mataatua: Nō Wai Tēnei Whare Tupuna? A Report on Ngāti Awa Claim (Wai 46).* Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal.

Mane-Wheoki, J. (1995). Imag(in)ing Our Heritage: Museums and People in Aotearoa. *New Zealand Museums Journal,* 25(3), 2-8.

Mattson, L. (1997). Examinations of the Systems of Authority of Three Canadian Museums and the Challenges of Aboriginal Peoples [PhD Thesis]. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

Mauze, M. (1992). Exhibiting One's Culture: Two Case Studies: The Kwakliuth Museum and the U'mista Cultural Centre. *European Review of Native American Studies,* 6(1), 27-30.

McAlear, D. (1996). First Peoples, Museums and Citizenship. In T. Bennet, R. Trotter and D. McAlear (Eds), *Museums and Citizenship: A Resource Book* (pp. 79-113). Brisbane: Queensland Museum.

McCarthy, K. (1998). The Rise and Fall of CCAC: A Case Study in Heritage Politics [MA Thesis]. Palmerston North: Massey University.

McKenzie, M. (1991). *The Manawatū Museum Society Incorporated 1970 - 1991: An Historical Survey*. Palmerston North: Manawatū Museum Society.

McKenzie, M. (1993). A Challenge to Museums - Keeping the taonga warm. *Zeitschrift fur Ethnologie,* 118*,* 79-85.

McKergow, F. (1997). Nature's Treasure House: The Founding and Early History of the Wanganui Public Museum 1870-1901 (unpublished).

McLoughlin, M. (1993). Of Boundaries and Borders. *Canadian Journal of Communications* [Online] 18(3). Retrieved June 16, 2003, from www.wllu.ca/~wwwpress/jrls/cjc/BackIssues/18.3/<CENTER

McLoughlin, M. (1999). *Museums and the Representation of Native Canadians: Negotiating the Borders of Culture.* New York: Garland Publishing.

McManus, G. (1991). The Crisis of Representation in Museums: The exhibition 'The Spirit Sings,' Glenbow Museum, Calgary, Canada. In S. Pearce (Ed.), *Museum Economics and the Community* (pp. 202-206). London: The Atholone Press.

McManus, G. (1992). The Te Māori Exhibition and the Future of Museology in New Zealand. In S. Pearce (Ed.), *Museums and Europe 1992* (pp. 192-199). London: Athlone Press.

Mead, H. (1986). *Magnificent Te Māori: Te Māori Whakahirahira*. Auckland: Heinemann.

Mead, H. (1990). *Nga Karoretanga o Mataatua Whare: The Wanderings of the Carved House Mataatua.* Whakatāne: Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Awa.

Mead, H. (1995). The Mataatua Declaration and the Case of the Carved Meeting House Mataatua. In J. Wong et al. (Eds), *Material Culture in Flux: Law and Policy of Repatriation of Cultural Property* (pp. 69-75). Vancouver: University of British Columbia, Faculty of Law.

Mead, S. (1984). *Te Māori: Māori Art from New Zealand Collections.* New York: Harry N. Abrams.

Mead, S. (1985a). Celebrating New Zealand's Cultural Heritage: A Māori Point of View. In J. Hoyle (Ed.), *Interpreting Cultural Diversity* (pp. 16-21). Museum Education Association of New Zealand.

Mead, S. (1985b). Concepts and Models for Māori Museums and Cultural Centres. *AGMANZ Journal,* 16(3), 3-5.

Mead, S. (1997). Two Blankets and a Puff of Tobacco: The Struggle to Build Bridges of Understanding. In *Landmarks, Bridges and Visions: Aspects of Māori Culture* (pp. 100-112). Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Merrill, W. Ladd, E. and Ferguson T. (1993). The Return of the Ahayu:Da: Lessons for Repatriation from Zuni Pueblo and the Smithsonian Institution. *Current Anthropology,* 34(5), 523-567.

Moon, P. (1998). The Historiography of the Moutoa Gardens Occupation. In P. Cleave (Ed.). *The Changing Field.* (pp. 47-71). Palmerston North: Campus Press.

Murchie, M. (1995). Whanganui Regional Museum and Māori 1895-1995 (unpublished).

Murphy, H. (1999). *Te Kaupapa Tikanga-ā-rua ki roto i ngā Whare Taonga o Aotearoa: Anei ko te Huarahi Bicultural developments in Museums of Aotearoa: A Way Forward.* Wellington: Te Papa Tongarewa.

Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa. (1999). *He Wānanga Tirohanga Rangapū mo Te Kaupapa Tikanga-ā-rua i roto i ngā Whare Taonga*: *Wānanga on Bicultural Development in Museums*. Wellington: Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa.

Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa. (2000). *He Wānanga Tirohanga Rangapū mo Te Kaupapa Tikanga-ā-rua i roto i ngā Whare Taonga: Wānanga on Bicultural Governance and Leadership in Museums*. Wellington: Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa.

Museums Aotearoa. (1999). Rules of Museums Aotearoa Te Tari o Ngā Whare Taonga o te Motu, The Museums of New Zealand Inc. (unpublished).

Myers, M. (1988). The Glenbow Affair. *Inuit Art Quarterly,* 3(1), 12-16.

NAGPRA at 10: Examining a decade of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. (2000). *Museum News,* 79(5), 42-9, 67-75.

Nanson, J. (1997). Beyond Repatriation: Cultural Policy and Practice for the Twenty-first Century. In B. Ziff and P. Rao (Eds), *Borrowed Power: Essays on Cultural Appropriation* (pp. 291-312). New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

National Art Gallery, National Museum and National War Memorial. (1978). *Report of the Board of Trustees of the National Art Gallery, National Museum and National War Memorial for the year ended 31 March 1978.* Wellington.

National Museum of the American Indian. (1991). National Museum of the American Indian Policy Statement on Native American Human Remains and Cultural Materials. *Museum Anthropology,* 15(2), 25-28.

Neich, R. (1979). The Restitution and Return of Cultural Property: A New Zealand viewpoint. *AGMANZ Newsletter,* 10(4), 5-10.

Neich, R. (1985). Interpretation and Presentation of Māori Culture. *AGMANZ Journal,* 16(4), 5-7.

Ngā Taonga o te Motu: Te Marae Taonga o Aotearoa Treasures of the Nation: National Museum of New Zealand, A Plan for Development. (1985). Report of the Project Development Team. Wellington: Department of Internal Affairs.

Ngata, Sir H. (2002). Preface. In N. Harrison, *Graham Latimer: A Biography.* (pp. vii-ix). Wellington: Huia.

Nicks, T. (1995). The Task Force on First Nations and Museums. In J. Wong et al. (Ed.), *Material Culture in Flux: Law and Policy of Repatriation of Cultural Policy* (pp. 143-147). Vancouver: University of British Columbia, Faculty of Law.

Notzke, C. (1996). Co-Managing Aboriginal Cultural Resources. *Muse,* 14(3), 53-56.

Orchiston, W. (1991). Bola and Beyond: Some Recent Developments at the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre. *New Zealand Museums Journal* 21(1), 11-15.

Ormond-Parker, L. (1997). A Commonwealth Repatriation Odyssey. *Indigenous Law Bulletin* [Online] 3. Retrieved September 5, 2001, from http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/special/rsjproject/rsjlibrary/ilb/vol3/no90/2.html

Oxendine, L. (1992). Tribally Operated Museums: A Reinterpretation of Indigenous Collections [PhD Thesis]. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

O'Biso, C. (1987). *First Light.* Auckland: Reed Books.

O'Regan, G. (1997a). *Bicultural Developments in Museums of Aotearoa: What is the current status?/ Ki te whakamana i te kaupapa tikanga-ā-rua ki roto i ngā whare taonga o*

te motu: Kei hea e tū ana?. Wellington: Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa National Services in partnership with Museums Association of Aotearoa New Zealand.

O'Regan, G. (1997b). Biculturalism, The Treaty and the Spirit of Partnership. *New Zealand Museums Journal,* 26(2), 28-30.

O'Regan, S. (1984). Taonga Māori Mana Māori. *AGMANZ Journal,* 15(4), 15-18.

O'Regan, T. (1987). Who Owns the Past? Change in Māori Perceptions of the Past. In J. Wilson (Ed.), *From the Beginning: The Archaeology of the Māori* (pp. 141-145). Auckland: Penguin Books, in association with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust.

Pascua, M. (1991). Ozette: A Makah Village in 1491. *National Geographic Magazine,* 180(4), 38-53.

Pearce, T. (1996). Previous Possessions New Obligations. *Museum National,* 5(2), 15.

Pettit, P. (2000). Minority Claims under Two Conceptions of Democracy. In: D. Ivison, P. Patton and W. Saunders, *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.* (pp.199-215) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pishief, E. (1998). Augustus Hamilton: Appropriation, Ownership and Authority [MA Thesis]. Palmerston North: Massey University.

Poata-Smith, E. (1996). He Pokeke Uenuku i Tū ai: The Evolution of Contemporary Māori Protest. In P. Spoonley, D. Pearson, and C. Macpherson (Eds), *Ngā Pātai: Racism and Ethnic Relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 97-116). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Poole, R. (1999). *Nation and Identity.* London: Routledge.

Potaka, U. and Butts, D. (2003). Ngā Taonga Tūhono – Treasures that Unite People. *Te Ara* 28(2), 4-9.

Povinelli, E. (2002). *The Cunning of Recognition: Indigenous Alterities and the Making of Australia's Multiculturalism.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Powell, A. (Ed.). (1967). *The Centennial History of the Auckland Institute and Museum.* Auckland: Auckland Institute and Museum.

Praat, A. (1998). The Occupation of Moutoa Gardens – Pakaitore Marae: A Discourse Analysis. [PhD Thesis]. Massey University, Palmerston North.

Prasad, A. (2003). The Gaze of the Other: Postcolonial Theory and Organisational Analysis. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial Theory and Organisational Theory: A Critical Analysis* (pp. 3-39). Palgrave: MacMillan.

Puketapu, T. (1998). Strategic Planning. Whanganui Regional Museum, 13 March 1998 (unpublished).

Ramsden, I. (2002). Cultural Safety and Nursing Education in Aotearoa and Te Waipounamu. [PhD Thesis]. Victoria University of Wellington.

Reynolds, K. and Turner, J. (2001). Prejudice as a Group Process: The Role of Social Identity. In M. Augoustinos and K. Reynolds (Eds), *Understanding Prejudice, Racism and Social Conflict*. London: Sage.

Robinson, J., Witenberg, R. and Sanson, A. (2001). The Socialization of Tolerance. In M. Augoustinos, K. Augoustinos and K. Reynolds (Eds), *Understanding Prejudice, Racism and Social Conflict* (pp. 73-88). London: Sage Publications.

Rossman, G. and Rallis, S. (1998). *Learning in the Field: An Introduction to Qualitative Research.* London: Sage Publications.

Rowlands, M. (2002). Heritage and Cultural Property. In V. Buchli (Ed.), *The Material Culture Reader* (pp. 105-114). Oxford: Berg.

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. *Report on the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*. Vol. 1, Part 3. Retrieved December 7, 2003, from www.ainc-inac.gc.cach/rcap/sg/sg57_e.html#162.

Royal Commission on Social Policy. (1988). *The April Report.* Wellington: Royal Commission on Social Policy.

Sanborn, A. (1995). Perceptions and Misconceptions. *U'mista News,* April 1995, pp. 12-3.

Saunders, B. (1995). Kwakwaka'wakw Museology. *Cultural Dynamics,* 7(1), 37-68.

Saunders, B. (1997). Contested Ethnie in Two Kwakwaka'wakw Museums. In J. MacClancy (Ed.), *Contesting Art: Art, Politics and Identity in the Modern World* (pp. 85-130). Oxford: Berg.

Sculthorpe, G. (1994). On the Margins? *Museum National,* February 1994, pp. 7-8.

Sharp, A. (1997). *Justice and the Māori: The Philosophy and Practice of Māori Claims in New Zealand since the 1970s.* Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Simpson, M. (1996). *Making Representations: Museums in the Post-colonial Era.* London: Routledge.

Simpson, M. (1997). *Museums and Repatriation: An account of contested items in museum collections in the UK, with comparative material from other countries*. London: Museums Association.

Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonising Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

Soutar, M. and Spedding, M. (2000). *Improving Bicultural Relationhips - a Case Study: The C Company 28 Māori Battalion collection and exhibition at the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre*. Wellington: Te Papa National Services.

Stake, R. (2003). Case Studies. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds), *Strategies for Qualitative Enquiry* (pp. 134-164). London: Sage.

Strickland, R. (1997). *Tonto's Revenge: Reflections on American Indian culture and policy*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Swidler, N., Dongoske, K., Anyon, R. and Downer, A. (1997). *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground*. Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press.

Tamarapa, A. Museum Kaitiaki: Māori Perspectives on the Presentation and Management of Māori Treasures and Relationships with Museums. In *Curatorship: Indigenous Perspectives in Post-Colonial Societies*. (pp. 160-172). Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization

Tapsell, P. (1995). Pukaki: Te Taonga o Ngāti Whakaue ki Rotorua [Diss.], Auckland: University of Auckland.

Tapsell, P. (1997). The Flight of Pareraututu. *Journal of the Polynesian Society, 106*(4), 223-274.

Tapsell, P. (1998). Taonga: A Tribal Response to Museums [D.Phil.]. Oxford: University of Oxford.

Tapsell, P. (2000). *Pukaki: A Comet Returns*. Auckland: Reed Books.

Taylor, C. (1994). The Politics of Recognition. In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Framing the Politics of Cultural Recognition* (pp. 25-73). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Te Awekotuku, N. (1985). He Tuhituhi Noa Iho. *AGMANZ Journal,* 16(4), 8.

Te Awekotuku, N. (1988). The Role of Museums in Interpreting Culture. *AGMANZ Journal,* 19(2), 36-7.

Te Awekotuku, N. (1991). *He Tikanga Whakaaro: Research ethics in the Māori community*. Manatu Māori: Wellington.

Te Manawa Museums Trust Board. (2002). Te Rangimarie Document: A Formal Relationship between Iwi and Te Manawa Museums Trust Board. Palmerston North (unpublished).

Te Māori Management Committee. (1988). *Te Māori: He Tukuna Kōrero*. Wellington: Department of Internal Affairs.

Te Rūnanganui o Tahu. (1993). *Kōiwi Tangata: Te Wawata o Ngāi Tahu e pā ana ki ngā Taoka Kōiwi o Ngā Tūpuna*. Christchurch.

Te Ua, H. (1987). Te Māori: Another View. *AGMANZ Journal,* 18(2), 7-9.

Thomson, K. (1981). *Art Galleries and Museums in New Zealand.* Wellington: A. H. and A. W. Reed Ltd.

Thornbury, P. (2002). *Indigenous Peoples and Human Rights.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Tramposch, W. (1998). Te Papa: Reinventing the Museum. *Museum Management and Curatorship,* 17 (4), 339-350.

Trigger, B. (1988a). A Present of Their Past? Anthropologists, Native People, and their Heritage. *Culture, 8*(1), 71-88.

Trigger, B. (1988b). Who Owns the Past? *Muse,* 6(3), 13-15.

Trope, J. and Echo-Hawke, W. (2000). The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act: Background and Legislative History. In D. Mihesuah (Ed.), *Repatriation Reader: Who Owns American Indian Remains?* (pp. 123-168). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Tully, J. (1995). *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tully, J. (2000). The Struggles of Indigenous Peoples for and of Freedom. In D. Ivison, P. Patton & W. Saunders (Eds), *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (pp. 37-59). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tumahai, T. (2002). New Māori Policy Initiatives at the Auckland War Memorial Museum. *Te Ara* 27(2), 41-43.

Tweedie, A. (1999). Drawing Back Culture: The Makah Tribe's Struggle to Implement the Native American Graves Repatriation Act [PhD Thesis]. Harvard University.

The United Kingdom Parliament, Select Committee on Culture, Media and Sport (2000a): Minutes of Evidence, Wednesday 10 May: Examination of Witness (Questions 300-319). Retrieved December 12, 2003, from http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm199900/cmselect/cmcumeds/371/0051006.htm

The United Kingdom Parliament, Select Committee on Culture, Media and Sport. (2000b). *Memorandum Submitted by the Foundation for Aboriginal and Islander Research Action: Summary of Recommendations*. Retrieved September 7, 2001, from http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm199900/cmselect/cmcumeds/371/0051002.htm.

The United Kingdom Parliament, Select Committee on Culture, Media and Sport (2000c). Appendices to the Minutes of Evidence: Appendix 58: *Memorandum Submitted by the Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre Inc.* Retrieved September 7, 2001, from http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm199900/cmselect/cmcumeds/371/371ap68.htm.

U'mista Cultural Society (1995). *U'mista Cultural Society Annual Report* April 1994 - March 1995.

U'mista Cultural Society (1999). *U'Mista Cultural Society Annual Report* March 31 1999.

Walker, R. (1984). The Auckland Museum as a Source of Pride for Māoritanga. *AGMANZ Journal,* 15(4), 21-2.

Wanganui Public Museum/ Whanganui Regional Museum Annual Reports 1900-2001

Ward, A. and Hayward, J. (1999). Tino Rangatiratanga: Māori in the Political and Administrative System. In P. Havemann (Ed.), *Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Australia, Canada, and New Zealand* (pp. 378-399). Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Warren, K. (1989). A Philosophical Perspective on the Ethics and Resolution of Cultural Properties Issues. In P. Messenger (Ed.), *The Ethics of Collecting Cultural Property: Whose Culture? Whose Property?* (pp. 3-11). Albuquerque: New Mexico Press.

Washburn, W. (1998). *Against the Anthropological Grain.* New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Watkins, J. (2000). *Indigenous Archaeology: American Indian Values and Scientific Practice*. New York: Alta Mira Press.

Weaver, J. (1999). Indigenous and Indigeneity. In S. Ray and H. Schwarz (Eds), *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies* (pp. 221-235). Oxford: Blackwell.

Whaanga, M. (1999). Development of Bicultural Policy for the Auckland Museum [MA Thesis]. Palmerston North: Massey University.

Williams, H. (1975). *A Dictionary of Māori Language.* Wellington: Government Printer.

Wilson, G. (1985). Return and Restitution: A Museum Perspective. In I. McBryde (Ed.), *Who Owns the Past?* (pp. 99-106). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Young, I. (1995). Together in Difference: Transforming the Logic of Group Potential. In W. Kymlicka (Ed.), *The Rights of Minority Cultures* (pp. 172-187). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Official Publications

Antiquities Act 1975
Auckland War Memorial Museum Act 1996.
Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act 1993
Local Electoral Act 2000
Local Electoral Amendment Act 2002
Local Government Act 2002
Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa Act 1992
National Art Gallery and Dominion Museum Amendment Act 1936
Otago Museum Trust Board Act 1996

Museum Trust Deeds

Gisborne Museum of Art and History Trust 1999
The Science Centre, Manawatū Museum and Manawatū Art Gallery Trust 1999
Whanganui Regional Museum Trust Deed 2001

Archival and Museum References

Te Papa Tongarewa Museum of New Zealand
Annual reports of the Dominion Museum, National Museum, and Te papa Tongarewa Museum of new Zealand 1937-1992

Auckland Museum
Auckland Institute and Museum Annual Report 1966-67.

Tairāwhiti Museum Archives
Gisborne Art Society Minute Book 1961-1968
Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre Minute Books 1969-1999
Gisborne Museum of Art and History Trust Minute Book 1999-
Gisborne Branch Hawkes Bay and East Coast Arts Society Minute Book 1948-1955
Minutes of meetings of the Māori Museum Committee 1955-1959
Halbert, R. and Fowler, L. Appeal to the Māori Community typescript, 13 April 1955.

Letter from R. Duff to L. Fowler 2 August, 1955 (Tairāwhiti Museum Correspondence Files)

Whanganui Regional Museum Archives
Declaration of Incorporation, Wanganui Public Museum 1893
Wanganui Public Museum/ Regional Museum Board Minute Books 1892-2001
Whanganui Regional Museum Trust Minute Book 2001-
Wanganui Public Museum/ Regional Museum Correspondence Files 1895-2002
Agreement for the Deposit of Te Wehi o Te Rangi 19 February 1938 (File Box: Te Wehi o Te Rangi)
Letter from M. McKenzie to Whanganui Regional Museum Board 6 July 1987 (File Box: Te Wehi o Te Rangi)
Fry, J. 1987. Condition Report on Te Wehi o Te Rangi, National Museum Conservation Report 82 (File Box:Te Wehi o Te Rangi).
Letter from H. Bennett, Chairman Whanganui Regional Museum Board, 27 February 1995 (File Box: Te Wehi o Te Rangi)
Minutes of meeting Māori Trusteeship Sub-committee, 23 March 1994 (File Box: Whare Taonga Waka)

Radio New Zealand Archives
Interview by Erin Sinclair with Hori Hipango, July 1968

Personal Communications

Durie, Mason (2002). Rangitāne, Ngāti Kauwhata, Professor of Māori Studies, School of Māori Studies Te Pūtahi-ā-Toi, Massey University, Palmerston North)
McManus, Greg (2002). Director, Rotorua Museum of Art and History, Rotorua, 22 July, 2002.
Mettner, Margaret (2002). Former Chairperson, Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre, Gisborne. November, 2002.
Sheehan, Ariana (2003). Curator, Waikato Museum of Art and History, Hamilton, 14 April, 2003.
Spedding, Michael (2002) Director, Tairāwhiti Museum.
Tinirau, Esther (2002). Ngāti Ruaka, Lecturer Te Pūtahi-ā-Toi School of Māori Studies, Massey University, Palmerston North, 5 November, 2002.

Glossary

awa	river
hapū	sub-tribal group tracing descent from a common ancestor
hei tiki	ancestral shaped pendant usually made from nephrite
hui	meeting or gathering of people
hui-ā-iwi	tribal gathering
iwi	tribe
karakia	prayer
kaiārahi	guide
kaimahi	worker
kaitiaki	guardian
kaitiakitanga	customary practices relating to guardianship of and authority over taonga
kaumatua	elder
kaumātua	elders
Kaunihera	council
Kaupapa	plan, proposal
kawa	protocol, rules
kawa whakaruruhau	cultural safety
kōauau	musical instrument played with the nose; flute for mouth
koha	presentation of gifts, food or money
kōhanga reo	lit. language nest, Māori language immersion nursery school
kōiwi tangata	human remains
komiti	committee
Korero	Story, narrative
kōwhaiwhai	painted patterns on the rafters of a whare
mana	authority, prestige
mana atua	mana of the god/s
mana Māori motuhake	Māori political control
mana taonga	authority over taonga
mana whenua	authority over land
manaakitanga	hospitality to visitors
marae	ceremonial courtyard in front of meeting house, sometimes used to refer to the whole complex focused on a meeting house
maunga	mountain
Mihinare	Anglican Church
nguru	flute
paepae	main speakers on a marae and the place where they sit
Pākehā	non-Māori New Zealander of predominantly European descent
pānui	notice
Papa-tū-ā-nuku	Mother Earth
patu	hand weapon
patu ponamu	greenstone patu
poupou	carved panel in a meeting house

rangatira	well born, noble, leader
rangatiratanga	sovereignty
rauawa	attached sides of a canoe
rohe	region
rūnanga	assembly, council
taha Pākehā	lit. Pākehā side, Pākehā cultural practice
tāhuhu	ridge pole of a meeting house
takawaenga	mediator
tangata	person
tangata tiaki	customary guardian
tangata whenua	lit. people of the land. people belonging to a particular place
tangihanga	ceremony of mourning the dead
taonga	treasure, something highly prized
tapu	sacred, set apart
tauiwi	outsider
te ao Māori	the Māori world
Te Reo Māori	Māori language
tikanga	customary practices
tikanga-ā-rua	recognition of both Māori and Pākehā cultural practices; two peoples development
tino rangatiratanga	sovereignty
tipuna	ancestor
tīpuna	ancestors
tohunga	priest, skilled person
toi moko	preserved head
tukutuku	woven panels in the walls of a whare nui
Tumuaki	Head, CEO
tupuna	ancestor
tūpuna	ancestors
uru moko	preserved head
urupā	burial ground
wāhi tapu	sacred place
waka	canoe
waka kōiwi	receptacle for human remains
waka taua	war canoe
wānanga	from whare wānanga, school of learning; conference (modern usage)
whakapakoko	mummy
whakapapa	genealogy
whakataukī	proverb
whānau	family
whanaunga	relative
whanaungatanga	family relationships
Whanganuitanga	customary practices of the people of the Whanganui area
whare	house
whare nui	meeting house on a marae

whare puni   sleeping house, sometimes used for the whare nui
whare tupuna   ancestral house
Wharewānanga   school of learning

Appendix One

Māori Participation in Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa Governance

The Board of Trustees of the National Art Gallery and Dominion Museum was established by legislation in 1936. The trust board membership was to include: the Prime Minister, Minister of Internal Affairs, Under-Secretary of Internal Affairs, Mayor of Wellington, Chairman of the Wellington Harbour Board, and eleven people to be appointed by the Governor-General, including nominees from the Royal Society of New Zealand, New Zealand Academy of Fine Arts, Wellington Branch of the New Zealand Institute of Architects, Wellington War Memorial Carillon Society and a local body nominee. The final position was for a representative of the 'Native Race'.[1] The first person appointed to this position was Sir Apirana Ngata who held the position until 1949. Three representatives followed Sir Apirana Ngata during the period 1952 to 1973: Tipiwhenua Ropiha (1952-57); M. R. Jones (1959-61) and W. T. Ngata (1962-73).

From 1974 until 1992 the Māori Trustees were nominated by the New Zealand Māori Council: Graham S. Latimer (1974-92, Deputy Chairman 1986-92); Maui O. W. Pomare (1978-92) and Stephen (Tipene) G. O'Regan (1986-92). These trustees were also members of the National Museum Council. In addition to the trustees, Venerable Archdeacon Kingi Ihaka was appointed a member of the National Museum Council from 1990-92. There were also Māori members of the National Art Gallery Council during the later period of its existence including Sidney (Hirini) M. Mead (1980-82), Katerina Mataira (1986-90) and Ngahuia Te Awekotuku (1991-92).[2]

The Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa Act 1992 creates a

> national museum that … shall provide a forum in which the nation may present, explore, and preserve both the heritage of its cultures and knowledge of the natural environment in

---

[1] *National Art Gallery and Dominion Museum Amendment Act* 1936.
[2] Information in this section was collated from Annual Reports of the Dominion Museum, National Museum, and Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa 1937-1992

order better (a) to understand and treasure the past; and (b) to enrich the present; and (c) to meet the challenges of the future.[3]

The act provides for a board to consist of

> not fewer than 6 not more than 8 members to be appointed from time to time by the Governor-General on the recommendation of the Minister of Cultural Affairs.[4]

In making recommendations to the Governor-General the Minister of Cultural Affairs is required to ensure that the members of the board have the "skills and experience required for carrying out the functions of the board", including financial and management skills and the "knowledge and experience of and commitment to the functions of the board and the specific activities of the museum".[5]

Although there is no specific provision for Māori representation, there is a requirement that in the performance of its functions the board will:

(a) Have regard to the ethnic and cultural diversity of the people of New Zealand, and the contributions they have made and continue to make to New Zealand's cultural life and the fabric of New Zealand society;

(b) Endeavour to ensure both that the Museum expresses and recognises the mana and significance of Māori, European, and other major traditions and cultural heritages, and that the museum provides the means for every such culture to contribute effectively to the Museum as a statement of New Zealand's identity;

(c) Endeavour to ensure that the Museum is a source of pride for all New Zealanders.[6]

Māori are mentioned specifically in the First Schedule of the act. Consistent with the State Services Act, the board is required to recognise

(i)   The aims and aspirations of the Māori people; and

---

[3] *Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa Act* 1992, S.4
[4] Ibid.: S.10(1)
[5] Ibid.: S.3(3).
[6] Ibid.: S.8.

(ii)   The employment requirements of the Māori people; and

(iii)   The need for substantial involvement of Māori people as employees of the board.[7]

In order to ensure that the museum board is able to meet the expectations outlined in the act, the Minister of Cultural Affairs has ensured that there are always Māori members of the board. It appears that the Minister has settled on two Māori members as the appropriate number for the board. Since the establishment of the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa the following Māori trustees have been appointed: Apirana Mahuika (1992-97), Georgina Te Heuheu (1993-6), Sir Robert Mahuta (1996-97), Rikirangi Gage (1998-2001, Professor Mason Durie (1998-2001), Josephine Karanga (2001-), Mark Solomon (2001-). It is unlikely that any of these individuals has considered themselves to have a mandate from iwi because there is no formal process in place to secure such a mandate (Durie 2002, pers. comm.). However, these individuals are widely known within the Māori world and recognised as authorities in their particular fields.

Two questions arise in relation to Māori participation in the governance arrangements for the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa. Should there be specific provision in the act for Māori representation on the board? Should Māori representation on the board take specific account of the role of the mana whenua of the Wellington region? It would be a challenge to find a mechanism through which all iwi could provide a mandate for Māori members on the museum board. There are a small number of organisations that might facilitate such a process, including Te Puni Kokiri, The National Māori Congress and New Zealand Māori Council. Individuals such as the Tūwharetoa Ariki Tumu Te Heuheu and Arikinui Dame Te Atairangikahu might also have the perceived authority required to bestow such a mandate, or to call a hui to bestow such a mandate.

 It is important to emphasise the distinction between a Māori trustee appointed by a non-Māori process and a Māori trustee who has the mandate of a Māori constituency. There is a parallel here with the types of Māori representation in the New Zealand Parliament. There is a clear distinction between Māori Members of Parliament who are elected by Māori electorates and those who stand in general seats or are elected because of their place

---

[7] Ibid.: 4.2(d).

on their party's candidate list. The only MPs who have a mandate from Māori are those who have been elected to represent one of the Māori electorates. Other Māori MPs may well advocate for Māori but they cannot claim to represent Māori. A similar situation pertains to Māori museum trustees. Those elected by a process that is endorsed and controlled by Māori can be said to represent Māori. Those elected by other processes, while advocating for Māori, cannot be said to represent Māori.

The question of the role the mana whenua should have in the governance of a museum located in their area is one that has been discussed by Paora Tapsell (1998) in his doctoral dissertation. He argues strongly for the inclusion (primacy) of mana whenua in the governance of museums and sees no reason to make an exception for the national museum. His research provides evidence that this is also the view of Te Ati Awa, mana whenua for the land where the museum is located in Wellington. He provides the following quote from an interview with Te Ati Awa leader Ngatata Love:

> Te Ati Awa's relationship with [the museum CEO and Kaihautu] is good. The problem lies with the Government. (Crown). They have imposed trustees and stepped across mana whenua. The Museum is national and represents everyone. We, as tangata whenua, see that they need to maintain proper protocols. But when it comes to actual governance we have no say. So there are feelings of hurt and quiet anger because we have expectations that the Government would give us a say in the Museum's governance. Therefore, whether we like it or not, they (the Museum) sit in a situation of being outsiders encroaching upon our rohe, our lands. These consequences, at the political; level, are perhaps not very discernible. This creates resentment amongst our own. But it will change in time. Treaty matters are supposed to be paramount, especially for an institution that is meant to be approaching these issues with sensitivity. But when you get down to real power, the governance in the museum is faulted. (Tapsell 1998: 200)

However Māori decide to resolve these two issues in the future it is becoming increasingly apparent that there is an inconsistency between the nature of Māori representation on the museum board, the notion of mana taonga espoused by the museum and the claim made

by the institution that its goal is to become a bicultural institution.[8] While most people speak of the governance as being at the top of the organisational structure, it may be useful to reverse this notion and consider the governance as the foundation upon which the institution is built. If there is a flaw in the construction of the foundation, it is unlikely that a safe structure will be created. While achieving mandated Māori representation on the board of the museum may be a complex task it may well be the only sound basis upon which to form a meaningful relationship with iwi; a relationship that recognises the rights of the indigenous peoples within the modern nation-state as outlined in the Draft Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and that satisfies the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.

It should be remembered that the Project Development Team for the National Museum of New Zealand recommended in their report in 1985 that a family of three national museums should be created including Te Whare Taonga Tangata Whenua. This recommendation was not accepted by the government and one institution was created with all the components (natural history, art, history, taonga Māori) woven together. Had the recommendation to create a family of museums been accepted, the Project Development Team's governance proposal might also have been accepted: "a single new governing body … the composition of which will express and maintain the unity of the concept" (*Ngā Taonga o Te Motu* 1985: 4). It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that at some future time the Māori component of the Museum of New Zealand may be restructured as an independent institution in a move similar to the establishment of the National Museum of the American Indian that has been established within the family of museums known as the Smithsonian Institution.

---

[8] The Mana Taonga and Bicultural Policies of the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa have been outlined in Chapter Four.

Appendix Two

Māori Participation in Auckland War Memorial Museum Governance

There was no provision for Māori representation in the governance of Auckland War Memorial Museum Te Papa Whakahiku (hereafter Auckland Museum) until the passing of the Auckland War Memorial Museum Act 1996.[1] Prior to 1996, the only Māori to have served on the Auckland Institute and Museum Council was Sir Hugh Kawharu who was first elected in 1966.[2] Sir Hugh was elected to the trust board as a representative of the Auckland Institute, although the Institute would also have been cognisant of his status as a spokesperson for Ngāti Whātua.

In November 1992 the Auckland Museum Council established a Māori advisory body known as Te Rūnanga Matua (Whaanga 1999: 71). The role of Te Rūnanga Matua was to assist in the promotion of biculturalism, to encourage greater involvement of Māori in museum activities and to secure a permanent voice for Māori opinion on the museum council (ibid.: 71). Sir Hugh Kawharu consulted with Tainui and Ngāti Paoa, and representatives of the Auckland District Māori Council and the Auckland Branch of Māori Women's Welfare League over the next two years in preparation for the drafting of the Auckland War Memorial Museum Bill. Although Sir Hugh's initial proposal was that a Ngāti Whātua representative should be appointed directly to the trust board in recognition of tangata whenua status, a lack of consensus amongst Māori in Auckland and beyond meant that this proposal was not included in the draft legislation (Whaanga 1999: 72-4). Sir Hugh's proposal would have been consistent with the direct representation of mana whenua on the board as in the Otago Museum legislation. By 1995 the draft bill stated that a Māori advisory body to be known as the Taumata-ā-Iwi would be established and that the Taumata-ā-Iwi would nominate one person for the museum trust board. The Taumata-ā-Iwi was to consist of one representative from each of Ngāti Whātua o Orakei Māori Trust Board, Tainui Māori Trust Board, Ngāti Paoa Whānau Trust, the Auckland District Māori Council and the Auckland Māori Women's Welfare League.

---

[1] Before 1996 Auckland Museum had been incorporated under the Charitable Trusts Act 1957.
[2] Auckland Institute and Museum Annual Report 1966-67, p. 3. Hugh Kawharu served an initial term from 1966-67 to 1969-70 and has served continuously since the 1980s

In March 1966 the Internal Affairs Select Committee heard objections to the draft bill at Auckland Museum. Waitakere City Council wanted Ngāti Tai ki Tamaki and Kawerau a Maki added to the membership of the Taumata-ā-Iwi. The Hauraki Māori Trust Board submission, made by Buddy Mikaere, sought representation for Hauraki iwi on the Taumata-ā-iwi and wanted more than one Māori representative on the trust board (Whaanga 1999: 75). The select committee made no particular accommodation for the issues raised by the objectors in the final draft of the bill. Instead it simply recommended the establishment of a Taumata-a-Iwi.

The Auckland War Memorial Museum Act 1996 creates the Auckland Museum Trust Board.[3] Section 11 of the act outlines the objectives of the museum:

> In carrying out its functions under section 12 of this act the Board shall recognise and provide for, in such manner as it considers appropriate, the following;
>
> (a) The recording and presentation of the history and environment of the Auckland Region, New Zealand, the South Pacific and, in more general terms, the rest of the world;
>
> (b) Conservation of the heritage of the museum, and of global resources;
>
> (c) The role of the museum as a war memorial
>
> (d) Celebration of the rich cultural diversity of the Auckland Region and its people;
>
> (e) Education which involves and entertains people to enrich their lives and promote the well-being of society;
>
> (f) The advancement and promotion of cultural and scientific scholarship and research;
>
> (g) Achievement of customer satisfaction by consultation, responsiveness, and continuous improvement;
>
> (h) Leadership through professionalism, innovation, and co-ordination of effort of relevant organisations;
>
> (i) Greater financial self-sufficiency through the prudent operation of compatible revenue-producing and fundraising activities which supplement public funding;
>
> (j) Providing maximum community benefit from the resources available.[4]

---

[3] *Auckland War memorial Museum Act* 1996 S3(1)
[4] Ibid.: S11

While Auckland Museum is not a national museum, the New Zealand Parliament has acknowledged the status of the museum, through the Auckland War Memorial Act and the significance not only of the New Zealand collections but also those that have been gathered from the wider world. No other New Zealand museum has such a broadly defined legislative mandate. It is clear in the nature of the governance arrangements outlined in the act that not only are the taonga Māori collections of particular importance but that Māori should be recognised as having an essential role in their management.

The membership of the board is to include five members appointed by the contributing territorial local authorities, four members appointed by the Auckland Museum Institute and, as recommended by the select committee, one member appointed by the Taumata-ā-Iwi. The board is required

> (c) To observe and encourage the spirit of partnership and goodwill envisaged by the Treaty of Waitangi, the implications of mana Māori and elements in the care of Māori cultural property which only Māori can provide;
> …
> (g) To consult with the Taumata-ā-Iwi on all matters set out in section 16(8) of this Act, and to take due regard of the advice given.[5]

The Taumata-ā-Iwi is a "Māori Committee … of not less than 5 persons appointed by the Board".[6] The role of the Taumata-a-Iwi is to:

> (8) Assist the Board to ensure that the Board's policies in relation to the matters set out in paragraphs (a) to (d) of this subsection accord properly with the Māori values as well as matters provided for in the Treaty of Waitangi, the Taumata-a-Iwi shall review proposed policies and make recommendations to the Board in relation to those matters:
> (a) Custodial policies and guardianship of all Māori taonga of whatever kind and tribal source;

---

[5] Ibid.: S12
[6] Ibid.: S16(1)

(b) Staffing policies, including taking affirmative action in recruitment and training programmes, which will lead Māori people into professional careers in New Zealand's bicultural museums;

(c) Display policies, including presentation of Māori taonga to the public in a culturally appropriate and informative manner;

(d) Development policies, including protection of both the substance and status of Māori taonga in any Museum development plan.

(9) The Taumata-ā-Iwi shall give advice on all matters of Māori protocol within the Museum and between the Museum and the Māori people at large.[7]

In the absence of any provision in the act for the composition of the Taumata-ā-Iwi the museum's Manager Iwi Values advised the board that in proceeding to appoint members to the Taumata-ā-Iwi it should have regard for the fact that Ngāti Whātua o Orakei are the mana whenua of the land on which the museum stands. It was stated that this would be consistent with the act's requirement that the board have regard for the Treaty of Waitangi and the implications of mana Māori (Kawharu, H. 2002:10-11; Whaanga 1999: 77-8). From this time the museum chose to recognise the role of the mana whenua iwi in the governance of the institution, taking a different stance on this matter to the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa which adopted the concept of mana taonga. Although Auckland Museum is not a national museum it does hold taonga Māori from throughout Aotearoa and could, on this basis, have chosen to adopt a mana taonga policy.

The museum wrote to the Ngāti Whātua o Orakei Māori Trust Board and "sought advice and assistance in the establishment of the Taumata-ā-Iwi" (Whaanga 1999: 78). Following advice from the Ngāti Whātua o Orakei Trust Board the Auckland Museum Trust Board adopted the following composition for the Taumata-ā-Iwi: three representatives from Ngāti Whātua and one each from Tainui and Ngāti Paoa. The first meeting of the Taumata-ā-Iwi was held on 24 July 1997. The members of the Taumata-ā-Iwi were the chairman Te Puna Tumahai (Ngāti Whātua), Bernard Makoare (Ngāti Whātua), Martin Mariassouce (Ngāti Whātua), Hariata Gordon (Ngāti Paoa), and Mr Rauwhero (Tainui).

---

[7] *Auckland War memorial Museum Act* 1996 S8 and S9

The Taumata-ā-Iwi elected Sir Hugh Kawharu as the Taumata-ā-Iwi representative on the Auckland Museum Trust Board even though he was not a member of the Taumata itself (Whaanga 1999:81-2).

The Taumata-ā-Iwi developed and proposed a statement of guiding principles, known as the Kaupapa, to the Auckland Museum Trust Board. This policy was adopted by the board in October 1998 and revised in December 2001.[8] At the same time as the revision in

[8] The Taumata-a-Iwi Kaupapa (in its 2001 revised form) articulates five principles:

PRINCIPLE I: THE RIGHT TO ADVISE
The Auckland War memorial Museum Act 1996 empowers the Taumata-a-Iwi to give advice on all matters of Māori protocol within the Museum and between the Museum and Māori people at large. Museum policies will reflect the aspirations of both Treaty partners by acknowledging that existing and proposed policies will be reviewed by the Taumata-a-Iwi, and recommendations to the Museum Trust Board will be made accordingly.

PRINCIPLE II: PARTNERSHIP
Both the Auckland Museum Trust Board and the Auckland Museum Taumata-a-Iwi will act reasonably and in utmost good faith by observing and encouraging the spirit of partnership and good will envisaged by the Treaty of Waitangi. The Trust Board recognises the Taumata-a-Iwi's cultural responsibility to wider Māori regarding any implications of mana Māori (lore of the Māori) as measured by mana whenua and associated obligations of manaakitanga (providing hospitality to visitors) or kaitiakitanga (cultural management and protection of taonga and resources) including Māori cultural, intellectual and commercial property rights, and will seek advice and direction in all such cases.

PRINCIPLE III: MĀORI EXPECTATIONS
The Museum recognises the right of all Māori to expect the Taumata-a-Iwi on their behalf as the recognised kaitiaki of the Museum, to
(i)   monitor the management – custody, care, display, accessibility and development - of their taonga within the Museum
(ii)   facilitate repatriation of all whakapakoko, uru moko and kōiwi.

PRINCIPLE IV: ACTIVE PROTECTION
The Taumata-a-Iwi will provide advice to the Auckland Museum Trust Board, and the Trust Board will protect the Taumata-a-Iwi by ensuring the rights of Māori in the Museum are protected, in kaitiakitanga terms, by:
    (i)   safeguarding mana whenua and the lore of Māori
    (ii)   safeguarding the tapu (spiritual restrictions) of the Museum's war shrines
    (iii)   Providing appropriate management - custody, care, display, accessibility and development - of all taonga
    (iv)   Providing all staff and visitors with a culturally safe environment
    (v)   taking affirmative action in recruitment, training and educational (primary, secondary and tertiary) programmes, which will lead Māori people into professional careers in New Zealand's culturally integrated museums.

PRINCIPLE V: REDRESS FOR PAST MISUNDERSTANDINGS
The Museum Trust Board acknowledges that there may be misunderstandings from the past related to taonga that need to be addressed and that there is a responsibility to seek advice from the Taumata-a-Iwi, and to:
    (i)   objectively explore and assess each example as it comes to light
    (ii)   put in place practices that minimise and eliminate future needs for redress.
(Tumahai, Te Puna, 2002. 43)

December 2001 the trust board also adopted the Guiding Principles for the Trust Board's relationship with the Taumata-ā-Iwi.[9] The fact that the trust board and the Taumata-ā-Iwi had to negotiate these two detailed statements about their relationship and the functions of the Taumata-ā-Iwi is a clear indication of the difficulties faced by Māori advisory bodies

---

[9] Guiding Principles for the Auckland War Memorial Museum Trust Board's Relationship with the Taumata-ā-Iwi:

Introduction: To continue to foster a beneficial relationship as envisaged by the Auckland War Memorial Museum Act 1996, the Trust Board and the Taumata-a-Iwi acknowledge the following:

1. The Trust Board Acts in the interests of the Museum/Te Papa Whakahiku, and all treasures and trusts within its care.
2. The Trust Board exercises trusteeship over the Museum/Te Papa Whakahiku, and all treasures and trusts within its care.
3. The Trust Board recognises the spirit of partnership and goodwill envisaged by the Treaty of Waitangi.
4. The Trust Board recognises the principle of mana whenua with regard to Te Papa Whakahiku and its taonga.
5. The Trust Board recognises the principle of mana whenua in making appointments to the Taumata-ā-Iwi.
6. The Trust Board and Taumata-a-Iwi have trusteeship obligations toward ngā iwi o te motu.
7. The Trust Board will seek advice from the Taumata-ā-Iwi on ways of ensuring that the Board's policies relating to
   (a) Custodial policies and guardianship of Māori taonga of whatever kind and tribal source;
   (b) Staffing policies, including affirmative action in recruitment and training programmes, which will lead Māori people into professional careers in New Zealand's culturally integrated museums;
   (c) Display policies, including presentation of Māori taonga to the public in a culturally appropriate and informative manner; and
   (d) Development policies, including protection of both the substance and status of taonga Māori in any Museum plan; give proper regard to Māori values; and those matters provided for in the Treaty of Waitangi.
8. The Trust Board recognises the right of the Taumata-a-Iwi to give advice on all matters of Māori protocol.
9. The Trust Board recognises the value of a direct relationship with the Taumata-a-Iwi, and will encourage hui where that is identified as being appropriate.
10. In giving effect to its special relationship with the Taumata-a-Iwi, the Trust Board recognises the following principles:
    (a) The right of the Taumata-a-Iwi to advise the Trust Board;
    (b) The principle of partnership;
    (c) The principle of trusteeship;
    (d) Active protection to ensure physical and cultural safety;
    (e) Resolution of past misunderstandings.
11. Where the Trust Board requests or the Taumata-a-Iwi provides formal advice to the Trust Board, that request or advice shall be in writing and shall clearly state:
12. (a) the grounds for that advice,
13. any alternative means or options required or available,
14. whether and on what basis, recommendations are to be made; and
15. the implications of not accepting the advice.
12. The Trust Board recognises the Tumuaki Māori Director has a dual role with respect to the Trust Board and the Taumata-a-Iwi:
    (a) as a member of executive management reporting through the Director to the Trust Board;
    (b) as a provider of services and advice to the Taumata-a-Iwi and consulting with it on such other matters as are delegated to the Tumuaki Māori from time to time by the Director.

(Tumahai, Te Puna 2002.: 42.)

within museum structures. If the museum act provided for an adequate level of Māori representation on the trust board this situation might not arise because an advisory body of this nature might not be required.

Kawharu outlines the purpose of the Kaupapa:

> The kaupapa has provided direction for both the Trust Board and the Taumata in their respective responsibilities. For the Taumata, the kaupapa and the Act prescribe general criteria for inter-relating not only with the Museum Trust Board and management but also with the wider community, with tangata whenua and other tribal groups who have taonga in the museum, as well as other indigenous communities (Kawharu, M. 2002:299).

Whaanga reports that following the adoption of the Kaupapa the trust board held three workshops, none of which were attended by the members of the Taumata-a-Iwi, to develop new statements of vision, mission, values and commitment.

> It is noticeable that references to biculturalism, partnership and mana Māori have all been removed, and the commitment to goodwill has been reduced to a statement of "respect for…the goodwill envisaged in the Treaty of Waitangi (Whaanga 1999;117)

Whaanga reviewed the level of recognition and effectiveness of the Kaupapa up to the time of her writing in 1999:

> The Trust Board has already devoted considerable resources and time to the development of plans and programmes to fulfill the obligations set out in Sections 11 and 12 of the Act. As yet, they have not addressed the Treaty obligations that are written into the Act. To address these inequalities, and conform with the Museum's Treaty obligations, either amendments need to be made to the legislation, or the Trust Board needs to take the initiative and look at developing a constitution or comprehensive operational policy that is Treaty-based (Whaanga 1999: 128).

Whaanga has also provided an account of the consultation process undertaken by the museum to gain approval for proceeding with the installation of new taonga Māori

exhibitions in 1999. She records critical comments made about this process and the planned exhibitions by individuals and collectives from Te Arawa, Ngā Puhi, Ngāti Porou and Ngāti Kahungunu (ibid: 129-144). These comments suggest that the Taumata-a-Iwi had not been able to ensure that the museum undertook appropriate consultation in the preparation of the new exhibits. Kawharu confirms Whaanga's comments about the lack of appropriate consultation (Kawharu, M. 2000: 301). While Kawharu's assessment of the governance arrangements at Auckland War Memorial Museum is perhaps more positive than that provided by Whaanga, she nevertheless concludes that "operational problems continue to paralyse the implementation of kaitiakitanga fully"(Kawharu, M. 2002:301). Kawharu also acknowledges the structural limitations of the governance model:

As primarily an advisory body, the taumata has minimal decision-making powers in comparison to the Board. Despite the act requiring the Board's policies to accord properly with matters provided for in the Treaty (section 16 (8)), and despite principles two and four of the kaupapa relating to partnership and active protection of Māori interests, little by way of equal partnership exists (Ibid.: 300)